



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
29 December 2021

Original: English

---

**Human Rights Council**  
**Twenty-fifth session**  
3-28 March 2014  
Agenda item 1  
**Organizational and procedural matters**

## **Report of the Human Rights Council on its twenty-fifth session**

*Vice-President and Rapporteur:* Ms. Kateřina **Sequensová** (Czech Republic)



## Contents

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
Part One: Resolutions, decisions and President's statements adopted by the Human Rights Council at its twenty-fifth session.....	4
I. Resolutions.....	4
II. Decisions .....	5
III. President's statements .....	6
Part Two: Summary of proceedings.....	7
I. Organizational and procedural matters.....	7
A. Opening and duration of the session .....	7
B. Attendance .....	7
C. High-level segment.....	7
D. General segment .....	13
E. Agenda and programme of work .....	14
F. Organization of work .....	14
G. Meetings and documentation .....	15
H. Election of members of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee .....	15
I. Selection and appointment of mandate holders .....	15
J. Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	16
K. Adoption of the report of the session .....	17
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.....	17
A. Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights .....	17
B. Reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General .....	19
C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	20
III. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development.....	22
A. Panels.....	22
B. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders .....	26
C. Interactive dialogue with Special Advisers and Representatives of the Secretary-General .....	32
D. General debate on agenda item 3 .....	35
E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	37
IV. Human rights situations that require the Council's attention .....	52
A. Interactive dialogue with the commission of inquiry on human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.....	52
B. Interactive dialogue with the commission of inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic.....	52
C. Interactive dialogue with special procedures mandate holders .....	53
D. General debate on agenda item 4 .....	54

E.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	55
V.	Human rights bodies and mechanisms .....	59
A.	Complaint procedure .....	59
B.	Forum on Minority Issues .....	59
C.	General debate on agenda item 5 .....	59
VI.	Universal periodic review .....	61
A.	Consideration of the universal periodic review outcomes .....	61
B.	General debate on agenda item 6 .....	134
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	136
VII.	Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories .....	138
A.	Interactive dialogue with the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian occupied territories since 1967 .....	138
B.	Reports of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General .....	138
C.	General debate on agenda item 7 .....	139
D.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	139
VIII.	Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action .....	143
A.	General debate on agenda item 8 .....	143
IX.	Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action .....	144
A.	General debate on agenda item 9 .....	144
B.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	144
X.	Technical assistance and capacity-building .....	146
A.	Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders .....	146
B.	General debate on agenda item 10 .....	147
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	148
Annexes		
I.	Attendance .....	151
II.	Agenda .....	158
III.	Documents issued for the twenty-fifth session .....	159
IV.	Advisory Committee member elected by the Human Rights Council at its twenty-fifth session .....	195
V.	Special procedure mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its organizational meeting of 8 May 2014 .....	196

## Part One

### Resolutions, decisions and President's statements adopted by the Human Rights Council at its twenty-fifth session

#### I. Resolutions

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
25/1	Promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka	27 March 2014
25/2	Freedom of opinion and expression: mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression	27 March 2014
25/3	Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights	27 March 2014
25/4	Integrity of the judicial system	27 March 2014
25/5	Mandate of the Independent Expert on minority issues	27 March 2014
25/6	Rights of the child: access to justice for children	27 March 2014
25/7	Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism	27 March 2014
25/8	The role of good governance in the promotion and protection of human rights	27 March 2014
25/9	The negative impact of the non-repatriation of funds of illicit origin to the countries of origin on the enjoyment of human rights, and the importance of improving international cooperation	27 March 2014
25/10	Ending violence against children: a global call to make the invisible visible	27 March 2014
25/11	Question of the realization in all countries of economic, social and cultural rights	27 March 2014
25/12	Freedom of religion or belief	27 March 2014
25/13	Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment: mandate of the Special Rapporteur	27 March 2014
25/14	The right to food	27 March 2014
25/15	Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order	27 March 2014
25/16	Mandate of the Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights	27 March 2014
25/17	Adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living	28 March 2014
25/18	Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders	28 March 2014
25/19	Promotion of the enjoyment of the cultural rights of everyone and respect for cultural diversity	28 March 2014

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
25/20	The right to education of persons with disabilities	28 March 2014
25/21	Human rights and the environment	28 March 2014
25/22	Ensuring use of remotely piloted aircraft or armed drones in counter-terrorism and military operations in accordance with international law, including international human rights and humanitarian law	28 March 2014
25/23	The continuing grave deterioration of the human rights and humanitarian situation in the Syrian Arab Republic	28 March 2014
25/24	Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran	28 March 2014
25/25	Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea	28 March 2014
25/26	Situation of human rights in Myanmar	28 March 2014
25/27	Right of the Palestinian people to self-determination	28 March 2014
25/28	Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan	28 March 2014
25/29	Human rights situation in Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem	28 March 2014
25/30	Follow-up to the report of the United Nations Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict	28 March 2014
25/31	Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan	28 March 2014
25/32	Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance	28 March 2014
25/33	International Decade for People of African Descent	28 March 2014
25/34	Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping and stigmatization of, and discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against, persons based on religion or belief	28 March 2014
25/35	Strengthening of technical cooperation and consultative services in Guinea	28 March 2014
25/36	Assistance to the Republic of Mali in the field of human rights	28 March 2014
25/37	Technical assistance for Libya in the field of human rights	28 March 2014
25/38	The promotion and protection of human rights in the context of peaceful protests	28 March 2014

## II. Decisions

<i>Decision</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
25/101	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Saudi Arabia	19 March 2014
25/102	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Senegal	19 March 2014
25/103	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Nigeria	20 March 2014
25/104	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Mexico	20 March 2014

<i>Decision</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
25/105	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Mauritius	20 March 2014
25/106	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Jordan	20 March 2014
25/107	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Malaysia	20 March 2014
25/108	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Central African Republic	20 March 2014
25/109	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Belize	20 March 2014
25/110	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Chad	20 March 2014
25/111	Outcome of the universal periodic review: China	20 March 2014
25/112	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Monaco	21 March 2014
25/113	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Congo	21 March 2014
25/114	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Malta	21 March 2014
25/115	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Israel	27 March 2014
25/116	Postponement of the renewal of the mandate of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances	27 March 2014
25/117	Panel on the right to privacy in the digital age	27 March 2014

### III. President's statements

<i>President's statement</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
PRST 25/1	Situation of human rights in Haiti	28 March 2014
PRST 25/2	Situation of human rights in South Sudan	28 March 2014

## **Part Two**

### **Summary of proceedings**

#### **I. Organizational and procedural matters**

##### **A. Opening and duration of the session**

1. The Human Rights Council held its twenty-fifth session at the United Nations Office at Geneva from 3 to 28 March 2014. The President of the Council opened the session.
2. At the 1st meeting, on 3 March 2014, the President of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the President and Head of the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Didier Burkhalter, addressed the plenary.
3. At the 13th meeting, on 7 March 2014, the Human Rights Council observed International Women's Day, which was celebrated on 8 March 2014. The High Commissioner and the Acting Director-General of the United Nations Office at Geneva made statements. The Permanent Representative of Romania to the United Nations Office at Geneva also made a statement on behalf of the Group of Women Ambassadors to the United Nations in Geneva.
4. 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 on the twenty-fifth session was held on 17 February 2014.
5. During the twenty-fifth session, 56 meetings were held over 20 days (see para. 55 below).

##### **B. Attendance**

6. The session was attended by representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council, observer States of the Council, observers for non-member States of the United Nations and other observers, and also by 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. High-level segment**

7. At its 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 5th, 7th, 8th and 10th meetings, from 3 to 6 March 2014, the Human Rights Council held a high-level segment, at which 94 dignitaries addressed the plenary, including one president, one vice-president, one prime minister, four deputy prime ministers, 40 ministers, 40 deputy ministers and seven representatives of observer organizations.
8. The following dignitaries addressed the Human Rights Council during the high-level segment, in the order that they spoke:
  - (a) At the 1st meeting, on 3 March 2014: the President of Tunisia, Moncef Marzouki; the Vice-President of Colombia, Angelino Garzón; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Argentina, Héctor Marcos Timerman; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Sergey V. Lavrov; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Liechtenstein, Aurelia Frick; the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Regional Cooperation of Burkina Faso, Yipènè Djibril Bassolé; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Paraguay, Eladio Ramón Loizaga Lezcano; the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Francophonie and Regional Integration of Gabon, Emmanuel Issoze-Ngondet; and the Minister for Human Rights of Iraq, Mohamed Shyaa Al-Sudani;
  - (b) At the 2nd meeting, on the same day: the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Namibia, Netumbo Nandi-Ndaitwah; the Minister for Justice and Liberties of Morocco, El Mostapha

Ramid; the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece, Dimitris Kourkoulas; the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Montenegro, Igor Lukšić; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Eritrea, Osman Saleh Mohammed; the Minister for Human Rights of Yemen, Hooria Mashhoor Ahmed; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Guatemala, Luis Fernando Carrera Castro; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Nikola Poposki; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Maldives, Dunya Maumoon; the Minister's Assistant for International Cooperation Affairs of Qatar, Mohammed bin Abdulrahman bin Jassim Al-Thani; the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan, Yerzhan Ashikbayev; the Minister of State at the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Ireland, Joe Costello; the Secretary of State for Foreign and European Affairs of Slovakia, Peter Javorčík; the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Slovenia, Bogdan Benko; the Minister of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Hugo Swire; the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Italy, Benedetto della Vedova; and the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Viet Nam, Pham Binh Minh;

(c) At the 3rd meeting, on the same day: the Secretary General of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, Iyad Ameen Madani; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Albania, Ditmir Bushati; the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation of the Congo, Basile Ikouebe; the Minister of State (Foreign Affairs and Consular) of Canada, Lynne Yelich; the Executive Director of the United Nations Population Fund, Babatunde Osotimehin; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Elías Jaua Milano; the Director-General for Legal Affairs of Sweden, Anders Rönquist; the Undersecretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Poland, Artur Nowak-Far; the Minister of Justice and Human Rights of Angola, Rui Carneiro Manguera (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries); the Undersecretary for Policy, Department of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, Evan P. Garcia; the Secretary General of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, Anders Johnsson; the Assistant Minister, Directorate General for Multilateral Affairs and Global Issues in the Ministry for Foreign and European Affairs of Croatia, Vesna Batistić-Kos; and the Parliamentary Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, Hirotaka Ishihara;

(d) At the 5th meeting, on 4 March: the Prime Minister of Vanuatu, Moana Carcasses Kalosil; the Third Deputy Prime Minister for Human Rights of Equatorial Guinea, Alfonso Nsue Mokuy; the Minister for State and Foreign Affairs of Portugal, Rui Chancerelle de Machete; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Estonia, Urmas Paet; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Malaysia, Dato Sri Anifah Aman; the Minister for International Relations and Cooperation of South Africa, Maite Nkoana-Mashabane; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Lithuania, Linas Linkevičius; the Deputy-Minister for Foreign Affairs of El Salvador, Juan José García; the Minister and President of the Human Rights Commission of Saudi Arabia, Bandar bin Mohammed Alaiban; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic, Lubomír Zaorálek; the Minister for External Relations of Cameroon, Pierre Moukoko Mbonjo; the Minister for Justice and Human Rights of Angola, Rui Carneiro Manguera; the President of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), Peter Maurer; the Director-General, Department for External Relations and Cooperation of Monaco, Mireille Pettiti; the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Dominican Republic, José Manuel Trullols; the Deputy State Secretary, Political Director of Hungary, Szabolcs Takács; the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Emirates, Anwar Mohamad Gargash; the Undersecretary of State for Legal Affairs of Denmark, Jonas Bering Liisberg; the Assistant Minister for Foreign Affairs of Serbia, Roksanda Ninčić; and the Undersecretary for Civilian Security, Democracy and Human Rights of the United States of America, Sarah Seawall;

(e) At the 7th meeting, on 5 March: the Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Honduras, Mireya Agüero de Corrales; the Attorney General and Minister for Justice, Legislation and Human Rights of Benin, Valentin Djenontin-Agossou; the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Belgium, Didier Reynders; the Minister for Law, Human Rights and Constitutional Affairs of Lesotho, Haee Phoofo; the Minister for External Affairs of Sri Lanka, G.L. Peiris; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Latvia, Edgars Rinkēvičs; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria, Ramtane Lamamra; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Armenia, Edward Nalbandian; the Minister for Justice, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs of Zimbabwe, Emmerson D. Mnangagwa; the



Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea, Yun Byung-se; the Minister of the Secretariat for Human Rights of the Presidency of Brazil, Maria do Rosário Nunes; and the Deputy Minister for Human Rights, Ministry of the Interior of Mexico, Lía Limón García;

(f) At the 8th meeting, on the same day: the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Georgia, Maia Panjikidze; the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Sierra Leone, Ebon Strasser-King; the Minister for Human Rights of Togo, Yacoubou Hamadou; the Deputy Minister for Human Rights of the Congo, Sakina Binti; the Minister and Chairman of the National Human Rights Centre of Uzbekistan, Akmal Saidov; the Minister for Justice of Libya, Salah El-Marghani; the Assistant Foreign Minister for Multilateral Affairs and International Security of Egypt, Hisham Badr; the Commissioner for Human Rights, Humanitarian Action and Relations with Civil Society of Mauritania, Aichetou Mint M'Haiham; the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Spain, Gonzalo de Benito Secades; the Federal Government Commissioner for Human Rights Policy and Humanitarian Aid of Germany, Christoph Straesser; the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mongolia, Damba Gankhuyag; the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Peter Stenlund; and the Solicitor General of Zambia, Musa Mwenye;

(g) At the 10th meeting, on 6 March: the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bahrain, Khalid Bin Ahmed Bin Mohamed Al-Khalifa; the Deputy Minister for Justice of Ghana, Dominic Ayine; the Secretary-General of the Commonwealth, Kamallesh Sharma; the Deputy Minister for Justice and Human Rights of Ecuador, Nadia Ruiz; the Minister for Justice, Attorney General, in charge of Judicial Reform and Human Rights of the Central African Republic, Isabelle Gaudeville; the Permanent Secretary for Foreign Affairs of Thailand, Sihasak Phuangketkeow; the Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Morteza Sarmadi; the Deputy Minister and Undersecretary, Ministry of Justice of the Sudan, Isam Eldin Abdelgadir Elzien; the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cuba, Abelardo Moreno Fernández; and the Assistant High Commissioner for Refugees, Janet Lim.

9. At the 3rd meeting, on 3 March, the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Japan, the Russian Federation and Ukraine made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

11. At the 6th meeting, on 4 March, the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Indonesia, Saudi Arabia and the Syrian Arab Republic made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

12. At the same meeting, the representatives of Saudi Arabia and the Syrian Arab Republic made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

13. At the 10th meeting, on 6 March, the representatives of Albania, Azerbaijan, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Japan, the Republic of Korea and the Syrian Arab Republic made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

14. At the 11th meeting, on 6 March, the representatives of Algeria, Armenia, Bahrain, China, Iraq, Morocco, the Philippines, Serbia and Uganda made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

#### **High-level panel on human rights mainstreaming**

16. At the 4th meeting, on 4 March 2014, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to its resolution 16/21, a high-level panel discussion to further the objective of promoting the mainstreaming of human rights throughout the United Nations system, with a focus on the human rights of migrants. The Council listened to a video message from the Deputy Secretary-General on the subject of the panel discussion. Opening statements for the panel were delivered by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights; the Ambassador and Permanent Observer of the African Union to the United Nations Office and

other international organizations in Geneva, Jean-Marie Ehouzou; and the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Italy, Benedetto della Vedova. The Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants, François Crépeau, gave a keynote address.

17. At the same meeting, the panellists Guy Ryder, Laura Thompson, Volker Türk, John Sandage and Christian Salazar made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two parts.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Burkina Faso, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ethiopia (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Belarus, Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Thailand, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam), Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Philippines, Senegal<sup>1</sup> (on behalf of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Sierra Leone;

(b) Representatives of observer States: El Salvador, Portugal;

(c) Observer for a national human rights institution: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme de Mauritanie;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Catholic Migration Commission, Save the Children International.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, Indonesia, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Egypt, Switzerland;

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

(d) Observer for ICRC;

(e) Observer for a national human rights institution: Conseil consultatif des droits de l'homme du Maroc.

20. At the same meeting, the panellists made their concluding remarks.

### **High-level dialogue with relevant United Nations entities on the promotion of preventative approaches within the United Nations system**

21. At the 6th meeting, on 4 March 2014, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to a decision taken by the Council at its organizational meeting on 16 December 2013, a high-level dialogue on the promotion of preventative approaches within the United Nations system. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made introductory remarks for the panel. Paola Gaeta, Professor at the Faculty of Law of the University of Geneva and Adjunct Professor of International Law at the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies moderated the discussion for the panel.

22. At the same meeting, the panellists Michael Møller, Adama Dieng, Kyung-wha Kang, Wilder Tayler and Anne-Birgitte Albrechtsen made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two parts.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Burkina Faso, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Maldives, Morocco (on behalf of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Namibia, Russian Federation (also on behalf

<sup>1</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

of Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Myanmar, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Sierra Leone, Uruguay<sup>2</sup> (also on behalf of Chile, Costa Rica, Ghana, Hungary, Maldives, Morocco, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Spain and Ukraine);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Denmark, Hungary, Poland;

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

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Austria, Brazil, China, France, India, Indonesia, Montenegro, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Egypt, Norway, Switzerland, Turkey;

(c) Observer for ICRC.

25. At the same meeting, the panellists made their concluding remarks.

### **High-level panel discussion on the question of the death penalty**

26. At the 9th meeting, on 5 March 2014, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council decision 22/117, a high-level panel discussion on the question of the death penalty with the aim of exchanging views on advances, best practices and challenges relating to the abolition of the death penalty and to the introduction of a moratorium on executions, and on national debates or processes on whether to abolish the death penalty. The Council listened to a video message by the Secretary-General on the subject of the panel discussion. An opening statement for the panel was delivered by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Nicolas Niemtchinow, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of France to the United Nations Office at Geneva, moderated the discussion for the panel.

27. At the same meeting, the panellists Valentin Djenontin-Agossou, Khadija Rouissi, Kirk Bloodsworth and Asma Jahangir made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two parts.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Brazil (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries), Ireland, Kuwait (on behalf of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf), Namibia, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore<sup>3</sup> (also on behalf of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, the Sudan, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam and Yemen), Switzerland<sup>3</sup> (also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Mongolia, New Zealand, Sudan;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, International Harm Reduction Association (IHRA), Penal Reform International.

<sup>2</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

<sup>3</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

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

- (a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Austria, China, France, Indonesia, Italy, Mexico, Morocco;
- (b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belgium, Egypt, Rwanda, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland;
- (c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: Council of Europe;
- (d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

30. At the same meeting, the panellists made their concluding remarks.

#### **High-level panel discussion dedicated to the sixty-fifth anniversary of the Convention on the Prevention of the Crime of Genocide**

31. At the 14th meeting, on 7 March 2014, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 22/22, a high-level discussion dedicated to the sixty-fifth anniversary of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. Opening statements for the panel were delivered by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Armenia, Edward Nalbandian.

32. At the same meeting, the panellists Esther Mujawayo, Adama Dieng and Jonathan Sisson made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two parts.

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

- (a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Cuba (also on behalf of Belarus, China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Myanmar, Nicaragua, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, the United Arab Emirates, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam), Estonia, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Montenegro, Sierra Leone;
- (b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Portugal, Turkey;
- (c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;
- (d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: European Union of Public Relations, Indian Council of South America (CISA), World Environment and Resources Council (WERC).

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

- (a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Morocco, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);
- (b) Representatives of observer States: Azerbaijan, Belgium, Egypt, Hungary, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Rwanda, Slovenia, Spain, Sudan;
- (c) Observer for ICRC;
- (d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

35. At the same meeting, the panellists made their concluding remarks.

#### **High-level dialogue on the lessons learned and the continuing challenges in combating sexual violence in the Democratic Republic of the Congo**

36. At the 47th meeting, on 25 March 2014, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 24/27, a high-level dialogue on the lessons learned and the continuing challenges in combating sexual violence in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to allow countries in conflict and post-conflict situations to share their experiences in the area. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights delivered the opening statement for the panel.

37. At the same meeting, the panellists Wivine Mumba Matipa, Jean-Marie Ehouzou, Zainab Hawa Bangura, Abdallah Wafy, Pramila Patten and Julienne Lusenge made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two parts.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Brazil, Czech Republic, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), France, Germany, Ireland, Montenegro, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belgium, Canada;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Médecins sans Frontières (International), World Young Women's Christian Association (also on behalf of Femmes Afrique Solidarité and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom).

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

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

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland;

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

(d) Observer for ICRC;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Comité international pour le respect et l'application de la Charte africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples (CIRAC).

40. At the same meeting, the panellists made their concluding remarks.

## **D. General segment**

41. At the 11th meeting, on 6 March 2014, a general segment was held, during which the following addressed the Human Rights Council:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Council: Botswana, China, Côte d'Ivoire, France, India, Romania, Viet Nam (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN));

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iceland, Madagascar, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Republic of Moldova, United Republic of Tanzania, Turkmenistan, Ukraine;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: Council of Europe;

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

(e) Invited members of civil society: Tetiana Pechonchyk, Issa Amro, Priti Darooka (by video message), Entisar Ariabi.

42. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iraq, Italy and Japan made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

## **E. Agenda and programme of work**

44. At the 12th meeting, on 6 March 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted its agenda and programme of work for the twenty-fifth session.

## **F. Organization of work**

45. At the 4th meeting, on 4 March 2014, the President outlined the modalities for the high-level panel discussion on human rights mainstreaming, which would be two minutes for States Members of the Human Rights Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

46. At the 11th meeting, on 6 March, the President outlined the modalities for the general segment, which would be five minutes for statements by States Members of the Human Rights Council and three minutes for statements by observer States and other observers.

47. At the 12th meeting, on 6 March, the President outlined the modalities for the electronic inscription in the list of speakers for the interactive dialogue on the annual report of the High Commissioner.

48. At the same meeting, on the same day, the President outlined the modalities for the interactive dialogue on the annual report of the High Commissioner, which would be three minutes for States Members of the Human Rights Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

49. At the 14th meeting, on 7 March, the President outlined the modalities for the electronic inscription in the list of speakers for the high-level panel discussion dedicated to the sixty-fifth anniversary of the Convention on the Prevention of the Crime of Genocide.

50. At the 16th meeting, on 10 March, the President outlined the modalities for clustered interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders, which would be 10 minutes for the presentation by the mandate holder of the main report, with a further 2 minutes to present each additional report; 5 minutes for States concerned, if any, and States Members of the Human Rights Council; 3 minutes for statements by observer States and other observers; and 5 minutes for concluding remarks by the mandate holder.

51. At the 25th meeting, on 13 March, the President outlined the modalities for the annual full-day meeting on the rights of the child, which would be seven minutes for panellists, two minutes for States Members of the Human Rights Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

52. At the 28th meeting, on 14 March, the President outlined the modalities for the general debate on agenda item 3, which would be three minutes for States Members of the Human Rights Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

53. At the 31st meeting, on 17 March, the President outlined the modalities for individual interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders, which would be 10 minutes for the presentation by the mandate holder of the report, 5 minutes for States concerned, if any, three minutes for Member States and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

54. At the 38th meeting, on 19 March, the President outlined the modalities 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 Council resolution 16/21; and up to 20 minutes for stakeholders to make general comments on the outcome of the review.

## **G. Meetings and documentation**

55. The Human Rights Council held 56 fully serviced meetings during its twenty-fifth session.

56. The list of resolutions, decisions and President’s statements adopted by the Human Rights Council is contained in Part One of the present report.

## **H. Election of members of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee**

57. At its 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the Human Rights Council elected, pursuant to Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, an expert to the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee. The Council had before it a note by the Secretary-General (A/HRC/25/18 and Add.1) containing the nomination of the candidate for election, in accordance with Council decision 6/102, and the biographical data of the candidate.

58. The candidate was Karla Hananía de Varela (El Salvador), nominated by the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States.

59. The number of candidates for the regional group (Latin American and Caribbean States) corresponded to the number of seats to be filled. The practice of holding a secret ballot pursuant to paragraph 70 of Human Rights Council resolution 5/1 was dispensed with and Ms. Hananía de Varela was elected as member of the Advisory Committee by consensus (see annex IV).

## **I. Selection and appointment of mandate holders**

60. At its 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the Human Rights Council decided to postpone its approval of the list of candidates presented by the President of the Council for the 19 vacancies (see para. 61 below) to an organizational meeting of the Council to be held before the end of the nineteenth session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (from 28 April to 9 May 2014). The Council also decided that the term of office of current mandate holders would be extended until their successors take up their functions.

61. The following special procedure mandate holders were due to be appointed:

- Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights
- Independent Expert on the enjoyment of all human rights by older persons
- Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Somalia
- Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context
- Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery, including its causes and consequences
- Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights
- Special Rapporteur on the right to food

- Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples
- Special Rapporteur on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography
- Special Rapporteur on the situation on human rights defenders
- Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar
- Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967
- Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (member from Asia-Pacific States)
- Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (member from Western European and other States)
- Working Group on Arbitrary Detention (member from African States)
- Working Group on Arbitrary Detention (member from Latin American and Caribbean States)
- Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances (member from African States)
- Working Group on the issue of discrimination against women in law and in practice (member from Latin American and Caribbean States)
- 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 Asia-Pacific States)

62. At its organizational meeting, on 8 May 2014, the Human Rights Council appointed 19 special procedure mandate holders in accordance with Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21 and its decision 6/102 (see annex V). The representatives of Argentina, Chile (also on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ethiopia, Germany, India, Kuwait, Pakistan and Peru made statements on the appointment of the mandate holders.

## **J. Consideration of and action on draft proposals**

### **Postponement of the renewal of the mandate of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances**

63. At the 53rd meeting, on 27 March 2014, the representative of France introduced draft decision A/HRC/24/L.4, sponsored by Argentina, France, Japan and Morocco. Subsequently, Armenia, Honduras, Portugal and the Republic of Moldova joined the sponsors.

64. 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 decision. The Chief of Finance and Budget Section of the Office of the High Commissioner (OHCHR) made a statement on the budgetary implications of the draft decision.

65. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision A/HRC/24/L.4 without a vote (decision 25/116).

### **Situation of human rights in South Sudan**

66. At the 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the President of the Human Rights Council introduced draft President's statement A/HRC/25/L.34 as orally revised.

67. At the same meeting, the representatives of Chile, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States) and Italy (on behalf of the European Union) made general comments on the draft statement.

68. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft President's statement A/HRC/25/L.34 (PRST/25/2).



## **K. Adoption of the report of the session**

69. At the 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representatives of Australia and Libya made statements as observer States with regard to the resolutions adopted.

70. At the same meeting, the Vice-President and Rapporteur of the Human Rights Council made a statement in connection with the draft report of the Council on its twenty-fifth session (A/HRC/25/2).

71. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft report and referendum and decided to entrust the Rapporteur with its finalization.

72. At the same meeting, the representatives of Egypt (also on behalf of Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Mauritania, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Turkmenistan, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe), Lithuania, Morocco, Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Algeria, Armenia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cambodia, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen and the State of Palestine) and the observers for the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of Reporters sans frontières international – Reporters Without Borders International) made statements in connection with the session.

73. 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. Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights**

74. At the 12th meeting, on 6 March 2014, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement in connection with her annual report (A/HRC/25/19 and Corr.1).

75. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, and at the 13th meeting, on 7 March, the following made statements and asked the High Commissioner questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Cuba, Czech Republic, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), France, Germany, Iceland<sup>4</sup> (also on behalf of Austria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of

<sup>4</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

America), India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)<sup>4</sup> (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Ireland, Japan, Kuwait, Maldives, Montenegro, Morocco, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam, Yemen<sup>4</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Armenia, Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Uruguay, Uzbekistan;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Center for Inquiry, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) (also on behalf Asociación Civil and Conectas Derechos Humanos), CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Federation, France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand (also on behalf of Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples), Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights Watch, International Buddhist Foundation (IBF), International Harm Reduction Association (IHRA), 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, Reporters sans frontières international – Reporters Without Borders International, United Nations Watch, Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik (also on behalf of the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission).

76. At the 12th meeting, on 6 March, the High Commissioner answered questions.

77. At the same meeting, the representative of Ukraine made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

78. At the 13th meeting, on 7 March, the High Commissioner answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

79. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, China, Egypt, Iraq and Morocco made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

80. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria and Morocco made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

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

81. At the 28th meeting, on 14 March 2014, the Deputy High Commissioner presented thematic reports prepared by the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General under agenda items 2 and 3.

82. At its 28th, 29th and 30th meetings, on 14 March, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on thematic reports presented by the Deputy High Commissioner (see chap. III, sect. D).

83. At the 44th meeting, on 24 March, the High Commissioner presented the reports prepared by the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General under agenda items 2 and 7 (see chap. VII, sect. B).

84. At the 51st meeting, on 26 March, the High Commissioner presented the report prepared by the Office of the High Commissioner on promoting reconciliation and accountability in Sri Lanka (A/HRC/25/23). In accordance with Council resolution 22/1, the presentation was followed by a discussion on the implementation of that resolution.

85. At the same meeting, the representative of Sri Lanka made a statement as the State concerned.

86. During the ensuing general debate at the same meeting, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Austria, China, Cuba, France, Germany, Greece<sup>5</sup> (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iceland, Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Ireland, Japan, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Canada, Denmark, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Nigeria, Norway, South Sudan, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Uganda, Uzbekistan, Zimbabwe;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action contre la faim, Amnesty International, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Association of World Citizens, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Human Rights Law Centre, Human Rights Watch, International Buddhist Foundation (IBF), International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Commission of Jurists, International Educational Development, Inc., International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR), Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada, Collectif des femmes africaines du Hainaut, Liberation, Norwegian Refugee Council, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, United Nations Watch, Vivekananda Sevakendra-O-Sishu Uddyan, World Barua Organization (WBO), World Evangelical Alliance (WEA).

87. At the same meeting, the representative of Sri Lanka made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

88. At the 52nd meeting, on 26 March, the Deputy High Commissioner introduced the country-specific reports submitted under agenda item 2 (A/HRC/25/19/Add. 1, Add.2, Add.2 and Corr.1, and Add.3, A/HRC/25/21 and A/HRC/25/26).

89. At the same meeting, the representatives of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Colombia, Cyprus, Guatemala and Iran (Islamic Republic of) made statements as the States concerned.

90. During the ensuing general debate on country-specific reports submitted under agenda item 2, at the same meeting, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Costa Rica, Greece<sup>6</sup> (on behalf of European Union, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), India, Ireland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America (also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belarus, Greece, Hungary, Norway, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine;

(c) Observer for the Holy See;

(d) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: Council of Europe;

<sup>5</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

<sup>6</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation, Amnesty International, Colombian Commission of Jurists, France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Indian Council of South America, International Buddhist Foundation (IBF), International Catholic Child Bureau, Collectif des femmes africaines du Hainaut, Oidhaco, Bureau international des droits humains – Action Colombie, Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, Vivekananda Sevakendra-O-Sishu Uddyan, World Organisation against Torture.

91. At the same meeting, the representatives of Bolivia (Plurinational Republic of), Cyprus, Greece, Turkey and the Russian Federation made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

92. At the 52nd meeting, on 26 March 2014, the Deputy High Commissioner presented the reports prepared by the High Commissioner under agenda items 2 and 10 (see chap. X, sect. B).

## C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

### Promoting reconciliation, accountability, and human rights in Sri Lanka

93. At the 53rd meeting, on 27 March 2014, the representatives of Mauritius, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.1/Rev.1, sponsored by Mauritius, Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, and co-sponsored by Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland. Subsequently, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Czech Republic, Malta and Slovenia joined the sponsors.

94. At the same meeting, the representatives of Italy (on behalf of the European Union), Montenegro and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made general comments on the draft resolution.

95. At the same meeting, the representative of Sri Lanka made a statement as the State concerned.

96. 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. The Chief of the OHCHR Finance and Budget Section made a statement on the budgetary implications of the draft resolution.

97. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Maldives, Pakistan, the Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

98. Also at the same meeting, in accordance with rule 116 of the rules of procedures, Pakistan moved for the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. Cuba and the Russian Federation made statements in favour of the motion. Montenegro and the United States of America made statements against the motion. Subsequently, a recorded vote was taken on the adjournment of the debate, in accordance with rule 116 of the rules of procedure. The voting was as follows:

#### *In favour:*

Algeria, China, Congo, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

#### *Against:*

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Montenegro, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Romania, Sierra Leone, the

former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Gabon, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, South Africa

99. The motion to adjourn the debate was rejected by 16 votes to 25, with 6 abstentions.

100. At the same meeting, at the request of Pakistan, a separate vote was taken on operative paragraph 10 of the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, Montenegro, Peru, Republic of Korea, Romania, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Against:*

Algeria, China, Congo, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Maldives, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Abstaining:*

Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Gabon, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Morocco, Namibia, Philippines, South Africa

101. The Human Rights Council adopted operative paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.1/Rev.1 by 23 votes to 14, with 10 abstentions.

102. 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:*

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, Montenegro, Peru, Republic of Korea, Romania, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Against:*

Algeria, China, Congo, Cuba, Kenya, Maldives, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Abstaining:*

Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Morocco, Namibia, Philippines, South Africa

103. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.1/Rev.1 by 23 votes to 12, with 12 abstentions (resolution 25/1).

104. At the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil, Cuba, Japan, Mexico, Pakistan, South Africa, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in their general comments and in explanation of vote after the vote on all resolutions adopted under agenda item 2.

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

#### A. Panel discussions

##### Panel discussion on the promotion and protection of civil society space

105. At its 21st meeting, on 11 March 2014, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to its resolution 24/21, a panel discussion on the importance of the promotion and protection of civil society space. The aim of the panel discussion was to contribute to the identification of the challenges facing States in their efforts to ensure space for civil society, and to highlight lessons learned and good practices in this regard. The Council listened to a video message from the Secretary-General on the subject of the panel discussion. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made introductory remarks for the panel discussion. Prominent human rights lawyer and pro-democracy campaigner Hina Jilani moderated the discussion.

106. At the same meeting, the panellists Safak Pavey, Frank La Rue, Deeyah Khan and Mokhtar Trifi made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two parts.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, China, Czech Republic, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Germany, India (also on behalf of Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe), Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Yemen<sup>7</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);

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

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS);

(d) Observer for intergovernmental organization: European Union;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: European Disability Forum, International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of Amnesty International, the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, the East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission and the World Organisation against Torture).

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Chile, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea;

(b) Representatives of the following observer States: Angola, Colombia, Hungary, Poland, Portugal, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Uruguay;

(c) Observer for a national human rights institution: Human Rights Commission of Malaysia (SUHAKAM);

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Save the Children

<sup>7</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

International (also on behalf of Defence for Children International (DCI), the International Catholic Child Bureau, Plan International and World Vision International).

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

### **Annual full-day meeting on the rights of the child**

110. An annual full-day meeting on the rights of the child was held on 13 March 2014, in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 22/32. The topic of the meeting was access to justice for children, and was informed by the reports of the Office of the High Commissioner (A/HRC/25/35 and Add.1). Introductory remarks were made by the Deputy High Commissioner. The meeting was divided into two panel discussions: the first was held at the 25th meeting, on 13 March 2014; the second, at the 27th meeting, on the same day.

111. The topic of the first panel discussion was international norms and standards on access to justice for children and child-sensitive justice. The Human Rights Council watched a PowerPoint presentation prepared by Child Rights Connect, entitled “What do children say about access to justice?”, on the subject of the panel discussion. The head of the Permanent Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, Mariangela Zappia, moderated the discussion.

112. At the same meeting, for the first panel, the panellists Marie-Pierre Poirier, Renate Winter, Tom Julius Beah, Rosa Maria Ortiz and Marta Santos Pais made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the first panel discussion into two parts, both held at the 25th meeting.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Chile, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Montenegro, Republic of Korea, Senegal<sup>8</sup> (on behalf of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Yemen<sup>8</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belgium, Poland, Thailand;

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

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Scottish Human Rights Commission;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Human Rights Advocates Inc., Plan International, Inc. (also on behalf of Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant, the International Catholic Child Bureau, Save the Children International, Terre Des Hommes Federation Internationale and World Vision International).

114. At the end of the first part, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Austria, China, Estonia, France, Italy, Kuwait, Pakistan, Sierra Leone;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Cyprus, Paraguay, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Slovenia, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Center for Environmental and Management Studies, International Institute for Non-aligned Studies.

<sup>8</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

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

117. The second panel discussion was held at the 27th meeting, on the same day. The topic of the panel discussion was empowering children to claim their rights. The Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Uruguay to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, Laura Dupuy Lasserre, moderated the discussion.

118. At the same meeting, for the second panel, the panellists Irene Khan, Maya Bhandari, Nikhil Roy, Abraham Bengaly and Marie Derain made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the second panel discussion into two parts, both held at the 27th meeting.

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

- (a) Representative of a State Member of the Human Rights Council: Ireland;
- (b) Representatives of observer States: El Salvador, Honduras, Monaco, Nepal, Norway, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland;
- (c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, European Union;
- (d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Defensoría del Pueblo of Colombia (by video message);
- (e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant, International Catholic Child Bureau.

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

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

- (a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Argentina, Brazil, India, Indonesia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United States of America;
- (b) Representatives of observer States: Egypt, Libya, Malaysia, Uruguay;
- (c) Observer for a national human rights institution: Canadian Human Rights Commission;
- (d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Center for Inquiry, Iranian Elite Research Center.

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

### **Annual interactive debate on the rights of persons with disabilities**

123. At its 37th meeting, on 19 March 2014, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to its resolution 22/3, its annual interactive debate on the rights of persons with disabilities in the form of a panel discussion. The topic of the discussion was the right of persons with disabilities to education. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made introductory remarks for the panel. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council and Chairperson of the Human Rights Council Task Force on Accessibility, Maurizio Enrico Serra, moderated the discussion.

124. At the same meeting, the panellists Ana Peláez Narváez, Philippe Testot-Ferry, Gordon Porter and Maria Magdalena Orlando made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two parts.

125. During the ensuing panel discussion for the first parts, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:



- (a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Austria, Chile, Estonia, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Montenegro, Russian Federation, Yemen<sup>9</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);
- (b) Representatives of observer States: Egypt, Norway, Paraguay, Turkey;
- (c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;
- (d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Human Rights Commission of Malaysia (SUHAKAM);
- (e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, European Disability Forum.

126. At the end of the first part, at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made comments. The Human Rights Council then watched the video “Picture on school board” prepared by UNICEF as part of its “All different, all equal” campaign.

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

- (a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Burkina Faso, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ethiopia, Ireland, Italy, Kuwait, Morocco, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Viet Nam;
- (b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Ecuador, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Singapore;
- (c) Observer for a national human rights institution: International Coordinating Committee of National Human Rights Institutions;
- (d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: China Disabled Person’s Federation, International Humanist and Ethical Union.

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

## **B. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders**

### **Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment**

129. At the 16th meeting, on 10 March 2014, the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, Juan E. Méndez, presented his reports (A/HRC/25/60 and Add.1–2).

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

131. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 16th and 17th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

- (a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, China, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);
- (b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Angola, Armenia, Australia, Belarus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Nepal, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Uruguay;
- (c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;

<sup>9</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network (also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association), Conectas Direitos Humanos, Permanent Assembly for Human Rights, World Organisation against Torture.

132. At the 17th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

133. At the 18th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Argentina and the Republic of Korea made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

#### **Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders**

134. At the 16th meeting, on 10 March 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, Margaret Sekaggya, presented her reports (A/HRC/25/55 and Add.1–3).

135. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Republic of Korea and Togo made statements as the States concerned.

136. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the National Human Rights Commission of the Republic of Korea made a statement.

137. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 16th and 17th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Botswana, China, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czech Republic, Estonia, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Angola, Australia, Belarus, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Honduras, Latvia, Lithuania, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, Uruguay;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: European Union, International Organization of la Francophonie;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network (also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association), East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Human Rights House Foundation, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (also on behalf of the World Organisation against Torture), International Service for Human Rights, Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada (also on behalf of Lawyers for Lawyers), MINBYUN – Lawyers for a Democratic Society, People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy (also on behalf of the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development and CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation).

138. At the 17th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

139. At the 18th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Cambodia, China, the Republic of Korea and the United Arab Emirates made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

#### **Special Rapporteur on the right to food**

140. At the 17th meeting, on 10 March 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the right to food, Olivier De Schutter, presented his reports (A/HRC/25/57 and Add.1–2).

141. At the 18th meeting, on the same day, the representative of Malaysia made a statement as the State concerned.

142. At the same meeting, the representative of the Malawi Human Rights Commission made a statement.

143. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council listened to a video message by the representative of the Human Rights Commission of Malaysia (SUHAKAM).

144. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 18th meeting, on the same day, and at the 19th meeting, on 11 March, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Costa Rica (also on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), France, Ireland, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Sierra Leone, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen<sup>10</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, Luxembourg, Paraguay, Portugal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Uruguay;

(c) Observer for the Holy See;

(d) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations;

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

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Technology Development Link, Centre Europe – Tiers Monde – Europe–Third World Centre (also on behalf of the International Federation of Rural Adult Catholic Movements), Foodfirst Information and Action Network (FIAN), Human Rights Advocates Inc., International Movement ATD Fourth World, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development.

145. At the 19th meeting, on 11 March, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

**Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context**

146. At the 17th meeting, on 10 March 2014, the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context, Raquel Rolnik, presented her reports (A/HRC/25/54 and Add.1–2).

147. At the 18th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Indonesia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements as the States concerned.

148. At the same meeting, the representative of the Scottish Human Rights Commission (also on behalf of the Equality and Human Rights Commission and the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission) made a statement.

149. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 18th meeting, on the same day, and at the 19th meeting, on 11 March, the following made statements and asked questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Benin, Brazil, Chile, China, Costa Rica (also on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, France, Germany (also on behalf of Finland), Kuwait, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Sierra Leone, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen<sup>10</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Bangladesh, Djibouti, Egypt, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Uruguay;

<sup>10</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

- (c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;
- (d) Observer for the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies;
- (e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland (also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association), Habitat International Coalition, Human Rights Advocates Inc., International Movement ATD Fourth World, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development.

150. At the 19th meeting, on 11 March, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

**Independent Expert on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment**

151. At the 19th meeting, on 11 March 2014, the Independent Expert on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment, John Knox, presented his reports (A/HRC/25/53 and Add.1).

152. At the same meeting, the representative of Costa Rica made a statement as the State concerned.

153. 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: Algeria, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, France, Indonesia, Ireland, Maldives, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Peru, Philippines, Sierra Leone, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen<sup>11</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);
- (b) Representatives of observer States: Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Guatemala, Slovenia, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uruguay;
- (c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: United Nations Environment Programme;
- (d) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;
- (e) Observers for national human rights institutions: Conseil consultatif des droits de l'homme du Maroc, Scottish Human Rights Commission;
- (f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development (also on behalf of the International Indian Treaty Council), Amnesty International, Earthjustice (also on behalf of the Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL)), East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand (also on behalf of the Indian Council of South America (CISA)), Human Rights Advocates Inc., Human Rights Now, Japanese Workers' Committee for Human Rights, VIVAT International (also on behalf of Franciscans International and Sisters of Mercy of the Americas).

154. At the 20th meeting, on the same day, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

**Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights**

155. At the 19th meeting, on 11 March 2014, the Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full

<sup>11</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights, Cephas Lumina, presented his reports (A/HRC/25/50 and Add.1–3).

156. At the same meeting, the representatives of Argentina, Greece and Japan made statements as the States concerned.

157. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 19th and 20th 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: Algeria, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Sierra Leone, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen<sup>12</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bangladesh, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Sudan, Tunisia;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Centre Europe – Tiers Monde – Europe – Third World Centre, European Union of Public Relations, VIVAT International (also on behalf of Franciscans International and Sisters of Mercy of the Americas).

158. At the 20th meeting, on the same day, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

### **Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief**

159. At the 20th meeting, on 11 March 2014, the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, Heiner Bielefeldt, presented his reports (A/HRC/25/58 and Add.1–2).

160. At the same meeting, the representatives of Jordan and Sierra Leone made statements as the States concerned.

161. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 20th meeting, on the same day, and at the 22nd meeting, on 12 March, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Austria, China, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen<sup>12</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, Egypt, Georgia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Qatar, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey;

(c) Observer for the Holy See;

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

(e) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: European Union, Independent Permanent Human Rights Commission of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, International Development Law Organization, International Organization of la Francophonie;

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: British Humanist Association, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Humanist and Ethical Union, World Barua Organization (WBO), World Jewish Congress.

162. At the 22nd meeting, on 12 March, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

<sup>12</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

163. At the 24th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of China and Saudi Arabia made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

164. At the 20th meeting, on 11 March 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, Ben Emmerson, presented his reports (A/HRC/25/59 and Add. 1-2).

165. At the same meeting, the representatives of Burkina Faso and Chile made statements as the States concerned.

166. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, on the same day, and at the 22nd meeting, on 12 March, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Austria, Brazil, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, France, Indonesia, Ireland, Mexico, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen<sup>13</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);

(b) Representatives of the following observer States: Australia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Malaysia, Nigeria, Qatar, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Tunisia;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: American Civil Liberties Union, United Schools International, VIVAT International (also on behalf of Franciscans International).

167. At the 22nd meeting, on 12 March, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

**Special Rapporteur on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography**

168. At the 23rd meeting, on 12 March 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, Najat Maalla M'jid, presented her reports (A/HRC/25/48 and Add.1-3).

169. At the same meeting, the representatives of Benin, Kyrgyzstan and Madagascar made statements as the States concerned.

170. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 23rd and 24th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, China, Costa Rica (also on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Cuba, Estonia, France, Indonesia, Morocco, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen<sup>14</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belarus, Egypt, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Serbia, Thailand;

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

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

<sup>13</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

<sup>14</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

(e) Observer for a national human rights institution: Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission (also on behalf of the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC));

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order of Preachers, and the International Catholic Child Bureau), Franciscans International, Human Rights Now, International Catholic Child Bureau (also on behalf of the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, and Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order of Preachers), Terre des Hommes federation internationale.

171. At the 24th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

### **Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights**

172. At the 23rd meeting, on 12 March 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, Najat Maalla M'jid, presented the reports of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, Farida Shaheed (A/HRC/25/49 and Add.1), on her behalf.

173. At the same meeting, the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina made a statement as the State concerned.

174. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 23rd and 24th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Botswana, China, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Cuba, Estonia, France, Indonesia, Morocco, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen<sup>15</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Egypt, Malaysia, Serbia, Switzerland;

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

(d) Observers for national human rights institutions: Conseil consultatif des droits de l'homme du Maroc, Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Chinese People's Association for Peace and Disarmament, Human Rights Advocates Inc., International Buddhist Relief Organisation, Liberation.

### **Independent Expert on minority issues**

175. At the 36th meeting, on 19 March 2014, the Independent Expert on minority issues, Rita Izsák, presented her reports (A/HRC/25/56 and Add.1).

176. At the same meeting, the representative of Cameroon made a statement as the State concerned.

177. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Austria, China, Estonia, Indonesia, Romania, Russian Federation, United States of America, Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bulgaria, Egypt, Hungary, Iraq, Nigeria, Serbia, Switzerland, Thailand, Ukraine;

(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: Center for Environmental and Management Studies, Center for Reproductive Rights, Inc., Centre for Human Rights and

<sup>15</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Peace Advocacy, China Association for Preservation and Development of Tibetan Culture (CAPDTC), International Buddhist Relief Organisation, Minority Rights Group, World Environment and Resources Council (WERC).

178. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

### **C. Interactive dialogue with special advisers and representatives of the Secretary-General**

#### **Special Adviser to the Secretary-General for the Prevention of Genocide**

179. At the 15th meeting, on 7 March 2014, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 22/22, an interactive dialogue dedicated to the tenth anniversary of the creation of the mandate of Special Adviser to the Secretary-General for the Prevention of Genocide. An opening statement was delivered by the current mandate holder, Adama Dieng.

180. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Adviser questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Ireland, Mexico, Morocco, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Bangladesh, Ecuador, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation.

181. At the same meeting, the Special Adviser answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

182. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Iraq made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

#### **Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children**

183. At the 24th meeting, on 12 March 2014, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children, Marta Santos Pais, presented her report (A/HRC/25/47).

184. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, on the same day, at the 26th meeting on 13 March 2014, and at the 28th meeting on 14 March, the following made statements and asked the Special Representative questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Botswana, China, Costa Rica (also on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Estonia, France, Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Montenegro, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Peru, Romania, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen<sup>16</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Latvia, Monaco, Nepal, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo;

(c) Observer for the Holy See;

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

<sup>16</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.



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

(f) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: European Union, International Development Law Organization;

(g) Observer for a national human rights institution: Network of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in the Americas;

(h) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Technical Association, European Centre for Law and Justice, Friends World Committee for Consultation, International Catholic Child Bureau (also on behalf of the Company of Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order of Preachers and International Juvenile Justice Observatory), International Institute for Non-aligned Studies, International Movement ATD Fourth World.

185. At the 28th meeting, on 14 March, the Special Representative answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

### **Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict**

186. At the 24th meeting, on 12 March 2014, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, Leila Zerrougui, presented her report (A/HRC/25/46).

187. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, on the same day, at the 26th meeting on 13 March, and at the 28th meeting on 14 March, the following made statements and asked the Special Representative questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Botswana, China, Costa Rica (also on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia<sup>17</sup> (also on behalf of Austria and Slovenia), Estonia, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), France, Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Peru, Russian Federation, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen<sup>17</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Angola, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Georgia, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Nepal, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Slovenia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, State of Palestine;

(c) Observer for the Holy See;

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

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

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

(g) Observer for ICRC;

(h) Observer for a national human rights institution: Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Republic of Azerbaijan;

(i) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Technical Association, Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities) (also on behalf of the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul and Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order of Preachers), Colombian Commission of Jurists, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Human Rights Now, International Movement ATD Fourth World, World Organisation against Torture (also on behalf of Save the Children International, Terre Des Hommes Federation Internationale and World Vision International).

<sup>17</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

188. At the 26th meeting, on 13 March, the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Qatar and the Syrian Arab Republic made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

190. At the 28th meeting, on 14 March, the Special Representative answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

#### **D. General debate on agenda item 3**

191. At the 28th meeting, on 14 March 2014, the Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights presented thematic reports prepared by the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General under agenda items 2 and 3.

192. At its 28th, 29th and 30th meetings, on the same day, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 3, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Chile (also on behalf of Denmark, Ghana, Indonesia and Morocco), Costa Rica, Egypt<sup>18</sup> (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, the Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, the United Republic of Tanzania, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe and the State of Palestine), Ethiopia (also on behalf of Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Mozambique, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Viet Nam), Germany (also on behalf of Austria, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America), Greece<sup>18</sup> (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Montenegro, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Iran (Islamic Republic of)<sup>18</sup> (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Ireland, Italy, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, the Niger,

<sup>18</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe and the State of Palestine), Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Philippines (on behalf of the Association of South East Asian Nations), Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey<sup>19</sup> (also on behalf of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America), United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Egypt (also on behalf of the Sudan), El Salvador, Ghana, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Myanmar, Netherlands, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Spain, Sudan;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, Independent Permanent Human Rights Commission of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation;

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: National Human Rights Commission of Mexico;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Advocates for Human Rights, African Technical Association, African Technology Development Link, Agence internationale pour le développement, Al-Hakim Foundation, Al-khoei Foundation, Al Salam Foundation, Amnesty International, Association of World Citizens, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities), the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order of Preachers, Edmund Rice International Limited, the International Catholic Child Bureau, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES and Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco), Auspice Stella, British Humanist Association, Canners International Permanent Committee, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, Center for Inquiry, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) (also on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union, Amnesty International, Conectas Direitos Humanos, the International Commission of Catholic Prison Pastoral Care, the International Commission of Jurists and Penal Reform International), Chinese People's Association for Peace and Disarmament, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, Conectas Direitos Humanos, Ecumenical Federation of Constantinopolitans, European Centre for Law and Justice, European Union of Public Relations, Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland, Foundation of Japanese Honorary Debts, France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Franciscans International, Friends World Committee for Consultation, Human Rights Advocates Inc., Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights Now, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL), International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, International Buddhist Foundation (IBF), International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Educational Development, Inc., International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Institute for Non-aligned Studies, International Institute for Peace, International Muslim Women's Union, International Organization for the Elimination

<sup>19</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Iranian Elite Research Center, Islamic Women's Institute of Iran, Japanese Workers' Committee for Human Rights, Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, Collectif des femmes africaines du Hainaut, Liberal International (World Liberal Union), Liberation, Ligue internationale contre le racisme et l'antisémitisme, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Maryam Ghasemi Educational Charity Institute, Minnesota Citizens Concerned for Life Inc. Education Fund, Minority Rights Group, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Reporters sans frontières international – Reporters Without Borders International, Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of Environment, Society Studies Centre (MADA ssc), Soka Gakkai International (also on behalf of Al-Hakim Foundation, the Asia-Pacific Human Rights Information Center, Association Points-Coeur, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, the Equitas International Centre for Human Rights Education, Human Rights Education Associates (HREA), the Institute for Planetary Synthesis, the International Association for Religious Freedom (IARF), the International Catholic Child Bureau, the International Federation of University Women, the International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR), the International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (OIDE), Servas International, the Sovereign Military Order of the Temple of Jerusalem (OSMTH), the Teresian Association and the United Network of Young Peacebuilders (UNOY Peacebuilders)), Tchad agir pour l'environnement, Transparency International, United Nations Watch, United Schools International, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization (WBO), World Environment and Resources Council (WERC), World Federation of Khoja Shi'a Ithna-Asheri Muslim Communities, World Muslim Congress.

193. At the 30th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Algeria, China, Iraq and Nigeria made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

## **E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals**

### **Freedom of opinion and expression: mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression**

194. At the 54th meeting, on 27 March 2014, the representative of the United States of America introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.2/Rev.1, sponsored by the United States of America and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay. Subsequently, Algeria, Azerbaijan, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Egypt, Indonesia, Israel, Jordan, Maldives, Monaco, Montenegro, the Republic of Korea, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Thailand and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

195. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made an oral revision to the draft resolution.

196. Also the same meeting, the President announced that, as a consequence of the oral revision, it was no longer necessary to take action on draft text A/HRC/25/L.43.

197. At the same meeting, the representative of Italy, on behalf of the European Union, made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

198. 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.

199. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.2/Rev.1 as orally revised, without a vote (resolution 25/2).

### **Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights**

200. At the 54th meeting, on 27 March 2014, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.3, sponsored by China, the Islamic Republic of Iran (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries) and the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Brazil and Yemen (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) joined the sponsors.

201. At the same meeting, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made general comments on the draft resolution.

202. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Italy, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council, made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

203. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.3 without a vote (resolution 25/3).

### **Integrity of the judicial system**

204. At the 54th meeting, on 27 March 2014, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.5, sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Belarus, China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Kyrgyzstan, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Tajikistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Egypt, El Salvador, India, Kazakhstan, Morocco, Namibia, Nicaragua, Sierra Leone and South Africa joined the sponsors.

205. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation made an oral revision to the draft resolution.

206. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

207. 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.

208. At the same meeting, the representatives of Italy, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council, and of the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

#### *In favour:*

Algeria, Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

#### *Against:*

United States of America

#### *Abstaining:*

Austria, Benin, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Maldives, Montenegro, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

210. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.5 as orally revised by 27 votes to 1, with 19 abstentions (resolution 25/4).

### **Mandate of the Independent Expert on minority issues**

211. At the 54th meeting, on 27 March 2014, the representative of Austria introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.8, sponsored by Austria and co-sponsored by Armenia, Australia, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Romania, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Cabo Verde, Colombia, the Congo, Cuba, Ethiopia, Guinea, Japan, Malta, Morocco, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Serbia, Somalia, Ukraine, the United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

212. 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.

213. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.8 without a vote (resolution 25/5).

### **Rights of the child: access to justice for children**

214. At the 54th meeting, on 27 March 2014, the representatives of Greece, on behalf of the European Union, and of Uruguay, on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.10, sponsored by Greece (on behalf of the European Union), Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Burkina Faso, the Congo, Georgia, Iceland, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, San Marino, Serbia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste and Turkey. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Cabo Verde, Djibouti, Guinea, Israel, Jamaica, Maldives, Morocco, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukraine and Viet Nam joined the sponsors.

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.

216. At the same meeting, the representative of Japan made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

217. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.10 without a vote (resolution 25/6).

218. At the 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

### **Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism**

219. At the 54th meeting, on 27 March 2014, the representative of Mexico introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.11, sponsored by Mexico and co-sponsored by Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, the Netherlands, Peru, Slovakia, Sweden and Uruguay. Subsequently, Armenia, Australia, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, Colombia, the Czech Republic, France, Japan, Luxembourg, Monaco, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, Switzerland, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

220. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.11 without a vote (resolution 25/7).

### **Panel on the right to privacy in the digital age**

221. At the 54th meeting, on 27 March 2014, the representative of Brazil introduced draft decision A/HRC/25/L.12, sponsored by Austria, Brazil, Germany, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Norway and Switzerland and co-sponsored by Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Maldives, Monaco, Montenegro, Mozambique, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Tunisia and Turkey. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Honduras, Indonesia, Lebanon, Malta, Morocco, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Serbia, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

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

223. At the same meeting, draft decision A/HRC/25/L.12 was adopted without a vote (decision 25/117).

### **The role of good governance in the promotion and protection of human rights**

224. At the 54th meeting, on 27 March 2014, the representative of Poland introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.13, sponsored by Australia, Chile, Poland, the Republic of Korea and South Africa and co-sponsored by Albania, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey and Uruguay. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guinea, Haiti, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lebanon, Libya, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, the Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, the Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Yemen and Zimbabwe joined the sponsors.

225. 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.

226. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.13 without a vote (resolution 25/8).

### **The negative impact of the non-repatriation of funds of illicit origin to the countries of origin on the enjoyment of human rights, and the importance of improving international cooperation**

227. At the 54th meeting, on 27 March 2014, the representative of Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States, and of Tunisia introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.14, sponsored by Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States. Subsequently, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) and Yemen (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) joined the sponsors.

228. At the same meeting, the representative of Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States, orally revised the draft resolution.

229. 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. The Chief of the OHCHR Finance and Budget Section made a statement on the budgetary implications of the draft resolution.

230. At the same meeting, the representatives of Italy, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council, and of the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

*In favour:*

Algeria, Argentina, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Japan, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Austria, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Montenegro, Republic of Korea, Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

232. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.14 as orally revised by 33 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions (resolution 25/9).

233. At the 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of Mexico made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

### **Ending violence against children: a global call to make the invisible visible**

234. At the 54th meeting, on 27 March 2014, the representative of Algeria introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.15/Rev.1, sponsored by Algeria and co-sponsored by Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Malaysia, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Canada, China, El Salvador, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Maldives, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Slovenia, Thailand, the United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam and Yemen (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) joined the sponsors.

235. At the same meeting, the representative of Costa Rica made general comments on the draft resolution.

236. 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.

237. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.15/Rev.1 without a vote (resolution 25/10).

238. At the 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

### **Question of the realization in all countries of economic, social and cultural rights**

239. At the 54th meeting, on 27 March 2014, the representative of Portugal introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.16, sponsored by Portugal and co-sponsored by Angola, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Montenegro, Mozambique, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav



Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Algeria, Armenia, Brazil, Haiti, Malta, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, the Niger, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Serbia, South Africa, Thailand, Ukraine and Vanuatu joined the sponsors.

240. At the same meeting, the representative of Portugal made an oral revision to the draft resolution.

241. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

242. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.16 as orally revised without a vote (resolution 25/11).

### **Freedom of religion or belief**

243. At the 54th meeting, on 27 March 2014, the representative of Greece, on behalf of the European Union, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.19, sponsored by Greece, on behalf of the European Union, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Georgia, Guatemala, Iceland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, Peru, San Marino, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and the United States of America. Subsequently, Armenia, Cabo Verde, Honduras, Israel, New Zealand, the Philippines, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Thailand, Ukraine and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

244. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.19 without a vote (resolution 25/12).

### **Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment: mandate of the Special Rapporteur**

245. At the 54th meeting, on 27 March 2014, the representative of Denmark introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.25, sponsored by Denmark and co-sponsored by Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay. Subsequently, Albania, Angola, Armenia, Benin, Cabo Verde, Canada, Comoros, Djibouti, El Salvador, Haiti, Malta, Mozambique, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Serbia, Togo, Ukraine, the United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

246. At the same meeting, the representative of Denmark made an oral revision to the draft resolution.

247. Also at the same meeting, the President announced that amendments A/HRC/25/L.53 and L.54 to the draft resolution had been withdrawn.

248. 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.

249. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.25 as orally revised without a vote (resolution 25/13).

### **The right to food**

250. At the 54th meeting, on 27 March 2014, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.26, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Andorra, Angola, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, China,

the Congo, Croatia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Georgia, Honduras, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mexico, Myanmar, Peru, San Marino, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Eritrea, Haiti, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Maldives, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, Viet Nam and Yemen (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) joined the sponsors.

251. At the same meeting, the representative of Cuba made an oral revision to the draft resolution.

252. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Italy, on behalf of the European Union, made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

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

254. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.26 as orally revised without a vote (resolution 25/14).

### **Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order**

255. At the 54th meeting, on 27 March 2014, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.27, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, the Congo, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Somalia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Belarus, Eritrea, Indonesia, Namibia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Senegal, Yemen (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Zimbabwe joined the sponsors.

256. At the same meeting, the representative of Cuba made an oral revision to the draft resolution.

257. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

258. At the same meeting, the representative of Italy, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council, made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

259. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Italy, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as orally revised. The voting was as follows:

#### *In favour:*

Algeria, Argentina, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

#### *Against:*

Austria, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Montenegro, Republic of Korea, Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

#### *Abstaining:*

Chile, Mexico, Peru

260. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.27 as orally revised by 30 votes to 14, with 3 abstentions (resolution 25/15).

**Mandate of the Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights**

261. At the 54th meeting, on 27 March 2014, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.28, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Angola, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burkina Faso, the Congo, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Myanmar, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Belarus, Eritrea, Indonesia, Namibia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Uruguay and Yemen (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) joined the sponsors.

262. At the same meeting, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made general comments on the draft resolution.

263. 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.

264. At the same meeting, the representative of Italy, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council, made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

*In favour:*

Algeria, Argentina, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Austria, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Montenegro, Republic of Korea, Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Chile, Mexico, Peru

266. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.28 by 30 votes to 14, with 3 abstentions (resolution 25/16).

**Adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living**

267. At the 55th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representatives of Finland and Germany introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.18/Rev.1, sponsored by Finland and Germany and co-sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Brazil, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Haiti, Morocco, the Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

268. At the same meeting, the representative of Germany made an oral revision to the draft resolution.

269. Also at the same meeting, South Africa withdrew its amendments A/HRC/25/L.55 to L.62 to the draft resolution.

270. 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.

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

272. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.18/Rev.1 as orally revised without a vote (resolution 25/17).

### **Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders**

273. At the 55th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of Norway introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.24, sponsored by Norway and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Armenia, Benin, Cabo Verde, Canada, Djibouti, Guinea, Haiti, Indonesia, Maldives, Malta, Morocco, Nigeria, Panama, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Serbia, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

274. At the same meeting, the representative of Norway made an oral revision to the draft resolution.

275. Also at the same meeting, the Russian Federation withdrew its amendments A/HRC/25/L.44 and L.45 to the draft resolution.

276. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced amendments A/HRC/25/L.46 and L.47 to draft resolution A/HRC/24/L.24. A/HRC/25/L.46 was sponsored by Algeria, Bahrain, Belarus, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam; A/HRC/25/L.47 was sponsored by Algeria, Bahrain, Belarus, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Namibia, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and Viet Nam.

277. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced the oral amendments to the draft resolution as orally revised.

278. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Cuba, France, Maldives, Mexico, the Russian Federation and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised and the amendments.

279. 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 and amendments.

280. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/25/L.46. The voting was as follows:

#### *In favour:*

Algeria, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Kenya, Kuwait, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

#### *Against:*

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Peru, Republic of Korea, Romania, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

#### *Abstaining:*

Congo, Gabon, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Namibia

281. Amendment A/HRC/25/L.46 was rejected by 15 votes to 27, with 5 abstentions.

282. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/25/L.47. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Kenya, Kuwait, Namibia, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Philippines, Peru, Republic of Korea, Romania, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Brazil, Gabon, Indonesia, Kazakhstan

283. Amendment A/HRC/25/L.47 was rejected by 15 votes to 28, with 4 abstentions.

284. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on the oral amendment to add a third preambular paragraph bis. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, China, Congo, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Kenya, Kuwait, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Peru, Republic of Korea, Romania, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Brazil, Gabon, Indonesia, Kazakhstan

285. The oral amendment to add a third preambular paragraph bis was rejected by 18 votes to 25, with 4 abstentions.

286. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on the oral amendment to add a third preambular paragraph ter. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, China, Congo, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Kenya, Kuwait, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Peru, Republic of Korea, Romania, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Brazil, Gabon, Indonesia, Kazakhstan

287. The oral amendment to add a third preambular paragraph ter was rejected by 18 votes to 25, with 4 abstentions.

288. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.24 as orally revised without a vote (resolution 25/18).

289. Also at the 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representatives of China, India and Viet Nam made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

### **Promotion of the enjoyment of the cultural rights of everyone and respect for cultural diversity**

290. At the 55th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.29/Rev.1, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burkina Faso, China, the Congo, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Mexico, Panama, Somalia, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Austria, Belarus, Cabo Verde, Eritrea, Haiti, Ireland, Namibia, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, Uruguay, Viet Nam and Yemen (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) joined the sponsors.

291. At the same meeting, the representative of Cuba orally revised the draft resolution.

292. 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.

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

294. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.29/Rev.1 as orally revised without a vote (resolution 25/19).

### **The right to education of persons with disabilities**

295. At the 55th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of Mexico introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.30, sponsored by Mexico and New Zealand and co-sponsored by Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Maldives, Montenegro, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Ethiopia, Haiti, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Luxembourg, Malta, Morocco, Namibia, Nicaragua, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Switzerland, Ukraine and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

296. 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.

297. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.30 without a vote (resolution 25/20).

### **Human rights and the environment**

298. At the 55th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of Costa Rica introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.31, sponsored by Costa Rica, Maldives, Morocco, Peru, Slovenia, Switzerland and Uruguay and co-sponsored by Austria, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark,

France, Gabon, Georgia, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Spain and Tunisia. Subsequently, Albania, Angola, Australia, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, the Czech Republic, Djibouti, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Germany, Haiti, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, the Sudan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Vanuatu, Yemen and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

299. At the same meeting, the representative of Costa Rica made an oral revision to the draft resolution.

300. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

301. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.31 as orally revised, without a vote (resolution 25/21).

**Ensuring use of remotely piloted aircraft or armed drones in counter-terrorism and military operations in accordance with international law, including international human rights and humanitarian law**

302. At the 55th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of Pakistan introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.32, sponsored by Pakistan and co-sponsored by Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Yemen. Subsequently, Brazil, Egypt, Nicaragua and South Africa joined the sponsors.

303. At the same meeting, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made general comments on the draft resolution.

304. 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.

305. At the same meeting, the representatives of France, Germany (also on behalf of the Czech Republic), India, Ireland, the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

306. 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 the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Gabon, Indonesia, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Austria, Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, Ethiopia, Germany, India, Italy, Montenegro, Namibia, Romania, United Arab Emirates

307. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.32 by 27 votes to 6, with 14 abstentions (resolution 25/22).

308. At the 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of Cuba made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

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

309. At the 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of Switzerland introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.20, sponsored by Costa Rica, Switzerland and Turkey and co-sponsored by Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Colombia, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Tunisia and the United States of America. Subsequently, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, France, Honduras, Israel, Japan, Malta, Montenegro, Morocco, New Zealand, Peru, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

310. At the same meeting, the representative of Costa Rica made an oral revision to the draft resolution.

311. Also at the same meeting, South Africa withdrew its amendment A/HRC/25/L.51 to the draft resolution.

312. At the same meeting, the representative of South Africa introduced amendments A/HRC/25/L.48, L.49, L.50 and L.52 to draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.20. Amendments A/HRC/24/L.48 to L.50 were sponsored by Algeria, Bahrain, Belarus, China, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/24/L.52 was sponsored by Algeria, Bahrain, Belarus, China, Cuba, Egypt, India, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Bangladesh and Sri Lanka subsequently joined the sponsors.

313. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Benin, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Maldives and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution.

314. 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. The Chief of the OHCHR Finance and Budget Section made a statement on the budgetary implications of the draft resolution.

315. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Costa Rica, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/25/L.48. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Namibia, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Peru, Republic of Korea, Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Brazil, Burkina Faso, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Indonesia, Morocco, Philippines, Sierra Leone

316. Amendment A/HRC/25/L.48 was rejected by 16 votes to 22, with 9 abstentions.

317. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Costa Rica, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/25/L.49. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*



Algeria, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Namibia, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Peru, Republic of Korea, Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Brazil, Burkina Faso, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Morocco, Philippines, Sierra Leone

318. Amendment A/HRC/25/L.49 was rejected by 17 votes to 22, with 8 abstentions.

319. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Costa Rica, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/25/L.50. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, China, Congo, Cuba, Ethiopia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Namibia, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Peru, Republic of Korea, Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Morocco, Philippines, Sierra Leone

320. Amendment A/HRC/25/L.50 was rejected by 19 votes to 23, with 5 abstentions.

321. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Costa Rica, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/25/L.52. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, China, Congo, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Namibia, Pakistan, Philippines,<sup>20</sup> Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Peru, Republic of Korea, Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Morocco

322. Amendment A/HRC/25/L.52 was rejected by 20 votes to 23, with 4 abstentions.

323. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Cuba, India, the Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

<sup>20</sup> The Philippines subsequently stated that there had been an error in its vote and that it had intended to abstain.

324. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of South Africa, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as orally revised. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Romania, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Against:*

China, Cuba, India, Kenya, Pakistan, Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Congo, Ethiopia, Kuwait, Namibia, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

325. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.20 by 31 votes to 9, with 7 abstentions (resolution 25/38).

326. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria and Japan made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

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

### **A. Interactive dialogue with the commission of inquiry on human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea**

327. At the 31st meeting, on 17 March 2014, the Chair of the commission of inquiry on human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Michael Kirby, presented the report of the commission (A/HRC/25/63), submitted pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 22/13.

328. At the same meeting, the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea made a statement as the State concerned.

329. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the same meeting, on the same day, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Argentina, Austria, Botswana, Chile, China, Cuba, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Montenegro, Republic of Korea, Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Australia, Belarus, Canada, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Myanmar, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Uruguay, Zimbabwe;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, International Commission of Jurists, International Service for Human Rights, Jubilee Campaign, People for Successful Korean Reunification, United Nations Watch.

330. At the same meeting, the Chair of the commission of inquiry answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

### **B. Interactive dialogue with the commission of inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic**

331. At the 33rd meeting, on 18 March 2014, the Chair of the commission of inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic, Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro, presented the report of the commission (A/HRC/25/65), submitted pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 22/24.

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

333. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 33rd and 34th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Canada, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark (also on behalf of Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Libya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Slovakia, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uruguay;

(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: Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, International Commission of Jurists, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (also on behalf of Reporters sans frontières international – Reporters Without Borders International), Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Presse Embleme Campagne, Syriac Universal Alliance, Federation Syriaque International.

334. At the 34th meeting, on the same day, the Chair of the commission of inquiry answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

## C. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders

### Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

335. At the 31st meeting, on 17 March 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ahmed Shaheed, presented his report (A/HRC/25/61).

336. At the same meeting, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran made a statement as the State concerned.

337. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 31st and 32nd 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: Botswana, China, Cuba, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Maldives, Pakistan, Russian Federation, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;
- (b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Canada, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Myanmar, New Zealand, Norway, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Zimbabwe;

(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: Baha'i International Community, European Centre for Law and Justice, Iranian Elite Research Center, Islamic Women's Institute of Iran, Lawyers for Lawyers, Maryam Ghasemi Educational Charity Institute, Prevention Association of Social Harms (PASH) (also on behalf of the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence), Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik (also on behalf of Human Rights Watch).

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

### Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar

339. At the 32nd meeting, on 17 March 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, Tomás Ojea Quintana, presented his report (A/HRC/25/64).

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

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

- (a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Argentina, China, Cuba, Czech Republic, France, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Philippines (on behalf of the Association of South East Asian Nations), Republic of Korea, United Kingdom of Great

Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Lao People's Democratic Republic, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Human Rights Now, Human Rights Watch, International Commission of Jurists, International Educational Development, Inc., Jubilee Campaign, Lawyers for Lawyers (also on behalf of Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada).

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

## **D. General debate on agenda item 4**

343. At the 34th and 35th meetings, on 18 March 2014, 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: Algeria, Austria, China, Cuba, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Greece<sup>21</sup> (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Montenegro, Nicaragua<sup>21</sup> (on behalf of the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America – Peoples' Trade Treaty), Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Canada, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Georgia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Agence internationale pour le développement, Alsalam Foundation, Amnesty International, Baha'i International Community, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Canners International Permanent Committee, Center for Inquiry, Centre Europe – Tiers Monde – Europe-Third World Centre, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociación Civil, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Comité international pour le respect et l'application de la Charte africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples (CIRAC), Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Edmund Rice International Limited (also on behalf of Franciscans International), European Centre for Law and Justice, Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland (also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association), France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand (also on behalf of Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples), Franciscans International (also on behalf of the World Organisation Against Torture (OMCT)), General Arab Women Federation, Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights Law Centre, Human Rights Watch, Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL), International Buddhist Foundation (IBF), International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Educational Development, Inc. (also on behalf of France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand), International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Institute for Peace, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR), International Muslim Women's Union, International

<sup>21</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Islamic Women's Institute of Iran, Collectif des femmes africaines du Hainaut, Liberation, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Maryam Ghasemi Educational Charity Institute, Minority Rights Group, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Presse Embleme Campagne, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Society for Threatened Peoples, Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of Environment, Society Studies Centre (MADA ssc), Syriac Universal Alliance, Federation Syriacque Internationale, Touro Institute on Human Rights and the Holocaust, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, United Schools International, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, Vivekananda Sevakendra-O-Sishu Uddyan, Women's Human Rights International Association, World Barua Organization (WBO), World Environment and Resources Council (WERC), World Muslim Congress.

344. At the 35th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Eritrea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Mauritania, Morocco, Sri Lanka, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

## **E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals**

### **The continuing grave deterioration of the human rights and humanitarian situation in the Syrian Arab Republic**

346. At the 55th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representatives of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.7, sponsored by France, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Luxembourg, Maldives, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United Arab Emirates. Subsequently, Botswana, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Israel, Japan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Senegal, Switzerland and Tunisia joined the sponsors.

347. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Italy (on behalf of the European Union), the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution.

348. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

349. 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.

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

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

#### *In favour:*

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Indonesia,

Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Peru, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Against:*

China, Cuba, Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Congo, Ethiopia, India, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Namibia, Pakistan, Philippines, South Africa, Viet Nam

352. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.7 by 32 votes to 4, with 11 abstentions (resolution 25/23).

353. At the same meeting, the representative of Argentina made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

**Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran**

354. At the 55th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of Sweden introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.9, sponsored by Panama, the Republic of Moldova, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Costa Rica, Israel, Malta, New Zealand and Saint Kitts and Nevis joined the sponsors.

355. At the same meeting, the representatives of France, Italy (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and the Republic of Moldova), Pakistan, the Russian Federation, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution.

356. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran made a statement as the State concerned.

357. 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.

358. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, China, Cuba, Japan, Republic of Korea and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

*In favour:*

Argentina, Austria, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Montenegro, Peru, Republic of Korea, Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Against:*

China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Benin, Burkina Faso, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Gabon, Kenya, Kuwait, Morocco, Namibia, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates

360. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.9 by 21 votes to 9, with 16 abstentions (resolution 25/24).

361. At the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil and Indonesia made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

#### **Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea**

362. At the 55th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representatives of Greece, on behalf of the European Union, and of Japan introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.17, sponsored by Greece, on behalf of the European Union, and Japan, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Switzerland, Turkey and the United States of America. Subsequently, Botswana, Chile, Costa Rica, Honduras, Israel, Maldives, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia joined the sponsors.

363. At the same meeting, the representative of Cuba made general comments on the draft resolution.

364. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea made a statement as the State concerned.

365. 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.

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

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

#### *In favour:*

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Romania, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

#### *Against:*

China, Cuba, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

#### *Abstaining:*

Algeria, Congo, Ethiopia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait, Namibia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa

368. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.17 by 30 votes to 6, with 11 abstentions (resolution 25/25).

369. At the same meeting, the representative of Viet Nam made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

#### **Situation of human rights in Myanmar**

370. At the 55th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of Greece, on behalf of the European Union, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.21/Rev.1, sponsored by Greece, on behalf of the European Union, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America. Subsequently, Canada, the Republic of Korea, Switzerland and Turkey joined the sponsors.



371. At the same meeting, the representative of Greece, on behalf of the European Union, made an oral revision to the draft resolution.

372. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of India, the Russian Federation and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised. The representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela also made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised, disassociating the delegation from the consensus on the text.

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

374. 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.

375. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Cuba, Japan and Viet Nam made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

376. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.21/Rev.1 as orally revised, without a vote (resolution 25/26).

377. At the same meeting, the representative of the Republic of Korea made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

## V. Human rights bodies and mechanisms

### A. Complaint procedure

378. At its 30th meeting, on 14 March 2014, and at its 46th meeting, on 24 March, the Human Rights Council held closed meetings of the complaint procedure.

379. At the 47th meeting, on 25 March 2014, the President made a statement on the outcome of the meetings, stating that the Human Rights Council had in the closed meetings examined the situation of human rights in Cameroon under the complaint procedure, established pursuant to Council resolution 5/1, and had decided to keep the situation under review until its twenty-seventh session.

### B. Forum on Minority Issues

380. At the 36th meeting, on 19 March 2014, the Independent Expert on minority issues, Rita Izsák, introduced the recommendations adopted by the Forum on Minority Issues at its sixth session, held on 26 and 27 November 2013 (see A/HRC/25/66).

### C. General debate on agenda item 5

381. At the 36th meeting, on 19 March 2014, and at the 43rd meeting, on 21 March, 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: Austria, Botswana (also on behalf Argentina, Australia, Austria, Benin, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, the Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay), China, Costa Rica (also on behalf of Chile, Honduras, Peru and Uruguay), Cuba, Greece<sup>22</sup> (on behalf of European Union, Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Serbia and Ukraine), Ireland, Italy, Morocco, Pakistan, Russian Federation;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Norway, Sri Lanka;

(c) Observers for international organizations: Council of Europe, Organization of Islamic Cooperation;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence internationale pour le développement, Alsalam Foundation, Amnesty International, Article 19 – International Centre Against Censorship (also on behalf of Amnesty International, the Asian Legal Resource Centre, the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, the East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project (EHAHRD), the International Service for Human Rights and Reporters sans frontières international – Reporters Without Borders International), Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, China Society for Human Rights Studies (CSHRS), Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Association of Schools of Social Work, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR), International Muslim Women's Union, International Service for Human Rights, Japanese Workers' Committee for Human Rights,

<sup>22</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Liberation, Maryam Ghasemi Educational Charity Institute, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, United Nations Watch, Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization (WBO), World Muslim Congress.

382. At the 36th meeting, on 19 March 2014, the representatives of Algeria, China and the Russian Federation made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

383. At the 43rd meeting, on 21 March 2014, the representative of Morocco made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

384. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria and Morocco made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

## VI. Universal periodic review

385. 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 seventeenth session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, held from 21 October 2013 to 1 November 2013.

386. The President pointed out that all recommendations must be part of the final document of the universal periodic review; consequently, States under review were to communicate clearly their position with regard to each recommendation made by indicating whether they supported or noted it.

### A. Consideration of universal periodic review outcomes

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

#### Saudi Arabia

388. The review of Saudi Arabia was held on 21 October 2013 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 Saudi Arabia in accordance with the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/SAU/1);
- (b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/SAU/2);
- (c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/SAU/3).

389. At its 38th meeting, on 19 March 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Saudi Arabia (see sect. C below).

390. The outcome of the review of Saudi Arabia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/25/3), the views of Saudi Arabia concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/25/3/Add.1).

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

391. The head of delegation congratulated the President and expressed his appreciation for the continuing efforts of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to promote and protect human rights. He thanked all delegations for their participation and for submitting important recommendations to contribute to their quest to protect and promote human rights, and looked forward to a substantive and constructive dialogue.

392. The head of delegation emphasized that the 225 recommendations made had received the greatest attention at different levels. They had been first studied by the Council of the Human Rights Commission, and then by a high-level committee representing 13 government entities. Several meetings had been held in different provinces, involving the participation of representatives of national human rights and civil society institutions, and of academia to discuss the recommendations and to propose effective ways to implement them.

393. The head of delegation explained that the State did not support certain recommendations, because they were either in conflict with constitutional, legal or cultural principles of the State or they contradicted the principles of the review, or included erroneous allegations.

394. With regard to the implementation mechanism, a royal directive had been issued to the parties concerned so that the action necessary for the application and enforcement of supported recommendations would be taken. The Human Rights Commission would work with all relevant parties to follow up on the implementation of the directive. The 88 recommendations that had been approved totally or in part had been implemented or were being implemented. With regard to accession to international human rights instruments, Saudi Arabia had recently ratified Convention No. 138 of the International Labour Organization on the minimum age for admission to employment; accession to a number of other international human rights instruments was currently being considered.

395. With regard to legislative and legal reforms, and criminal justice, amendments had been recently made to the Criminal Procedure Code and to legal proceedings systems as part of an effort to develop the judicial system, to consolidate rights and justice. The judicial system was bound by the principle of incrimination and punishment, as stipulated in article 38 of the Basic Law of Governance. The judiciary paid great attention to the principle of public hearings, while the Human Rights Commission continued to attend trial sessions, which were also attended by representatives of the National Society for Human Rights and the media. The head of delegation referred to the cooperation witnessed among different actors inside and outside the State in organizing and holding training courses and workshops. Implementation of the memorandum of understanding signed between Saudi Arabia and OHCHR had been initiated. The memorandum aimed at strengthening the capacity of national competencies in the field of human rights, while a training programme on international mechanisms for human rights had been already organized.

396. The head of delegation referred to the measures taken to fight domestic violence, such as the issuance of a regulation on protection from abuse, which had the aim to protect individuals from exploitation and maltreatment, and to monitor and document any cases of violence.

397. The head of delegation also referred to a directive on enabling women to participate in municipal election as candidates and voters; women would in fact be participating in the forthcoming municipal elections, which would contribute to the promotion of their role in political, economic and social life.

398. The head of delegation informed the council of government actions to promote and strengthen the role of civil society, such as through the approval of the establishment of several institutions and public associations working in many areas of human rights, enabling them to operate with full independence and to propose several regulations to be adopted by the legislative authority. With regard to the dissemination of a culture of human rights, a comprehensive national plan had been prepared with the participation of all relevant government agencies and civil society organizations.

399. Saudi Arabia appreciated the role of migrant workers and was keen to create an appropriate and convenient working environment, by establishing laws and regulations and developing mechanisms and procedures to define their rights and their duties, without discrimination, to ensure them a decent and safe life. The most recent development in this regard was the launch of the Musaned awareness-raising programme, which had the aim to introduce a regulation on domestic workers and to inform them on lodging complaints and seeking remedies. At the same time, a “wage protection” programme, dealing with complaints on wages and employment benefits, had been launched. The State worked to preserve the rights of foreign labour by establishing a number of rules and procedures to correct the status of the violators of residency and labour laws.

400. The head of delegation emphasized that the promotion and protection of human rights was a strategic choice for the State, and the backbone of its holistic development policy.

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

401. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Saudi Arabia, 13 delegations made statements. The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints<sup>23</sup> are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.

402. Lebanon made two comments on the report, the approach and methodology adopted by Saudi Arabia to produce its report, in which the recommendations were thematically categorized in order to ensure transparency and to facilitate implementation of the recommendations supported. It welcomed the fact that the State had supported many recommendations, which reflected its openness to the review process.

403. Libya welcomed the efforts made by Saudi Arabia to implement the recommendations supported, which reflected the State's positive approach to international mechanisms and the Human Rights Council. It appreciated the incorporation of the question of human rights in the political, social and economic reform process, which had led to positive results, in education and health. Libya noted that Saudi Arabia had not supported certain specific recommendations for religious, cultural and social reasons.

404. Malaysia appreciated the engagement of Saudi Arabia in the universal periodic review process, and was pleased with its response to various comments and questions made by Member States during the interactive dialogue. It applauded the efforts made by Saudi Arabia to promote and protect human rights further. The delegation was aware of the advances made in the promotion and protection of human rights, although more time and space were necessary.

405. Montenegro welcomed the updated report on the situation of the protection and promotion of human rights in Saudi Arabia. It applauded the openness of the Government during the examination process and its acceptance of recommendations made by Member States during the interactive dialogue. Montenegro encouraged Saudi Arabia to strengthen further its legislative framework for the protection and promotion of human rights in accordance with international law standards, particularly the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the optional protocols thereto.

406. Morocco thanked Saudi Arabia for the additional information and clarifications on the developments and procedures adopted since the submission of its report for the second cycle of the universal periodic review. It commended Saudi Arabia for its efforts to promote and protect human rights by strengthening and developing the relative national institutional and legislative framework and its consultation with civil society in studying the recommendations. Morocco noted the acceptance of its two recommendations, on adopting a personal status law, and on strengthening the promotion of women's rights and their legal capacity.

407. Oman welcomed the positive measures taken by Saudi Arabia to promote and protect human rights, including through the adoption of development policies, ensuring the independence of the judiciary, the involvement of women in public life, and the inclusion of women in the Consultative Council, municipal councils and in establishing health-care centres. It understood the reasons given by the State for rejecting several recommendations.

408. Pakistan welcomed the update provided by Saudi Arabia in its report for the second cycle of the universal periodic review. It appreciated the Government's acceptance of most of the recommendations made during the session of the Working Group, including those made by Pakistan. It greatly valued the State's constructive engagement with review mechanism and the noteworthy developments witnessed, in particular the establishment of a national human rights association and its accession to important international conventions.

409. The Philippines commended the acceptance by Saudi Arabia of many of the recommendations made during the second cycle. It recalled the State's bilateral labour agreement with the Philippines for the enhancement of a protection mechanism for household service workers. The State's acceptance of a recommendation made by the Philippines on

<sup>23</sup> <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/25thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

protecting the rights of household service workers and of migrant workers and their families was a positive development that built on the agreement. It hoped that Saudi Arabia would consider ratifying more core human rights conventions, including the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

410. Qatar noted the measures taken by Saudi Arabia to protect and promote human rights. It appreciated the acceptance of the two recommendations that Qatar made during the interactive dialogue, and commended its positive approach to the universal periodic review and the State's cooperation with the Human Rights Council.

411. Senegal welcomed the constructive dialogue offered by Saudi Arabia and its cooperation with the universal periodic review mechanism. It took note of the update provided and the continued commitment by the State to protect and promote human rights. The delegation encouraged Saudi Arabia to continue its efforts to strengthen protective measures for women and migrant workers.

412. South Sudan congratulated Saudi Arabia on its election to the Human Rights Council and for its active participation in the universal periodic review process. It also congratulated the State on its efforts to take measures to promote and protect human rights, both locally and globally. It commended the achievements made by the State in all areas of human rights, in particular in health and education. The delegation was pleased that Saudi Arabia had accepted the recommendation made by South Sudan.

413. Sri Lanka thanked Saudi Arabia for its constructive engagement during the second cycle of the universal periodic review. It noted that the State had accepted the majority of the recommendations made, including the ones made by Sri Lanka. The delegation was encouraged by the measures taken by the State to promote the empowerment of women and the protection of their rights, such as the national campaign to raise women's awareness of the laws and measures in place to protect their rights. It also commended the efforts made to provide social welfare to disadvantaged groups, and to secure their other economic, social, and cultural rights.

414. Egypt commended the positive approach of Saudi Arabia to cooperation with the international human rights mechanisms, particularly the universal periodic review, as reflected by the State's support for some 84 per cent of all recommendations, including those made by Egypt. It encouraged the State to continue to integrate its legal framework and policies to strengthen human rights, in particular by strengthening the protection and respect of women's rights, enhancing the protection of migrant workers' rights and developing its cooperation with human rights mechanisms. It called upon the State to strengthen the protection measures in place to protect migrant workers, including remedies, and to continue its openness with civil society during the implementation of review recommendations.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

415. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Saudi Arabia, nine other stakeholders made statements. The statements of the stakeholders that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints<sup>24</sup> are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.

416. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues regretted the rejection by Saudi Arabia of key recommendations, on withdrawing general reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and inviting the Working Group on the issue of discrimination against women in law and in practice to visit the country. It urged the Government to revoke the male guardianship system and to abolish the gender segregation policy. It was concerned about the State's "partial acceptance" of recommendations relating to civil and political rights. It urged the authorities to put an end to the judicial harassment of human rights defenders and peaceful political activists, and to set a time frame for the adoption of a law on associations in accordance with international standards.

<sup>24</sup> <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/25thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

417. Human Rights Watch stated that the authorities in Saudi Arabia had intensified efforts to repress and silence peaceful dissidents and human rights activists. It regretted that the State had either partially accepted or not responded to recommendations to guarantee freedom of expression and belief. In 2013, the State had harassed, investigated, prosecuted and jailed prominent peaceful dissidents and human rights activists on vague charges. The new terrorism law was a concern, because it contained serious flaws. It was also concerned about the situation of religious freedom and the discrimination perpetrated against Shias. It noted the deportation of at least 250,000 foreign workers, including at least 12,000 Somalis, who had not been allowed to make a claim for refugee status. It regretted the rejection of recommendations on removing its reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

418. The Center for Inquiry noted the \$1 million donation made to the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women). Nonetheless, the situation of women remained deplorable; the cornerstone of patriarchal abuse was the male guardianship system, which violated the fundamental human rights of women and enabled violence against them. In a state where judges and clerics were given free license to interpret cases with prejudice, women remained unprotected and without a voice. Nearly two in three women were unemployed. The Center for Inquiry welcomed the progress made in women's rights and gender desegregation; however, this would be in vain if the male guardianship system were not overturned and abolished.

419. The Indian Council of South America commended Saudi Arabia for increasing its support for OHCHR and the donation it had made to the United Nations Counter-Terrorism Centre. It noted the continued work towards acceding to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, as well as to other international human rights instruments. It recommended that Saudi Arabia continue to address the disadvantages that women faced, and to adopt legal measures to counter violence against women. It called upon the State to continue to improve the situation of migrants and labour, and children's rights, to issue a moratorium on death penalty and to study possibilities other than the death penalty.

420. Amnesty International was concerned at long-standing systemic discrimination in the country, particularly against women and minorities, and the unwillingness to address these violations effectively, as shown by the State's rejection of recommendations on ratifying key human rights treaties and on allowing access to human rights mechanisms and international non-governmental organizations. It regretted the rejection of recommendations on enacting and implementing a law on associations, and was concerned at the sentencing of most founders of non-governmental organizations to lengthy prison terms after grossly unfair trials. It had witnessed a continued ban of and increasing reprisals against peaceful protests. The new anti-terrorism law was a concern, as it defined terrorist crimes in vague terms. It was concerned by the situation of freedom of belief and religion. It noted that the death penalty was applied to juveniles, and continued to be applied to a wide range of non-lethal crimes.

421. United Nations Watch asked whether the report of Saudi Arabia lived up to the goal of promoting and protecting human rights. It quoted some of the recommendations made by States that commended Saudi Arabia for its efforts to promote and protect human rights, and particularly women's and children's rights, and praised its accession to several instruments. It regarded that praise as an inaccurate representation of the situation of human rights in Saudi Arabia; there were no women's, religious or minority rights in the country. Saudi Arabia had an entrenched system of gender apartheid, and should never have been elected as a member of the Human Rights Council.

422. Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale congratulated Saudi Arabia on having taken measures to ensure the access of women to labour market, and the progress made in women's access to education. It welcomed the progress made in the participation of women in municipal elections, both to vote and as candidates, through the amendments made to the law. It noted an increase of 8 per cent in the number of women active in the public sector over the previous year. It was concerned at domestic violence, and recommended that more efforts be made to promote gender equality both in law and in practice. It encouraged the State to withdraw its



reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, and to ratify other international instruments.

423. The Organization for Defending Victims of Violence stated that there had been systematic discrimination and hostility against religious minorities, especially Shia citizens, as they were prohibited from performing their religious rituals. Shias did not have the right to appeal court decisions. They faced serious restrictions on job opportunities and in government positions. The Organization noted that the new counter-terrorism law criminalized any speech critical of the Government or of any attempt to make reforms or fight against corruption and discrimination, and granted the police extensive powers for the arbitrary arrest of human right activists, without any monitoring by the judiciary. It called for the promotion and protection of interfaith dialogue.

424. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme acknowledged the adoption of ILO provisions pertaining to children and the progress made in the promotion of women's rights, in establishing mechanisms for women's advancement and for protection from violence. It acknowledged the efforts made to streamline the labour situation, fighting human trafficking and improving the protection of the rights of migrant workers. It called upon Saudi Arabia to ratify the main human rights instruments, and to accelerate its accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. It encouraged the State to introduce legislation, measures and practices to ensure the elimination of discrimination against women, and to strengthen the institutional and legal protection of human rights. It also urged the State to take steps to abolish the male guardianship system over women, and called for it to extend invitations to all special procedures.

#### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

425. The President stated that, on the basis of the information provided, of the 225 recommendations made, 151 enjoyed the support of Saudi Arabia, while the others had been noted.

426. The head of delegation stated that he had listened with interest to the presentations made by representatives of States and civil society. He emphasized that Saudi Arabia was proud of its reliance on and abidance by Islamic sharia, and also to be a State Member of the Human Rights Council. The success of the universal periodic review depended on several key factors, and in particular, objectivity, which could contribute to the achievement of the review goals. Persistence was another important factor, which required supporting the review mechanism and preventing any attempt to defeat it. Another was the cultural diversity of all States, given that the difference between cultures was undeniable, and attempts to impose certain cultures on communities in matters of human rights brought more harm than good to those same human rights. Hence, it was necessary to take cultural diversity into account and to reinvest in the protection and promotion of human rights. This was the concept of "universal human rights".

#### **Senegal**

427. The review of Senegal was held on 21 October 2013 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 Senegal in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/SEN/1);
- (b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/SEN/2);
- (c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/SEN/3).

428. At its 38th meeting, on 19 March 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Senegal (see sect. C below).

429. The outcome of the review of Senegal comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/25/4), the views of the State concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/25/4/Add.1).

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

430. The delegation, headed by the Minister for Justice, Sidiki Kaba, recalled the importance attributed by the Government of Senegal to the universal periodic review and its commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights.

431. Upon its independence, Senegal had resolved to consolidate the rule of law, to establish a democracy and to promote and protect the fundamental rights and freedoms of the person. It was therefore committed to a multiparty system; the organization of regular, free and fair elections; the fight against impunity and corruption; the protection of children; the protection, promotion and respect of women's rights; the fight against torture and arbitrary detentions; the abolition of the death penalty; and the fight against all forms of discrimination.

432. During its second review, Senegal had received 185 recommendations. During the session of the Working Group, it had accepted 152 recommendations and rejected 14. The Government had deferred its decision on the remaining 19 recommendations.

433. Senegal had submitted an addendum to the report of the Working Group (A/HRC/25/4/Add.1) to explain its position on the outstanding 19 recommendations. The delegation had then provided additional clarifications regarding five of the recommendations. Regarding the recommendations made by the Niger Switzerland, Senegal had accepted them on principle.

434. To stay true to its reputation as a defender of human rights, inherent with its rule of law and democratic experience, the Government had undertaken to continue the process of ratification of the few international conventions to which it was not yet a party.

435. With regard to recommendation 125.9, the delegation recalled that the draft penal and criminal procedure codes took into account the need to harmonize national legislation with international human rights law.

436. Moreover, with the forthcoming revision of the two codes, the Senegalese authorities intended to decriminalize press offences, in the light of the regulatory role played by the media in a democracy.

437. In the light of the above-mentioned elements, which reflected the progress made on this subject by Senegal, recommendations 125.16, made by the Democratic Republic of the Congo, 125.17 by France and 125.18 by Greece, had been rejected.

438. In conclusion, Senegal was fully aware of its responsibility to carefully monitor the effectiveness of the enjoyment of human rights. Indeed, Senegal had chosen a political model that gave primacy to them.

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

439. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Senegal, 13 delegations made statements. The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints<sup>25</sup> are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.

440. The Niger highlighted the efforts made by Senegal to protect and promote human rights through its ratification of or accession to most international and regional human rights

<sup>25</sup> <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/25thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

instruments, and its implementation of an institutional framework to guarantee them. The Niger recognized the adoption of the 2010-11 law establishing absolute equality between men and women in elective and semi-elective decision-making bodies. The Niger considered that the adoption of an implementation plan for the recommendations made during the review of Senegal would project the State to an even greater degree in terms of respect for human rights.

441. The Republic of Moldova acknowledged the commitment made by Senegal to all the stages of the universal periodic review. It noted the different measures taken by the Government of Senegal to ensure the promotion and protection of human rights, especially for children and women. It welcomed the fact that Senegal had accepted most of the recommendations it received, and that some of them were already being implemented. This approach demonstrated the open and constructive spirit of the Government.

442. Rwanda congratulated Senegal on having accepted the vast majority of the recommendations made during the review, including those put made by Rwanda. It was encouraged by the State's cooperation with OHCHR and by the measures taken to promote and protect human rights in the country.

443. Sri Lanka acknowledged the constructive engagement shown by Senegal during the second cycle of the universal periodic review. Senegal had accepted the majority of recommendations made during its review, including those made by Sri Lanka. It was encouraged by the State's commitment to human development and its continuing efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goals. The role of the national strategy for economic and social development (2013-2017), which focused on accelerated, more sustainable and better distributed growth, was relevant in this regard. Sri Lanka also welcomed the State's commitment to promote the empowerment of women and the measures it had taken to that end.

444. The Sudan welcomed the delegation of Senegal and thanked it for its presentation on the State's cooperation with the universal periodic review process. The Sudan commended Senegal for the efforts made to promote and consolidate human rights. It emphasized, in particular, the measures taken to strengthen the role of schools and the initiative intended to allow 75 per cent of the population to benefit from health services and sanitation by 2017, measures which would improve the quality of life and dignity of the Senegalese population. It praised Senegal for having accepted most of the recommendations made, including those made by the Sudan.

445. Togo noted that Senegal had accepted almost all the recommendations it had received during the review, including those made by Togo. It acknowledged the progress made by Senegal in the promotion of democracy and the well-fare of its population. Togo invited the international community to support the implementation of the recommendations accepted by Senegal.

446. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela recognized the efforts made by the Government to comply with its human rights commitments, which were reflected during the review. It highlighted the establishment of compulsory education in the country and the significant increase in the number of schools, teachers and the enrolment rate in primary education. It noted the impulse given by the Government to implement economic, social and cultural rights in favour of the most vulnerable sectors of the population. It encouraged Senegal to strengthen its social policies further in order to improve the living conditions of its people.

447. Viet Nam welcomed the commitment made by Senegal during its review and its efforts to promote and protect human rights. It was pleased that the Government of Senegal had prioritised the enjoyment of rights and freedoms of its people in its policies, despite the many socioeconomic challenges it faced. It noted with interest the significant progress that Senegal had made in different fields, including girls' education, access to drinking water and sanitation. It commended Senegal for having accepted a large number of recommendations during its review, including two recommendations made by Viet Nam.

448. Algeria recognized the efforts made by Senegal at the legal and institutional levels to promote and protect human rights, such as the establishment of a national observatory for

parity, the creation of a national working group against human trafficking, and the amendments made to the code of nationality. It also praised the Government's efforts to promote the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights through plans and programmes for achieving the Millennium Development Goals. Algeria recognized that Senegal had accepted the two recommendations it had made.

449. Angola welcomed the commitment of the Government of Senegal to the promotion and protection of human rights, including its accession to several international conventions, and its cooperation with the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council. It welcomed the State's constructive spirit in accepting the recommendations made during its review. For that reason, Angola encouraged the Government to take the measures necessary to implement the recommendations it had accepted. The promotion and protection of human rights posed a great challenge to all States; Angola therefore supported the actions taken by Senegal in this regard.

450. Benin welcomed the qualitative progress outlined in the report submitted by Senegal for its second review. It encouraged Senegal to continue its efforts and achievements in the area of human rights, especially in the field of education, health, the empowerment of women, the fight against child trafficking, and family assistance for the most vulnerable sectors. Benin urged Senegal to intensify its efforts to implement the recommendations made at its review.

451. Botswana recalled that it had served in the troika during the review of Senegal and had been encouraged by the State's cooperation with the review mechanism, including its commitment to the implementation of accepted recommendations. It commended Senegal for the legislative reforms undertaken since its first review. The amendment of the nationality code that ended discrimination in transmitting Senegalese nationality was one of the welcome developments in the promotion and protection of civil and political rights. Senegal also deserved recognition for other legislative measures, including the implementation of the new multi-sectorial policies aimed at combating violence against women and girls.

452. Burkina Faso commended Senegal for the quality of its national report, which highlighted good practices in the promotion and protection of human rights. It welcomed the efforts made by Senegal to ensure the enjoyment of human rights, particularly in the areas of education, health, the protection of persons deprived of their liberty, the rights of women, and the fight against child trafficking. It acknowledged the Government's initiative to provide universal health coverage for the people of Senegal and the efforts made to decriminalize press offences, improve conditions of detention, and fight impunity.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

453. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Senegal, five other stakeholders made statements.

454. Save the Children welcomed the launch of the universal health coverage scheme to provide free health care for children between 0 and 5 years of age, even though other measures were needed. It acknowledged the establishment of a drafting committee for a new code regarding children, and called for the State to raise the age of marriage from 16 to 18 years. It urged the State to mobilize additional resources for social issues and for the implementation of a national strategy for child protection, and also to increase transparency in the planning and expenditure of resources for the protection of children. It requested the Government to review the law on begging, to provide proper care to child victims of exploitation, and to eliminate corporal punishment for children, especially *talibé* children.

455. Action Canada for Population and Development welcomed the willingness of the Government of Senegal to engage in the universal periodic review and its acceptance of recommendations regarding trafficking of children. Nonetheless, Senegal ranked 28th among States with a high rate of maternal mortality. It was therefore important that the Government take concrete steps to contribute to the realization of women's right to health, specifically reproductive rights. Also, it remained concerned at the Government's refusal to respect the rights of individuals with a sexual orientation, gender identity or expression. It was disturbed by the State's rejection of the recommendation on taking steps to combat the persecution of persons on the basis of their sexual orientation or gender identity by repealing article 319.3

from the Penal Code so as to decriminalize consensual sexual conduct between persons of the same sex.

456. Amnesty International welcomed the acceptance by Senegal of recommendations to make resources available to bodies working on trafficking, gender and human rights, and to ensure the independence of the national observatory of places of deprivation of liberty. It raised concerns about the excessive use of force by security forces to repress freedom of expression and assembly, and therefore welcomed the State's acceptance of recommendations on protecting those rights. It was disappointed at the Government's decision to reject recommendations on ratifying the second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. It was also concerned at the fate of dozens of disappeared Casamance people at the hands of government forces. It noted the rejection of recommendations on amending legislation permitting discrimination against minorities and ensuring respect for the human rights of LGBTI persons.

457. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme (RADDHO) drew attention to some of the challenges to be addressed by the Government of Senegal, such as the need for an assessment of the recommendations received during the first review and to organize a participatory mechanism to follow-up on the recommendations received during the second review; to be more firm in the enforcement of laws concerning the prohibition of begging, the exploitation and trafficking of children, and the protection of their image through the media; to prevent the dissemination through the media of any message conveying sexist stereotypes that are unfavourable to women; to end overcrowding in prisons; and to take strong measures to stop police brutality.

458. Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs and Comité international pour le respect et l'application de la Charte africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples welcomed the commitment of Senegal to democracy. They invited Senegal to consolidate its efforts in the health sector, including by strengthening the universal health coverage programme. The establishment of the national human rights committee and the national observatory of prisons were accomplishments that should be supported. They noted the efforts made to consolidate peace in Casamance. In this respect, it was urgent to support the economic development plan initiated by the Government and to combat inequality in the region. They encouraged Senegal to continue its implementation of relevant recommendations, including the decriminalization of press offences and the promotion of equality in the transmission of Senegalese nationality.

#### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

459. The President stated that, on the basis of the information provided, of 185 recommendations received, 154 had enjoyed the support of Senegal, while the rest had been noted.

460. Senegal thanked the delegations that had taken the floor to acknowledge the efforts made by the State to implement the recommendations received during its review.

461. The delegation also thanked the non-governmental organizations that had taken the floor, and proceeded to answer some of the concerns expressed by them.

462. With regard to the situation in prisons and long periods of detention, the delegation acknowledged that prisons were overcrowded. The State was implementing a policy to reduce overcrowding by a greater use of probation (as seen in the recent release of 800 people under probation); the reform in progress of the Penal Code and Code of Criminal Procedure; and the construction, in 2014, of a prison with capacity for more than 1,500 detainees.

#### **Nigeria**

463. The review of Nigeria was held on 22 October 2013 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 Nigeria in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/NGA/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/NGA/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/NGA/3).

464. At its 39th meeting, on 20 March 2014, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Nigeria (see sect. C below).

465. The outcome of the review of Nigeria comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/25/6), the views of Nigeria concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group.

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

466. The delegation of Nigeria recalled that, during the review in October 2013, the State had received 219 recommendations, of which 175 recommendations had been immediately accepted, 10 recommendations rejected, and 34 recommendations deferred for further consideration.

467. Of the afore-mentioned 34 recommendations, nine had been accepted, while the remaining 25 recommendations, dealing mostly with abolition of the death penalty, had not been accepted. The death penalty fell within the joint jurisdiction of the Federal Government and the 36 State governments. Consequently, it was not feasible to implement a moratorium on the death penalty given the federal system guaranteeing autonomy to its federating units.

468. The Court of Justice of the Economic Community of West African States had granted an injunction against the execution of the death penalty, and had directed the Government to continue to abide by its commitment to maintain a moratorium on the death penalty. The Government would respect the court order, as dialogue on the death penalty continued.

469. The Criminal Procedure Act and the Criminal Procedure Code both provided that no person could be sentenced to death if that person was under the age of 18 years at the time of the offence. The courts had applied these provisions strictly, even where heinous crimes had been committed.

470. Nigeria had not accepted the recommendation on the amendment to article 12 of the Constitution. The rationale for article 12 was to ensure that international obligations, as expressed in treaties between Nigeria and other States, were brought to the attention of the legislature in order to promote an inclusive Government, and to ensure harmony between municipal laws and international obligations. However, a constitutional review process was being conducted in the National Assembly, and the outcome might include an amendment to section 12 along the lines suggested in the recommendation.

471. Article 33, order 237 of the Nigerian Police Act was currently under review, and the National Assembly had taken note of the relevant recommendation, which had been accepted by the State.

472. Harmful traditional practices, addressed in one recommendation that enjoyed the support of Nigeria, were deeply rooted in ancient traditional beliefs and cultural practices, and could not be eliminated overnight. The Government, through the Ministry for Women's Affairs and Social Development, the National Human Rights Commission and the Ministries of Culture and Tourism would continue to educate the general public and raise awareness on this matter.

473. The Government encouraged educational institutions to adopt a progressive approach to the introduction of sex education in their curricula. Advocacy on sex education would continue on a progressive basis, given the cultural sensitivities of parents, religious bodies and other stakeholders in the education of young people.

474. Nigeria was currently unable to accept the recommendations on the issue of early marriage. Marriage fell within the concurrent jurisdiction of the Federal Government and the State governments. At the federal level, the National Assembly had passed the Child Rights Act, which prohibited the marriage of any girl below the age of 18 years. To ensure the nationwide application of this principle, the Federal Government had stepped up advocacy to encourage the State governments to enact their own version of the Act; 26 of 36 States had already done so. In addition, the Government was, at all levels, engaged in advocacy to discourage girl-child marriages through various measures, including subsidized education for girls.

475. While pointing out that Nigeria had accepted the relevant recommendation, the delegation explained that there were no restrictions on the formation or activities of trade unions in Nigeria. Trade unions would continue to exercise their mandates fully and freely, pursuant to section 40 of the 1999 Constitution (as amended) and the Trade Union Act.

476. Nigeria had accepted the recommendation on forced evictions, which stopped. The evictions carried out in Lagos and Rivers States by the respective State governments had been undertaken for the purpose of urban renewal projects, and to spare residents of the hardship and negative effects of potential coastal flooding. In future, when it became necessary to evacuate residents of any community for any overriding public purpose, appropriate notices and effective compensation and resettlement plans would be put in place.

477. Pointing out that the relevant recommendation enjoyed the support of Nigeria, the delegation stated that the proposed Petroleum Industry Bill before the National Assembly was designed to address the concerns contained in the recommendation.

478. With regard to a recommendation that Nigeria had rejected, the delegation stated that, in the light of the investigation within the Joint Task Force, no incident or organized abuse of the human rights of the people by the Task Force had occurred in Baga.

479. The Nigerian security agencies fighting Boko Haram were under strict directives to operate within the limitations of global best practices and rules of engagement that adhered to applicable humanitarian and international human rights laws.

## **2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Council on the review outcome**

480. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Nigeria, 15 delegations made statements. If available, statements of those delegations which could not be delivered due to time constraints<sup>26</sup> are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council.

481. Senegal welcomed the determination shown by Nigeria to cooperate with the universal periodic review mechanism, and commended the State's ongoing commitment to strengthen, promote and protect human rights. It encouraged Nigeria to continue to take positive measures to improve the situation and to consolidate the achievements made in the area of human rights, particularly through implementation of the accepted recommendations.

482. South Sudan commended Nigeria for having accepted most of the recommendations made, and was pleased that Nigeria had accepted its recommendation. It acknowledged with appreciation the efforts made to strengthen the promotion and protection of human rights, and noted the challenges that Nigeria faced in countering terrorist activities.

483. Sri Lanka noted that the majority of the recommendations made during the review enjoyed the support of Nigeria, including the two made by Sri Lanka. It noted the progress made in relation to human rights, and also that the development of the child was at the centre of the State's development priorities. Sri Lanka welcomed the measures taken to address security challenges.

484. The Sudan expressed its appreciation for the openness shown by Nigeria to the universal periodic review mechanism, for its consideration of all the recommendations and its acceptance of a large number of recommendations. Many of the recommendations were highly sensitive for Nigerian society; consideration should be given to the cultural, social and

<sup>26</sup> <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/25thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

traditional specificities of each state. The Sudan expressed its hope that Nigeria would be able to implement all recommendations accepted.

485. Togo commended Nigeria for having accepted most of the recommendations made during the session of the Working Group, including the those made by Togo. It welcomed, *inter alia*, the setting-up of the national human rights commission with financial and decision-making independence, and its accession to various international human rights instruments. Togo encouraged Nigeria to continue its efforts to abolish the death penalty.

486. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland welcomed the acceptance by Nigeria of its recommendations. It deeply condemned the increasing levels of terrorist violence, which only strengthened the importance of its recommendations. The United Kingdom encouraged Nigeria to ensure respect for the rights on all minorities. It welcomed the commitment made by the Government to hold free and fair elections, and also noted the commitment to protect the independence of the electoral commission.

487. The United States of America encouraged Nigeria to make every effort to ensure credible, transparent and peaceful elections. It noted the acceptance of the recommendation on holding security forces accountable for human rights violations. It urged Nigeria to implement a human rights-based approach and to hold to account all parties responsible for gross violations or large-scale abuses of human rights, as the Government strove to counter Boko Haram and others committing acts of terrorism. It urged Nigeria to repeal the Same-Sex Marriage (Prohibition) Act.

488. Uzbekistan welcomed the State's constructive participation in the universal periodic review, and noted with satisfaction that Nigeria had accepted most of the recommendations made, including the ones made by Uzbekistan. The measures taken to implement the recommendations would continue to strengthen the system for protecting human rights.

489. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela highlighted the efforts made by Nigeria to improve access to housing through the implementation of new mortgage financing standards, which had paved the way for an increase in the number of homes built. It urged Nigeria to continue to broaden its social programmes and policies with a view to reaching those segments of the population most in need, with the support and partnership of the international community.

490. Algeria welcomed the State's determination to strengthen the democratic process and to promote a culture of respect for human rights. It noted the efforts that Nigeria had made to reform policies and programmes aimed to promote and protect human rights, and referred to the review of the Constitution and the strengthening of the autonomy of the electoral commission. It welcomed the State's acceptance of the recommendations that it had made. It called upon the international community to provide the technical assistance that Nigeria required to implement its human rights commitments.

491. Angola commended the efforts made by Nigeria to protect the rights of women and other vulnerable groups, particularly persons with disabilities. It thanked Nigeria for having accepted the relevant recommendation made by Angola.

492. Benin noted with satisfaction the qualitative progress contained in the second national report submitted by Nigeria. It encouraged the State to continue its efforts, including in the areas of education, health, the empowerment of women and combating terrorism. Benin urged Nigeria to step up its efforts to implement the recommendations it had accepted. It invited the international community to support Nigeria in combating terrorism.

493. Botswana welcomed the State's acceptance of many of the recommendations made during the review; it was convinced that Nigeria would ensure their full implementation. The State's acceptance of many recommendations relating to the health sector demonstrated its commitment to the fight against HIV/AIDS, and other health issues in general.

494. Burkina Faso expressed its satisfaction with the report presented by Nigeria, and congratulated the State on having prepared it in an inclusive and participatory manner. It took note of the progress made in areas that included access to housing, combating terrorism, combating human trafficking, and torture. It welcomed the efforts made to bring its national human rights commission into line with the Paris Principles.



495. Chad welcomed Nigeria and thanked the delegation for having expressed the State's position on the recommendations. It also thanked Nigeria for having accepted one recommendation made by Chad.

### 3. General comments made by other stakeholders

496. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Nigeria, nine other stakeholders made statements.

497. The Centre for Reproductive Rights pointed out that, in Nigeria, more than one quarter of women and adolescents between the ages of 15 and 49 years did not have access to effective contraception. Unsafe abortion and lack of access to post-abortion care had led to a significant number of deaths. It called for sexuality education in schools, an increase in family planning services, access to safe abortions and post-abortion care, and a review of the State's restrictive abortion law.

498. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom welcomed the State's acceptance of the recommendations on passing the bill on the prohibition of violence against persons, and urged it to do so promptly. It also welcomed the State's acceptance of the recommendation on implementing the national plan of action on Security Council resolution 1325 (2000). It pointed out that the Arms Trade Treaty recognized the link between gender-based violence and the arms trade, and called upon Nigeria to establish a national commission to oversee the application of the Treaty.

499. The International Humanist and Ethical Union stated that anti-homosexuality legislation in Nigeria was unacceptable and could not be justified by national and cultural values. Popular support for anti-homosexual legislation was irrelevant, as it was the State's responsibility as guarantor of human rights to safeguard equality without distinction of any kind. It was deplorable that Nigeria had not only failed to address rampant homophobia, but also enshrined it in national law. It called for State to accept the relevant recommendation thereon.

500. Amnesty International stated that there had been a sharp increase in the attacks by gunmen suspected of being members of Boko Haram. The Government of Nigeria had also committed violations in response to Boko Haram. Amnesty International welcomed the fact that the State had accepted to provide accountability for these violations. It also welcomed the acceptance of the recommendation on preventing forced evictions, and urged the Government to put in place legal protections and other safeguards. It called upon Nigeria to repeal the Same-Sex Marriage (Prohibition) Act and to establish a moratorium on executions, with a view to abolishing the death penalty.

501. Jubilee Campaign stated that the constitutional provisions on freedom of religion were not always enjoyed by religious minorities, particular since the adoption of the sharia penal code by 12 northern States. Non-Muslims in those States were generally denied the rights, opportunities and protections that Muslims enjoyed. The situation had been exacerbated by the emergence of Boko Haram. While prioritization of counter insurgency was essential, Nigeria also had to address the systematic discrimination that contributed to a climate that facilitated impunity with regard to religion-related violence, and the general undermining of the rule of law in these areas.

502. The World Evangelical Alliance stated that Nigeria had not fulfilled the commitments made at its review in 2009 to pursue its fight against corruption. Following the second review, there were increasing doubts with regard to the Government's stand against corruption, particularly in the light of allegations of missing oil revenues to the sum of \$20 billion between January 2012 and July 2013. There was no security for ordinary citizens and human rights were being violated.

503. The International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA) expressed its concern at the Same-Sex Marriage (Prohibition) Act. Innocent Nigerians had been targeted on the basis of the perception of their sexual orientation and gender identity, resulting in mass arrests and mob violence, with perpetrators enjoying impunity. ILGA referred to specific emblematic cases. The Act was being used for the purposes of a witch-hunt. ILGA expressed disappointed that not a single recommendation on homosexuality had been accepted by Nigeria.

504. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droit de l'homme welcomed the reforms that had been undertaken in the area of social, economic and cultural rights. It urged Nigeria to implement the recommendations on corruption, religious fundamentalism, violence against women and discrimination against minorities. It encouraged the promotion of intercultural and religious dialogue in order to combat religious violence.

505. The Association for Progressive Communication welcomed the acceptance by Nigeria of recommendations relating to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, violence against women and children, education, and to human rights defenders, journalists and other civil society actors. It noted that Nigeria had accepted similar recommendations during its review in 2009, but no significant progress had been made since. It recommended the discontinuation of online interference and of efforts to conduct Internet surveillance. It expressed concern at the State's rejection of a number of important recommendations.

#### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

506. The President stated that of the 219 recommendations made, 184 enjoyed the support of Nigeria and while the remaining recommendations had been noted.

507. The delegation expressed its appreciation to all delegations, non-governmental and civil society organizations for their questions, candid comments and kind suggestions on how to improve the situation of human rights in Nigeria. Nigeria was fully committed to deepening the state of its democracy through free and fair elections. There was no policy of targeting any group; the anti-gay marriage law was strictly the outcome of a democratic process, which no democratic country could actually ignore. There were no violations of rights of persons in detention, particularly in relation to Boko Haram insurgents. The Constitution guaranteed freedom of religion and the Federal Government, the State Governments and other stakeholders were working closely in various interreligious platforms to attain religious harmony. Every effort was being made through institutional, legal and legislative means to reduce and ultimately eliminate corruption. Lastly, Nigeria was one of the freest countries in terms of press freedom, both online and offline.

508. The delegation reiterated that Nigeria would, as always, continue to play an active role in the work of the Human Rights Council, and was fully committed to facilitating the promotion and protection of the global ideals of human rights in the country and the subregion. In this regard, Nigeria acknowledged the importance and usefulness of the universal periodic review mechanism, in particular, its potential for guiding the United Nations and its Member States towards the realization of the fundamental freedoms for people everywhere. For Nigeria, the review process and its outcomes had been a worthwhile experience that would guide policy formulation and execution for the foreseeable future.

#### **Mexico**

509. The review of Mexico was held on 23 October 2013 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 Mexico in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/MEX/1 and Corr.1);
- (b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/MEX/2);
- (c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/MEX/3).

510. At its 39th meeting, on 20 March 2014, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Mexico (see sect. C below).

511. The outcome of the review of Mexico comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/25/7), the views of Mexico concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not

sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/25/7/Add.1).

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

512. The delegation of Mexico stated that an objective and responsible analysis of each of the review recommendations had been made by a working group that included 37 agencies and institutions of the federal public administration, the legislature and the judiciary, the National Governors' Conference and the National Commission for Higher Courts, allowing for the identification of concrete actions in order to implement them. Mexico expressed the goal of keeping this inter-agency framework to advance on these and other recommendations.

513. The current situation of human rights in Mexico could not be understood without the work, construction and cooperation of civil society. The Government assumed, as part of this exercise, the commitment to identify, together with civil society, effective cooperative mechanisms for the follow-up on recommendations.

514. Almost half of the recommendations received by Mexico referred to the need to consolidate or advance ongoing processes, to provide greater resources to mechanisms and institutions that already existed, to accelerate the implementation of existing laws and to address pending issues on legislative harmonization.

515. The message of the international community was clear: Mexico needed to consolidate a State policy on human rights on the basis of important legislative and public policy changes made in recent years, in particular, the constitutional reform of the justice penal system (in 2008) and human rights reform (in 2011).

516. On 5 March 2014, a new Code of Criminal Procedure had been adopted. The Code would improve transparency and agility in criminal trials, thus strengthening the instruments to ensure due process and respect for human rights.

517. On 4 February 2014, the Senate had approved the withdrawal of reservations to five human rights instruments, and the withdrawal of another reservation, which would permit the recognition of the jurisdiction of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. It had also withdrawn a reservation to the Inter-American Convention on Forced Disappearance of Persons, which would allow civilian courts to try members of the armed forces who had participated in the commission of enforced disappearances. The recommendations on military justice had also been accepted.

518. Mexico had accepted the vast majority of the recommendations made, which reaffirmed its commitment to comply with them. It was not possible for Mexico, however, to implement a small number of recommendations; a detailed explanation had been provided to explain this position.

519. Mexico was determined to build a society of rights, which was the unavoidable duty of any democratic State. It was currently concluding a number of important political agreements, which would be crucial to achieving the reforms adopted in 2013 on education, politics, elections, transparency, public finances and telecommunications, which all recognized and extended human rights.

520. Mexico was committed to strengthening the international human rights system and the universal periodic review as part of its foreign policy. The President had indeed recently reiterated the State's commitment to the recommendations made at its review. Unlike four years earlier, the response to the recommendations reflected an inclusive process of broad consultation and transparency. For the first time, the process of acceptance of the recommendations had provided an opportunity for dialogue, which had resulted in a document (A/HRC/25/7/Add.1) that reflected the State's policy on human rights and intended actions.

521. The State's second participation in the universal periodic review had coincided with the development of the national human rights programme for 2014-2018, which would respond to the need to link international recommendations to public policy.

522. The recommendations accepted by Mexico would help to promote the protection of persons in situations of vulnerability, who suffered from many forms of discrimination. The State would therefore continue to propose initiatives to ensure the protection of human rights of migrants, indigenous peoples and persons with disabilities, and the empowerment of women as well.

523. The addendum presented reflected the State's commitment to ensure that everyone can exercise and enjoy their rights effectively. The report contained information about the action taken to advance on issues such as military justice, enforced disappearances, the protection of human rights defenders and journalists and the eradication of violence against women, among others. Mexico had accepted all the recommendations on these issues, as well as those relating to education, sexual and reproductive rights, poverty eradication, public safety, social inclusion, the reduction of inequality, impunity and gender stereotypes. The full acceptance of the recommendations by Mexico confirmed its commitment to meet its international human rights obligations.

524. The delegation acknowledged the interest shown by all Member States and their recommendations, and emphasized that Mexico was committed to taking action to comply with the activities described in the addendum submitted: first, Mexico would design a mechanism for monitoring and implementing each of the accepted recommendations; second, all agencies involved would coordinate their activities to ensure due compliance; and third, Mexico would seek to guarantee the participation of civil society in this exercise.

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

525. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Mexico, 11 delegations made statements.

526. Burkina Faso noted the reforms introduced at the constitutional level, which had permitted the strengthening of the Human Rights Commission. It commended Mexico for adopting and implementing a national development plan for 2013-2018 as a framework to fight poverty. It also appreciated the progress made by the State in education and human rights training, the protection of migrants, the fight against inequality, and access to housing and food. It was convinced that the implementation of the recommendations accepted would favour the situation of human rights.

527. China welcomed the State's commitment to continue to implement the recommendations accepted. It thanked the delegation for accepting the recommendations made by China and for continuing to give top priority to the elimination of poverty in its national development plan in order to build more solid material conditions for the enjoyment of human rights. China thanked the State for the efforts made to promote legislation and action to remove discrimination and to strengthen the protection of the rights and interests of all groups, including women, children and elderly.

528. Cuba congratulated Mexico on the progress made, and encouraged it to continue to take measures to promote the human rights of its population. Cuba recalled the significant challenges that the State faced, as identified in the report of the Working Group. Cuba had made several recommendations aimed at reducing inequalities in incomes to a minimum among different social sectors and geographic regions, fighting corruption at all levels and enhancing efforts in the fight against drug trafficking. Cuba urged Mexico to continue to take measures contributing to the promotion and protection of all human rights.

529. Djibouti stated that, by means of the constitutional reform and the Pact for Mexico, the Government had sent a clear message to its population and the international community about its determination to improve the situation of human rights. It welcomed the State's collaboration with the special procedures and regional institutions, and the fact that its ambitious programme has led to the creation of mechanisms for accountability and follow-up. It noted the State's position with regard to the various recommendations made by Djibouti, and hoped that Mexico would integrate persons of African descent in to its special consideration of indigenous peoples and other vulnerable groups, to combat effectively all forms of discrimination.

530. India highlighted the State's commitment to the universal periodic review, and its progress in efforts to promote and protect human rights, and thanked it for accepting the recommendation made by India on focusing on marginalized social groups. India took positive note of laudable progress made by Mexico in reducing poverty and inequality, and was encouraged by the State's acceptance of many recommendations on promoting and protecting human rights.

531. Libya highlighted the importance of the efforts made by Mexico to promote and protect human rights, and to participate actively in the work of the Human Rights Council. It appreciated the positive developments and progress made, especially the setting-up of a national programme for 2013-2018 to achieve equal opportunities and to fight discrimination against women, as well as the efforts aimed at reforming the electoral law with a view to ensuring the full participation of women. Libya thanked Mexico for having accepted most of the recommendations made.

532. Malaysia was satisfied by the explanation and clarification provided by Mexico on a number of issues raised by Member States during the interactive dialogue, particularly with regard to the rights of persons with disabilities. Malaysia acknowledged the continuous efforts made by the Government to promote and protect human rights, including its measures to combat poverty and its serious efforts to promote the right to education. It was pleased that the recommendations made by Malaysia on these issues had been accepted by the State.

533. Morocco welcomed the State's inclusive and participatory process to define its position on recommendations, and welcomed the involvement of all departments and ministries concerned as a good practice. It also welcomed its acceptance of most recommendations, particularly those on institutional reforms, and the one made by Morocco on continuing efforts to ensure the effective implementation of the new 2011 constitutional provisions, which included the strengthening of the national human rights commission, which would be enabled to investigate grave violations of human rights.

534. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela was pleased that the Government of Mexico had taken steps to provide sufficient information, which had allowed positive interaction on its human rights achievements and the challenges it faced. It highlighted the launching of the initiative to guarantee food security to more than 7 million people living in extreme poverty, and the access afforded to 52 million people to Seguro Popular, a health insurance programme available to those who were not covered social security. It recognized the efforts made by Mexico to overcome the obstacles to comply with the recommendations accepted at its first review, thereby reaffirming its commitment to human rights.

535. Viet Nam welcomed the seriousness with which Mexico had provided detailed feedback on the recommendations received. It appreciated the considerable number of recommendations that Mexico had accepted, including two made by Viet Nam on social inclusion, equality and non-discrimination. As achievements were made, expectations rose; much more therefore had to be done. With its firm commitment and determination, Mexico would make the utmost effort to ensure the full enjoyment of all human rights for all people.

536. Algeria welcomed the State's acceptance of two recommendations made by Algeria, on ensuring better protection for children and adolescents against violence linked to organized crime, and strengthening measures to combat human trafficking and violence against migrants. Algeria was confident that the measures already taken or under consideration by the Government of Mexico would have a positive impact on the promotion and protection of human rights.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

537. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Mexico, 10 other stakeholders made statements.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>27</sup> The statements of the stakeholders that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted, if available, on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, at <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/25thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

538. The World Organisation against torture welcomed the commitment of Mexico to the prevention and punishment of torture; despite that commitment, the practice of torture and other forms of mistreatment had been systematic since 2009, committed by, inter alia, the police and members of armed forces to obtain confessions. Impunity was almost absolute for torture; the organization in fact expressed concern at the use of *arraigo* (preventive detention) (*arraigo*). Cases of enforced disappearance had re-emerged in Mexico, even though the authorities did not categorize it as such, but as another form of crime.

539. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom highlighted the coexistence of normative advances and the establishment of judicial institutions with generalized patterns of violence and discrimination against women. It denounced the threats and acts of aggression against women human rights defenders, who should be protected. It hoped that Mexico would install an inter-institutional mechanism to comply with the recommendations made by the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, and called upon Mexico to take prompt measures to prepare the agenda for the visit of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders.

540. Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos highlighted the significant increase in the use of the armed forces in public security, despite the calls repeatedly made by human rights mechanisms against it. It expressed concern at the State's rejection of the recommendation on eliminating the use of preventive detention, and stated that the human rights violations committed by the armed forces were continuing.

541. According to Centro de Derechos Humanos Miguel Agustín Pro Juárez, torture was still practiced systematically in Mexico, covered almost universally by impunity. It stated that the judicial authorities should exclude any evidence obtained through a human rights violation. It stressed that, as long as torture was being used as a *modus operandi*, no advances would be made in the professionalization of the police and in criminal investigations. The Human Rights Council should be prepared address situations whenever they occur, not only within the context of the universal periodic review. The situation in Mexico demanded its attention.

542. Save the Children International welcomed the acceptance of the recommendations made on children's rights. It urged Mexico to engage in a review and a reform process of all legislation to ensure its compliance with international standards, to adopt a comprehensive child rights act by 2016, to take measures to ensure that the rights of migrant children were fully respected, and to guarantee women's access to a universal health-care system prior to, during and after childbirth.

543. Tlachinollan described the situation in the State of Guerrero as one where poverty and generalized violence had become a systematic violation of rights, aggravated by the lack of civilian control over the armed forces. It highlighted the persistence of discriminatory practices and the existence of 40 criminal procedures against indigenous authorities from Guerrero for exercising their right to self-determination. Tlachinollan stated that, while Mexico spoke about protocols on consultations with indigenous peoples, secondary laws violated daily the right of indigenous peoples to consultation.

544. Action Canada for Population and Development welcomed the State's acceptance to carry out follow-up work on universal periodic review outcomes. It noted the persistent gender stereotypes and the significant obstacles to the realization of the human rights of women and LGBT persons, and sexual and reproductive rights. It appreciated the effort made by the Government of Mexico to introduce legal provisions to protect individuals from discrimination based on gender, sexual orientation or sexual identity, but was deeply concerned that the measures taken to date did not recognize the concept of gender identity. It urged Mexico to adopt federal laws and policies to address these types of discrimination.

545. According to Amnesty International, the situation in Mexico was critical, characterized by ongoing patterns of enforced disappearances, torture and ill-treatment, arbitrary detention, and routine attacks on women, human rights defenders, journalists and migrants. It therefore called upon the State to strengthen measures to investigate these cases. It urged Mexico to act on the recommendations made to ensure prompt, full and impartial investigations and prosecution of those responsible for arbitrary detention, torture and ill-treatment, and the excessive use of force by security forces and the police. It called upon the

State to reform the Military Justice Code to ensure prosecution in the civilian justice system, and regretted the State's decision not to abolish *arraigo* (preventive detention).

546. The Jubilee Campaign expressed its concerns at the continuing and frequent violations of the right to freedom of religion or belief and the persistent religious discrimination. Local authorities often attempted to enforce uniformity and dominant forms of worship and belief at the expense of the rights of religious minorities; in this regard, Mexico should end the exemption from prosecution that perpetrators of religious offences often enjoyed. Where possible, the Government should protect church leaders threatened by illegal groups, investigate thoroughly the crimes committed against them, and prioritize the protection of those who spoke out against corruption and human rights violations.

547. Grupo de Información en Reproducción Elegida acknowledged the acceptance by Mexico of the recommendations regarding sexual reproductive rights. It had informed the State about the need to reject the recommendation made on the protection of life from conception, as it was contrary to human rights standards; nonetheless, Mexico had an unclear position, based on reasons that were not discussed in the dialogue process with civil society. It was discouraged by the lack of determination that the Government of Mexico had shown in defending the reproductive rights of women. It called upon all authorities to comply with the recommendations made on reproductive health.

#### 4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

548. According to the information available, out of 176 recommendations received, 166 enjoy the support of Mexico, additional clarification had been provided on another two recommendations, while the others had been noted.

549. With regard to *arraigo*, the delegation stated that its use in 2013 was less than half of that witnessed in 2011 and 2012, and that a reform had reduced the number of days of detention from 80 to 30 days. Article 57.2 of the Military Justice Code was being amended to ensure consistency with the Constitution and international standards. The Prosecutor General's Office had adopted a practice of directing cases of alleged human rights violations to civilian authorities.

550. Work was ongoing to design protocols guaranteeing consultations with indigenous peoples in cases of development projects that had an impact on them, on the basis of concrete processes and past experiences, such as the consultations held with the Yaqui tribe and the El Espinal community in Oaxaca. Mexico pointed out the existence of a mechanism that led to the release imprisoned indigenous persons in the event of identification of a violation of due process.

551. The delegation informed the Human Rights Council that the decree against homophobia would be published on 21 March 2014.

552. Mexico had a policy of total openness to international scrutiny, and had extended a permanent invitation to any of the special procedures to carry out visits to the country. The Special Rapporteur on torture would carry out a visit in the near future.

553. Regarding the mechanism for the protection of human rights defenders and journalists, that had been in place since 2012, 152 requests had already been received, benefitting 220 human rights defenders and journalists. Mexico was working to strengthen the mechanism, also with international organizations.

#### Mauritius

554. The review of Mauritius was held on 23 October 2013 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 Mauritius in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/MUS/1);
- (b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/MUS/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/MUS/3).

555. At its 39th meeting, on 20 March 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Mauritius (see sect. C below).

556. The outcome of the review of Mauritius comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/25/8), the views of Mauritius concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/25/8/Add.1).

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

557. The Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations presented additional information on the review of Mauritius to the Human Rights Council. The Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review had examined the national report of Mauritius on 23 October 2013; on that occasion, Mauritius had received 150 recommendations. On the adoption of the draft report by the Working Group, Mauritius declared that it had accepted 114 recommendations and that it would submit its views on the remaining 36 before the adoption of the report at the present session of the Council. After close consultations with all stakeholders, Mauritius had submitted its views to the secretariat on 3 March 2014.

558. Mauritius informed the Human Rights Council that it would submit an interim report before its next review.

559. Mauritius reaffirmed its unrelenting commitment to the highest standards of human rights at the national level and to engaging effectively in the universal promotion and protection of human rights.

560. It was recalled that the Minister for Foreign Affairs, who had led the delegation at the review in October had highlighted that the priority of the Government was to provide the people of Mauritius with a quality of life based on human dignity, equality of treatment, economic empowerment and social justice. In Mauritius, the welfare of its citizens remained at the core of development. The State had always endeavoured to foster development on the basis of the universal values of democracy, good governance, the rule of law, the promotion and protection of human rights, and fundamental freedoms. It had adopted an inclusive approach to addressing human rights issues, including in relations with stakeholders, such as national human rights institutions, non-governmental organizations and civil society on both mainland Mauritius and the island of Rodrigues.

561. Mauritius had received recommendations relating to, inter alia, domestic violence, racial discrimination, legislation on child protection, protection for the disabled, the situation of human rights of working migrants, and accession to and ratification of certain international human rights instruments. Mauritius assured the Human Rights Council that it valued those recommendations highly and that serious consideration was being given to them while it further pursued its efforts to promote and protect the human rights of its citizens.

562. Mauritius reiterated its stance stated during the session of the Working Group, that is, that the national human rights plan of action for 2012-2020 addressed most of the recommendations it had received. The plan placed much emphasis on the strengthening of international cooperation in the field of human rights, the realization of social, economic and cultural rights, the strengthening of women's rights and the protection of the rights of vulnerable persons, including elderly persons, children and persons with disabilities.

563. Mauritius highlighted the action it had taken in a number of fields.

564. On the issue of disabilities, Mauritius had taken measures to implement a policy of inclusive education with a view to addressing shortfalls in the education of disabled children. The aim of the measures was to achieve parity in government funding for disabled and other



children. Once parity was reached, the Government would withdraw its reservation to article 24.2(b) of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

565. The Ministry of Social Security, National Solidarity and Reform Institutions was also reviewing its policy paper and plan of action on disability in the context of the post-2015 development agenda of the United Nations.

566. The previous month, the Government of Mauritius had set up a steering committee at the level of the Ministry of Information and Communications Technology to monitor the report and to promote collaboration among stakeholders on an online child sexual abuse reporting portal.

567. An advisory committee had been established under the chairmanship of the Chief Executive Officer of the Law Reform Commission to strengthen the legal framework for the protection of victims of domestic violence.

568. With regard to the ratification of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and the Protocol thereto, it was recalled that Mauritius, being a small and densely populated island with limited resources, had not yet adopted a policy or laws to grant refugee status to foreigners. Requests for refugee status and political asylum were treated on a case-by-case basis; Mauritius also called for the assistance of friendly countries and relevant agencies for the re-settlement of applicants.

569. With regard to the recommendation on acceding to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Mauritius recalled that all death sentences had been commuted to life sentences. The Constitution, however, had not yet been amended to prohibit the death penalty. An amendment to the Constitution could not be made unless it was supported by at least three quarters of the members of the National Assembly.

570. With regard to the recommendation relating to Mauritian citizens of Chagossian origin who were evicted by the United Kingdom from the Chagos Archipelago, an integral part of Mauritius, the delegation pointed out that the long-standing struggle of Mauritius to exercise its sovereignty over the Archipelago and the right of its former inhabitants, as Mauritian citizens, to be resettled in the Archipelago were inseparable. The Government of Mauritius would continue to press for the early and unconditional return of the Chagos Archipelago to the effective control of Mauritius, while firmly supporting the right of return of Mauritian citizens of Chagossian origin and other Mauritians to it. With regard to the question of reparation for victims, Mauritius held the view that it should be addressed by the United Kingdom, which had forcibly removed the former inhabitants of the Chagos Archipelago to Mauritius.

571. The Constitution of Mauritius guaranteed to all citizens the right to equal protection and to benefit from the law, without discrimination based on race, caste, colour, sex, religious beliefs, place of origin or political opinion. A number of legislative measures had been taken to ensure the effective exercise of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights and a conducive environment for equal opportunities for all, and to sustain a cohesive and harmonious society in a multi-racial and multi-ethnic island State.

572. Mauritius fully subscribed to the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, respected the universality of human rights, and considered human rights to be indivisible from economic, social and cultural rights and as important as civil and political rights. The manner in which all rights were attained and implemented nevertheless had to take into account specific national circumstances and the multi-ethnic composition of the country.

573. In conclusion, Mauritius reiterated its gratitude for the support given during its second review.

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

574. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Mauritius, 14 delegations made statements.<sup>28</sup>

575. India congratulated Mauritius on the successful completion of its review. It commended Mauritius for its progress in the promotion and protection of human rights through the consolidation of its institutional framework and the steps taken to put in place legislation and public policies in the areas of gender equality, ending gender-based violence, youth empowerment and persons with disabilities. India appreciated the State's acceptance of 114 recommendations during the session of the Working Group, noted its position on the remaining recommendations, and recommended that the report be adopted.

576. Libya welcomed the positive participation of Mauritius and commended its positive responses to the 114 recommendations that it had accepted. It thanked Mauritius for the positive steps taken to promote institutions that address the promotion and protection of human rights, particularly those of persons with disabilities. Libya recommended that the outcome of the review be adopted.

577. Mauritania appreciated the constructive cooperation of Mauritius with the Human Rights Council during the universal periodic review, where it had demonstrated its commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights in the economic, social and political fields. It noted the national human rights plan of action, which included a number of important measures, including increasing international cooperation in the field of human rights. Mauritania hoped that the Council would adopt the report.

578. Morocco stated that the acceptance of the great majority of the recommendations received demonstrated the commitment of Mauritius to human rights, and commended particularly its acceptance of its recommendation on continuing efforts in the field of human rights education, in particular by implementing the relevant provisions of the relevant United Nations declaration. Morocco considered Mauritius an example of democracy; its independent judiciary played an important role in ensuring the protection of fundamental freedoms. In addition, strong and independent national institutions, such as the National Human Rights Commission and the Ombudsperson for Children, contributed to the protection of all citizens.

579. Mozambique noted that it was remarkable that Mauritius had not rejected any of the recommendations made during the session of the Working Group, but had accepted 114 and undertaken to examine the 36 others and to provide its responses in due course. This demonstrated the State's open-minded approach to human rights-based reports. Its acceptance of the recommendation on considering extending a standing invitation to the special procedures was a clear indication of its commitment to improve the human rights of its people. It recommended that the outcome report be adopted.

580. Namibia thanked Mauritius for the update on its efforts to uphold its human rights obligations. It welcomed the State's acceptance of the recommendations it had made. Namibia noted the progressive laws, policies and programmes adopted to promote and protect economic, social and cultural rights, in particular free education, health care and pensions for the elderly, and encouraged Mauritius to continue to strengthen them. Namibia was pleased that the rights of women continued to receive the Government's full attention through the national gender policy framework across ministries, and encouraged the Government to promote the framework in the private sector.

581. Rwanda congratulated Mauritius on its positive and constructive cooperation with the universal periodic review mechanism, as shown by its acceptance of the great majority of the recommendations received. It thanked Mauritius in particular for having accepted its

<sup>28</sup> The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted, if available, on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, at <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/25thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

recommendation on continuing to address gender-based violence. It commended the State for the progress made in the promotion and protection of human rights.

582. Senegal took note of the additional information provided by the delegation, and congratulated Mauritius on its commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights. It encouraged Mauritius to strengthen, in the framework of the implementation of recommendations it had accepted during the second cycle, its efforts to eliminate all forms of violence and discrimination against women and children.

583. Togo congratulated Mauritius on its full cooperation with the universal periodic review mechanism and the progress made in the area of human rights. It invited the international community to support Mauritius in the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted, and wished the State every success in its efforts.

584. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had been impressed by the generally positive approach that had been adopted by Mauritius to the universal periodic review. It expressed its appreciation for the acceptance by the State of its recommendation on emphasis and transparency in tackling gender-based violence. It did not think the universal periodic review was the appropriate forum for raising issues relating to territorial disputes. The Government of the United Kingdom maintained that the British Indian Ocean Territory was British, and had been since 1814; it did not recognize the sovereignty claim by the Government of Mauritius. It added that the Government of the United Kingdom had expressed regret about the events of the 1960s and 1970s, and that the substantial compensation rightly paid had been held to be the full and final settlement of the Chagossian claims by both British and European courts. A new study into the feasibility of resettlement of the territory by Chagossians was under way and would be finalized in 2015. It thanked the delegation for its engagement with the review and the Human Rights Council.

585. Algeria thanked Mauritius for its constructive engagement in the universal periodic review process, clearly shown by the State's acceptance of the majority of the recommendations made, including two made by Algeria on continuing efforts with regard to human rights education, and in favour of the promotion of the rights of women and children, and in the area of the fight against discrimination. Algeria was confident that Mauritius would spare no effort to implement its review commitments, and recommended therefore that the Council adopt the outcome report.

586. Angola commended commitment of Mauritius and its efforts in the promotion and protection of human rights, particularly through its close collaboration with the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council. It appreciated the State's acceptance of the recommendations made during the review, in particular the one made by Angola, and the measures taken for their implementation, such as the poverty reduction strategies and the creation of the Ministry of Social Integration and Economic Empowerment, and ensuring access to justice by vulnerable groups. It recommended that the Council adopt the outcome report.

587. Botswana noted with appreciation the additional information provided by the State. As a model of democracy in Africa, Mauritius had continued to respect and promote the rule of law and good governance at the national and international levels. It commended Mauritius for its efforts to address concerns about domestic violence and its commitment to end gender-based violence by 2015, which included the launch of a national plan of action to combat domestic violence in 2011 and special awareness-raising programmes for young people. It supported the adoption of the outcome report.

588. Burkina Faso thanked Mauritius for the information provided, and commended it for its efforts aimed at the effective implementation of human rights. It particularly appreciated the launching in 2012 of the national human rights plan of action for 2012-2020 and the measures for its implementation, such as the establishment of a monitoring committee. It also appreciated the creation of a database on human rights, with the support of the United Nations Development Programme and the University of Mauritius, to assess progress in the field of human rights. It recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the outcome report.

### 3. General comments made by other stakeholders

589. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Mauritius, other stakeholders made statements.

590. The Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network welcomed the steps taken by the State towards non-discrimination, including on the grounds of sexual orientation. It noted that Mauritius had stated that further consultations were required on the issue of the decriminalization of consensual same-sex conduct. It also recalled that Mauritius had accepted recommendations on legislating positively in this area at its first review, and considered that this remained a recommendation accepted by the State that awaited implementation. It requested the delegation to give its timetable for consultations in accordance with the commitments it had made during the first review cycle and its international human rights obligations.

591. The European Disability Forum congratulated Mauritius on having accepted the recommendations on the rights of persons with disabilities made by several delegations. It noted the reservations made by Mauritius to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities on articles 9 (accessibility), 24 (education) and 11 (on protection in situations of risks and emergencies), and thanked Togo and Uruguay for echoing the concerns of persons with disabilities regarding these reservations. It also noted the recommendation made by Australia on ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention, and the recommendation on developing legislation to prevent the abuse and exploitation of children with disabilities. It requested Mauritius to clarify whether it had accepted the pending recommendations and, if not, to consult with the Governments that had made the recommendations. It recommended that the Government address other key issues of the report of the Federation of Disabled Peoples Organisations (DPO) Mauritius.

### 4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

592. Of the 150 recommendations made, 114 enjoyed the support of Mauritius, while the others had been noted.

593. The delegation expressed its sincere thanks and appreciation for the active participation in the consideration of the second national report on the situation of human rights submitted by Mauritius in the context of the universal periodic review, and in particular, for the unanimous recommendation for the adoption of its outcome report. It greatly valued the comments, observations and recommendations made, and had taken note of the statements made by non-governmental organizations.

594. Some of the questions raised had already been addressed by Mauritius in the addendum to the report of the Working Group. With regard to the statement made by the United Kingdom, however, Mauritius reiterated that the Chagos Archipelago, including Diego Garcia, was an integral part of the territory of the Republic of Mauritius under both Mauritian and international law, and that it did not recognize the so-called “British Indian Ocean Territory”.

595. The Government of Mauritius repeated that it was the only Government with the lawful authority to determine issues relating to resettlement in the Chagos Archipelago.

596. The delegation reiterated the fact that the promotion and protection of human rights were very high on the agenda of the Government of Mauritius. Mauritius would continue to pursue cooperation with the Human Rights Council and its universal periodic review mechanism, given that it strongly believed that the ultimate goal of the review was to improve the situation of human rights in the State under review.

### Jordan

597. The review of Jordan was held on 24 October 2013 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 Jordan in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/JOR/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/JOR/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/JOR/3 and Corr.1).

598. At its 40th meeting, on 20 March 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Jordan (see sect. C below).

599. The outcome of the review of Jordan comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/25/9), the views of Jordan concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group.

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

600. The delegation of Jordan expressed the State's full commitment to working with all partners to ensure the success of the universal periodic review mechanism. Jordan had already commenced the implementation of the recommendations; for example, the provision on granting Jordanian civil rights to the children of Jordanian women married to non-Jordanians had been recently approved. Jordan had also begun studies on the introduction of electronic systems to provide daily information on arrested persons and to monitor their legal status.

601. With regard to the 13 recommendations to be examined and recommendation 119.1 in particular, the delegation highlighted the State's contributions to and its leading role in the establishment of the International Criminal Court. Jordan was not opposed to privileges and immunities, but considered that the security and political stability necessary to implement them did not currently exist in the Middle East.

602. With regard to recommendation 119.2, the delegation pointed out that Jordanian law provided for the criminalization of all acts that constitute violence against women, and highlighted the law on protection against domestic violence.

603. With regard to recommendation 119.3, the Constitution of Jordan considered all citizens to be equal before the law; sex could not, therefore be used to discriminate against citizens. All the rights enshrined in national legislation granted to men were enjoyed by women; the same applied to duties.

604. With reference to the inheritance rights of women and recommendation 119.4, the delegation pointed out that Jordanian legislation, which was derived from sharia law, included a comprehensive formula in this area. Women sometimes received half of an estate, and sometimes more. Any breach of this formula would threaten a woman's right to inheritance. The personal status law, which governed inheritance issues, had been the subject of lengthy public discussions; a consensus had been reached that confirmed citizens' acceptance of it.

605. With regard to divorce, the personal status law gave the husband the right to divorce, and also protected women. A woman could divorce whenever she wanted, and retained all her rights arising from the marriage contract, for example in cases where the husband initiates a divorce. Women had the right to petition for a separation in court in the event of sexual or physical disorder. The law also allowed a woman to be the custodian of a minor, whether she had custody or not.

606. With regard to recommendation 119.5, the constitutional amendments of 2011 provided for the explicit criminalization of all acts of torture. There had been many court rulings invalidating confessions made under torture. In addition, the sentences of the State Security Court, which applied the Criminal Procedure Code, were subject to appeal.

607. When there was evidence that a public security official had engaged in acts of torture or other crimes that constituted a violation of human rights, it was forwarded to the police court, an independent court that incorporated all standards and guarantees of a fair trial. Its decisions were subject to appeal before the Court of Cassation. Public security personnel did not enjoy any kind of immunity from criminal prosecution.

608. With regard to recommendation 119.6, a manual for prosecutors investigating cases of torture had been issued and workshops on its application had been held for judges and all prosecutors. Public security officials also had participated in the workshops. The Civil Code had provisions on compensation for victims of abuse.

609. With regard to recommendation 119.7, any mitigating circumstances for a crime alleged to have been committed for reasons of honour must be proved in accordance with article 340 of the Penal Code, which imposed an additional burden of proof on the accused. Removing mitigating circumstances would therefore have an adverse impact on the prosecution of honour crimes.

610. In relation to recommendation 119.8, many of the amendments to the Penal Code had increased the level of respect for human rights, including, for example, the abolition of the death penalty for a number of crimes, and the amendments to article 208 to increase sanctions for perpetrators of torture. Accordingly, the abolition of these amendments was unacceptable.

611. With regard to recommendation 119.9, the Government was open to any proposal to amend the Press and Publications Law. The law had been promulgated to regulate the activities of websites and to increase transparency and accountability in the circulation of information. Amendments had been introduced to the law on the association of journalists to broaden participation and to take into account the electronic media. The requirement for prior permission to publish applied to all forms of media: the goal was organizational. There was no prior censorship of what was published. The Government continued dialogue with all parties concerned to provide a suitable environment and a legal framework that ensured the freedom and responsibility of the electronic media.

612. With regard to recommendation 119.10, registration procedures applied to all media, not just websites. All media had to abide by the same rules. Jordan attached great importance to having a modern media system compatible with potential reform and constitutional amendments, and creating an environment conducive to the freedom of the media.

613. With respect to recommendation 119.11, a decision had been made to commence drafting amendments to the law on associations.

614. With regard to recommendation 119.12, the Government had worked recently with civil society, and this had been reflected in the draft amendments to the law on associations. There was no intention to impose restrictions on foreign funding. The measures were intended simply to ensure that funds were channelled to the purpose for which they had been allocated.

615. With regard to recommendation 119.13, the Constitution guaranteed the protection of refugees. Jordan had hosted successive waves of refugees since 1948, despite its scarce resources. In 1997, a memorandum of understanding was signed with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), which included respect for the principle of non-refoulement, the rights of refugees to education, religion, access to justice, employment and exemptions from residency and immigration fees.

## **2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Council on the review outcome**

616. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Jordan, 12 delegations made statements.<sup>29</sup>

617. Sri Lanka appreciated the constructive engagement of Jordan with the universal periodic review, noting that the State had accepted most of the recommendations made. It commended the attention paid to improving living standards, and noted that the Government continued to strengthen the institutional framework for human rights. Sri Lanka recommended the outcome report on Jordan be adopted.

<sup>29</sup> The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are, if available, posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council at <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/25thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

618. The State of Palestine thanked Jordan for its clarifications with regard to the report. It commended it for strengthening its infrastructure and increasing respect for human rights, and its cooperation with the universal periodic review mechanism, whereby it considered all the recommendations made after consultations with stakeholders. It welcomed the fact that Jordan had accepted the majority of the recommendations, including its own, on the rights of domestic workers.

619. The Sudan expressed its appreciation for the thorough responses given by the delegation; Jordan had thus proven its will to protect and promote human rights. It noted the implementation of recommendations accepted at its first review, and appreciated the State's acceptance of the recommendation that the Sudan had made. The Human Rights Council should provide any support that Jordan required in the field of human rights.

620. UNICEF welcomed the initiatives taken by Jordan, such as its endorsement of the law on juveniles, and looked forward to the review of other legislation relating to children. It commended the State's commitment to reporting to the Committee on the Rights of the Child, and called for the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure. It noted the steps taken towards ending corporal punishment in schools and violence against children. UNICEF commended the State's generosity to refugees, and encouraged other efforts to protect refugees, including reviewing its decisions relating to their livelihoods. It also reiterated its readiness to provide technical support relating to foster care and social protection.

621. The United Arab Emirates commended the cooperation shown by Jordan and its acceptance of the recommendations. It noted the significant measures taken in the field of human rights, including those aimed at safeguarding the dignity of citizens, equality, social justice and the rule of law. It saluted the efforts made to consolidate human rights in the long term, and hoped that the Human Rights Council would note the substantial progress made by the State in this regard.

622. According to the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Jordan had irrefutably demonstrated its commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights and openly cooperated with the universal periodic review mechanism. It appreciated the State's efforts to implement the review recommendations accepted, and encouraged the Government to continue its efforts to implement the national strategy for persons with disabilities and to boost its social programmes. It recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the outcome report on Jordan.

623. Yemen congratulated Jordan on its many successes in the field of human rights, and appreciated the State's efforts to consolidate the situation of human rights. It noted the State's acceptance of many recommendations, which bore witness to its resolve to promote human rights. It paid tribute to Jordan for its progress, and called for the adoption of the outcome report.

624. Algeria thanked Jordan for the clarifications on the recommendations that it had taken back for consideration. It congratulated Jordan on its efforts to improve the situation of human rights despite the problems and challenges it faced. It paid tribute to Jordan for its acceptance of many recommendations, including the two that Algeria had made. It hoped that the outcome report would be adopted.

625. Bahrain underlined the importance that Jordan had attached to the universal periodic review mechanism and the transparency that it had demonstrated during the session of the Working Group. The State's efforts to implement the review recommendations, especially with regard to constitutional and legislative amendments, reflected its efforts to improve the protection of human rights, particularly those of women and children and persons with disabilities. It thanked Jordan for having accepted the recommendations it had made, and encouraged the State to continue its implementation of the recommendations.

626. Chad thanked Jordan for its presentation and its views on the recommendations made. Jordan had not accepted the recommendation that Chad had made on the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. It called for the adoption of the report, and wished Jordan success in implementing the recommendations it had accepted.

627. China commended Jordan for its constructive efforts during its participation in the universal periodic review. It thanked Jordan for its comprehensive and positive responses and its decision to accept most of the recommendations made, including those by China. The State's efforts, such as those to protect the rights of women and children, its specialized national strategies to promote human rights and reform and its hosting of a large number of refugees should be recognized.

628. Egypt appreciated the positive approach taken by Jordan to human rights mechanisms, in particular the universal periodic review, which was reflected in the State's acceptance of most of the recommendations made. It noted the State's progress in its legislation and policies to protect and promote human rights, despite the challenges it faced, especially the waves of refugees arriving in the country. Egypt also appreciated the efforts made by Jordan to improve the rights of women and children. Jordan was close to achieving Millennium Development Goal 1. It urged the State to continue its open dialogue with civil society, especially in the follow-up to the recommendations.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

629. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Jordan, five other stakeholders made statements.

630. The National Centre for Human Rights noted that there were still gaps and shortcomings in legislation, practice and policy. Referring to legislation, it noted that the rights of detainees were not guaranteed in the initial phases of detention and there were flaws in the independence of the judiciary. It was also concerned that civilians were not always tried in civilian courts. Anti-terrorism legislation required amendments in order to ensure fair trials. Legislation relating to elections and political parties, employment, freedom of expression and association also required improvement. With reference to policies and practice, while progress had been made, allegations of torture, cruel or inhuman treatment were still being made by persons taken into police custody, although these cases were limited in number. The situation of poverty and unemployment was deteriorating. Measures were needed to tackle violence against women, to end discrimination against women and to ensure their proper inclusion in decision-making. It called upon the authorities to ensure the independence of the Centre and its compliance with the Paris Principles.

631. Human Rights Watch noted that although the Jordanian authorities were undertaking legislative changes to realize reforms announced in 2011, to date the reform agenda had fallen short of the basic changes needed to ensure respect for the rights to freedom of expression and association, freedom of the press and an end to impunity for torture. Following the street protests witnessed in 2011 and 2012, dozens of largely peaceful protestors had been charged with vague, politicized charges that limited their rights. It was regrettable that Jordan had rejected a recommendation on amending the Penal Code in relation to those charges. Human Rights Watch referred to women's inability to pass on their citizenship to their children, and regretted that Jordan had not accepted the recommendations on lifting its reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. It mentioned the lack of convictions for torture or ill-treatment, and considered that the State's rejection of a recommendation on transferring prosecution of such crimes from police and military courts to civilian courts reflected the continuation of impunity for them.

632. The Amman Centre for Human Rights Studies considered that the Jordanian legal system lacked the necessary protection recognized in international conventions. Laws perpetuated impunity in cases of torture, and did not recognize guarantees for detainees, or freedom of opinion. Regular courts refused to rule on appropriate compensation for victims of torture. Restrictions on the flow of information and opinions, including via electronic means, had fallen under the permanent control of the security apparatus. It recommended the abolition of the role of special courts in judging civilians, noting that the role of the State Security Court had increased. The election law was not fully consistent with international standards. Administrative detention was being used to deprive people of their freedom. The measures taken by the Government had led to an exorbitant rise in education and health-care costs. While it noted the moratorium on the death penalty in place since 2006, it pointed out that courts still passed death sentences.



633. Amnesty International welcomed the State's commitment to amend legislation to end impunity for torture, to prevent torture and to ensure victims' rights to justice and compensation. It urged Jordan to reconsider its rejection of the recommendation on ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. Amnesty International welcomed the State's acceptance of recommendations aimed at limiting the use and duration of administrative detention and ensuring the judicial control of detention. It was concerned that the State Security Court continued to try civilians; it therefore welcomed the State's support of recommendations on abolishing the court. While expressing concern about the use of legislation to criminalize peaceful political dissent, it acknowledged the State's acceptance of many recommendations relating to freedom of expression and assembly. It urged Jordan to amend the Penal Code, the press and publications law, the law on societies and the law on information system crimes. It urged Jordan to review the recommendations it had rejected concerning its reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and on the ability of women to pass on their nationality to children and spouses, with a view to their eventual implementation. While recognizing the enormous efforts made by Jordan to accommodate refugees, it hoped that the State would commit to guaranteeing the rights of refugees and asylum seekers to non-refoulement.

634. Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik considered that Jordan had taken a major step forward with the abolition of the death penalty for crimes related to drugs and explosives, and noted that no execution had been carried out since 2006. It encouraged Jordan to abolish the death penalty immediately. It urged the State to withdraw its reservations to article 9 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. It referred to the economic, social and psychological impact of the inability of Jordanian women to pass on their nationality to their spouses and children. The number of women in decision-making positions was low, and was visible in the judiciary and political institutions. It recommended that Jordan ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture, withdraw all reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, and ratify the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and the Protocol thereto. It regretted the fact that Jordan had not responded in due time on the 13 recommendations left to be examined by the State, thus preventing non-governmental organizations from responding themselves.

#### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

635. Of the 173 recommendations received, 126 enjoyed the support of Jordan, while the remainder had been noted.

636. In closing, the delegation thanked all those who had contributed to review of Jordan.

#### **Malaysia**

637. The review of Malaysia was held on 24 October 2013 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 Malaysia in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/MYS/1);
- (b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/MYS/2);
- (c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/MYS/3).

638. At its fortieth meeting, on 20 March 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Malaysia (see sect. C below).

639. The outcome of the review of Malaysia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/25/10), the views of Malaysia concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not

sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/25/10/Add.1 and Corr.1).

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

640. Malaysia stated that, in accordance with the provisions of Human Rights Council resolution 5/1, it was able to support 150 recommendations, on which it had exercised considerable flexibility on a number of difficult issues. The Government of Malaysia had demonstrated its commitment to making progressive and incremental improvements to the situation of human rights, in accordance with national laws and priorities and the aspirations of the people.

641. With regard to the recommendations that did not enjoy the State's support, Malaysia did not completely reject the possibility of reviewing those recommendations. This had been the State's approach since its first universal periodic review in 2009, after which Malaysia had taken steps to implement a number of recommendations that it had initially rejected.

642. Malaysia had taken steps to implement a number of recommendations. In this regard, it had provided an update on developments relating to recommendations made on establishing a national human rights action plan. On 4 December 2013, the Minister in charge of legal affairs convened the inaugural meeting of a national steering committee composed of senior government officials, representatives of academia and civil society, currently represented by the National Human Rights Commission of Malaysia. The steering committee had established five technical subcommittees with responsibility for five key areas of the national human rights action plan: (a) civil and political rights; (b) economic, social and cultural rights; (c) the rights of vulnerable and marginalized groups; (d) the rights of the Orang Asli and natives of Sabah and Sarawak; and (e) international obligations.

643. Malaysia reaffirmed its commitment to develop the action plan in consultation with interested partners and stakeholders. At the same time, it was exploring ways to engage more effectively with stakeholders and to disseminate information on the universal periodic review at the grass-roots level.

644. The Government of Malaysia had launched in 2012 a direct cash-transfer programme, known as the BR1M (Brim) programme. Payments were paid to the most vulnerable households and individuals in the country. On 22 February 2014, the Government had rolled out the third round of pay-outs that were expected to benefit some 7 million people. The programme was to be seen in the context of the Government's long-term agenda, where it was currently considering the establishment of a comprehensive social safety net.

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

645. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Malaysia, 15 delegations made statements.<sup>30</sup>

646. Senegal praised the State's renewed engagement in the promotion and protection of human rights. Senegal was convinced that the protection and strengthening of the rights of vulnerable persons would be adequately addressed in the implementation process of the recommendations supported by Malaysia.

647. Singapore welcomed the State's positive response to the recommendations received during the review, including its acceptance of the two made by Singapore. Singapore would continue to cooperate with Malaysia to promote human rights in the region, including through the initiatives of ASEAN.

648. Sri Lanka noted that Malaysia was a multi-ethnic and multicultural society where diversity had enriched the social fabric of the country. Malaysia had successfully harnessed

<sup>30</sup> The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are, if available, posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council at <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/25thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

this diversity in the development of the country. The “1Malaysia” concept was aimed at reflecting values such as moderation, tolerance, understanding and acceptance through tangible and positive people-oriented programmes and initiatives.

649. The Sudan appreciated the open approach taken by Malaysia to prepare for its review, and praised the positive and reasonable consideration of the recommendations made to Malaysia during the first cycle, and the efforts made by Malaysia to promote and protect human rights in the country.

650. Thailand appreciated the fact that Malaysia supported most of the recommendations made, including one made by Thailand on universal access to affordable health services for the poor and for vulnerable and marginalized groups.

651. Uzbekistan welcomed the State’s support for a large number of recommendations, including to those made by Uzbekistan. It noted the major legislative reforms undertaken to protect the rights of children, women and invalids. Uzbekistan also noted that Malaysia had developed its cooperation with United Nations bodies.

652. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the State’s responses, which highlighted its commitment to human rights. It also welcomed the successfully implemented programmes designed to overcome social inequality under the transformation programme. It appreciated the remarkable progress made in the implementation of the recommendations supported by Malaysia at its first review, and the will that it had shown during the current cycle.

653. Viet Nam welcomed the State’s continued efforts and achievements in strengthening socioeconomic development and tolerance, cohesion and freedom from worry and fear in society, and in enhancing the enjoyment of other human rights and freedoms for its people. Viet Nam commended Malaysia for its commitment and efforts to implement a large number of supported recommendations, including those made by Viet Nam, on promoting gender equality and women participation in society, and for sharing its good experience and practices in other fields.

654. Yemen welcomed the achievements made by Malaysia, and its efforts to improve the situation of human rights. Yemen welcomed the State’s support for a large number of recommendations, which reflected its commitment to the universal periodic review.

655. Algeria welcomed the State’s support for the two recommendations that Algeria had made, on continuing consultations with a view to ratifying major international human rights treaties, and combating trafficking in persons and protecting the rights of migrants.

656. Botswana stated that the introduction of the transformation programme, which was aimed at supporting efforts to promote and protect human rights, demonstrated the State’s commitment to improving the situation of human rights of its people. Botswana commended the legislative reforms aimed at enhancing the enjoyment of civil and political rights, including the repeal of the 1960 Internal Security Act and the promulgation of the 2012 Peaceful Assembly Act.

657. Brunei Darussalam welcomed the efforts made by Malaysia to improve the socioeconomic rights of its people through the implementation of various government programmes, initiatives to enhance the well-being of children, the empowerment of women in the labour force, and the education of its young citizens.

658. Cambodia was encouraged by the steps taken by Malaysia for the promotion and protection of the human rights of its people. Cambodia appreciated the fact that Malaysia had supported its two recommendations.

659. China appreciated the State’s support for the recommendations made by China on pursuing international and regional cooperation, and on stepping up the fight against human trafficking and, in the light of its national conditions, enhancing mutual respect and tolerance among different cultures and religions and maintaining its social diversity.

660. Cuba commended Malaysia for the tangible results witnessed in the implementation of the recommendations supported by the State in the first cycle, which showed that Malaysia was committed and gave priority to the promotion and protection of human rights of its

population. Cuba highlighted the progress made in education and health, and in the fight against poverty, and the efforts made to improve the living standards of its population and to promote the rights of women, children, persons with disabilities and indigenous peoples. Cuba appreciated the fact that Malaysia supported its recommendations on measures to eradicate poverty and ensuring health services and quality education.

### 3. General comments made by other stakeholders

661. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Malaysia, 10 other stakeholders made statements.<sup>31</sup>

662. The Human Rights Commission of Malaysia suggested that the recommendations supported by the State made up the content the national human rights action plan currently being developed in Malaysia. It urged the Government of Malaysia to give priority to accession to the remaining core international human rights treaties. The Commission acknowledged the progress made in the field of economic, social and cultural rights, particularly in poverty eradication and in the rights to health and education. It welcomed the Government's decision to establish a national task force to look into the expeditious implementation of recommendations contained in its report on the land rights of indigenous peoples. It expressed its concern, however, about the strengthening of recourse to detention without trial through the amendments to the Prevention of Crime Act and the enactment of the 2012 Security Offences (Special Measures) Act, reiterating that detention without trial went against the rights to personal liberty, fair trial and to be presumed innocent until proven guilty. While underscoring the right of civil society to contribute actively to good governance, the Commission regretted any punitive action against non-governmental organizations for their involvement in human rights issues.

663. The Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development congratulated Malaysia on having supported several recommendations on women's rights. It was disappointed, however, that Malaysia did not support all seven recommendations on removing reservations to, inter alia, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and on criminalizing marital rape. With regard to the recommendations on children's rights, it noted that, despite the statement made by Malaysia that child marriage had never been a trend, more than 1,000 special permissions to marry had been given for Muslim girls under 16 and boys under 18 in 2012. It added that the Government had directly and indirectly harassed human rights groups that participated in the universal periodic review, including by declaring the Coalition of Malaysian NGOs in the UPR process (COMANGO) illegal.

664. While welcoming the recommendations calling for the prohibition of corporal punishment, the enactment of an anti-torture law, the establishment of an independent police oversight mechanism, the abolition of the death penalty and the ratification of major human rights treaties, the World Organisation against Torture deeply regretted the fact that Malaysia did not support most of them. Malaysian police routinely used torture or other forms of ill-treatment during arrests and detention, or when responding to protests; between 2009 and August 2013, 124 people had been shot dead by the police. It also recalled that the Enforcement Agency Integrity Commission lacked prosecuting powers, independence and effectiveness. Furthermore, the risk of torture and ill-treatment was compounded by the State's legal framework allowing for *incommunicado* detention without charge or judicial review, such as the Security Offences Act, the Prevention of Crime Act and the Dangerous Drugs Act. It also noted that whipping and canning remained widespread forms of punishment of prisoners, including asylum seekers and migrants. There were currently some 900 prisoners on death row.

665. The Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative noted that the Government had declared COMANGO illegal after it had made a submission in which the coalition urged the Government of Malaysia to cease all acts of intimidation and reprisal against human rights

<sup>31</sup> The statements of the stakeholders that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted, if available, on the extranet of the Human Rights Council at <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/25thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

defenders and to cooperate with the universal periodic review. The Enforcement Agency Integrity Commission was not independent, sufficiently resourced or effective in responding to allegations of excessive use of force, abuse of power or custodial deaths. It also regretted that Malaysia did not support all recommendations relating to sexual orientation and gender identity, noting that “carnal intercourse against the order or nature” was punishable by imprisonment and whipping in Malaysia. It urged the Government to declare a moratorium on prosecutions and to take the action necessary to protect members of the community concerned and all human rights defenders from threats, intimidation and violence.

666. Dignity International noted that Malaysia did not support key recommendations to ensure that laws and policies concerning indigenous peoples complied with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People. While commending the State’s support for the recommendation on eliminating poverty and enhancing social welfare, Dignity International stated that these issues could not be addressed without also recognizing the rights to self-governance and the land and cultural rights of indigenous peoples. It deplored the State’s continuing disavowal of well-established international standards, such as the principle of non-refoulement and the protection of migrants, and the Government’s resistance to law reforms aimed at the full realization of the human rights of non-citizens. It condemned the Government’s acts of reprisal against COMANGO and the attacks by non-State actors conducted with the tacit support by the Government.

667. The Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development regretted that Malaysia did not support the recommendations on revising its legislative framework to safeguard freedom of religion and to ensure the exercise of freedom of religion without State interference. It deplored the Government’s failure to uphold, defend, protect and promote freedom of religion, as demonstrated in the ban on the usage of the word “Allah” by non-Muslims. The recent conviction and sentencing of two leading opposition Members of Parliament – Karpal Singh under the Sedition Act and Anwar Ibrahim for trumped-up sodomy charges – which resulted in their disqualification from Parliament raised serious questions about the independence of the judiciary and the impartiality of the administration of justice. It also deplored the use of “national security” as a basis to curtail the freedoms of expression, assembly and association through provisions of repressive laws, including the Societies Act, the Peaceful Assembly Act and the Security Offences Act, and the reintroduction of detention without trial through amendments to the Prevention of Crime Act. It reiterated the call for the immediate repeal or reform of all repressive laws. It also urged the Government to expedite the ratification of all core international human rights treaties.

668. Human Rights Watch noted that the Peaceful Assembly Act added unnecessary restrictions on public assembly. It also noted that the Printing Presses and Publication Act required that all publications be licensed, in violation of free expression rights. Malaysia continued to prosecute political opponents and activists under the Sedition Act, and to deny due process to criminal suspects; the Security Offences Act in fact allowed police detention for up to 28 days with no judicial review. Human Rights Watch also regretted that Malaysia refused to recognize the basic rights of its LGBT population, and had failed to repeal article 377B of its Penal Code, which criminalized consensual adult sexual relations.

669. Action Canada for Population and Development encouraged the Government of Malaysia to remove any legal barriers to abortion services, to ensure access to a range of contraceptive methods and to integrate comprehensive sexuality education as part of formal school curriculum. It expressed concern at the State’s refusal to respect, protect and fulfil the rights of individuals with diverse sexual orientations, gender identities and expressions, and to criminalize marital rape.

670. Amnesty International noted the State’s lack of commitment to ratifying key human rights treaties, which reflected its continued refusal to align national legislation with international human rights law. It expressed concern at the recent attempt to outlaw COMANGO, a coalition of Malaysian non-governmental organizations formed to represent civil society’s human rights concerns at the universal periodic review. It noted that Malaysia had rejected key recommendations to amend laws that were used to restrict the rights to freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly. Human rights violations by the police, including torture and ill-treatment, deaths in custody, fatal shootings and the excessive use of force and firearms remained a critical human rights concern. Such violations were not

adequately investigated and the perpetrators were rarely held to account. Amnesty International expressed concern about the use of the death penalty, where executions had been carried out in secret without any prior or posthumous announcement.

671. The British Humanist Association noted that the Constitution of Malaysia placed a number of restrictions on freedom of religion, in violation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Article 11.4 of the Constitution facilitated assaults on freedom of expression and thought, which were backed by various laws, such as the Printing Presses and Publication Act. It called for the Government of Malaysia to amend the Constitution and to take effective steps, including by implementing the Rabat Plan of Action, to ensure that the freedoms of religion or belief, expression and assembly could be enjoyed equally by all Malaysians.

#### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

672. The information provided showed that, out of 232 recommendations received, 150 enjoyed the support of Malaysia, while the rest were noted.

673. Malaysia stated that that all comments made and issues raised would be studied and considered by the Government in the implementation of the review recommendations it had accepted.

674. While acknowledging the remaining challenges to the protection and promotion of human rights in the country, the Government would continue to undertake the actions necessary make further improvements in several key areas.

675. Malaysia remained committed to reviewing its position on the six core international human rights instruments, to which Malaysia had yet to accede.

676. Malaysia emphasized that in introducing the Security Offences (Special Measures) Act or Security Offences Act and the recent amendments to the Prevention of Crime Act and the Peaceful Assembly Act, sufficient safeguards for the protection and promotion of human rights had been included in accordance with international law.

678. Regarding the issue of the right to land of the Orang Asli and the natives of Sabah and Sarawak, the Government did not wish to prejudge the outcome of the deliberations of the task force, which has been mandated to study the findings and recommendations of the inquiry conducted by the Human Rights Commission of Malaysia to determine, inter alia, ways and means to implement review recommendations.

679. Malaysia noted the acknowledgement by the Special Rapporteur on the right to food of the State's adoption of a wide range of policies and programmes to ensure the effective enjoyment of the right to food as part of the right to an adequate standard of living, including for the Orang Asli and the natives of Sabah and Sarawak. One such programme was the Murum resettlement action plan. All 353 indigenous families affected were resettled at two resettlement sites, chosen by them, with schools and kindergartens and offering the Murum Penan literacy programme and other initiatives, which were aimed at realizing their aspirations for a better future for themselves and their children.

680. Malaysia reaffirmed its commitment to continuing its cooperation with United Nations human rights mechanisms, in particular the special procedures. In this regard, the Government had decided to extend an invitation to the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children and the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health.

681. Malaysia welcomed its engagement with all stakeholders on human rights issues in general, and on the universal periodic review and its follow-up and implementation in particular. Such engagement should be undertaken in accordance with the law in the interest of full transparency and accountability for all parties.

682. The universal periodic review had given Malaysia the opportunity to evaluate its progress, achievements and shortcomings in the promotion and protection of human rights. It had also given the Government the impetus to continue to make improvements to the existing human rights framework.

683. Malaysia was steadfast in its commitment to improving the protection and promotion of human rights. To that end, it remained open to constructive cooperation with all interested partners and stakeholders in the follow-up to the review and the implementation of review recommendations.

### **Central African Republic**

684. The review of the Central African Republic was held on 25 October 2013 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 Central African Republic in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/CAF/1);
- (b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/CAF/2);
- (c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/CAF/3).

685. At its 40th meeting, on 20 March 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the Central African Republic (see sect. C below).

686. The outcome of the review of the Central African Republic comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/25/11), the views of the Central African Republic concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group.

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

687. The delegation of the Central African Republic expressed its appreciation of the support given by the international community, in particular the activity and mobilization of the Human Rights Council at a time when the country was going through one of the most difficult moments in its history.

688. The Central African Republic had committed itself in earnest to the issue of human rights in its territory by acknowledging that human rights brought peace, calm and dignity to the people. Both organizationally and legally, the Central African Republic had established all the structures necessary to promote and protect those rights.

689. With regard to the national report of the Central African Republic submitted for the second cycle of the universal periodic review, the country had adopted a new Penal Code and a new Code of Criminal Procedure, and had ratified the conventions on indigenous peoples, on violence against women, on gender-based violence and on inhuman and degrading treatment. The Military Justice Code had been adapted to the current situation, while the laws establishing a national human rights commission and on fundamental freedoms were to be adopted by the National Transitional Council.

690. The Transitional Constitutional Charter reaffirmed the commitment of the Central African Republic to international human rights instruments. The preamble to the Charter addressed in particular the sacred and inviolable of nature of the human being.

691. The road map followed by the transitional Government covered issues such as the protection of the civilian population against all forms of violence, especially those based on gender; humanitarian assistance to ensure the rapid return of displaced persons and refugees to their homes; good governance and the rule of law, through proper judicial administration; and stepping up the fight against impunity.

692. During the session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, the Central African Republic had accepted almost all of the recommendations, with three pending: on the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on

Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, on extending a standing invitation to special procedures, and on standing invitations to special procedures that would allow them to travel to the Central African Republic to examine the situation on the ground and to make recommendations.

693. The delegation of the Central African Republic reassured the members of the Human Rights Council that the above three recommendations had been accepted as a whole. Of 178 recommendations made, the State had accepted 177 and rejected only one, which was no longer topical.

694. The State's acceptance of almost all recommendations bore witness to its firm commitment to setting human rights at the centre of its priorities. In fact, since the outbreak of the crisis, the country had hosted several humanitarian missions and missions from OHCHR. The most recent ones included that of the Independent Expert, who had been on a 10-day mission since 6 March 2014, the International Commission of Inquiry established by the Security Council, since 12 March 2014, and that of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, from 18 to 20 March 2014.

695. Referring to the difficult prevailing conditions in the country, the Central African Republic sought the support of OHCHR, the Human Rights Council and the international community in the implementation of and follow-up to the review recommendations accepted by the State.

## **2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Council on the review outcome**

696. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Central African Republic, 12 delegations made statements.<sup>32</sup>

697. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela condemned all violations of human rights in the Central African Republic, in particular those against women and children, and encouraged the State to make every effort to achieve peace and re-establish law and order. All parties involved should dedicate their efforts to the pursuit of durable solutions to the crisis and to national reconstruction. The international community should work in close collaboration with the Central African Republic to bring the State all the assistance and cooperation that it needed. Genuine dialogue and cooperation were the only ways forward towards peace.

698. Morocco congratulated the Central African Republic on its acceptance of almost all the recommendations made during the review, despite the political crisis and the difficult security situation. The election of the new Head of State on 23 January 2014 was a first step towards the re-establishment of law and order and a return to peace and security. The international community should, however, support the Central African Republic, which faced challenges posed by the weakness of State institutions, interreligious violence and impunity. Morocco called upon the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic urgently to identify, in collaboration with the transitional Government, the issues requiring priority assistance from the international community.

699. Mozambique pointed out that, in spite of the uncertain situation on the ground, the transitional authority should be praised for its efforts to abolish the death penalty through an amendment to the Penal Code. Mozambique looked forward to the report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic, to be submitted to the Human Rights Council, and recommended that the outcome report of the Working Group should be adopted.

700. Namibia, which expressed solidarity with the Central African Republic and its people, remained gravely concerned about the human rights and humanitarian situations in the country, with thousands of people internally displaced and reports of ongoing killings. Namibia encouraged the Central African Republic to continue to promote dialogue and to bring all parties together to find a sustainable and peaceful solution to a situation that

<sup>32</sup> The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted, if available, on the extranet of the Human Rights Council at <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/25thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.



demanded the urgent attention of the international community. Namibia called upon the international community to assist the country in meeting its human rights obligations and to provide humanitarian aid sufficient to restore the country to normality.

701. Rwanda appreciated the fact that the Government of the Central African Republic had cooperated fully with the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, and that it had accepted almost all the recommendations made, including those by Rwanda. Rwanda understood the difficulties that the Central African Republic was facing in the implementation of its human rights obligations in the current transitional period, and stood ready to explore every means of cooperation and exchange of good practices with the Central African Republic. Concerned about the extent of human rights violations, Rwanda was looking forward to an oral update by the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic at the twenty-fifth session of the Human Rights Council, and to her preliminary report to the Council at its twenty-sixth. Rwanda supported the adoption of the report of the Working Group on the Central African Republic.

702. Senegal commended the engagement of the Central African Republic in the promotion and protection of human rights, and encouraged it to strengthen measures to protect those of women and children in particular. Senegal echoed the appeal of the Central African Republic, and urged the international community to help the country in the implementation of the recommendations accepted. Lastly, it invited the Human Rights Council to adopt the report of the Working Group on the Central African Republic.

703. South Sudan stated that, as a neighbouring country, it knew the challenges that the Central African Republic was facing. South Sudan urged all parties to pursue political stability, peace and security throughout the country, and encouraged interreligious dialogue between Muslims and Christians. It also called upon the international community to provide the Central African Republic with technical assistance and capacity-building in the field of human rights, and recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group on the Central African Republic.

704. The Sudan stated that, by taking a series of positive steps to ensure the restoration of peace and security, the Central African Republic had expressed its determination to improve and promote the situation of human rights in the country. The immense challenges posed by the current situation, however, required the support of the international community, which should provide the Government and the people of the Central African Republic with more assistance. The Sudan supported the adoption of the report of the Working Group on the Central African Republic.

705. The United States of America welcomed the decision by the interim Government of the Central African Republic to accept the recommendations on combating impunity for perpetrators of human rights abuses, ending the recruitment and use of child soldiers, ensuring the free circulation of humanitarian workers, and conducting free and fair presidential elections without undue delay. The United States expressed its deep concern about the range of human rights violations and abuses committed in the Central African Republic since the Seleka rebellion in 2012, and referred to the recommendations made on combating the recruitment and use of child soldiers. It stressed that the Government of the Central African Republic should consider as a matter of priority ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict. It urged the Government to ensure greater protection for the human rights of children in the Central African Republic, to fulfil its public pledge to prioritize justice and accountability for past violations and abuses, and to consider seeking technical assistance from OHCHR and the international community to assist with justice and accountability efforts. The United States expressed its satisfaction with the engagement of the Government in the universal periodic review process and its readiness for continued dialogue.

706. Mauritania noted the cooperation of the Central African Republic with international human rights mechanisms, including the universal periodic review. It regretted the severe human rights violations in the Central African Republic. The universal periodic review process was a unique opportunity to assess the situation of human rights by different parties in the Central African Republic, and clarified the measures it had adopted to promote and protect human rights. It encouraged the Central African Republic to continue to improve and

to prioritize the promotion and protection of human rights. It recommended the adoption of the outcome report on the Central African Republic.

707. Angola commended the high quality of the presentation of the outcome report on the Central African Republic, despite the difficulties the country currently encountered. It applauded the efforts made by the State to maintain ongoing cooperation with United Nations human rights mechanisms during such a difficult period. Angola also supported the Government in its undertaking to enact legal reforms for the promotion and protection of women's rights, including a draft law on parity, the revision of the Family Code and the involvement women in the conflict settlement process. In the light of the political, economic and social difficulties that had been encountered, Angola would join the appeal made to the international community to provide assistance to the country to restore democracy and rule of law as *sine qua non* conditions for the promotion and protection of human rights. Angola recommended that the outcome report on the Central African Republic be adopted.

708. Benin saluted the efforts made by the Central African Republic in its second report submitted for the universal periodic review. It encouraged the current authorities to continue their efforts with regard to human rights, particularly in the area of upholding public order, the peaceful settlement of conflicts and the fight against impunity. Benin called upon the international community to provide the Central African Republic with technical and financial assistance. It recommended that the outcome report on the Central African Republic be adopted.

### 3. General comments made by other stakeholders

709. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Central African Republic, three other stakeholders made statements.

710. Amnesty International expressed concern about the serious human rights violations, including war crimes and crimes against humanity, that continued to be committed in many parts of the Central African Republic, despite the presence of the African Union and forces from France. Extrajudicial killings, torture, looting and other atrocities were committed on a daily basis. Ethnic cleansing of the Muslim population had forced thousands of people to flee to neighbouring countries. Meanwhile, thousands of people forced to flee the violence in the Central African Republic were now facing another humanitarian crisis in neighbouring Chad. Despite the new Government, a greater humanitarian and civilian protection crisis still loomed if nothing was done to tackle the ongoing serious human rights abuses committed by all sides. Amnesty International was encouraged by the State's acceptance of recommendations aimed at restoring peace and stability in the country, and welcomed its commitment to facilitate and provide humanitarian assistance to all those in need, in particular refugees and internally displaced persons. It also welcomed the State's acceptance of the recommendations on strengthening the rule of law and the capacity of peace and security forces, and the commitment to work actively with the international community to end the current humanitarian and human rights crisis. Lastly, it stressed that peace in the Central African Republic would involve ensuring that the current peacekeeping forces had a strong, effective and fully resourced human rights mandate and that they were positioned in areas where civilians were most in need of protection.

711. Jubilee Campaign thanked the Central African Republic for its engagement with the universal periodic review process. Since December 2012, the human rights and humanitarian situations had continually worsened. Most alarming had been the advent of sectarian violence. It added that, also since December 2012, local sources increasingly noted the targeting of the Christian population. The targeted violence had worsened when Seleka seized power in March 2013, which ultimately led to an outbreak of retributive violence in the form of anti-Balaka militia groups that had been responsible for significant human rights violations, including the current and abhorrent cleansing of the Muslim community. Regular reports had indicated that the targeting of Christian communities continued. The portrayal in international media and elsewhere of a multifaceted conflict between Christians and Muslims in a country that included followers of indigenous and other beliefs and in a region where violent and religious based insurgencies existed was unhelpful and dangerous. It risked an escalation by playing into the "clash of civilizations" narrative that fed local Islamists insurgencies. The Central African Republic, with the help of the international community,

had to work to ensure that all citizens enjoyed the same rights guaranteed under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights. The Jubilee Campaign applauded religious leaders of different creeds who continued their work of reconciliation. The Government of the Central African Republic needed assistance in restoring the rule of law and civil administration to ensure that all perpetrators of violence and human rights violations were brought to justice, regardless of religion, political affiliation or ethnicity.

712. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme welcomed the delegation of the Central African Republic, and supported concerns expressed of repeated and widespread human rights violations in the country. It expressed its concern about the implementation of universal periodic review recommendations by the transitional authorities regarding the cycle of violence, instability and humanitarian crisis in the country. It hoped that the recent visit of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights would help to improve the situation of human rights and lead to an end to impunity in the country. It also profoundly appreciated the continuing efforts of the States members of the Central Africa Economic and Monetary Community, and saluted the organization of a special session on the situation of Central Africa. It also supported the appointment by the Human Rights Council of an Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic. It condemned the violence, crimes of torture, rape, and enrolment of child soldiers, and the systematic pillaging of property of both citizens and foreigners by anti-Balaka armed groups and by Seleka militias. It called upon the transitional authorities to organize promptly a global dialogue that included all parties, such as refugees and internally displaced persons, to put an end to the violation of human rights and international humanitarian law. Lastly, it called upon politicians and civil society in the Central African Republic to engage in a lucid and responsible manner, to bring about a durable solution.

#### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

713. Of 178 recommendations received, 177 enjoyed the support of the Central African Republic, while one was noted.

714. The representative of the Central African Republic stated that, while the universal periodic review was considered to be a kind of a sword of Damocles, it was also a barometer measuring a State's respect for human rights. He appreciated the international community's support in finding a solution to the current crisis, and appealed for its ongoing assistance. He referred to the statements made by States and non-governmental organizations calling for an international mobilization to address two major and interconnected challenges in the country: the security situation, and the humanitarian situation. He reiterated his appeal to the international community not to abandon the country at this alarming time. In conclusion, he thanked the President and the Office of the President, and Member States, for their advice. The representative referred to the upcoming interactive dialogue with the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Central African Republic and its positive impact for the future of the country.

#### **Belize**

715. The review of Belize was held on 28 October 2013 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 Belize in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/BLZ/1);
- (b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/BLZ/2);
- (c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/BLZ/3).

716. At its 41st meeting, on 20 March 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Belize (see sect. C below).

717. The outcome of the review of Belize comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/25/13), the views of Belize concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/25/13/Add.1).

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

718. The delegation of Belize reiterated the commitment of its Government to the promotion and protection of the human rights of all Belizeans. The Government viewed human rights as fundamental to development, democracy and way of life in Belize. It was for this reason that the Government had approached the universal periodic review of Belize in an open and transparent manner, indispensable to making the review a meaningful exercise.

719. For Belize, the universal periodic review was not just the process that had taken place before the Human Rights Council. The Government had taken an inclusive and consultative approach at the national level as well. From the preparation of the report to its finalization, from the outcome of the review in October to the consideration of how to address pending recommendations, Belize had, at every stage, involved and engaged with a wide cross section of stakeholders, from government ministries and agencies to, most importantly, civil society and citizens.

720. While the Government was fully committed to its singular role as duty bearer, the active and informed engagement of Belizeans in the assessment of the Government's efforts and its role was equally important to ensure that human rights was meaningful to the daily lives of Belizeans.

721. At the conclusion of its review, Belize had received 103 recommendations. All recommendations were very constructive and made with the intention of assisting Belize in strengthening its human rights framework and guaranteeing the enjoyment of all human rights by all Belizeans.

722. At the conclusion of the review, on 31 October 2013, Belize had immediately announced that it accepted 59 of the recommendations, or 57 per cent of all recommendations received. Of these 59, it regarded 26 as already being implemented. The recommendations supported by Belize related to issues such as racial discrimination, equity and non-discrimination, child labour, juvenile justice, the rights to health and to education, the rights of migrants and of persons with disabilities, women's rights and addressing violence against women, preventing and combating trafficking in persons, expanding the scope of human rights treaty obligations and strengthening institutional infrastructure and policy measures. There was also a number of recommendations that Belize had accepted relating to the right to development and poverty reduction.

723. Belize was of the view that these recommendations would contribute to the strengthening of its human rights framework and deepen the Government's rights-based approach to development. Since its review, the Government had decided to make further investments in expanding access to education and health care, and strengthening the social protection system by enlarging the scope of the national health insurance scheme to include northern Belize, increasing the beneficiaries of the conditional cash transfer and food pantry programmes and expanding education subsidies for high school students. These concrete actions by the Government would serve to advance its efforts in guaranteeing the right and access to education, to health and to development.

724. Belize had reserved its position on 44 of the recommendations. While it agreed with the spirit in which they had been made, they required further consultations at the national level.

725. In the four months since the review, the Government had reflected on all of the recommendations received, in particular, on the 44 recommendations on which it had reserved its position.

726. The Government had decided to accept six more recommendations, in whole or in part. Therefore, Belize had accepted a total of 65 recommendations, and would thus move towards the ratification of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness. These intended actions would clearly demonstrate the Government's commitment to expanding the national human rights framework. Belize had recently launched an internal process for the preparation of its initial report to the Human Rights Committee, in compliance with the implementation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

727. The Government was not able to support, or in part, 11 of the recommendations made, many of which were overlapping. These were clearly indicated in the addendum to the report of the Working Group (A/HRC/25/13/Add.1).

728. While the Government did not support recommendations on extending a standing invitation to special procedure mandate holders, it was open to considering such invitations on a case-by-case basis. Indeed, in 2013, Belize had acceded to the request for a visit by the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children, who undertook her mission to Belize in December 2013.

729. With regard to the recommendations relating to the Second Option Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, on the abolition of the death penalty, the Government was not able to support them, considering that the death penalty was enshrined in the Constitution and a valid part of the laws of Belize. It should nonetheless be noted that the death penalty had not been used in its jurisdiction in almost 30 years.

730. Similarly, Belize was not able to support the recommendations relating to the minimum age of marriage, which had already been raised to 16 years with parental consent; and, with due regard to cultural factors, this would require extensive national consultations before any considerations could be given to raising it further.

731. Belize had decided to take note of 29 of the recommendations, which were clearly indicated in the addendum to the report of the Working Group. The Government had given thorough consideration to the recommendations, which related to some six themes. Belize supported the spirit in which several of them had been made.

732. Belize was of the view that many required further national consultations, while others had financial implications that merited further consideration, such as those recommendations on the establishment of new institutions. Others were sub judice, such as those relating to decriminalization of same-sex acts, and a few were of such a nature that complex implementation measures were entailed, such as those requiring constitutional amendments. Belize would continue to keep these 29 recommendations under review.

733. The continuous involvement of Belizeans in a dialogue on human rights at the national level was essential to the evolution in national attitudes that might lead to expanding the scope of human rights, to implementing the recommendations made during the review process, and to strengthening a culture of human rights.

734. Belize remained committed to fulfilling its international human rights treaty obligations and to ensuring that the human rights and fundamental freedoms enshrined in its Constitution are guaranteed to every citizen. The Government would continue to work to strengthen its specialized human rights institutions, including the National Women's Commission, the National Committee for Families and Children, the National Council on Aging, the National AIDS Commission, the Office of the Ombudsman and the legal aid office.

735. The rights-based approach of Belize to development, which was fully evident in its national report, would continue to guide the Government's efforts to ensure that human rights were realized in all its dimensions: legal, social, political and economic.

736. At the national level, the universal periodic review process served as a catalyst for national stocktaking, reflection, dialogue and self-assessment on the effectiveness of national

human rights institutions. At the global level, the review was a useful tool for States to engage in an open dialogue, to share experiences and to receive recommendations in the context of mutual assessment. Another layer to the process was necessary, however; one that allowed for the firm exchange of technical assistance and cooperation to support the efforts of developing countries, especially small States like Belize.

737. The frustrating capacity constraints Belize faced as a small state inhibited its best intentions in areas such as timely reporting to treaty bodies. The assistance of the international community and the United Nations agencies was important in this regard in building capacity in treaty implementation and reporting, and in mainstreaming human rights education. Belize considered that this would be an added value to the UPR process.

738. The Government of Belize reiterated its commitment to the international human rights system and to the promotion and protection of human rights in the country. Belize strove to realize the basic fundamental freedoms described in the Constitution the highest law of the land.

739. The Government would make every effort to ensure that human rights were deeply embedded in the social, political and cultural fabric of society. As well as civil and political rights, it had established a foundation for economic, cultural and social rights, as it had explained in its national report.

740. The delegation commended the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Belize (A/HRC/25/13) submitted to the Human Rights Council.

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

741. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Belize, four delegations made statements.

742. UNICEF welcomed the efforts made by Belize to promote the protection of children through legislative reforms, such as the amendment to the Criminal Code, increasing penalties for violence against children. It commended the State for adopting a bill on commercial sexual exploitation and the amendments to the Trafficking in Persons Prohibition Act. UNICEF also welcomed the greater attention paid to the rights of children with disabilities and to increasing birth registration rates. It noted the implementation of the conditional cash transfer programmes, an initiative contributing to the well-being of the most vulnerable children. To further strengthen these positive advances, UNICEF called upon Belize to support the juvenile justice reform in order to guarantee the rights of children in conflict with the law, in particular by raising the age of criminal responsibility in accordance with internationally accepted standards, and to consider legislating a full ban on corporal punishment. UNICEF encouraged Belize to consider raising the minimum legal age of marriage to bring it into line with the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and to take steps to reduce the incidence of child marriage. It also encouraged Belize to strengthen its system for birth registration by increasing efforts to implement the 2009 memorandum of understanding with the Ministry of Health, which would ensure that children were registered shortly after birth. UNICEF also urged Belize to submit its overdue report to the Committee on the Rights of the Child and to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure.

743. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the spirit of openness and constructive dialogue that it had had with Belize during the review. The ratification by Belize of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities spoke volumes about its commitment to the full integration of this vulnerable group into the population. It appreciated the efforts that Belize had made to promote and protect human rights despite the economic difficulties it faced, and drew the attention to the determination of Belize to achieve the goals that it had set.

744. Algeria welcomed the commitment of Belize to the universal periodic review, as had been seen in its acceptance of a significant number of recommendations. Algeria welcomed in particular the fact that Belize had accepted its recommendation on continuing efforts aimed at implementing the national policy on gender equality, adopted by Belize in March 2013.

Algeria hoped that Belize would be able to benefit from the assistance and support necessary to implement the recommendations it had accepted.

745. Cuba recalled that, during the review of Belize, it had praised the efforts made by the State to achieve gender equality through the implementation of the revised national policy on gender equality, approved in March 2013. It had also drawn attention to the efforts made to reduce poverty and unequal income distribution, a key priority for Belize. Furthermore, it had noted that the implementation of the education sector strategy for 2012 had enabled the country to promote access to and the quality of teaching, despite the challenges that remained. It welcomed the fact that Belize had accepted the recommendations it had made on continuing to strengthen measures aimed at ensuring development in a manner that was resistant to risks, to develop projects aimed at reducing poverty, and to implement programmes aimed at guaranteeing quality education for all, with an emphasis on access, school enrolment and reducing the rate of school drop-out.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

746. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Belize, three other stakeholders made statements.

747. The Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network congratulated Belize on the sincere efforts made in consulting its lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) citizens in 2013 when drafting its national report. With regard to recommendation 97.7 on equality and non-discrimination, Belize was not acting in conformity with its international commitments. It urged the State to develop a practical mechanism and to seek technical support to expand its capacity to respond to discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. It also noted that the State's reluctance to address recommendations 99.28 to 99.39 in any substantive way remained a cause for concern. The advances made in responses to HIV, gender issues and the economic concerns of citizens had not affected LGBT persons in any visible way. There were no adequate national institutional mechanisms for reporting or seeking redress from human rights violations; reports of this type therefore went without investigation or prosecution. No legislative amendment had been made to end discriminatory laws, such as the Immigration Act or section 53 of the Criminal Code. The current statute sanctioned and even promoted impunity. It asked whether Belize would follow the example of other States and decide to address substantively the social disparities affecting its LGBT citizens in a timely manner.

748. Minority Rights Group International welcomed the State's engagement with the universal periodic review process and its statement that, with regard to the decision made in July 2013 by the Court of Appeal affirming the rights of the Maya over their traditional lands, the Government was seeking, in conjunction with the representatives of the Maya, to determine a mutually agreeable framework for the implementation of that decision. It looked forward to Belize engaging with it on this issue, and presumed that Belize would withdraw its appeal to the Caribbean Court of Justice challenging the finding of the court that the Maya were indigenous to southern Belize. Although it welcomed the State's support for the recommendation on monitoring the extractive activities of oil companies in Mayan territory, it was extremely concerned that Belize believed that the recommendation would be met merely by oil companies with an environmental compliance plan in place. In accepting that recommendation, Belize had recognized that extractive activities could not be conducted on Maya territory without the free, prior and informed consent of the Maya population. It urged Belize to review the concession granted to US Capital Energy. It regretted that Belize was not prepared to accept the recommendations on adopting ILO Convention No. 169 and on obtaining the free, prior and informed consent of the Mayan communities, and urged it to reconsider its position and to engage with representatives of Mayan communities.

749. Action Canada for Population and Development appreciated the willingness and commitment of Belize to providing information and education on sexually transmitted infections to its population, and to combat stigma against persons living with HIV/AIDS. It was concerned, however, that no activities had been carried out to address discrimination based on the grounds of sexual orientation. Non-heterosexual persons remained one of the most discriminated groups in Belize. Moreover, it was very disappointed at the lack of acceptance of several recommendations regarding violations of human rights based on sexual

orientation and gender identity; these included ensuring the prohibition of discrimination on that basis; ensuring that the Criminal Code did not criminalize individuals on the basis of their sexual orientation; or the removal of national legislation that outlawed same-sex activity between consenting adults, among others. It urged Belize to address this issue by adopting and implementing laws and policies that would eliminate discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity, as recommended by several States during the second review cycle.

#### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

750. Of 103 recommendations received, 63 enjoyed the support of Belize, additional clarification was provided on two recommendations, and the remainder were noted.

751. Belize thanked the Human Rights Council for its support and recommendations. Belize had noted with great respect its constructive comments, which would be taken into consideration as the State moved to take action on the recommendations accepted. Belize believed that its national report and responses in the interactive dialogue held in October 2013, and the addendum to the report of the Working Group that it had submitted, addressed many issues and concerns raised. Belize looked forward to continuing the dialogue until its next review, and commended the report of the Working Group on Belize submitted to the Human Rights Council.

#### **Chad**

752. The review of Chad was held on 29 October 2013 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 Chad in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/TCD/1);
- (b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/TCD/2);
- (c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/TCD/3).

753. At its 41st meeting, on 20 March 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Chad (see sect. C below).

754. The outcome of the review of Chad comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/25/14), the views of Chad concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/25/14/Add.1).

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

755. The delegation of Chad reiterated its willingness to cooperate fully on implementation of the recommendations made at the seventeenth session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review. It pointed out that the current session was an opportunity to seek the active cooperation and support of the United Nations system to strengthen the capacity of Chadian national human rights institutions.

756. After having carefully examined the 174 recommendations received by Chad during the interactive dialogue, the Government had accepted 119 and noted 55. The authorities had accepted the recommendations encouraging them to take measures to improve the national legislative and institutional framework.

757. The Government noted the recommendations that had already been implemented or were being implemented.



758. With regard to the recommendations on the ratification of the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights aimed at the abolition of the death penalty, the Government was willing to ratify a number of international legal instruments on human rights, but it wanted to do so gradually. It was considering ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention on Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

759. The Government had already implemented the recommendation concerning the development of a national plan of action for human rights. The plan had been developed and validated, and its adoption was in progress.

760. With regard to the revision of national legislation on gender equality, article 13 of the Constitution attributed Chadians of both sexes the same rights and duties; they were equal before the law. Gender equality was one a priority of the Chadian authorities. They would continue to take measures to promote equality in social life, and hoped to achieve a balance between men and women in positions of responsibility. The authorities encouraged the participation of women in the management of public affairs and favoured female candidates in the public domain.

761. The Government had already taken measures to combat traditional practices through legislation and awareness-raising campaigns. A broad campaign targeting traditional and religious leaders had been organized to eradicate certain harmful practices.

762. In order to ensure compliance with the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Optional Protocols thereto, the Government had established focal points in the ministries working in partnership with UNICEF and UNDP.

763. The plan of action signed by the Government and UNICEF in June 2011 had been implemented and had produced the expected results; there were no longer any child soldiers in the ranks of the army. In the draft Penal Code, the recruitment of child soldiers was a criminal offence and; pending the adoption of the bill, a decree had been adopted prohibiting and criminalizing the recruitment and use of children in the army.

764. With regard to violence against children, corporal punishment in public institutions was prohibited by law, and structures dealing specifically with children's issues did exist in government ministries.

765. On detention issues, the delegation referred to a decree of October 2011 that allowed detainees access to their files and to use their right to legal remedy.

766. Contrary to some allegations, no revision of law No. 017/PR/2010 on the status of the press had been initiated. The law did not affect the freedom of expression, but rather protected journalists.

767. With regard to human trafficking, Chad had ratified the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Abuja Agreement. Currently, the authorities, with the technical support of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and the United States of America, planned to develop a specific law on trafficking in persons to harmonize its internal legal framework with ratified international instruments.

768. The successful PRAJUST programme, which supported judicial reform, had come to an end; negotiations were under way for PRAJUST II. The Government would need to build or rehabilitate more than 30 prisons to international standards.

769. A report on the recommendations of the commission of enquiry into the events of February 2008 had been issued by monitoring committee. On the judicial side, proceedings had been dismissed by the investigating magistrate in July 2013.

770. With regard to the allegations of torture and ill-treatment by police officers, the delegation confirmed that they were being investigated.

771. Elected officials and members of the opposition were protected by national law; none should be prosecuted, investigated, arrested, detained or tried for their opinions in the

performance of their duties, unless there was a flagrant offence where the lifting of immunity could be requested.

772. With regard to the freedom of association and expression, human rights defenders and journalists operated freely in Chad under the law.

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

773. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Chad, 15 delegations made statements.<sup>33</sup>

774. Algeria expressed its satisfaction that the Government of Chad had implemented several programmes aimed at strengthening the promotion and protection of human rights, such as PRAJUST, the plan of action on children associated with armed groups and forces, and the national development plan. Algeria also appreciated the efforts made by Chad to promote economic and social rights. It reiterated its call to the international community to provide the technical assistance and capacity-building necessary to allow Chad to meet its human rights challenges.

775. Benin encouraged Chad to continue its efforts and achievements in human rights, particularly in the areas of health, education, women's empowerment and child protection. It urged Chad to ratify international instruments to which it was not yet a party, including the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights aimed at the abolition of the death penalty.

776. Botswana commended Chad for having accepted many of the recommendations made during the second review cycle. It welcomed the efforts made by the Government, in collaboration with UNICEF, to end the recruitment of children as soldiers, and to withdraw child soldiers from army and reintegrate them into society. Botswana also commended the State for having approved the national gender policy and the national strategy aimed at combating gender-based violence.

777. Burkina Faso welcomed the efforts made by Chad to encourage peace and international solidarity in Africa, especially in Mali and the Central African Republic. It noted with satisfaction the initiatives in favour of disadvantaged persons, such as the audits of the age of soldiers conducted jointly with UNICEF, and the implementation of a programme for family reunification and reintegration of child soldiers. Burkina Faso noted the efforts made to integrate the provisions of international instruments ratified by Chad into national legislation. It encouraged the authorities to complete its legislative reform regarding the Family and Personal Code, the Criminal Code, the Code of Criminal Procedure, the Civil Code, the Code on the Protection of Children and the code of conduct of Chadian soldiers.

778. China noted that Chad had an ongoing commitment to the eradication of poverty, the improvement of living standards and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. The authorities had made a greater effort to combat violence against children and child trafficking. It encouraged Chad to implement actively its national development strategy, to give priority to agricultural and infrastructure development, and to ensure that people had sufficient food. Lastly, China urged the international community to provide Chad with the active support and assistance that it needed.

779. Côte d'Ivoire thanked the Government of Chad for its attention to the recommendations received during its review. It strongly encouraged the authorities to pursue the institutional and legal reforms needed to strengthen the promotion and protection of human rights, and pursue their actions to protect the most vulnerable.

780. Cuba noted with satisfaction the priorities that the Chadian authorities had set, aimed at combating inequality, poverty and social exclusion, improving governance, protecting the environment and developing the rural sector and basic economic infrastructure. It thanked

<sup>33</sup> The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted, if available, on the extranet of the Human Rights Council at <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/25thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

Chad for having accepted the recommendations made by Cuba on the implementation of programmes and measures regarding child labour, violence against women and the persistence of poverty, and on strengthening efforts to improve access to and quality of health services and education for all citizens.

781. Djibouti noted with satisfaction that Chad had accepted most of the recommendations made at its review. It also appreciated the commitment undertaken by Chad to promote and protect human rights.

782. Eritrea noted with satisfaction that Chad had accepted most of the recommendations made, and had assured its commitment to implement them. The delegation of Eritrea would continue to work closely with Chad in the spirit of constructive engagement and cooperation in all areas of common concern.

783. Gabon commended Chad for having ratified many human rights instruments, and welcomed the amendment made to the national human rights commission to bring it into line with the Paris Principles. It encouraged further reforms to strengthen economic, social and cultural rights, and the rights of women and children. Gabon also called upon the international community to support Chad.

784. Libya commended the positive developments in human rights achieved by Chad. It welcomed its ratification and accession to several human rights treaties and the integration of international norms into its national legal framework. It noted that Chad faced challenges and obstacles to the promotion of human rights, such as social and cultural issues, limited financial capabilities, and limited human resources. It appreciated the positive approach of Chad towards the recommendations made during its review, and encouraged it to ensure their implementation.

785. Mali welcomed the engagements made by Chad, which had accepted most of the recommendations that it had received. It encouraged the Government to pursue the improvement of the rights of its people.

786. Mauritania commended the cooperation of Chad with all United Nations mechanisms, including the universal periodic review. It noted the positive response and approach by Chad to its review through the implementation of supported recommendations and the initiation of implementation of other recommendations. It encouraged Chad to continue its efforts to overcome the challenges it faced and to strengthen the promotion and protection of human rights.

787. Morocco supported the commitment of the Chadian authorities to recover a legislative and policy environment that would allow the development and enjoyment of the rule of law and human rights. It congratulated Chad on its commitment to an open social dialogue, and the progress made in the fight against poverty and in the health sector. Morocco also welcomed the PRAJUST programme for the reform of the judicial system. Lastly, it supported the request made by Chad to the international community for technical assistance.

788. The Niger referred to the positive steps taken by Chad, such as the ratification of international legal instruments relating to human rights and the incorporation into national law of the provisions of those instruments. The recommendations made during the review would allow Chad to intensify its efforts to improve the promotion and protection of human rights.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

789. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Chad, five other stakeholders made statements.

790. The International Federation for Human Rights welcomed the acceptance by Chad of the recommendations on the ratification of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. Many cases of enforced disappearances, particularly linked to an attempted coup in 2008, remained unsolved. It was necessary to establish the truth about the disappearance of Mahamat Saleh, a major political opponent, by implementing the conclusions and recommendations made by national commission of enquiry, which had involved the highest military authorities. The same applied to the fate of

136 prisoners, who had disappeared since those events. It remained concerned at the acts of repression against civil society, the violations of the freedom of expression and the general impunity and non-respect of the independence of the judiciary, as seen in the case of Jean Bernard Padaré, the former Minister for Justice. It was regrettable that Chad had not accepted the recommendations on modifying the law on freedom of the press, putting an end to acts of intimidation against journalists and protecting them against arbitrary detention. It also regretted the fact that Chad had also rejected the recommendations on guaranteeing the protection of elected people, opponents and human rights defenders. It called upon Chad to guarantee a safe and supportive environment for human rights defenders, to investigate all allegations of threats and attacks against them, and to punish perpetrators of such acts.

791. Amnesty International expressed its concern at the cases of enforced disappearance, torture and ill-treatment, the attacks against human rights defenders, journalists and political opponents, and forced evictions, in Chad. Even though it welcomed the State's acceptance of 119 recommendations, it regretted the fact that many of the recommendations rejected addressed key human rights concerns, such as on preventing and eliminating the recruitment and use of children under 18 in armed conflict. Important recommendations relating to the prevention and investigation of torture and other forms of ill-treatment, including by law enforcement officers, had been rejected. It was also disappointed by the State's failure to accept many recommendations on freedom of expression, and in particular on the protection of journalists, human rights defenders and political opponents, despite well-founded reports of harassment against them. It expressed concern at the lack of adequate investigation of cases of enforced disappearance, and in particular into the events of early 2008. With regard to violence against women and girls, it welcomed the State's support for the recommendations on ensuring that women and girls who were victims of rape or other forms of violence were given medical assistance and psychological support, and its commitment to protect women and girls from female genital mutilation.

792. Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale (OCAPROCE International) welcomed all the positive findings observed in the relevant review reports, and the commitments made by the Government of Chad, which it encouraged to continue efforts in the area of education of women and children. It also welcomed the recommendations on issues of particular concern in particular those relating to strengthening the promotion and protection of women's and children's rights. The Government had made efforts to strengthen the protection of women's rights and developed a national gender policy and a strategy against gender-based violence. It recommended that the sanctions against the perpetrators of violence against women and of female genital mutilation be implemented. It also recommended that a specific law on combating violence and discrimination against women be adopted. The law should prohibit, *inter alia*, early and forced marriage and marital rape.

793. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme (RADDHO) stated that, since its first review, Chad had made enormous progress in submitting its initial and periodic reports to the treaty bodies. It appreciated the fact that the Government of Chad had issued a standing invitation to the special procedures of the Human Rights Council. It was concerned, however, at the persistence of harmful traditional practices and violence against women and children. It called upon Chad to take measures to eradicate these practices, such as the socio-professional reintegration of victims. Despite the repeal of press offences by Chad, certain practices within society still limited freedom of expression. It was urgent that the authorities take steps to create a space for dialogue. The organization invited Chad to intensify measures to put an end to the recruitment and use of child soldiers. It supported the commitment of the authorities to try the former dictator, Hissène Habré, in the framework of the fight against impunity in the country.

794. Tchad agir pour l'environnement et le développement welcomed the intervention of the Chadian army in the Central African Republic that had saved thousands of lives, regardless of gender, age or nationality. If action had not been taken by the Chadian army, there was a risk of genocide, like in Rwanda. The support of the international community was essential to assist people in the Central African Republic, who had lost everything. It called for the prosecution of all persons involved in human rights violations and acts of retaliation in the Central African Republic. Victims should be able to obtain justice and reparation. It

also called upon the international community to support Chad in the establishment of a reforestation plan in refugee areas, because there was a risk of advanced deforestation, as seen in the case of refugee camps in eastern Chad.

#### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

795. Of 174 recommendations received, 119 enjoyed the support of Chad while the remainder had been noted.

796. The delegation of Chad welcomed the interest shown by States and organizations in assisting the State in the area of human rights. As mentioned earlier, many recommendations had already been implemented or were in the process of implementation.

797. Chad had endured a long period of armed conflict, which had had a negative impact on its development and the situation of human rights. Despite the action taken by the Government to improve that situation, problems remained, such as the persistence of harmful traditional practices, illiteracy, poverty and the lack of resources.

798. Chad would respect all the international treaties that it had ratified. It was the Government's duty to ensure the well-being of its people by implementing legislation that took into account their aspirations and concerns.

799. The delegation of Chad thanked once again all States for their recommendations and comments.

#### **China**

800. The review of China was held on 22 October 2013 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 China in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/CHN/1);
- (b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/CHN/2);
- (c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/CHN/3 and Corr.1).

801. At its 41st meeting, on 20 March 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of China (see sect. C below).

802. The outcome of the review of China comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/25/5 and Corr.1), the views of China concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/25/5/Add.1).

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

803. China attached great importance to the second round of the universal periodic review. It had received 252 recommendations at the session of the Working Group in 2013. China had established an inter-agency coordination mechanism, led by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and joined by more than 30 legislative, judicial and administrative departments, to consider the recommendations made and to consult extensively with various sectors of society. China pledged to adopt any recommendation that was compatible with the conditions in the country, operable and conducive to its human rights development. On the basis of studies and joint efforts, China had decided to accept 204 of the 252 recommendations (or 81 per cent of the total) that covered more than 20 thematic areas, including poverty reduction, education and judicial reform.

804. Since October 2013, the Government of China had taken many initiatives to advance the cause of human rights. In particular, the third plenum at the eighteenth session of the

Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, held in November 2013, a host of major decisions were made to comprehensively deepen reform, including by improving the human rights and judicial safeguard system. The report on the work of the Government adopted at the twelfth National People's Congress set out new measures, including those for further promoting and protecting economic, social and cultural rights.

805. The right to survival and development was a primary human right, and China attributed top priority to development. China was one of the few countries in the world that had formulated two human rights plans of action. The plan for 2012-2015 was being implemented. The Government was devoted to poverty alleviation and had made tremendous efforts to address old-age support, health care and other issues of special concern to the people of China. It had implemented a proactive policy for job creation. In 2013, China had created 13.1 million urban jobs. The rights and interests of the 269 million migrant workers in China were comprehensively safeguarded. To ensure that each and every student enjoyed equal access to education, in 2013, China launched a project to alleviate poverty through education. In response to the evolving demographic situation, China had decided, in November 2013, to implement a policy that allowed married couples to have two children if one parent were a single child.

806. At the third plenum of the eighteenth session of the Central Committee, the decision was made to further enhance the rule of law in China. At the end of 2013, the National People's Congress had adopted a decision to officially abolish the system of "re-education through labour". China had more Internet users than any other country in the world. The Government had always attached great importance to safeguarding the rights of citizens to be informed, to participate, to be heard and to oversee in accordance with the law by promoting the open and free flow of information on the Internet. Religions had developed strongly in China; religious communities benefited from solidarity and stability; and freedom of religious belief was effectively guaranteed for citizens in China. China had a system of regional ethnic autonomy, and that minority areas enjoyed preferential policies.

807. In December 2013, China had hosted a visit by the Working Group on the issue of discrimination against women in law and in practice, which had yielded positive results. China would arrange for the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, the Special Rapporteur on the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation and the Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights to visit China at a time convenient for both sides. Also, China was communicating with OHCHR on further cooperation.

808. In reply to the recommendations made by other States, China had decided not to accept some made by a small number of States, for the following main reasons. First, some recommendations could be taken as directions for China to work along, but were not practicable at the current stage; for instance, on ratifying the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights or setting a timetable thereon, the national legislative bodies would determine the speed of ratification depending on the maturity of national conditions. Second, some recommendations were at odds with the reality in China, and were therefore not ready for implementation, for example, on the abolition of the death penalty for all crimes. Third, a small number of States had made recommendations that were inconsistent with the facts. There was no arbitrary or extrajudicial detention in China nor had anybody protecting human rights, within the framework of the law, ever been harassed.

809. In accordance with the Basic Law and relevant legislation, the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region would continue to protect human rights and freedoms. The Macao Special Administrative Region continued to protect the rights of its residents in accordance with the law.

810. The Government of China had set two "centenary goals" aimed at achieving the renewal of the Chinese nation. 2014 would mark the tenth anniversary of the inclusion in the Constitution of China of the amendment that "the State respects and preserves human rights". The anniversary would be an opportunity to open a new chapter in human rights development in China.

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

811. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of China, 13 delegations made statements.<sup>34</sup>

812. Cuba thanked China for its responses to the recommendations made. It drew attention to the implementation of the second national human rights plan of action, and the progress made in the rights to work and social security, education, health, the development of cultural rights, the rights of children and women, and freedom of religion. It welcomed the State's acceptance of the recommendations it had made in which it called upon China to, inter alia, investigate activities of fabrication and the dissemination of false information and to take measures regarding persons engaged in unlawful Internet activities; and on giving special treatment to ethnic minorities in politics, the economy, culture and education.

813. Djibouti noted with satisfaction that China had accepted the majority of the recommendations addressed to it, including those made by Djibouti. It acknowledged the remarkable efforts and achievements made in strengthening human rights in China, and encouraged the State to continue its actions, including in the field of human rights education and awareness-raising.

814. Egypt was encouraged in seeing that China had accepted all the recommendations it had made and more than 80 per cent of all recommendations received during the session of the Working Group. It commended China for its important role in realizing the right to development globally, including through its efforts in the areas of South-South and triangular cooperation. Conscious of the challenges that could exist for a country as demographically and geographically large as China, Egypt encouraged it to continue to address the persisting challenges it faced in accordance with a vision based on its national priorities.

815. Eritrea spoke highly of China and its focus on the universal periodic review as the main mechanism to achieve the goal of promoting and protecting the human rights of its people. Eritrea expressed satisfaction that all relevant recommendations had been taken on board by China, including those made by Eritrea. It supported the approach followed by China in placing its own situation and the challenges it face at the centre of its consideration of the context, needs and betterment of the Chinese people.

816. The United States of America welcomed the acceptance of recommendations by China, including those on the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and urged China to ratify the Covenant and to put an end to all forms of arbitrary detention. It expressed deep concern that policies in ethnic Uighur, Tibetan and Mongolian areas of China had contributed to unrest, and at the ongoing detention of three activists. It was disappointed that China had not accepted the recommendations on the freedoms of peaceful assembly, association and expression, including on the Internet. It remained concerned at detentions, including of Xu Zhiyong and Liu Xiaobo, and the house arrest of the Nobel laureate's wife. It expressed concern at the death of Cao Shunli, who had sought to engage the Government of China on issues raised in the context of the universal periodic review and was detained for her efforts.

817. Gabon welcomed the State's cooperation with international human rights procedures and mechanisms. It welcomed the prioritization of the right to development, while ensuring that such progress also benefited vulnerable groups, given that the economic system enabled the maintenance of sustained growth. Gabon encouraged China, in combating all forms of discrimination, to continue to taking all measures necessary to ensure the full enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms by its people.

818. Germany welcomed the participation of China in the universal periodic review. While noting positively the abolition of the "re-education through labour" system in law, Germany hoped that the system would not be replaced by other forms of extralegal detention. The participation of civil society was part and parcel of the universal periodic review process, and

<sup>34</sup> The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted, if available, on the extranet of the Human Rights Council at <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/25thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

that Cao Shunli had paid with her life for taking this engagement seriously. Germany urged China to establish the circumstances of her death and bring to justice those involved in her secret detention and death, and also to live up to its commitment to ensure the unimpeded participation of civil society in the universal periodic review and in public life in China.

819. India noted positively the receptive and constructive manner in which China had participated in the universal periodic review. India was encouraged that China had accepted 204 of the 252 recommendations made, particularly the two made by India, on the participation of women in public affairs and on strengthening the capacity for development in ethnic minority regions. India trusted that China would further intensify its efforts to implement the recommendations that it had accepted in the coming years.

820. The Islamic Republic of Iran commended China for its positive approach to cooperating with international human rights mechanisms, including its participation in the universal periodic review. It referred to significant endeavours, including in the field of economic and social development and the implementation of several plans of action. It was pleased that both of its recommendations had been accepted, and encouraged China to continue its constructive approach and to build on what had already been accomplished in strengthening its human rights system.

821. Ireland thanked China for having accepted both of its recommendations and the majority of those that had been made. It encouraged China to submit a voluntary mid-term report on the implementation of recommendations. Ireland expressed deep concern that a well-known human rights defender, Cao Shunli, had died following the deterioration of her health in custody. Recalling the important role assigned to civil society in the universal periodic review process by Human Rights Council resolution 5/1 and other relevant documents, Ireland called upon China to, *inter alia*, ensure unhindered access to and communication with international bodies, particularly the United Nations, including the Council and the review mechanism.

822. The Lao People's Democratic Republic was pleased to note that China had accepted a large number of recommendations and had taken significant steps and actions to implement them. China had actively implemented the international instruments to which it was a party. It commended the Government of China for the remarkable progress made in protecting and promoting human rights, including the right to development for the poor and for vulnerable groups.

823. Lebanon noted with appreciation the commitment and the comprehensive cooperation of China during its universal periodic review. It commended China for the measures it had taken to promote and protect human rights, in particular economic and social rights. The national human rights plan of action would help to strengthen its efforts to promote human rights. Lebanon welcomed the State's support for a significant number of recommendations made during its review.

824. The Sudan welcomed the positive approach taken by China to the universal periodic review. It encouraged China to continue its efforts to combat poverty in its pursuit of development. It commended China for its success in reducing unemployment by providing job opportunities for recent graduates. The Sudan noted with appreciation the State's support for more than 200 recommendations, including the one that the Sudan had made.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

825. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of China, nine other stakeholders made statements.<sup>35</sup>

826. The International Service for Human Rights (ISHR) stated that it was manifestly untrue that a recommendation that had been accepted had already been implemented; a flagrant case of "deadly reprisal" was that of the Chinese human rights defender, Cao Shunli. She had been arrested attempting to attend the twenty-fourth session of the Human Rights

<sup>35</sup> The statements of the stakeholders that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted, if available, on the extranet of the Human Rights Council at <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/25thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.



Council, in September. While in prison, she was denied proper medical attention, and had died the previous week as a result. Several human rights defenders had been disappeared or detained for allegedly showing support for her. Cao Shunli's detention, ill-treatment and ultimately her death were manifestly incompatible with the State's obligations as a Council member. ISHR used its remaining speaking time to observe a moment of silence.

827. China raised a point of order. It referred to Human Rights Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 31 of the annex thereto, in which it was stated that other relevant stakeholders would have the opportunity to make general comments before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary. China stated that the speaking time allocated to stakeholders should only be used for making general comments and statements, in compliance with the Council's rules of procedure; any other use of speaking time ran counter to those rules.

828. Twelve delegations took the floor to support the point of order raised by China.<sup>36</sup> Nine delegations spoke against the point of order.<sup>37</sup>

829. Having listened to all speakers and taking note of the different views expressed, the President recalled that, in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 16/21, it was crucial that individuals or groups wishing to cooperate with the Council and its mechanisms were able to do so. With regard to the use of speaking time, the President ruled that, as the matter pertained to procedure, he would submit it to the Bureau for its consideration.

830. China objected to the President's ruling, which was put to a vote. Of the 47 members of the Council called to vote, 45 were present and two were absent. Thirteen voted in favour, 12 abstained and 20 voted against the President's ruling.

831. The World Organization against Torture (OMCT) regretted the State's refusal to consider ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and urged China to implement the recommendations made by the Committee against Torture. Torture remained rampant in China, and the reported abusive treatment of Tibetan monks and nuns was of particular concern. OMCT expressed concern at the claims by China that there was no arbitrary detention and that human rights defenders were not subjected to reprisals, and referred to the reported detention of 94 Tibetan political prisoners since October 2013. It called upon the Human Rights Council to ensure accountability for the death of Chinese human rights defender Cao Shunli, and for the human rights abuses she had tried to bring to the attention of the international community. The organization fully supported the minute of silence.

832. In a joint statement, Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit (COC Nederland) and the International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA) expressed their full support for the moment of silence. They referred to reports of widespread discrimination and stigma faced by LGBT persons in different settings, and pointed out that no law mentioned discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. They encouraged China to close the gap in existing and future laws and regulations. They also called upon China to promote understanding and support of diversity, including in the media, to promote the health of LGBT populations, to adopt a domestic violence law that recognized survivors of same-sex intimate partner violence, to simplify procedures for changing gender identity on legal documents, and to permit LGBT non-governmental organizations to register officially.

833. According to the China Disabled Persons' Federation, the Government of China had solicited and respected opinions given by non-governmental organizations, including the Federation, when preparing its national report for the universal periodic review in 2013. With reference to the Government's efforts and achievements, it noted that China had amended and enacted a series of laws and regulations on disability, in accordance with the principles of non-discrimination described by the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, integrated work on disability in programmes on development and adopted new plans of action on disability. It looked forward to further efforts to increase the financing of public services,

<sup>36</sup> Algeria, Cuba, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Maldives, Morocco, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam.

<sup>37</sup> Austria, Canada, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

to improve the quality of services and to establish a database for persons with disabilities. The Federation called for inclusion of the issue of disability in the post-2015 development agenda.

834. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (FIDH), together with two of its member organizations, stated that they supported the moment of silence and appreciated the numerous recommendations made on civil society and human rights defenders.

835. China made a point of order requesting clarification with regard to the status of organizations referred to in the statement of FIDH.

836. The secretariat referred to the practice of indicating the organizations supporting each statement made, and clarified that the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, as a non-governmental organization in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council, would be reported as having delivered the statement.

837. FIDH continued by referring to the recent trial of at least 11 human rights defenders, and called for an end to their prosecution and the urgent release of all persons arbitrarily detained, including five named persons. Mourning the death of human rights defender Cao Shunli, FIDH called for those responsible for her death to be held accountable. It urged that repressive laws and measures in ethnic areas be reformed and that the root causes of protests, such as self-immolations, be addressed, in order to realize the State's commitment to protect the rights of ethnic groups. FIDH urged further steps to ensure the effective monitoring of the implementation of recommendations.

838. Human Rights Watch supported the moment of silence. It expressed its concern at misleading claims made by China in the outcome report; if as reported no one suffered reprisal for taking part in lawful activities or international mechanisms, why had Cao Shunli been detained, and why had she died?.. The reported respect for the rights of ethnic minorities did not explain the basis for the State's allegations of "separatism" against a Uighur economist who criticized government policies in Xinjiang, but explicitly rejected independence for that region. The response of China challenged not only the integrity of and the State's participation in the universal periodic review but also demonstrated that China did not uphold the highest standards in the promotion and protection of human rights.

839. Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada (LRWC) stated that it supported the moment of silence. The Human Rights Council should be gravely concerned about the case of democracy activist Cao Shunli, who campaigned peacefully for input by civil society into the review of China. LRWC referred to a petition that had been signed by 1.5 million people and forwarded to the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, calling for an end to and an investigation into the State's alleged "slaughter of prisoners of conscience for organ procurement"; and to reported organ harvesting from mainly executed Falun Gong practitioners. China prohibited lawyers from defending such practitioners; the outcome report provided no meaningful response to documentation of China's attacks on human rights lawyers.

840. Action Canada for Population and Development (ACPD) welcomed the Government's actions to recognize the human rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) persons in China. It noted the Government's response that LGBTI people were equal before the law and should be protected under specific existing laws. Without a legal interpretation of the term "other aspects" as a forbidden ground of discrimination under current laws, LGBTI individuals were prevented from seeking court redress when they encountered discrimination in schools or at the workplace. ACPD recommended either clarification of the term "other aspects" or the inclusion of a specific reference to sexual orientation and gender identity in laws.

841. Amnesty International, while welcoming the commitment of China to participation, deplored the death of Chinese activist Cao Shunli, who campaigned for greater transparency and civil society participation in the universal periodic review process. The trials of members of the "New Citizens Movement" had shown numerous procedural flaws. Amnesty International reported that legitimate and peaceful public participation had been criminalized, under charges such as "disturbing the public order". It welcomed the step to abolish "re-education through labour", but pointed to evidence of the continued use of arbitrary

detention, including in legal education centres and in house detention. The forced eviction of people from their homes or farmland had become a routine occurrence in China and represented a gross violation of human rights. Ethnic minorities, including Tibetans, Uighurs and Mongolians, continued to experience severe discrimination.

#### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

842. Of 252 recommendations received, 204 enjoyed the support of China while the remainder had been noted.

843. The delegation of China had listened to all parties attentively. Many States and organizations had made positive comments on the achievements made to develop human rights, and had commended China for its openness and sincerity in its universal periodic review. The delegation expressed its thanks to them for also recognizing the State's efforts to implement the recommendations it had accepted and the support for the Human Rights Council in considering and adopting the report of the Working Group.

844. Referring to opinions raised by some States and organizations, the delegation stressed three points. First, the principle that the State was to respect and preserve human rights was enshrined in the Constitution of China; China acknowledged the universality of human rights, and its human rights protection mechanisms served every person in China. At the same time, all citizens and organizations should abide by the law; anyone who breached the law or violated the rights or interests of others would be held to account.

845. Second, the path of human rights development chosen independently by China deserved respect. Different countries had different customs and traditions. The path that a country chose for its human rights development should comply with its history and culture, conform to its economic and social development and be approved by its own people.

846. Third, China opposed politicization and double standards on human rights issues. Some States adopted a selective approach to evaluating human rights, and this did not convince people. Some non-governmental organizations openly violated the rules of procedure of the Council and the meeting order, which could not be accepted. The majority of Council members had, by voting, clearly recorded their strong opposition to such a practice.

847. The universal periodic review was an important procedure for States Member of the United Nations to review the situation of human rights on an equal footing and through cooperation and dialogue. The Government of China had taken the review as an important opportunity to fulfil its human rights commitments and to hear views from other parties. China would continue to uphold the effective operation of the universal periodic review mechanism, earnestly put into practice the recommendations it had accepted and promote and protect human rights through concrete efforts.

#### **Monaco**

848. The review of Monaco was held on 28 October 2013 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 Monaco in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/MCO/1);
- (b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/MCO/2);
- (c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/MCO/3).

849. At its 42th meeting, on 21 March 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Monaco (see sect. C below).

850. The outcome of the review of Monaco comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/25/12), the views of Monaco concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented

before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/25/12/Add.1).

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

851. The Ambassador of the Permanent Mission of Monaco thanked all delegations that had taken the floor during the session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, on 28 October 2013. Monaco had carefully examined all the comments and recommendations made during its review, and conveyed its position in a report transmitted to the Human Rights Council in February 2014.

852. The preparation of the second review had mobilized many human resources, demonstrating again the commitment of Monaco to the promotion and protection of human rights and its support for the universal periodic review mechanism. The delegation recalled that, as part of preparation, the Government of Monaco consulted with representatives of civil society. Similarly, she highlighted the participation in the review of the President of the Foreign Relations Committee of the National Council of Monaco (the Parliament).

853. With regard to the 81 recommendations made, 51 were fully supported by Monaco. In the case of some recommendations, implementation was already under way. In other cases, the recommendations referred to actions already implemented, for which continuity had to be ensured.

854. In this regard, Monaco drew attention in particular to the creation in 2013 of the post of high commissioner for the protection of rights, freedoms and mediation, with a mandate to address appeals and disagreements between users or citizens and the administration and public services, which included the executive services that depended directly on the authority of the Minister of State, and services relevant to the administration of justice, the National Council, the municipality and public institutions. The office of the high commissioner was surrounded by a number of guarantees that referred specifically to its neutrality, impartiality and its functional and financial independence.

855. The delegation explained that 11 of the recommendations made could not be supported either because were unsuitable to the situation of the country or because Monaco had chosen different mechanisms to achieve similar goals.

856. The ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families was not considered because of existing specificities in Monaco with regard to job priorities and housing for national citizens.

857. Concerning discrimination in the field of employment, the Constitution, laws and regulations in force in the Principality of Monaco did not contain any discrimination based on race, colour, sex, language or religion. The employment priority given to the citizens of Monaco was only intended to protect national citizens, which were a minority in their own country, and to ensure that they could find employment in their own country.

858. Monaco could not make any commitment to the implementation of the advisory opinion of the Venice Commission of the Council of Europe with regard to the Constitution of Monaco.

859. Monaco did not intend to decriminalize defamation insofar that, although it was an independent criminal offence, it did not constitute an obstacle to the freedom of expression.

860. The eligibility of naturalized citizens of Monaco was provided for by the Constitution and subjected only to a condition related to the age and duration of possession of nationality.

861. The independence of the judiciary was fully guaranteed by existing provisions of the Constitution and laws of Monaco.

862. During the review, Monaco had committed to providing a response on a certain number of recommendations.

863. With regard to the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the

Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, relevant studies had been launched by Monaco. Before taking any decision about ratification, the Government was awaiting the finalization of the studies.

864. On the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, Monaco was not able to make a commitment given that the State had only one prison, in which between 20 and 30 detainees were serving short-term sentences. The prison was not a detention centre as such.

865. The ratification of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court would require deep reform of several provisions, in particular the Constitution, the Criminal Code and the Code of Criminal Procedure. Consequently, Monaco could not provide a formal response, but pledged to continue its consideration. Monaco was nonetheless determined to cooperate with the International Criminal Court when the Court requested it. The delegation stressed that Monaco had already complied with a request of mutual assistance from the Prosecutor of the Court.

866. Although Monaco had already signed the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance in 2007, a subsequent review of the treaty provisions had revealed constitutional and legislative inconsistencies with the provisions of national law. Thus, Monaco could not engage firmly today to ratify the Convention.

867. Accession to the International Labour Organization and some of its conventions raised issues, particularly with regard to the existing system of employment priority in Monaco, which would require deep reform. Therefore, Monaco could not provide a formal response, but undertook to continue ongoing studies.

868. In conclusion, the delegation thanked the President of the Human Rights Council, the members of the troika (Guatemala, the Philippines and Uganda) and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Monaco hoped that the second review had highlighted the progress made by Monaco, which would continue to work with the utmost determination, both nationally and internationally, to defend the most vulnerable.

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

869. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Monaco, six delegations made statements.

870. Nigeria thanked Monaco for its cooperation and engagement with the universal periodic review and the High Commissioner. It commended the State's commitment to enacting international human rights conventions into its national statutes. Nigeria encouraged the Government to continue to promote and protect the human rights of citizens and residents of Monaco, and also those of irregular migrants. Nigeria supported the adoption of outcome report and wished Monaco every success in the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted.

871. The Republic of Moldova commended Monaco on its commitment to human rights and its cooperation with the universal periodic review. It welcomed the State's acceptance of most recommendations addressed during its review and the action taken to implement them. It acknowledged the establishment of the post of high commissioner for the protection of rights, freedoms and mediation, and the guarantees for its impartiality and functional and financial independence. It appreciated the acceptance of the recommendation made by the Republic of Moldova on protecting migrant workers against all forms of discrimination, including access to health and social services, and encouraged Monaco to continue its positive action in that area. The Republic of Moldova wished Monaco every success in the implementation of and follow-up to the recommendations it had accepted.

872. Togo commended Monaco for its commitment to international solidarity, the most disadvantaged segments of the population and those affected by conflicts. It thanked Monaco for having accepted most of the recommendations submitted during its second review, including those formulated by Togo. It congratulated Monaco on its full cooperation with the universal periodic review, and wished it every success in the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted.

873. Viet Nam thanked Monaco for the update on recent developments in the promotion and protection of human rights. It welcomed the State's commitment to the protection and promotion of human rights in general and to the universal periodic review in particular. Viet Nam reaffirmed its great appreciation for the efforts made by Monaco and its contribution to international cooperation in this field. It welcomed the State's acceptance of a large number of recommendations made, including those made by Viet Nam. It invited the Human Rights Council to adopt the report of the Working Group on Monaco.

874. Algeria noted with satisfaction that Monaco had accepted more than 50 recommendations made during its review, including one made by Algeria on the establishment of an independent human rights structure. It regretted the fact that Monaco had not accepted a second recommendation, on ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. Algeria recommended the adoption of the outcome report and wished Monaco every success in the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted.

875. The Council of Europe, while welcoming the measures already taken by Monaco to address issues raised by monitoring bodies of the Council of Europe, referred to the recommendations made by those monitoring bodies. It particularly stressed the problems relating to discrimination against foreigners and the lack of overall procedural guarantees against discrimination as recommended by the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance and the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, and shortcomings in the prevention of corruption in public administration, in the transparency of legal persons and of party funding, as identified by the Group of States against Corruption. It welcomed the establishment of a national human rights institution, a priority area for the Council of Europe. It invited Monaco to ratify the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence.

876. Cuba highlighted the improvements made by Monaco in the areas of protection of the rights of persons with disabilities, women and children. It noted, however, that Monaco still faced several human rights challenges. It appreciated the State's acceptance of the recommendations made by Cuba, and wished Monaco every success in the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

877. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Monaco, no other stakeholder made statements.

### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

878. Of 81 recommendations received, 51 enjoyed the support of Monaco and the remainder had been noted.

879. The Ambassador of the Permanent Mission of Monaco expressed her gratitude to the President of the Human Rights Council and the OHCHR secretariat for their assistance during the preparation of the review in October and for the review of its report today. She also warmly thanked all delegations that intervened in the current session and that had, in most cases, encouraged Monaco and highlighted its progress since its previous review.

880. With regard to the question asked by the representative of the Council of Europe, she concluded her intervention by explaining that the Istanbul Convention was under review by legal services in Monaco, and complementary information had recently been sent to the Group of States against Corruption.

### **Congo**

881. The review of the Congo was held on 30 October 2013, 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 Congo in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/COG/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/COG/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/COG/3).

882. At its 42nd meeting, on 21 March 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the Congo (see sect. C below).

883. The outcome of the review of the Congo comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/25/16), the views of the Congo concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/25/16/Add.1).

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

884. The delegation, which was led by the Minister for Communications and Relations with the Parliament, Bienvenu Okiemy, reaffirmed its thanks to all States for their high-quality participation in the interactive dialogue on the Congo during the session of the Working Group. It applauded the valuable contribution made by the members of the troika in drawing up the final report.

885. The Congo had supported the universal periodic review mechanism since its establishment. It had been mobilized and spared no effort to consolidate the foundations of a free society, where respect for the rights and fundamental freedoms of citizens continued to be the prerequisite, a society governed by the rule of law.

886. The Congo had accepted 161 recommendations of 171 made. Seven recommendations had been taken up for study, while three others were not supported. Most of the recommendations that the Congo had accepted were already being implemented and could be clustered thematically.

887. With regard to the signing and ratification of international human rights instruments, the Congo was a party to most of them. In this context, it had recently, ratified on 14 March 2014, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Optional Protocol thereto. Moreover, the procedure to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure had already commenced. The Congo restated its undertaking to continue the process of acceding to and ratifying the international human rights instruments to which it was not yet a party.

888. Regarding the reform of legal and judicial codes, the Ministry of Justice and Human Rights had tackled the objective of establishing a framework for exchanging views and positions to develop mechanisms and strategies for the reform of all codes governing the judiciary and prison system. A commission had been already established to implement this reform effort. The European Union was providing major support for the initiative.

889. With regard to women's rights, the status of women in the Congo had improved over the years, with progress being made in the areas of gender equality, training, employment and the participation of women in public life. Some obstacles due to the sociocultural context had yet to be overcome by education and greater awareness. Since January 2014, the Government had embarked on a wide-ranging campaign on women's rights.

890. With regard to the rights of the child, the relevant national policy was based on two pillars: active participation in international instruments on the rights of the child and the enhancement of international cooperation, and the strengthening of the national legal framework protecting the rights of the child.

891. On the rights of minorities and vulnerable social groups, the normative framework was based on the principle of equality. The enactment of Law No. 5-2011 of 25 February 2011 on the promotion and protection of the rights of indigenous peoples was a major step; indeed, the Congo was the first country in Africa to have such legislation, thanks to the progress made in the area of education and health of indigenous peoples.

892. Regarding the submission of national reports on human rights to treaty bodies, the national report on the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child had been reviewed by the Committee on the Rights of the Child in January 2014. Reports had also been submitted to the Committee against Torture, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women.

893. With regard to the fight against torture, in accordance with the provisions of articles 9 and 10 of the Constitution, the practice of torture was forbidden. Where allegations of torture or deaths in custody were proven, perpetrators were punished in accordance with the criminal provisions in force; for example, four police officers had recently been dismissed from the national police force on charges of indecent assault with violence, while 15 others had been brought before the courts.

894. With regard to detention conditions, the Congo had embarked on a programme to rehabilitate and build prison facilities. Prisons had been built in Mossaka, Owando, Ewo, Ouesso and Impfondo, while others had been restored. Two prison centres were under construction in Brazzaville and Pointe-Noire, with respectively a capacity of 1,500-1,700 and 600 places. Congolese prisons were open to all requests from non-governmental human rights organizations and other institutions, in accordance with the legal provisions on the protection of human rights. To solve the problem of lengthy pretrial detention, the Minister for Justice and Human Rights had recently taken measures to accelerate procedures for the conditional release of prisoners.

895. The independence of the justice system was guaranteed by article 136 of the Constitution. Judicial proceedings were conducted in strict compliance with the law. A policy on strengthening the capacity of the judicial and prison institutions was being formulated. The trigger for this policy was the reform of the judicial map, which allowed for the establishment of new courts in order to bring justice closer to citizens (they included six high Courts and a dozen ordinary courts). To give this approach more consistency, 500 young judges had been recruited in recent years, while 300 others had been trained in the Congo and abroad.

896. The Congo had accepted a recommendation on the ratification of the Kampala amendments relating to the Rome Statute. Similarly, it had accepted a recommendation on acceding to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure, and a recommendation on cooperation with the International Criminal Court, which was being implemented.

897. With regard to the recommendation on the ratification of the Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the International Criminal Court, the Congo, as a State member of the African Union, was not yet planning to ratify the agreement until the final position of the African Union was known on the subject. The Congo therefore did not accept the recommendation.

898. On the recommendations relating to the standing invitation to thematic special procedure mandate holders, the Congo had affirmed its commitment to cooperate with all United Nations institutions, including the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council. Cooperation between the Congo and the special procedures was witnessed in recent years: the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of indigenous peoples visited the Congo in 2010, and the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearance visited in 2011. The Congo intended to continue its cooperation, and requests for working visits by special procedures would be given special attention by the Government. The above recommendations had not been supported by the Congo.

899. Having endured the tumult of internal conflicts, violence and the denial of human rights, the Congo had now entered a phase of stability and was engaged in a process of robust development. The Congo needed time to achieve better results, but observers agreed in the meantime that it was on the right track.



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

900. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Congo, 13 delegations made statements. Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the International Criminal Court

38

901. Rwanda appreciated the commitment of the Congo to the universal periodic review process, which had been demonstrated by its detailed response on the recommendations made during the second review cycle. Rwanda noted that the State had accepted a large number of recommendations, including those made by Rwanda.

902. Senegal welcomed the ongoing commitment and full cooperation of the Congo to the universal periodic review mechanism, which attested to the State's will and desire to pursue the protection, promotion and full enjoyment of human rights. Senegal remained convinced that the Congo would make every effort to implement the recommendations accepted in order to improve the living conditions of its people, particularly in the rural areas.

903. Sri Lanka noted that the Congo had accepted 161 of the 171 recommendations made during its review, including the two made by Sri Lanka on reducing the rates of unemployment and underemployment among young people and on promoting the enrolment of girls at all levels of education. Sri Lanka acknowledged the commitment of the Congo to continue its cooperation with the United Nations, the Human Rights Council and its mechanisms. It was noteworthy that, since its first review, the Congo had become party to several international instruments, including two Optional Protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Sri Lanka was also pleased to observe that the Congo had taken measures to strengthen its national normative framework.

904. The Sudan noted the commitment of the Congo to cooperate on an ongoing basis with the universal periodic review mechanism. The Congo had received 171 recommendations, which were mainly positive and constructive. The Sudan welcomed the immediate acceptance by the Congo of 161 recommendations.

905. Togo congratulated the Congo on its full cooperation with the universal periodic review mechanism and its commitment to the universally shared values of human rights. It was pleased to note that the Congo had accepted almost all of the recommendations, including those made by Togo. It requested the international community to provide the Congo with support and assistance in the implementation of the recommendations accepted.

906. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela appreciated the full cooperation and of the Congo with the universal periodic review and its commitment to it. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela had noted significant progress made by the State in the situation of human rights. It was pleased to note the efforts made by the Government to fight poverty and the significant results achieved in access to education and employment.

907. Algeria noted with satisfaction the efforts made by the Congo in its normative and institutional levels to promote and protect human rights. It also commended the Congo for its efforts to continue the sweeping structural reform programme and to strengthen governance. The Congo had achieved important results in consolidating democracy and had helped to strengthen peace. Algeria welcomed the efforts that the State had made to promote the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights.

908. Angola noted with satisfaction that the Congo had accepted almost all of the recommendations made, and in particular the ones made by Angola. Angola welcomed the progress made in consolidating peace, security and institutional stability, which had in turn strengthened democratic institutions and improved living standards, which will help to reduce poverty and build the rule of law.

909. Belarus noted the constructive approach that the Congo had taken to the universal periodic review mechanism. The Congo was still in a post-conflict situation but was taking

<sup>38</sup> Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the International Criminal Court are posted, if available, on the extranet of the Human Rights Council at <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/25thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

serious steps to strengthen the rule of law and promote human rights. Belarus welcomed the measures that the State had taken to ensure social, economic and cultural rights, and the efforts to improve living standards and to eradicate poverty. Belarus noted the serious approach taken by the Congo to the implementation of the recommendations received at its first review and the fact that it had accepted most of the recommendations made in the second cycle.

910. Benin praised the efforts made by the Congo as contained in its report. It encouraged the Congo to pursue its efforts and achievements by upholding human rights, particularly in the areas of education, health care, the empowerment of women, child protection and the justice system. Benin urged the Congo to step up its efforts to ratify the international legal instruments to which it was not yet a party.

911. Botswana noted that the acceptance by the Congo of many of the recommendations made during the second cycle of the universal periodic review demonstrated its commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights. Botswana also noted the progress made in addressing the human rights of women and children, in particular the measures taken to combat trafficking in persons, particularly in children and women. Botswana commended the Congo for the efforts made to address issues of gender equality. It also welcomed the ratification by the State of various human rights instruments, including the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.

912. Burkina Faso stated that the second review of the Congo and the State's acceptance of almost all recommendations made demonstrated its commitment to the protection and promotion of human rights. Burkina Faso noted that significant progress had been made, particularly in reducing poverty and protecting the rights of women, children, the elderly, persons with disability and indigenous peoples, and in the fight against corruption in the justice system.

913. Chad thanked the Congo for sharing its position on the recommendations made during its review in October 2013. Chad congratulated the Congo on the efforts made to ensure that its people enjoyed economic, social and cultural rights.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

914. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Congo, five other stakeholders made statements.

915. In a joint statement, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, Volontariato Internazionale Donna Educazione Sviluppo and the Catholic International Education Office welcomed the approach of the Congo at its second review. They welcomed in particular the State's acceptance of the recommendation on ensuring the implementation of a birth registration system that was free of charge and free from corruption. They encouraged the Congo to ensure the efficient implementation of relevant measures in this regard. With regard to the right to education, they commended the State for having accepted the recommendations on the quality of and access without gender distinction to education. They encouraged the effective implementation of the recommendation on lowering the school dropout rate and ensuring continuous education, in particular for disadvantaged families. They also requested the Congo to take specific measures to reduce health risks related to early pregnancy and to ensure the reintegration of young mothers in the education system. Lastly, they requested the Congo to promote decent work for persons with disabilities.

916. Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale (OCAPROCE Internationale) welcomed the efforts made by the Congo to overcome gender inequality. It was nonetheless alarmed at certain legal provisions, customary practices and discriminatory local traditions relating to marriage, inheritance and property rights. It requested the Government of the Congo to pursue its efforts to ensure that decision-making processes were equitable in access of women and to ensure the effective implementation of economic, social and cultural rights for women and children in the country.

917. In a joint statement, Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs and Comité international pour le respect et l'application de la Charte africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples (CIRAC) stated that they had noted with satisfaction the commitment of the Congo to the promotion and full enjoyment of all rights recognized by human rights instruments. They voiced their concern, however, at the specific implementation of that commitment, particularly with regard to the freedom of expression and the effective enjoyment of economic and social rights by the Congolese people, in the light of the impunity that perpetrators of serious human rights violations still enjoyed, the barriers to the good functioning and independence of the judiciary, and the lack of resources allocated to the education sector, training and health, despite the Millennium Development Goals. Cases of arbitrary detention and harassment had been brought to their knowledge and were a source of major concern. Consequently, they urged the Congo to do its utmost to comply fully with its commitment to the protection of human rights, which constituted the basis of true stability in the Central Africa region, which was prone to serious upheavals caused by the endless crisis in the Great Lakes region and the Central African Republic.

918. Franciscans International reaffirmed its concern at corruption in the management of State resources, which undermined the State's capacity to provide services on a fair basis, particularly in the health sector. It requested the Government of the Congo urgently to take specific measures to fight corruption in the health system in order to guarantee access to high-quality health services for the entire population, including its most disadvantaged members. Franciscans International called upon the Congo to implement immediately and effectively the recommendation on birth registration in order to guarantee a universal and free of charge system for birth registration.

919. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme (RADDHO) recalled that the Congo had accepted 51 recommendations at its first review, but that most of them had not yet been implemented. The obstacles to the implementation of review recommendations included corruption in the judiciary system and administration, a culture of impunity, prison overcrowding, the use of torture to obtain confessions in police stations, the exploitation of children and the ill-treatment of women. In this context, RADDHO called upon the Congo particularly to combat ethno-centrism in its management of power in the country, by developing an educational system for human rights to promote a true civic culture; guaranteeing the independence of the justice system and of judges; and taking measures to create an atmosphere conducive to political dialogue and promoting the organization of elections in the near future. RADDHO lastly called upon the Congo to take appropriate measures to eliminate disparities in the distribution of revenue from natural resources in the country, in particular in the regions of Likouala, Lalekoumou, Plateaux, Niari, Sangha and Pool.

#### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

920. The President stated that, of the 171 recommendations received, 164 recommendations had enjoyed the support of the Congo and the remainder had been noted.

921. The Congo thanked the delegations that had taken the floor. The State's ultimate goal was to establish a legal framework providing for the protection of human rights. The reforms that had been introduced had that objective. A national observatory to combat corruption, and other mechanisms, had been established. Of course, violations of the rule of law could sometimes be seen. In this case, the justice system was the answer.

922. Since the declaration of the State's independence, the social contract in the Congo was based on the law and democracy. The efforts that had been made were also aimed at ensuring access to education and health-care services, including for indigenous peoples, and at improving detention conditions. The Congo needed time to solve the issues that it still faced. All countries had been through the same process.

#### **Malta**

923. The review of Malta was held on 30 October 2013 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 Malta in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/MLT/1);
- (b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/MLT/2);
- (c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/MLT/3).

924. At its 42nd meeting, on 21 March 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Malta (see sect. C below).

925. The outcome of the review of Malta comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/25/17), the views of Malta concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/25/17/Add.1).

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

926. The delegation of Malta reaffirmed the State's commitment to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other landmark documents. The provisions for specific rights had been progressively implemented in constitutional development. Malta was planning to set up a national human rights institution in conformity with the Paris Principles.

927. The universal periodic review was a unique mechanism that had had a far-reaching and positive impact since its inception. Through the review, the international community could examine and address the human rights record of all States Members of the United Nations, periodically and without distinction. The review was about dialogue and the sharing of best practices among States and stakeholders. It was about full cooperation and engagement with the Human Rights Council, the treaty bodies and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. It was for these reasons and more that the Government of Malta attached great importance to the universal periodic review.

928. For Malta, the universal periodic review had been an extremely useful and forward-looking exercise. It had helped in the establishment of expert teams committed to collaborate further within and beyond the mandated scope of the review. Equally important had been the continued dialogue between the Government and civil society. The contribution of civil society was welcome and indeed invaluable.

929. In examining the 134 recommendations made during the second cycle, the Government of Malta had the objective of further improving on its previous achievements. Some of the recommendations made during the session of the Working Group had already been implemented or enacted in national policy. A number of recommendations were similar in nature. The responses of the Government on recommendations addressing the same topic were grouped on the basis of the issue concerned. Other recommendations were rather ambiguous or considered too general. In instances where States made recommendations linking two issues on which Malta had different positions, the position of the Government was presented to address each issue specifically.

930. The recommendations that the State accepted in part were those where Malta supported the principle and idea behind the recommendation, but was not yet in a position to implement it. The Government did not regard all the recommendations as being on the same level. Some recommendations could not be accepted fully because they were still subject to internal considerations; hence, it was felt that accepting them at this stage could prejudice internal considerations. Other recommendations had been rejected because the Government had no intention of changing its current policy or because it deemed that the recommendations had been already addressed in its legislation and policies.

931. With regard to the ratification of international instruments and human rights protection, Malta was party to a number of international covenants. The Government had taken various legislative initiatives aimed at further safeguarding the implementation of

human rights. Malta was planning to continue its process of accession to core human rights treaties by introducing new legislation that addressed relevant human rights issues. Malta was not, however, in a position to accede to all treaties and conventions. One such case was the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

932. A number of specialized national commissions and authorities had been set up with specific mandates to protect vulnerable groups and to guarantee the protection of their rights. They included the National Commission for the Promotion of Equality, the National Commission Persons with Disability, the Commissioner for Children, the National Employment Authority and the Commissioner for Voluntary Organizations. Furthermore, Malta remained committed to strengthen the rule of law and good governance in order to safeguard, protect and promote human rights and freedoms.

933. With regard to equality and gender balance, the Parliament of Malta had been discussing a bill on civil unions, which was aimed at regulating civil unions between persons of the same sex, or of different sexes. The bill proposed that a civil union, once registered, would have the corresponding effects and consequences in law of civil marriage. While the Government remained committed to supporting the traditional family model, as the fundamental unit of society, it had embarked upon legislation that did not discriminate against any form of other family model.

934. The bill would also strengthen laws on discrimination. Persons who used threatening, abusive or insulting language or behaviour or displayed any written or printed material that was threatening, abusive or insulting with the intent of inciting violence or hatred on these grounds would be liable to imprisonment upon conviction. The amendment would ensure that no law included any provision that was discriminatory, and would prevent any person acting by virtue of any written law from causing a person to experience discriminatory treatment on the grounds of sexual orientation.

935. Malta also safeguarded the rights of transgender persons. The amendments to the Civil Code removed legal obstacles to persons who had undergone a legally recognized sex change to be regarded as pertaining to the acquired gender for all the intents and purposes of their civil status, including marriage.

936. Following the extension of the remit of the National Commission for the Promotion of Equality, the Commission had been working to develop a human rights culture through capacity-building. Moreover, through transnational cooperation with other equality bodies, research was being planned to outline various formal and informal working processes to be utilized in equality bodies in order for them to implement their respective obligations with regard to equal treatment.

937. The National Commission for the Promotion of Equality had been working on various initiatives with the aim of increasing the number of women in decision-making positions, including by empowering and enabling women to take up such positions, and supporting and advising policymakers on gender balance in decision-making.

938. The National Commission for the Promotion of Equality also provided training on racism and xenophobia that was tailored to the needs of specific groups, including migrants. The Commission also carried out research to develop a national plan of action against racism and xenophobia.

939. With regard to the rights of persons with disabilities, the Government was committed to ensuring that all socially or culturally constructed barriers were overcome and that strong legislation was made available to ensure the protection and consolidation of human rights for persons with disabilities. It was also committed to providing a variety of alternatives so that persons with disabilities could receive a service of their choice, tailor-made and developed around their specific needs and aspirations. In the area of education, independent living and accessibility to multimedia, the Government had its own structures to provide the support required, or when necessary engaged with the voluntary sector to ensure that such services were provided.

940. With regard to the rights of asylum seekers, the Government had noted with appreciation that delegations recognized the disproportionate pressures that Malta had been

facing because of the influx of irregular migrants. Despite those challenges, Malta remained committed to do its utmost to honour its international obligations and to ensure that the human rights and dignity of irregular migrants were protected.

941. Detention centres in Malta already met international standards, and efforts had been made to ensure upkeep and, where necessary, an improvement in conditions. In addition, Malta had been pursuing policy reform at the European level, given that the challenges posed by migration could not be addressed by Malta acting alone, but in cooperation with neighbouring countries and the European Union.

942. Irregular migrants could challenge their detention, and had the right to file an asylum application. They also had access to health and other benefits. In 2015, reforms were planned for migration and detention policies and integration-oriented initiatives with a view to comply with the recast Reception Conditions Directive, which would be enacted in national legislation. The reasons for detaining asylum applicants would also be introduced in the Reception of Asylum Seekers (Minimum Standards) Regulations, in accordance with article 8(3) of the Directive. New legislative provisions in the Immigration Act and the Reception of Asylum Seekers (Minimum Standards) Regulations introducing the possibility to challenge detention in accordance with article 9(3) of the Directive would be introduced.

943. Warehouse II at the Safi detention centre was refurbished. Further refurbishment initiatives were also conducted in 2012 to Hermes Block at the Lyster detention centre. Moreover, under the emergency funds (2012) of the European Refugee Fund, a number of initiatives had been conducted to improve the reception facilities of service users. All tents had been removed from the Hal Far tent village and replaced by 100 modern mobile homes through the emergency measures (2011) of the European Refugee Fund. The success of this initiative was repeated under the emergency measures (2012) of the European Refugee Fund, when 100 more units were installed to upgrade another open centre at Hal-Far.

944. Several initiatives were undertaken as a result of the national action plan on combating trafficking, including an awareness-raising campaign and training activities for stakeholders in the sector, and the adoption of national indicators for the identification of trafficking victims.

945. While Malta agreed with the principle that unaccompanied minors should not be detained, no amendments to legislation would be required to prevent the detention of such minors. In particular, criminal law in Malta did not have any provisions on the detention of unaccompanied minors.

946. The Government's firm commitment to strengthen the human rights and equality framework had been reflected in a number of decisions taken in recent months. Earlier in March 2014, Malta had announced that it would be the fourth member State of the European Union to ratify the Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence. It also announced that, by amending the Criminal Code, it would be prohibit punishment in all forms, both in the home and in alternative care settings, thereby confirming that proper respect for human rights, and in particular for the rights of the child, required that children should never be subjected to corporal punishment. To that end, the new legislation held that any reference to the "bounds of reasonable chastisement" was no longer acceptable.

947. Issues relating to the right to life and sexual and reproductive health had been comprehensively addressed in the national report submitted by Malta, its opening statement and subsequent explanations delivered by the delegation during the session of the Working Group, and also in the State's written replies submitted in response to the recommendations.

## **2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Council on the review outcome**

948. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Malta, seven delegations made statements.

949. Djibouti noted with appreciation the measures taken by Malta to improve the Criminal Code by improving access to justice and the realization of the rights of the child. It commended Malta for having accepted the recommendations on the detention of migrants,

which had demonstrated the willingness of the Government to address the challenges posed in this area. Djibouti encouraged Malta to continue its efforts in this area. It reiterated its appeal to the international community to support Malta so the Government had the means to ensure the rights of migrants.

950. Libya noted with appreciation the efforts taken by Malta to advance human rights and to strengthen legislation in this area. It commended the Government on the measures that had been taken to bring its legislation into line with international human rights instruments. Libya also commended Malta for having ratified most international human rights treaties.

951. The Republic of Moldova commended Malta for its action in promoting and protecting human rights. It noted with appreciation the State's acceptance of the recommendations that it had made on combating human trafficking. The Republic of Moldova had noted positively the amendments to the Criminal Code, envisaging compensation for victims of human trafficking.

952. Togo noted with satisfaction the willingness of the Government of Malta to promote and protect human rights despite the numerous challenges at national and international levels. It commended Malta for its policies on the protection of the rights of migrants. Togo encouraged Malta to pursue its initiatives to rescue migrants attempting to cross the Mediterranean Sea. It noted with appreciation that Malta had accepted a large number of recommendations made during the session of the Working Group.

953. Algeria noted with satisfaction the acceptance by Malta of two recommendations, on combating all forms of discrimination and on ensuring the rights of migrants. It was confident that the measures that had been already taken or had been planned would have a positive impact on the promotion and protection of human rights.

954. The Council of Europe referred to the recommendations addressed to Malta by various monitoring bodies of the Council of Europe. Among the issues raised in those recommendations, it highlighted three priority areas: the rights of irregular migrants and asylum seekers; problems relating to xenophobia, discrimination and the lack of integration of immigrants; and problems relating to access to courts. The Council of Europe commended Malta on the measures that had been taken to address the issues raised by the said monitoring bodies. It also noted with satisfaction the measures that had been taken to ratify the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence.

955. Cuba highlighted the progress made by Malta in several areas, including the protection of the rights of persons with disabilities. At the same time, Malta had faced challenges in the field of human rights, as it had noted in its national report. Cuba noted with satisfaction that Malta had accepted three recommendations made by Cuba, had taken measures to ensure the rights of migrants and to combat racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance, and attached great importance to the realization of social and economic rights.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

956. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Malta, four other stakeholders made statements.

957. Action Canada for Population and Development was concerned about women's access to reproductive health-care services, and in particular with regard to the legal provisions regulating the right to terminate a pregnancy. Women had no legal access to termination of a pregnancy under any circumstances, and were subject to criminal charges if they underwent one. Malta had refused to acknowledge the positive obligations under the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women to guarantee women equal access to health services and access to safe and legal abortion. The national sexual rights policy and strategy did not contain provisions on women's access to legal abortion. It urged the Government of Malta to recognize access to abortion as a critical human rights issue and to review its legislation regarding abortion and, as a minimum, to amend existing laws to ensure that women were not criminalized for having an abortion.

958. Amnesty International noted that Malta had accepted a recommendation on continuing its cooperation with neighbouring countries in rescue operations at sea, and had

expressed its commitment to continue to abide by its international obligations and to cooperate with neighbouring countries. Amnesty International urged Malta to guarantee, in all cases, access to asylum and protection from removal to a country where there was a real risk of persecution or other serious human rights abuse. Malta should also commit never to resort to push-backs or collective expulsions. It urged Malta to ensure full accountability and transparency with regard to the shipwreck in the State's search and rescue zone in October 2013, when hundreds of asylum seekers died.

959. Recontre africaine pour la défense de droits de l'homme (RADDHO) positively noted that Malta had implemented the recommendations made at its previous review, and had consulted with civil society and other stakeholders in the process. It expressed its concern, however, at the inhumane treatment of African asylum seekers and migrants, particularly the policy of detention of migrants seeking protection under international norms. It urged the Government of Malta to ensure that the rights of asylum seekers and migrants were protected. Detention conditions had to be improved and the duration of the detention of asylum seekers minimized. It called upon the Government to make every effort to create an environment welcome to asylum seekers and migrants in its territory. RADDHO invited the Government to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and the Members of Their Families and to intensify its efforts to check the growth of racism and xenophobia in the country.

960. Human Rights Watch noted positively the steps taken by Malta since its first review to improve its system for receiving asylum seekers. It noted with regret, however, that Malta continued to subject migrants and asylum seekers arriving by boat to automatic detention. Malta had to, in accordance with the judgement of the European Court of Human Rights of 2013 and a number of recommendations made during the universal periodic review, put an end to its practice of automatic detention and improve safeguards for and conditions of detainees. Malta should in addition revise its age-determination policies to give unaccompanied migrant children the benefit of the doubt, treating them as a child and releasing them from detention until found not to be children.

#### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

961. The President stated that, on the basis of the information provided, of 134 recommendations received, Malta had accepted 73 and noted the remainder.

962. In concluding, the delegation expressed its appreciation and gratitude to all those who had collaborated with the delegation in the past months and to all delegations and non-governmental organizations that had sought to enlighten the Government further with their constructive recommendations.

#### **Israel**

963. The review of Israel was held on 29 October 2013 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 the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/17/ISR/1);
- (b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/15/ISR/2, A/HRC/WG.6/17/ISR/2 and Corr. 1);
- (c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 16/21, paragraph 5 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/15/ISR/3 and Corr.1 and A/HRC/WG.6/17/ISR/3).

964. At its 53rd meeting, on 27 March 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Israel (see sect. C below).

965. The outcome of the review of Israel comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/25/15), the views of Israel concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented



before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/25/15/Add.1).

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

966. Pursuant to the letter dated 24 March 2014 from Israel and on its behalf, the President of the Human Rights Council stated that, as previously announced, Israel was not in a position to send a delegation to Geneva for the session of the Human Rights Council owing to an ongoing labour strike at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

967. The President informed the Human Rights Council that Israel had submitted an addendum to the report of the Working Group, which had been circulated to the Council in accordance with the usual procedure, and which clarified the position of Israel with regard to the recommendations received during its review by the Working Group. The President also drew the attention of the Council to information additional to that contained in the addendum to the report of the Working Group, which was also available on the webpage dedicated to the universal periodic review.

968. On behalf of Israel, the President of the Human Rights Council read the following statement, as contained in the letter dated 24 March 2014 from Israel addressed to the President by the Deputy for Foreign Policy and International Affairs of Israel:

The State of Israel has carefully reviewed the 237 recommendations received during the second universal periodic review of Israel, held on 29 October 2013, which were summarized in the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/25/15), and was happy to submit a document regarding the universal periodic review (second cycle) of Israel.

As you know, the State of Israel is deeply committed to the universal periodic review. Following the report of the Working Group, relevant government ministries, as well as civil society organizations, were consulted in the process of drafting the replies to each of the observations and recommendations received. As a result of these consultations, it was pleased to report that Israel had been able to support 105 recommendations, either in whole or in part.

Unfortunately, owing to an ongoing labour strike at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, representatives of Israel will not be able to participate in the scheduled dialogue with the Council and to present its views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies. We apologize for the inconvenience and wish to take this opportunity to renew the assurance of our highest consideration.

969. The President of the Human Rights Council concluded that, of the 244 recommendations received during the session of the Working Group, Israel had identified 54 recommendations that fully enjoyed the support of Israel. All other recommendations had been noted.

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

970. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Israel, nine delegations made statements.

971. Pakistan took note of the outcome report on Israel. It regretted that Israel had not implemented the recommendations made during the first cycle of the universal periodic review. It expressed its concern at the rejection of some recommendations, including those that contained the term "State of Palestine". It called upon Israel to fulfil its obligations under international law, including human rights and international humanitarian law, and to implement all Security Council, General Assembly and Human Rights Council resolutions. It also called upon Israel to protect the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories. Pakistan urged Israel to implement all recommendations.

972. The Syrian Arab Republic had made recommendations regarding the application of United Nations resolutions relevant to the occupied Arab territories in the hope that the Human Rights Council, with its different mechanisms, could contribute to the implementation of those resolutions or mitigate the impact of occupation. The language used by Israel did not reflect a serious interest in engaging with the Council, and its responses reflected a lack of will to implement the recommendations. Accordingly, the Syrian Arab Republic was not concerned by the report. It supported the point of order made previously by Pakistan.

973. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland welcomed the participation of Israel in the universal periodic review process. It regretted the fact that Israel was unable to be present, but did not characterize its absence owing to a strike as being evidence of non-cooperation. It welcomed some positive steps made since the first review of Israel, but remained deeply concerned at the situation of human rights in the occupied Palestinian territories. It encouraged Israel to adopt the recommendations made during the universal periodic review, including on ending the use of solitary confinement for children in military detention.

974. The United States of America stated that Israel was justifiably proud of its democratic traditions and values. It encouraged Israel to implement the recommendations it had made, on women's rights, the equitable allocation of resources to Arab Israeli and Bedouin communities, and efficient refugee status processing and detention adjudication for asylum seekers and migrants. It was concerned that some States had made recommendations that fell outside the scope and mandate of the Human Rights Council and the universal periodic review process and that should be addressed only by the Israeli and Palestinian parties jointly as a part of the process of direct bilateral negotiations.

975. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela expressed its disappointment at the unwillingness of Israel to desist from the numerous and systematic human rights violations it commits. It urged Israel to, inter alia, respect the right to self-determination of the State of Palestine and end its illegal occupation; cease its programme of colonization with illegal settlements; end the inhumane blockade on Gaza, and put an end to the illegal detention and torture of Palestinians; and the criminal military attacks in which thousands of innocents had died. It urged Israel to show its real commitment to human rights by complying with the recommendations made by the community of nations as part of the universal periodic review.

976. Canada stated that Israel, as a stable democracy with a robust system of rule of law, despite the bias that was often expressed against it by the Human Rights Council, had a great deal to contribute to discussions, of which itself and those under its jurisdiction were the primary beneficiaries. It welcomed the commitment of Israel to implement accepted recommendations, including those made by Canada, on efforts to ensure non-discrimination, particularly in the areas of access to justice, property and housing rights, and additional measures to improve the status of women and to improve the promotion and protection of the rights of persons with disabilities.

977. Cuba regretted the decision by Israel not to participate in the adoption of its review outcome report. The illegal occupation of Palestinian and Arab territories amounted to the greatest human rights violation, which should be addressed by the Human Rights Council in the context of the review of the State. It regretted that Israel had not considered the majority of recommendations made by Cuba, specifically those on ending the occupation of all Arab and Palestinian territories, including the Syrian Golan; guaranteeing full access of the Palestinian population to all basic services; and ending military attacks against the civilian population. It urged Israel to comply with international humanitarian law norms.

978. Egypt deplored the absence of Israel. It noted the State's rejection of recommendations on ending the occupation of Palestine and other Arab territories. It reiterated certain recommendations, including on policies that continued to violate human rights, including on the status of al-Aqsa Mosque; the occupation of Arab territories; the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination; the settlements in the Arab territories; the violation of religious sites; political prisoners and access by representatives of humanitarian agencies to them; the attacks against Gaza and the blockade; the lack of implementation of

the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice concerning the separation wall; and the abusive practices used against the Palestinian citizens.

979. Montenegro welcomed the universal periodic review outcome of Israel and commended the presentation on its views on the conclusions and recommendations made during the review. The universal periodic review was an excellent opportunity for States to make progress on a number of important human rights issues. It strongly encouraged Israel to continue to engage positively with the review process. It wished Israel every success in addressing the challenges posed in the promotion and protection of human rights, and its efforts to implement fully the recommendations it had accepted.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

980. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Israel, eight other stakeholders made statements.

981. The Touro Institute on Human Rights and the Holocaust stated that, while the mechanism was called universal, it was not true that the Human Rights Council applied the same rules to Israel as to every other State. The permanent agenda of the Council included Israel-bashing at every session. It was no secret that the biggest fans of the universal periodic review were States with the worse human rights records. Regardless of their record, States emerged from the review with a polite knock of the gavel, without a resolution or a rapporteur appointed. The Council was about to adopt five resolutions condemning only Israel, and nothing on several other Council members. That was discrimination.

982. The International Commission of Jurists called upon Israel to implement the recommendations on complying with international humanitarian and international human rights law. It urged Israel to end its unlawful settlement policy, to dismantle existing settlements and to ensure that there were no new settlements. Israel should take effective measures to prevent “price-tagging” and other crimes committed against Palestinians. It called upon Israel to dismantle the separation wall on Palestinian land. The recommendations on abolishing laws and policies on administrative detention should be fully implemented. Israel should ensure that the internment of those subject to administrative detention was reviewed by independent and impartial courts.

983. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (FIDH) deplored the position of Israel that human rights conventions to which Israel was a party did not apply in the occupied Palestinian territories. Israel should act on recommendations regarding the activities of business enterprises in Israeli settlements in the occupied Palestinian territories involved in violations of international laws. Israel had failed to investigate and prosecute the ongoing pillaging of Palestinian natural resources and the appropriation of Palestinian territories. FIDH welcomed the acceptance by Israel of the recommendation made by Austria on ensuring a free environment for human rights defenders.

984. Human Rights Watch stated that Israeli authorities had not held to account members of security forces responsible for unlawful killings of Palestinian civilians, and had failed to enforce the law against Israeli settlers in occupied territories who had harmed Palestinians and their properties. In 2013, the Israeli authorities had illegally demolished the homes of more than 1,100 Palestinians on the West Bank. Israel had continued to build illegal settlement housing units and other infrastructure. Israeli authorities had continued to detain Palestinians arbitrarily, including for administrative reasons. Bedouin citizens of Israel living in “unrecognized” villages had been subjected to discriminatory home demolitions. Israeli authorities should release asylum seekers from detention and examine their claims fairly.

985. Al-Haq/Law in the Service of Man stated that the recent killing by Israeli soldiers of a Palestinian child was the eighth incident in four weeks in which Israeli military forces had used excessive force against the Palestinian population. While Israel had approved 184 new settlement housing units in Beit Hanina, house demolition and settlement expansion had more than doubled in the past eight months. Israel had refused to support recommendations calling for the respect of international human rights law in the occupied territories, to cooperate with United Nations mechanisms, to end practices of discrimination and racial discrimination and to ensure that Palestinian children were not subjected to discriminatory treatment in military prisons.

986. Amnesty International was concerned that the national report submitted by Israel had omitted all reference to the situation of human rights in the occupied Palestinian territories, despite the international community's agreement that the human rights treaties signed by Israel and the Fourth Geneva Convention applied to them, including the Gaza Strip and East Jerusalem. Israel should seriously engage with all recommendations relating to its conduct in the occupied territories, and with those relevant to the territory of Israel itself. Amnesty International, together with Israeli civil society actors, looked forward to monitoring the implementation of the recommendations once the outcome report was adopted.

987. The International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists commended the Working Group for its work, and Israel for its decision to participate in the universal periodic review process and continue its cooperation with the Human Rights Council. It noted, however, that beside the population living in the occupied Palestinian territories, more than seven million people live in Israel, all of whom deserve to see the universal periodic review process focusing on the promotion of their human rights. It hoped that, in future, the platform offered by the Human Rights Council would be better used for the promotion of human rights of all persons under the jurisdiction of Israel, as is the case of the review of other States.

988. UN Watch hoped that the strike by the foreign service of Israel would soon end so that Israel could continue to engage with the Human Rights Council and its mechanisms. It called upon Israel to pay attention to the valuable comments and recommendations contained in its report, such as on improving the status of women, eliminating discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity and fighting manifestations of religious intolerance. According to UN Watch, the Council's selective and politicized treatment of Israel was reflected in paragraphs 6 and 7 of the report and in having before it five separate resolutions in which it condemned Israel.

#### **4. Concluding remarks**

989. Having all statements been delivered, the President proposed that the Human Rights Council adopt the decision relating to the universal periodic review outcome document of Israel.

### **B. General debate on agenda item 6**

990. At its 43rd meeting, on 21 March 2014, 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: China, Czech Republic, Estonia, Ethiopia (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Greece<sup>39</sup> (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), Ireland, Morocco (also on behalf of Armenia, Bahrain, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Guinea, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Poland, Qatar, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, the Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yemen and the State of Palestine), Romania, Sierra Leone, United States of America, Uruguay<sup>39</sup> (also on behalf of Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Yemen<sup>39</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);

<sup>39</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

- (b) Representatives of observer States: Libya, Poland, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic;
- (c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: International Organization of la Francophonie;
- (d) Observers for national human rights institutions: Australian Human Rights Commission (by video message), Irish Human Rights Commission;
- (e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Colombian Commission of Jurists, International Commission of Jurists, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco (also on behalf of Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, the Catholic International Education Office, the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order of Preachers, Edmund Rice International Limited, Fondazione Marista per la Solidarietà Internazionale ONLUS, Franciscans International, Good Neighbors International, the International Catholic Child Bureau, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development and Mouvement international d’apostolate des milieux sociaux independants), Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l’homme, UPR Info (also on behalf of Article 19 – International Centre Against Censorship, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (FIDH), the International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR), the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, Reporters sans frontières international – Reporters Without Borders International and Save the Children International), Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

991. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Nepal, Saudi Arabia and the Syrian Arab Republic made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

992. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Saudi Arabia and the Syrian Arab Republic made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

## C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

### **Saudi Arabia**

993. At the 38th meeting, on 19 March 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 25/101 on the outcome of the review of Saudi Arabia.

### **Senegal**

994. At its 38th meeting, on 19 March 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 25/102 on the outcome of the review of Senegal.

### **Nigeria**

995. At the 39th meeting, on 20 March 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 25/103 on the outcome of the review of Nigeria.

### **Mexico**

996. At the 39th meeting, on 20 March 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 25/104 on the outcome of the review of Mexico.

### **Mauritius**

997. At the 39th meeting, on 20 March 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 25/105 on the outcome of the review of Mauritius.

### **Jordan**

998. At the 40th meeting, on 20 March 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 25/106 on the outcome of the review of Jordan.

### **Malaysia**

999. At the 40th meeting, on 20 March 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 25/107 on the outcome of the review of Malaysia.

**Central African Republic**

1000. At the 40th meeting, on 20 March 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 25/108 on the outcome of the review of the Central African Republic.

**Belize**

1001. At the 41st meeting, on 20 March 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 25/109 on the outcome of the review of Belize.

**Chad**

1002. At the 41st meeting, on 20 March 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 25/110 on the outcome of the review of Chad.

**China**

1003. At the 41st meeting, on 20 March 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 25/111 on the outcome of the review of China.

**Monaco**

1004. At the 42nd meeting, on 21 March 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 25/112 on the outcome of the review of Monaco.

**Congo**

1005. At the 42nd meeting, on 21 March 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 25/113 on the outcome of the review of the Congo.

**Malta**

1006. At the 42nd meeting, on 21 March 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 25/114 on the outcome of the review of Malta.

**Israel**

1007. At the 53rd meeting, on 27 March 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 25/115 on the outcome of the review of Israel.

## **VII. Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories**

### **A. Interactive dialogue with the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967**

1008. At the 44th meeting, on 24 March 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967, Richard Falk, presented his report (A/HRC/25/67).

1009. At the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made a statement as a State concerned.

1010. 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: Algeria, Chile, Cuba, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)<sup>40</sup> (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Kuwait (on behalf of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf), Maldives, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen<sup>40</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mauritania, Qatar, Senegal, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: League of Arab States;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Haq/Law in the Service of Man, Amuta for NGO Responsibility (also on behalf of the European Union of Jewish Students), International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples (also on behalf of Defence for Children International (DCI), France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand and the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination), United Nations Watch.

1011. At the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

### **B. Reports of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General**

1012. At the 44th meeting, on 24 March 2014, the High Commissioner introduced her report on the implementation of Human Rights Council resolutions S-9/1 and S-12/1 (A/HRC/25/40 and Corr.1) and the report of the Secretary-General on Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan (A/HRC/25/38). Pursuant to Council resolution 22/29, the High Commissioner also presented her report on the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report of the independent international fact-finding mission on the implications of Israeli settlements on the civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights of the Palestinian people throughout the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem (A/HRC/22/63) (A/HRC/25/39).

### **C. General debate on agenda item 7**

1013. At its 44th and 45th meetings, on 24 March 2014, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 7, during which the following made statements:

<sup>40</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

- (a) The representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and the State of Palestine, as States concerned;
- (b) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, China, Cuba, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)<sup>41</sup> (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Ireland, Kuwait, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa (also on behalf of Brazil and India), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen<sup>41</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);
- (c) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Oman, Portugal, Qatar, Senegal, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, Uruguay, Yemen;
- (d) Observers for the following non-governmental organizations: Al-Haq/Law in the Service of Man, Amuta for NGO Responsibility (also on behalf of the European Union of Jewish Students), BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches, Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations (also on behalf of B'nai B'rith), European Union of Jewish Students, International Commission of Jurists, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Israeli Committee against House Demolitions, Collectif des femmes africaines du Hainaut, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Presse emblème campagne, Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of the Environment, Touro Institute on Human Rights and the Holocaust, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, World Jewish Congress.

## D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

### Right of the Palestinian people to self-determination

1014. At the 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of Pakistan introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.36, sponsored by Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Namibia, San Marino, South Africa, Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Zimbabwe. Subsequently, Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Finland, Greece, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden joined the sponsors.

1015. At the same meeting, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made general comments on the draft resolution.

1016. Also the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made a statement as a State concerned.

1017. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

1018. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution.

#### *In favour:*

Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czech Republic, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Germany, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the former Yugoslav

<sup>41</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.



Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

United States of America

1019. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.36 by 46 votes to 1, with no abstentions (resolution 25/27).

**Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan**

1020. At the 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of Pakistan introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.37/Rev.1, sponsored by Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Namibia, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Zimbabwe. Subsequently, Angola, Cabo Verde, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

1021. 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.

1022. At the same meeting, the representative of Italy, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council, made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

1023. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution.

*In favour:*

Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czech Republic, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Germany, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

United States of America

1024. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.37/Rev.1 by 46 votes to 1, with no abstentions (resolution 25/28).

**Human rights situation in Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem**

1025. At the 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of Pakistan introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.38/Rev.1, sponsored by Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Honduras, Namibia, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Zimbabwe. Subsequently, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Ireland, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Portugal, Slovenia and Sweden joined the sponsors.

1026. 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.

1027. At the same meeting, at the request of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution.

*In favour:*

Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czech Republic, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Germany, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

United States of America

1028. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.38/Rev.1 by 46 votes to 1, with no abstentions (resolution 25/29).

### **Follow-up to the report of the United Nations Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict**

1029. At the 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of Pakistan introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.39, sponsored by Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Namibia, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Zimbabwe. Subsequently, Angola and Nicaragua joined the sponsors.

1030. At the same meeting, at the request of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution.

*In favour:*

Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czech Republic, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Germany, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

United States of America

1031. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.39 by 46 votes to 1, with no abstentions (resolution 25/30).

### **Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan**

1032. At the 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.40, sponsored by Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, Namibia, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Zimbabwe. Subsequently, Angola, Belarus, Cabo Verde and Nicaragua joined the sponsors.

1033. At the same meeting, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

1034. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Argentina, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Austria, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Montenegro, Republic of Korea, Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

1035. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.40 by 33 votes to 1, with 13 abstentions (resolution 25/31).

## VIII. Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

### A. General debate on agenda item 8

1036. At its 45th and 46th meetings, on 24 March 2014, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 8, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Austria, Brazil, China, Egypt<sup>42</sup> (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, the Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, the Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, the Philippines, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, the United Republic of Tanzania, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe and the State of Palestine), France, Germany, Greece<sup>42</sup> (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Indonesia, Kuwait, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Iran (Islamic Republic of), Netherlands, Slovenia, Tunisia;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: Council of Europe;

(d) Observers for the following non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Alsalam Foundation, Amnesty International, Amuta for NGO Responsibility, British Humanist Association, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand (also on behalf of Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples), Indian Council of South America (CISA), Institute on Human Rights and the Holocaust, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Muslim Women's Union, Liberation, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Organisation mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale, Presse emblème campagne, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, United Nations Watch, Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization, World Muslim Congress.

1037. At the 46th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Nigeria and the Russian Federation made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

<sup>42</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

## **IX. Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action**

### **A. General debate on agenda item 9**

1038. At its 48th meeting, on 25 March 2014, the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the Ad Hoc Committee on the elaboration of complementary standards to strengthen and update international instruments against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance in all their aspects, Abdul Samad Minty, presented the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on its fifth session (A/HRC/25/69).

1039. At the same meeting, the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the Intergovernmental Working Group on the Effective Implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, Mohamed Siad Douale, presented the reports of the Working Group on its eleventh session (A/HRC/25/75).

1040. During the ensuing general debate on agenda item 9, at the same meeting, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Council: Algeria, Brazil, China, Cuba, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Greece<sup>43</sup> (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen<sup>43</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Iran (Islamic Republic of), Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: Council of Europe;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence internationale pour le développement, Amuta for NGO Responsibility, Association of World Citizens, Center for Inquiry, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, European Union of Jewish Students, Indian Council of South America, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Educational Development, Inc., International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Muslim Women's Union, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Collectif des femmes africaines du Hainaut, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Social Service Agency of the Protestant Church in Germany, Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of Environment, United Nations Watch, Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, Vivekananda Sevakendra-O-Sishu Uddyan, World Barua Organization, World Muslim Congress.

### **B. Consideration of and action on draft proposals**

#### **Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance**

1041. At the 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.22, sponsored by Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Cuba, Honduras, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the

<sup>43</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

State of Palestine. Subsequently, Chile, Colombia, Indonesia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Russian Federation and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

1042. 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.

1043. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

1044. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.22 without a vote (resolution 25/32).

#### **International Decade for People of African Descent**

1045. At the 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.23, sponsored by Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine. Subsequently Brazil, Colombia, Honduras, Indonesia, Jamaica, Nicaragua, Uruguay and Yemen (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) joined the sponsors.

1046. At the same meeting, the representative of Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States, orally revised the draft resolution.

1047. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

1048. At the same meeting, the representative of Italy, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council, made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

1049. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.23, as orally revised, without a vote (resolution 25/33).

#### **Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping and stigmatization of, and discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against persons based on religion or belief**

1050. At the 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of Pakistan introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.41, sponsored by Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, and co-sponsored by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. Subsequently, Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Nicaragua, Thailand and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

1051. At the same meeting, the representative of Italy, on behalf of the European Union, made general comments on the draft resolution.

1052. 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.

1053. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.41 without a vote (resolution 25/34).

## **X. Technical assistance and capacity-building**

### **A. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders**

#### **Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Côte d'Ivoire**

1054. At the 49th meeting, on 25 March 2014, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Côte d'Ivoire, Doudou Diène, presented his report (A/HRC/25/73).

1055. At the same meeting, the representative of Côte d'Ivoire made a statement as the State concerned.

1056. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), France, Italy, Morocco, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belgium, Central African Republic, Egypt, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Sudan, Togo;

(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: Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Comité international pour le respect et l'application de la Charte africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples, Franciscans International, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, World Organisation against Torture.

1057. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

#### **Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Haiti**

1058. At the 49th meeting, on 25 March 2014, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Haiti, Gustavo Gallón, presented his report (A/HRC/25/71).

1059. At the same meeting, the representative of Haiti made a statement as the State concerned.

1060. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Cuba, France, Mexico, Morocco, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Norway, Togo;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Conectas Direitos Humanos (also on behalf of Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales).

1061. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

#### **Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Mali**

1062. At the 50th meeting, on 26 March 2014, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Mali, Suliman Baldo, presented his report (A/HRC/25/72).

1063. At the same meeting, the representative of Mali made a statement as the State concerned.

1064. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

- (a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Austria, Burkina Faso, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, France, Ireland, Morocco, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;
- (b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belgium, Djibouti, Egypt, Netherlands, Niger, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Togo;
- (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: Femmes Afrique Solidarité, Human Rights Watch, International Catholic Child Bureau, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, World Vision International (also on behalf of the International Rescue Committee, the Norwegian Refugee Council, OXFAM and Save the Children International).

1065. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

#### **Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic**

1066. At the 50th meeting, on 26 March 2014, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic, Marie-Thérèse Keita Bocoum, presented an oral update.

1067. At the same meeting, the representative of the Central African Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

1068. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

- (a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, China, Czech Republic, France, Gabon, Ireland, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, United States of America;
- (b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belgium, Chad, Djibouti, Egypt, Lithuania, Norway, Senegal, Slovakia, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Togo;
- (c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union, Organization of Islamic Cooperation;
- (d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities) (also on behalf of the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul), CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Femmes Afrique Solidarité, Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Save the Children International, World Evangelical Alliance.

1069. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

## **B. General debate on agenda item 10**

1070. At the 52nd meeting, on 26 March 2014, the Deputy High Commissioner introduced country-specific reports of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General submitted under agenda item 10 (A/HRC/25/41, A/HRC/25/42, A/HRC/25/44 and Corr.1, and A/HRC/25/45).



1071. At the 53rd meeting, on 27 March 2014, representatives of Afghanistan, the Central African Republic, Guinea, Libya and Somalia made statements as the States concerned.

1072. During the ensuing general debate, at the same meeting, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, China, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), France, Greece<sup>44</sup> (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Georgia, Iceland, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Ireland, Italy, Morocco (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Angola, Australia, Bahrain, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Cambodia, the Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Equatorial Guinea, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Somalia, South Sudan, the Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen and the State of Palestine), Switzerland<sup>44</sup> (on behalf of the International Organization of la Francophonie), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen<sup>44</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Sudan, Thailand, Togo;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Council of Europe;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation, Association of World Citizens, United Nations Watch.

## C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

### Strengthening of technical cooperation and consultative services in Guinea

1073. At the 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.6, sponsored by Ethiopia on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by the Czech Republic, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Romania, Slovakia and the United States of America. Subsequently, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Monaco, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Switzerland, Thailand and Turkey joined the sponsors.

1074. At the same meeting, the representative of Italy, on behalf of the European Union, made general comments on the draft resolution.

1075. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Guinea made a statement as the State concerned.

1076. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.6 without a vote (resolution 25/35).

### Assistance to Mali in the field of human rights

1077. At the 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.33, sponsored by Ethiopia on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland,

<sup>44</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand and Turkey joined the sponsors.

1078. At the same meeting, the representative of Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States, orally revised the draft resolution.

1079. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Italy, on behalf of the European Union, made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

1080. At the same meeting, the representative of Mali made a statement as the State concerned.

1081. 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.

1082. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.33, as orally revised, without a vote (resolution 25/36).

#### **Technical assistance for Libya in the field of human rights**

1083. At the 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the representative of Morocco introduced draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.35, sponsored by Morocco and Libya and co-sponsored by Bahrain, Chad, Egypt, France, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Maldives, Mauritania, the Niger, Norway, Oman, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Yemen and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Japan, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Thailand and Yemen (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) joined the sponsors.

1084. At the same meeting, the representative of Morocco orally revised the draft resolution.

1085. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Libya made a statement as the State concerned.

1086. 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.

1087. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.35, as orally, without a vote (resolution 25/37).

1088. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of the Russian Federation and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

#### **Situation of human rights in Haiti**

1089. At the 56th meeting, on 28 March 2014, the President of the Human Rights Council introduced draft President's statement A/HRC/25/L.42.

1090. At the same meeting, the representative of France, also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, France, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru, the United States of America and Uruguay, made general comments on the draft President's statement.

1091. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Haiti made a statement as the State concerned.

1092. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft President's statement.

1093. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft President's statement A/HRC/25/L.42 (PRST/25/1).



## Annex I

[English only]

### Attendance

#### Members

Algeria		Peru
Argentina	Gabon	Philippines
Austria	Germany	Republic of Korea
Benin	India	Romania
Botswana	Indonesia	Russian Federation
Brazil	Ireland	Saudi Arabia
Burkina Faso	Italy	Sierra Leone
Chile	Japan	South Africa
China	Kazakhstan	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Congo	Kenya	United Arab Emirates
Costa Rica	Kuwait	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Côte d'Ivoire	Maldives	United States of America
Cuba	Mexico	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
Czech Republic	Montenegro	Viet Nam
Estonia	Morocco	
Ethiopia	Namibia	
France	Pakistan	

#### States Members of the United Nations represented by observers

Afghanistan	Cyprus	Israel
Albania	Democratic People's Republic of Korea	Jamaica
Andorra	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Jordan
Angola	Denmark	Kyrgyzstan
Antigua and Barbuda	Djibouti	Lao People's Democratic Republic
Armenia	Dominica	Latvia
Australia	Dominican Republic	Lebanon
Azerbaijan	Ecuador	Lesotho
Bahamas	Egypt	Liberia
Bahrain	El Salvador	Libya
Bangladesh	Equatorial Guinea	Liechtenstein
Barbados	Eritrea	Lithuania
Belarus	Fiji	Luxembourg
Belgium	Finland	Madagascar
Belize	Gambia	Malawi
Bhutan	Georgia	Malaysia
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Ghana	Mali
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Greece	Malta
Brunei Darussalam	Grenada	Mauritania
Bulgaria	Guatemala	Mauritius
Burundi	Guinea	Monaco
Cabo Verde	Guinea-Bissau	Mongolia
Cambodia	Guyana	Mozambique
Cameroon	Haiti	Myanmar
Canada	Honduras	Nepal
Central African Republic	Hungary	Netherlands
Chad	Iceland	New Zealand
Colombia	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Nicaragua
Comoros	Iraq	Niger
Croatia		Nigeria

Norway	Seychelles	Togo
Oman	Singapore	Trinidad and Tobago
Panama	Slovakia	Tunisia
Papua New Guinea	Slovenia	Turkey
Paraguay	Solomon Islands	Turkmenistan
Poland	Somalia	Uganda
Portugal	South Sudan	Ukraine
Qatar	Spain	United Republic of Tanzania
Republic of Moldova	Sri Lanka	Uruguay
Rwanda	Sudan	Uzbekistan
Saint Kitts and Nevis	Suriname	Vanuatu
Saint Lucia	Swaziland	Yemen
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Sweden	Zambia
San Marino	Switzerland	Zimbabwe
Sao Tome and Principe	Syrian Arab Republic	
Senegal	Tajikistan	
Serbia	Thailand	
	Timor-Leste	

### **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
Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	United Nations Environment Programme
Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
	United Nations Population Fund

### **Specialized agencies and related organizations**

Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations	World Health Organization
International Labour Organization	World Intellectual Property Organization
International Telecommunication Union	World Meteorological Organization
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	

### **Intergovernmental organizations**

African Union	International Organization for Migration
Commonwealth Secretariat	International Development Law Organization
Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries	International Organization of la Francophonie
Council of Europe	League of Arab States
European Union	Organization of Islamic Cooperation

## Other entities

International Committee of the Red Cross  
 Inter-Parliamentary Union  
 International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies  
 Sovereign Military Order of Malta

## National human rights institutions, international coordinating committees and regional groups of national institutions

Australian Human Rights Commission (by video message)	Irish Human Rights Commission
Canadian Human Rights Commission	Malawi Human Rights Commission
Commission nationale des droits de l'homme de Mauritanie	National Centre for Human Rights – Jordan (by video message)
Conseil consultative des droits de l'homme du Royaume du Maroc	National Council for Human Rights - Egypt
Defensoría del Pueblo – Colombia (by video message)	National Human Rights Commission of Mexico
Defensoría del Pueblo of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela	National Human Rights Commission of the Republic of Korea
Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain	National Human Rights Commission of Togo
German Institute for Human Rights	New Zealand Human Rights Commission
Human Rights Commission of Malaysia (SUHAKAM)	Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission
International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights	Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights (Ombudsman) of the Republic of Azerbaijan
	Office of the Ombudsman – Nigeria
	Scottish Human Rights Commission
	South African Human Rights Commission

## Non-governmental organizations

ACT Alliance – Action by Churches Together	Alsalam Foundation
Action Canada for Population and Development	Al-Zubair Charity Foundation
Action contre la faim	American Civil Liberties Union
Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs	Amis des étrangers au Togo (ADET)
Advocates for Human Rights	Amman Center for Human Rights Studies
Africa Culture Internationale	Amnesty International
African Association of Education for Development	Amuta for NGO Responsibility
African-American Society for Humanitarian Aid and Development	Arab NGO Network for Development
African Technical Association	Arab Organization for Human Rights
African Technology Development Link	Archbishop E. Kataliko Actions for Africa “KAF”
Agence internationale pour le développement	Article 19 – International Centre against Censorship
Al-Hakim Foundation	Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development
Al-Haq/Law in the Service of Man	Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development (Forum-Asia)
Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement	Asian Legal Resource Centre
Al-khoei Foundation	Association apprentissages sans frontières
	Association de défense des droits de l'homme
	Association of World Citizens
	Association for the Prevention of Torture

Association for Progressive Communications	Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches
Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII	Commission to Study the Organization of Peace
Auspice Stella	Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative
Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Resource Rights	Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul
Baha'i International Community	Conectas Direitos Humanos
B'nai B'rith	Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations in Consultative Relationship with the United Nations
British Humanist Association	Consortium for Street Children, Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations
Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies	Defence for Children International
Canners International Permanent Committee	Democracy Coalition Project
Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities)	Development Innovations and Networks
Catolicas Por El Derecho A Decidir	Dignity International
Center for Reproductive Rights, Inc.,	Disabled People's International
Centre Europe – Tiers Monde – Europe-Third World Centre	Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order of Preachers
Centre for Environmental and Management Studies	Earthjustice
Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy	East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project
Center for Inquiry	Eastern Sudan Women Development Organization
Center for the Study of State and Society	ECPAT International
Centrist Democratic International	Ecumenical Federation of Constantinopolitans
Centro de Derechos Humanos Miguel Agustín Pro Juárez	Edmund Rice International Limited
Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims	Equality Now
Child Development Foundation	Espace Afrique International
China Association for Preservation and Development of Tibetan Culture	European Centre for Law and Justice
China Disabled Person's Federation	European Disability Forum
China NGO Network for International Exchanges	European Law Students' Association
China Society for Human Rights Studies	European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Association
Chinese People's Association for Peace and Disarmament	European Union of Jewish Students
Civicus – World Alliance for Citizen Participation	European Union of Public Relations
Colombian Commission of Jurists	Family Planning Association, I.R.Iran
Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Asociación Civil	Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit COC Nederland
Comité international pour le respect et l'application de la Charte africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples	Federation of Associations for the Defense and the Promotion of Human Rights - Spain
Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme	Femmes Afrique Solidarité
	Foodfirst Information and Action Network
	Foundation for GAIA
	Foundation for International Relations and Development Studies
	Foundation of Japanese Honorary Debts

France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand	International Educational Development, Inc.
Franciscans International	International Federation for Human Rights Leagues
Freedom House	International Federation of ACAT (Action by Christians for the Abolition of Torture)
Friedrich Ebert Foundation	International Federation of Social Workers
Friends World Committee for Consultation (Quakers)	International Federation of University Women
Front Line: International Foundation for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders	International Fellowship of Reconciliation
General Arab Women Federation	International Harm Reduction Association
Geneva for Human Rights – Global Training	International Humanist and Ethical Union
Global Hope Network International	International Institute for Non-Aligned Studies
Grupo de Informacion en Reproduccion Elegida, A.C.	International Institute for Peace
Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant	International Institute for Peace, Justice and Human-Rights
Habitat International Coalition	International Lesbian and Gay Association
Handicap International	International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism
Hawa Society for Women	International Movement ATD Fourth World
Himalayan Research and Cultural Foundation	International Movement for Fraternal Union among Races and Peoples
Human Rights Advocates, Inc.	International Muslim Women's Union
Human Rights House Foundation	International Office for Human Rights – Action on Colombia, Oidhaco
Human Rights Law Centre	Organization for the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination
Human Rights Now	International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education
Human Rights Watch	International Peace Bureau
Human Security Initiative Organization	International Service for Human Rights
Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries	International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development
Indian Council of South America	International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs
Ingénieurs du Monde	International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations
Institute for Planetary Synthesis	Iranian Elite Research Center
Institute for Women's Studies and Research	Islamic Human Rights Commission
International Association for Democracy in Africa	Islamic Women's Institute of Iran
International Association of Democratic Lawyers	Israeli Committee against House Demolitions
International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists	Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco
International Association for Religious Freedom	Japanese Workers' Committee for Human Rights
International Bridges to Justice, Inc.	Journalists and Writers Foundation
International Buddhist Foundation	Jubilee Campaign
International Buddhist Relief Organisation	Kenya Alliance for the Advancement of Children
International Campaign to Ban Landmines	Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Violence
International Catholic Child Bureau	Korea Women's Associations United
International Commission of Jurists	
International Committee for the Indians of the Americas (Incomindios Switzerland)	



Kyrgyz Committee for Human Rights	Plan International, Inc.
Latter-Day Saint Charities	Presse emblème campagne
Lawyers for Lawyers	Rencontre africain pour la défense des droits de l'homme
Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada	Reporters sans frontières international – Reporters without Borders International
Collectif des femmes africaines du Hainaut	Save the Children International
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights Education Fund	Servas International
Liberal International (World Liberal Union)	Social Service Agency of the Protestant Church in Germany
Liberation	Society for Development and Community Empowerment
Ligue internationale contre le racisme et l'antisémitisme	Society for Threatened Peoples
Lutheran World Federation	Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of Environment
Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development	Society Studies Centre
Mandat International	Soka Gakkai International
Maryam Ghasemi Educational Charity Institute	SOS Kinderdorf International
Médecins sans Frontières (International)	Stichting Justitia et Pax Nederland
Mexican Environmental Law Center	Sudan Council of Voluntary Agencies
Minbyun – Lawyers for a Democratic Society	Sudanese Women General Union
Minnesota Citizens Concerned for Life Inc. Education Fund	Survival International Ltd.
Minority Rights Group	Syriac Universal Alliance
Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples	Tchad – Agir pour l'Environnement
Myochikai (Arigatou Foundation)	Terre des Hommes International Fédération
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People	Tlacinollan; Grupo de Apoyo a los Pueblos Indios de la Montaña
Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational and Transparty	Touro Institute on Human Rights and the Holocaust
Norwegian Forum for Environment and Development	Union de l'action féminine
Norwegian Refugee Council	Union of Arab Jurists
ONG Hope International	United Nations Watch (UN Watch)
Open Society Institute	United Network of Young Peacebuilders (UNOY Peacebuilders)
Organisation mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale	United Schools International
Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale (OCAPROCE International)	United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation
Organisation des laïcs engagés du Sacré- Cœur pour le développement de Kimbondo	UPR Info
Organization for Defending Victims of Violence	Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik
Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation	Village Suisse ONG
Pax Christi International	Vivat International
Penal Reform International	Vivekananda Sevakendra-O-Sishu Uddyan
People for Successful Corean Reunification	Women's Federation for World Peace International
People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy	Women's Human Rights International Association
Permanent Assembly for Human Rights	Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
	Women's World Summit Foundation
	Word of Life Christian Fellowship
	World Barua Organization
	World Environment and Resources Council
	World Evangelical Alliance

World Federation of Khoja Shi'a  
Ithna-Asheri Muslim Communities  
World Federation of United Nations  
Associations  
World Jewish Congress  
World Muslim Congress

World Network of Users and Survivors of  
Psychiatry  
World Organization against Torture  
World Vision International  
World Young Women's Christian Association  
Worldwide Organization for Women

---

## Annex II

### Agenda

- Item 1. Organizational and procedural matters.
- Item 2. Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General.
- Item 3. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development.
- Item 4. Human rights situations that require the Council's attention.
- Item 5. Human rights bodies and mechanisms.
- Item 6. Universal periodic review.
- Item 7. Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories.
- Item 8. Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action.
- Item 9. Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action.
- Item 10. Technical assistance and capacity-building.

## Annex III

[English, French and Spanish only]

## Documents issued for the twenty-fifth session

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/25/1	1	Annotations to the agenda for the twenty-fifth session of the Human Rights Council: note by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/25/1/Corr.1	1	Corrigendum
A/HRC/25/2	1	Report of the Human Rights Council on its twenty-fifth session
A/HRC/25/3	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Saudi Arabia
A/HRC/25/3/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/25/4	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Senegal
A/HRC/25/4/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/25/5	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on China
A/HRC/25/5/Corr.1	6	Corrigendum
A/HRC/25/5/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/25/6	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Nigeria
A/HRC/25/7	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Mexico
A/HRC/25/7/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/25/8	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Mauritius
A/HRC/25/8/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/25/9	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Jordan
A/HRC/25/10	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Malaysia
A/HRC/25/10/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/25/10/Add.1/Corr.1	6	Corrigendum
A/HRC/25/11	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on the Central African Republic
A/HRC/25/12	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Monaco

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/25/12/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/25/13	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Belize
A/HRC/25/13/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/25/14	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Chad
A/HRC/25/14/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/25/15	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Israel
A/HRC/25/15/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/25/16	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on the Congo
A/HRC/25/16/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/25/17	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Malta
A/HRC/25/17/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/25/18	1	Election of members of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee: note by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/25/18/Add.1	1	Addendum
A/HRC/25/19	2	Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/25/19/Corr.1	2	Corrigendum
A/HRC/25/19/Add.1	2	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the activities of her office in Guatemala
A/HRC/25/19/Add.2	2	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the activities of her office in the Plurinational State of Bolivia
A/HRC/25/19/Add.2/Corr.1	2	Corrigendum
A/HRC/25/19/Add.3	2	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the situation of human rights in Colombia
A/HRC/25/20	2	Conclusions and recommendations of special procedures: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/25/21	2	Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the question of human rights in Cyprus: note by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/25/22	2	Measures taken to implement resolution 9/8 and obstacles to its implementation, including recommendations for further improving the effectiveness of,

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		harmonizing and reforming the treaty body system: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/25/23	2	Promoting reconciliation and accountability in Sri Lanka: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/25/24	2	Special Fund established by the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment: note by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/25/24/Corr.1	2	Corrigendum
A/HRC/25/25	2	United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture: note by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/25/26	2	Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/25/27	2, 3	Role of the public service as an essential component of good governance in the promotion and protection of human rights: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/25/28	2, 3	Human rights and arbitrary deprivation of nationality: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/25/29	2, 3	Thematic study on the right of persons with disabilities to education: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/25/29/Corr.1	2, 3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/25/30	2, 3	Rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/25/31	2, 3	Question of the realization in all countries of economic, social and cultural rights: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/25/32	2, 3	Seminar on effective measures and best practices to ensure the promotion and protection of human rights in the context of peaceful protests: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/25/32/Corr.1	2, 3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/25/33	2, 3	Summary of the panel discussion on the human rights of children of parents sentenced to the death penalty or executed: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/25/34	2, 3	Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping and stigmatization of, and discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against, persons based on religion or belief: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/25/35	2, 3	Access to justice for children: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/25/35/Add.1	2, 3	Addendum
A/HRC/25/36	2, 6	Operations of the Voluntary Fund on participation in the Universal Periodic Review: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/25/37	2, 7	Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/25/38	7	Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/25/39	2, 7	Implementation of the recommendations contained in the report of the independent international fact-finding mission on the implications of Israeli settlements on the civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights of the Palestinian people throughout the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem (A/HRC/22/63): report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/25/40	2, 7	Implementation of Human Rights Council resolutions S-9/1 and S-12/1: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/25/40/Corr.1	2, 7	Corrigendum
A/HRC/25/41	2, 10	Situation of human rights in Afghanistan and the achievements of technical assistance in the field of human rights in 2013: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/25/42	2, 10	Technical assistance for Libya in the field of human rights: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/25/43	2, 10	Situation of human rights in the Central African Republic: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/25/44	2, 10	Situation of human rights in Guinea: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/25/44/Corr.1	2, 10	Corrigendum
A/HRC/25/45	2, 10	Stand-alone high-level interactive dialogue on assistance to Somalia in the field of human rights: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/25/46	3	Annual report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, Leila Zerrougui
A/HRC/25/47	3	Annual report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children
A/HRC/25/48	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, Najat Maalla M'jid
A/HRC/25/48/Add.1	3	Mission to Kyrgyzstan
A/HRC/25/48/Add.2	3	Mission to Madagascar
A/HRC/25/48/Add.3	3	Mission to Benin
A/HRC/25/49	3	Memorialization processes: report of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, Farida Shaheed
A/HRC/25/49/Add.1	3	Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina
A/HRC/25/50	3	Report of the Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights, Cephass Lumina
A/HRC/25/50/Add.1	3	Mission to Greece
A/HRC/25/50/Add.2	3	Mission to Japan
A/HRC/25/50/Add.3	3	Mission to Argentina
A/HRC/25/52	3	The negative impact of the non-repatriation of funds of illicit origin on the enjoyment of human rights: final report of the Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights, Cephass Lumina
A/HRC/25/53	3	Report of the Independent Expert on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment, John H. Knox



*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/25/53/Add.1	3	Mission to Costa Rica
A/HRC/25/54	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context, Raquel Rolnik
A/HRC/25/54/Add.1	3	Mission to Indonesia
A/HRC/25/54/Add.2	3	Mission to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
A/HRC/25/54/Add.4	3	Comments by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
A/HRC/25/55	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, Margaret Sekaggya
A/HRC/25/55/Add.1	3	Mission to the Republic of Korea
A/HRC/25/55/Add.2	3	Mission to Togo
A/HRC/25/55/Add.3	3	Observations on communications transmitted to Governments and replies received
A/HRC/25/56	3	Report of the Independent Expert on minority issues, Rita Izsák
A/HRC/25/56/Add.1	3	Mission to Cameroon
A/HRC/25/57	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to food, Olivier De Schutter
A/HRC/25/57/Add.1	3	Mission to Malawi
A/HRC/25/57/Add.2	3	Mission to Malaysia
A/HRC/25/58	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, Heiner Bielefeldt
A/HRC/25/58/Add.1	3	Mission to Sierra Leone
A/HRC/25/58/Add.2	3	Mission to Jordan
A/HRC/25/58/Add.3	3	Comments by Sierra Leone
A/HRC/25/58/Add.4	3	Comments by Jordan
A/HRC/25/59	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, Ben Emmerson
A/HRC/25/59/Add.1	3	Mission to Burkina Faso
A/HRC/25/59/Add.2	3	Mission to Chile
A/HRC/25/59/Add.3	3	Comments by Chile
A/HRC/25/60	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment of punishment, Juan E. Méndez

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/25/60/Add.1	3	Mission to Ghana
A/HRC/25/60/Add.2	3	Observations on communications transmitted to Governments and replies received
A/HRC/25/61	4	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran
A/HRC/25/62	4	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Marzuki Darusman: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/25/63	4	Report of the commission of inquiry on human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea
A/HRC/25/64	4	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, Tomás Ojea Quintana
A/HRC/25/64/Add.1	4	Comments by the State
A/HRC/25/65	4	Report of the independent international commission of inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/25/66	3	Guaranteeing the rights of religious minorities: recommendations of the Forum on Minority Issues at its sixth session (26 and 27 November 2013)
A/HRC/25/67	7	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967, Richard Falk
A/HRC/25/68	9	Report of the Intergovernmental Working Group on the Effective Implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action on its eleventh session: note by the secretariat
A/HRC/25/68/Rev.1	9	Report of the Intergovernmental Working Group on the Effective Implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action on its eleventh session: note by the secretariat
A/HRC/25/69	9	Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the elaboration of complementary standards on its fifth session
A/HRC/25/70	9	Report of the group of independent eminent experts on the implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action on their third meeting: note by the secretariat
A/HRC/25/71	10	Report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Haiti, Gustavo Gallón

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/25/72	10	Report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Mali, Suliman Baldo
A/HRC/25/73	10	Report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Côte d'Ivoire, Doudou Diène
A/HRC/25/74	3,4,7,9 and 10	Communications report of special procedures
A/HRC/25/75	9	Report of the Intergovernmental Working Group on the Effective Implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action on its eleventh session

*Documents issued in the conference room papers series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/25/CRP.1	4	Detailed findings of the commission of inquiry on human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea
A/HRC/25/CRP.2	10	Compte rendu oral de l'Experte Indépendante sur la situation des droits de l'homme en République Centrafricaine

*Documents issued in the limited series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/25/L.1 and Rev.1	2	Promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka
A/HRC/25/L.2 and Rev.1	3	Freedom of opinion and expression: mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression
A/HRC/25/L.3	3	Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights
A/HRC/25/L.4	1	Postponement of the renewal of the mandate of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances
A/HRC/25/L.5	3	Integrity of the judicial system
A/HRC/25/L.6	10	Renforcement de la coopération technique et des services consultatifs en Guinée
A/HRC/25/L.7	4	The continuing grave deterioration of the human rights and humanitarian situation in the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/25/L.8	3	Mandate of the Independent Expert on minority issues

*Documents issued in the limited series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/25/L.9	4	Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran
A/HRC/25/L.10	3	Rights of the child: access to justice for children
A/HRC/25/L.11	3	Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism
A/HRC/25/L.12	3	Panel on the right to privacy in the digital age
A/HRC/25/L.13	3	The role of good governance in the promotion and protection of human rights
A/HRC/25/L.14	3	The negative impact of the non-repatriation of funds of illicit origin to the countries of origin on the enjoyment of human rights, and the importance of improving international cooperation
A/HRC/25/L.15 and Rev.1	3	Ending violence against children: a global call to make the invisible visible
A/HRC/25/L.16	3	Question of the realization in all countries of economic, social and cultural rights
A/HRC/25/L.17	4	Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea
A/HRC/25/L.18 and Rev.1	3	Adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living
A/HRC/25/L.19	3	Freedom of religion or belief
A/HRC/25/L.20	3	The promotion and protection of human rights in the context of peaceful protests
A/HRC/25/L.21 and Rev.1	4	Situation of human rights in Myanmar
A/HRC/25/L.22	9	Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance
A/HRC/25/L.23	9	International Decade for People of African Descent
A/HRC/25/L.24	3	Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders
A/HRC/25/L.25	3	Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment: mandate of the Special Rapporteur
A/HRC/25/L.26	3	The right to food
A/HRC/25/L.27	3	Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order
A/HRC/25/L.28	3	Mandate of the Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights,

*Documents issued in the limited series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		particularly economic, social and cultural rights
A/HRC/25/L.29 and Rev.1	3	Promotion of the enjoyment of the cultural rights of everyone and respect for cultural diversity
A/HRC/25/L.30	3	The right to education of persons with disabilities
A/HRC/25/L.31	3	Human rights and the environment
A/HRC/25/L.32	3	Ensuring use of remotely piloted aircraft or armed drones in counter-terrorism and military operations in accordance with international law, including international human rights and humanitarian law
A/HRC/25/L.33	10	Assistance à la République du Mali dans le domaine des droits de l'homme
A/HRC/25/L.34	1	Situation of human rights in South Sudan
A/HRC/25/L.35	10	Technical assistance for Libya in the field of human rights
A/HRC/25/L.36	7	Right of the Palestinian people to self-determination
A/HRC/25/L.37 and Rev.1	7	Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan
A/HRC/25/L.38 and Rev.1	7	Human rights situation in Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem
A/HRC/25/L.39	7	Follow-up to the report of the United Nations Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict
A/HRC/25/L.40	7	Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan
A/HRC/25/L.41	9	Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping and stigmatization of, and discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against persons based on religion or belief
A/HRC/25/L.42	10	Situation des droits de l'homme en Haïti
A/HRC/25/L.43	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.2/Rev.1
A/HRC/25/L.44	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.24
A/HRC/25/L.45	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.24
A/HRC/25/L.46	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.24

*Documents issued in the limited series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/25/L.47	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.24
A/HRC/25/L.48	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.20
A/HRC/25/L.49	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.20
A/HRC/25/L.50	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.20
A/HRC/25/L.51	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.20
A/HRC/25/L.52	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.20
A/HRC/25/L.53	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.25
A/HRC/25/L.54	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.25
A/HRC/25/L.55	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.18/Rev.1
A/HRC/25/L.56	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.18/Rev.1
A/HRC/25/L.57	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.18/Rev.1
A/HRC/25/L.58	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.18/Rev.1
A/HRC/25/L.59	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.18/Rev.1
A/HRC/25/L.60	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.18/Rev.1
A/HRC/25/L.61	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.18/Rev.1
A/HRC/25/L.62	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/25/L.18/Rev.1

*Documents issued in the Government series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/25/G/1	4	Note verbale datée du 17 décembre 2013 adressée au Haut-Commissariat des Nations Unies aux droits de l'homme par la Mission permanente de la République arabe syrienne auprès de l'Office des Nations Unies et des autres organisations internationales à Genève
A/HRC/25/G/2	4	Letter dated 20 January 2014 from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office

*Documents issued in the Government series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/25/G/3	4	Note verbale dated 17 January 2014 from the Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations Office and Other International Organizations in Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/25/G/4	6	Note verbale dated 24 January 2014 from the Permanent Mission of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/25/G/5	4	Letter dated 29 January 2014 from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/25/G/6	4	Letter dated 3 February 2014 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/25/G/7	6	Note verbale dated 3 February 2014 from the Permanent Mission of the State of Eritrea to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the Office of the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/25/G/8	2	Note verbale dated 12 February 2014 from the Permanent Mission of Guatemala to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/25/G/9	2	Comments received from the Permanent Mission of Sri Lanka on the draft report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on promoting reconciliation and accountability in Sri Lanka (A/HRC/25/23)
A/HRC/25/G/10	2	Letter dated 27 February 2014 from the Permanent Mission of Sri Lanka to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/25/G/11	4	Note verbale dated 1 March 2014 from the Permanent Mission of Ukraine to the

*Documents issued in the Government series**Symbol**Agenda item*

		United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/25/G/12	1	Note verbale dated 3 March 2014 from the Permanent Mission of Ukraine to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/25/G/13	1	Note verbale dated 4 March 2014 from the Permanent Mission of Indonesia to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the Office of the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/25/G/14	4	Letter dated 24 February 2014 from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/25/G/15	4	Letter dated 14 March 2014 from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Armenia to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/25/G/16	2, 3	Note verbale dated 13 March 2014 from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Singapore to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/25/G/17	2	Letter dated 18 March 2014 from the Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/25/G/18	3	Note verbale dated 13 March 2014 from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Turkey to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/25/G/19	3	Note verbale dated 19 March 2014 from the Permanent Mission of Ukraine to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/25/G/20	6	Note verbale dated 21 March 2014 from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Poland to the United Nations Office at



---

*Documents issued in the Government series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/25/G/21	2	Note verbale dated 21 March 2014 from the Permanent Mission of Turkey to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/25/G/22	5	Note verbale dated 28 March 2014 from the Permanent Representative of Canada to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/25/G/23	3,4	Letter dated 26 March 2014 from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Armenia to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/25/G/24	3	Note verbale dated 28 March 2014 from the Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/25/G/25	4	Letter dated 7 April 2014 from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/25/G/26	2	Note verbale dated 25 April 2014 from the Permanent Mission of Cyprus to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

---

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/25/NGO/1	3	Written statement submitted by the Permanent Assembly for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/2	4	Written statement submitted by Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, a non-governmental organization on the roster

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/25/NGO/3	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/4	3	Written statement submitted by the Child Foundation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/5	2	Joint written statement submitted by Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities) and New Humanity, non-governmental organizations in general consultative status, and Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, Associazione Points-Coeur, the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order of Preachers, the Edmund Rice International Limited, the International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (OIDE), the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES and Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, VIVAT International, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/6	3	Written statement submitted by the World Muslim Congress, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/7	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/8	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/9	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/10	3	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/11	3	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/12	4	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/13	4	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/14	6	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/15	7	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/16	9	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/17	3	Written statement submitted by Foundation ECPAT International (End Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and Trafficking in Children for Sexual Purposes), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/18	3	Written statement submitted by the Society Studies Centre (MADA ssc), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/19	4	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Law Centre, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/20	3	Written statement submitted by the Federal Union of European Nationalities, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/21	2	Written statement submitted by the European Centre for Law and Justice / Centre Européen pour la justice et les droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/22	6	Written statement submitted by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/23	4	Written statement submitted by United Nations Watch, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/24	3	Written statement submitted by France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/25	4	Written statement submitted by the Baha'i International Community, 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/25/NGO/26	3	Written statement submitted by Reporters sans frontières international – Reporters Without Borders International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/27	4	Joint written statement submitted by France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, the Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact, Cultural Survival, the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, Minority Rights Group, the Netherlands Centre for Indigenous Peoples (NCIV), Shimin Gaikou Centre and the Women's Human Rights International Association, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, and the Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development, and Survival International Ltd., non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/28	3	Written statement submitted by the Permanent Assembly for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/29	3	Written statement submitted by France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand (Special)
A/HRC/25/NGO/30	3	Joint written statement submitted by France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, and the Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Educational Development, Inc., Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, and Survival International Ltd., non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/31	3	Joint written statement submitted by Centre Europe – Tiers Monde – Europe-Third World Centre, non-governmental organization in general consultative status, France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, non-governmental organization in special consultative status, Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Educational Development, Inc., Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/32	3	Written statement submitted by the Friends World Committee for Consultation, 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/25/NGO/33	3	Joint written statement submitted by Centre Europe – Tiers Monde – Europe-Third World Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status; France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, and the Women's Human Rights International Association, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status; and the Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Educational Development, Inc., and Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/34	7	Written statement submitted by the European Centre for Law and Justice / Centre Européen pour la justice et les droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/35	4	Written statement submitted by the European Centre for Law and Justice / Centre Européen pour la justice et les droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/36	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/37	3	Written statement submitted by the International Commission of Jurists, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/38	2	Written statement submitted by the Friends World Committee for Consultation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/39	6	Written statement submitted by the International Commission of Jurists, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/40	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/41	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/42	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/43	4	Joint written statement submitted by France Libertés : Fondation Danielle

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		Mitterrand and the Society for Threatened Peoples, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status;; and the Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Educational Development, Inc., and Survival International Ltd., non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/44	4	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/45	4	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/46	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/47	3	Written statement submitted by the Friends World Committee for Consultation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/48	4	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/49	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/50	4	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/51	3	Written statement submitted by France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/52	6	Written statement submitted by the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/53	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/54	4	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/25/NGO/55	6	Written statement submitted by the Arab NGO Network for Development, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/56	3	Joint written statement submitted by the World Federation of Trade Unions, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, and France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, and the American Association of Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/57	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/58	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/59	4	Written statement submitted by France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/60	4	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/61	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/62	7	Joint written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status; the BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, the Habitat International Coalition, and the Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status; and Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/63	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/64	3	Written statement submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, 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/25/NGO/65	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/66	3	Written statement submitted by Ligue internationale contre le racisme et l'antisémitisme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/67	4	Written statement submitted by Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/68	4	Joint written statement submitted by the Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational and Transparty, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status; France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, and the Women's Human Rights International Association, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status; and Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples and International Educational Development, Inc., non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/69	4	Joint written statement submitted by the Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational and Transparty, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status; the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status; and Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/70	8	Written statement submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/71	3	Written statement submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/72	3	Written statement submitted by Liberal International (World Liberal Union), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/73	3	Written statement submitted by Gazeteciler ve Yazarlar Vakfı, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/74	3	Written statement submitted by Pax Romana (International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs and International Movement of Catholic



*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		Students), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/75	3	Written statement submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/76	10	Joint written statement submitted by Femmes Afrique Solidarité, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and the World Young Women's Christian Association, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/77	3	Joint written statement submitted by Al-khoei Foundation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, and the World Federation of Khoja Shi'a Ithna-Asheri Muslim Communities, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/78	3	Joint written statement submitted by Al-khoei Foundation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, and the World Federation of Khoja Shi'a Ithna-Asheri Muslim Communities, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/79	2	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/80	3	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/81	3	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/82	3	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/83	4	Written statement submitted by People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/84	3	Written statement submitted by the Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/85	3	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/86	3	Joint written statement submitted by People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy and MINBYUN-Lawyers for a

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		Democratic Society, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/87	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/88	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/89	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/90	3	Written statement submitted by the European Centre for Law and Justice / Centre Européen pour la justice et les droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/91	3	Written statement submitted by the European Centre for Law and Justice / Centre Européen pour la justice et les droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/92	2, 3	Joint written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status; the Union of Arab Jurists, the Arab Lawyers Union, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, the General Arab Women Federation, the Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES, Nord-Sud XXI - North-South XXI, Organisation mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale, the United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status; and International Educational Development, Inc. and the International Human Rights Association of American Minorities (IHRAAM), non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/93	3	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/25/NGO/94	2	Written statement submitted by the International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/95	4	Joint written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status; the Union of Arab Jurists, the Arab Lawyers Union, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, the General Arab Women Federation, the Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”, the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES, Nord-Sud XXI - North-South XXI, Organisation mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale, the United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status; and the Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Educational Development, Inc., the International Human Rights Association of American Minorities (IHRAAM) and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/96	4	Written statement submitted by Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/97	3	Written statement submitted by the Iranian Elite Research Center, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/98	6	Written statement submitted by the Iranian Elite Research Center, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/99	3	Written statement submitted by the Iranian Elite Research Center, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/100	2	Written statement submitted by the European Centre for Law and Justice / Centre Européen pour la justice et les 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/25/NGO/101	3	Written statement submitted by the Alliance Defense Fund, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/102	4	Written statement submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/103	7	Written statement submitted by the European Centre for Law and Justice / Centre Européen pour la justice et les droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/104	2	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/105	3	Written statement submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights (JKCHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/106	4	Written statement submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights (JKCHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/107	4	Written statement submitted by Presse emblème campagne, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/108	2	Written statement submitted by the Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/109	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/110	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/111	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/112	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/113	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/114	6	Written statement submitted by Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Asociación Civil, and the World Organisation against Torture,

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
	non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/115	7 Joint written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status; the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), the Arab Lawyers Union, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, the General Arab Women Federation, the Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES, Nord-Sud XXI – North-South XXI, Organisation mondiale des associations pour l’éducation prénatale, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique Internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale, the Union of Arab Jurists, the United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, and the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status; and the Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Educational Development, Inc., the International Human Rights Association of American Minorities (IHRAAM) and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/116	7 Joint written statement submitted by Al-Haq/Law in the Service of Man, the Al Mezan Centre for Human Rights, the BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, Defence for Children International, and the Women’s Centre for Legal Aid and Counselling, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/117	4 Joint written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status; the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), the Arab Lawyers Union, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, the General Arab Women Federation, the Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES, Nord-Sud XXI – North-South XXI, Organisation mondiale des

## Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		associations pour l'éducation prénatale, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique Internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale, the Union of Arab Jurists, the United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status; and the Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Educational Development, Inc., the International Human Rights Association of American Minorities (IHRAAM) and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/118	3	Written statement submitted by Reporters sans frontières international – Reporters Without Borders International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/119	3	Joint written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status; the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), the Arab Lawyers Union, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, the General Arab Women Federation, the Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES, Nord-Sud XXI – North-South XXI, Organisation mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale, the Union of Arab Jurists, the United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status; and the Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Educational Development, Inc., the International Human Rights Association of American Minorities (IHRAAM) and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/120	4	Joint written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		consultative status; the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), the Arab Lawyers Union, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, the General Arab Women Federation, the Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES, Nord-Sud XXI – North-South XXI, Organisation mondiale des associations pour l’éducation prénatale, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale, the Union of Arab Jurists, the United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, and the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status; and the Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Educational Development, Inc., the International Human Rights Association of American Minorities (IHRAAM) and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/121	3	Written statement submitted by the International Association for the Defence of Religious Liberty – Association internationale pour la défense de la liberté, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/122	2	Written statement submitted by Liberation, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/123	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/124	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/125	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/126	4	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/127	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/128	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/129	3	Written statement submitted by the International Catholic Child Bureau, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/130	3	Joint written statement submitted by CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/131	3	Written statement submitted by the International Catholic Child Bureau, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/132	4	Written statement submitted by International Educational Development, Inc., a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/133	4	Written statement submitted by International Educational Development, Inc., a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/134	3	Written statement submitted by the International Catholic Child Bureau, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/135	4	Joint written statement submitted by International Educational Development, Inc. and Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/136	4	Joint written statement submitted by International Educational Development, Inc. and Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/137	4	Written statement submitted by Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/138	7	Written statement submitted by Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/139	2	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/140	4	Written statement submitted by the East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, 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/25/NGO/141	3	Written statement submitted by Liberation, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/142	9	Written statement submitted by Liberation, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/143	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/144	2	Written statement submitted by the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/145	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/146	3	Written statement submitted by the Alsalam Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/147	3	Written statement submitted by the International Federation of University Women, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/148	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/149	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/150	3	Written statement submitted by the Permanent Assembly for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/151	3	Written statement submitted by the Permanent Assembly for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/152	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/153	4	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/154	3	Written statement submitted by the Permanent Assembly for Human Rights, a

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/155	4	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/156	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/157	3	Written statement submitted by the Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/158	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/159	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/160	4	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/161	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/162	4	Joint written statement submitted by the Union of Arab Jurists, the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES, Nord-Sud XXI – North-South XXI, the Arab Lawyers Union, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, the General Arab Women Federation, the Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", Organisation mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale and the United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status;, and the Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Educational Development, Inc., the International Human Rights Association of American Minorities (IHRAAM) and the 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/25/NGO/163	3	Written statement submitted by the Consortium for Street Children, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/164	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/165	2	Joint written statement submitted by the Union of Arab Jurists, the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the General Arab Women Federation, the Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES, the Arab Lawyers Union, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, Nord-Sud XXI – North-South XXI, Organisation mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique Internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale and the United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status; and the Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Educational Development, Inc., the International Human Rights Association of American Minorities (IHRAAM) and World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/166	8	Written statement submitted by Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/167	3	Written statement submitted by Ekta Welfare Society, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/168	4	Joint written statement submitted by the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/169	3	Written statement submitted by Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/170	9	Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		Discrimination (EAFORD), the Arab Lawyers Union, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, the General Arab Women Federation, the Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES, Nord-Sud XXI – North-South XXI, Organisation mondiale des associations pour l’éducation prénatale, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique Internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale, the Union of Arab Jurists, the United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation and the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status; and the Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Educational Development, Inc., the International Human Rights Association of American Minorities (IHRAAM) and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/171	3	Written statement submitted by the Ecumenical Federation of Constantinopolitans, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/172	3	Written statement submitted by the Ecumenical Federation of Constantinopolitans, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/173	3	Written statement submitted by Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/174	9	Written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/175	3	Written statement submitted by the Penal Reform International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/176	5	Joint written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status; Amnesty International, the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, the East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, the International Service for Human Rights, and Reporters sans frontières international – Reporters Without Borders International,

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		non-governmental organizations in special consultative status; and Article 19 – International Centre against Censorship, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/177	4	Written statement submitted by the Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/178	4	Joint written statement submitted by CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/179	4	Joint written statement submitted by the Union of Arab Jurists, the Arab Lawyers Union, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, the General Arab Women Federation, the Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”, the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES, Nord-Sud XXI – North-South XXI, Organisation mondiale des associations pour l’éducation prénatale, the United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation and the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status; and the Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Educational Development, Inc., the International Human Rights Association of American Minorities (IHRAAM) and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/25/NGO/180	1	Joint written statement submitted by Save the Children International, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/181	2	Written statement submitted by the Norwegian Refugee Council, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/182	3	Written statement submitted by Organisation mondiale des associations pour l’éducation prénatale, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/183	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/25/NGO/184	4	Written statement submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/185	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/186	3	Written statement submitted by the Chinese People's Association for Peace and Disarmament, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/25/NGO/187	3	Written statement submitted by the Chinese People's Association for Peace and Disarmament, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

*Documents issued in the national institutions series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/25/NI/1	1	Information provided by the National Human Rights Council of Morocco: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/25/NI/2	1	Information presented by the National Human Rights Council of Morocco: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/25/NI/2/Corr.1	1	Corrigendum
A/HRC/25/NI/3	1	Information presented by the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/25/NI/4	2	Information presented by the Equality and Human Rights Commission of Azerbaijan: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/25/NI/5	3	Information presented by the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/25/NI/6	3	Information presented by the Kenyan National Commission for Human Rights: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/25/NI/7	3	Information presented by the Kenyan National Commission for Human Rights: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/25/NI/8	3	Information presented by the National Human Rights Council of Morocco: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/25/NI/9	3	Information submitted by the Network of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights of the Americas: note by the Secretariat

---

*Documents issued in the national institutions series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/25/NI/10	6	Information presented by the Australian Human Rights Commission: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/25/NI/11	6	Information presented by the Irish Human Rights Commission: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/25/NI/12	3	Information presented by the National Human Rights Commission of Korea: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/25/NI/13	3	Information presented by the Scottish Human Rights Commission: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/25/NI/14	3	Information presented by the Scottish Human Rights Commission: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/25/NI/15	3	Information presented by the Equality and Human Rights Commission, the Scottish Human Rights Commission and the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/25/NI/16	3	Information presented by the National Human Rights Council of Morocco: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/25/NI/17	3	Information presented by the Greek Human Rights Commission: note by the Secretariat

---

## **Annex IV**

### **Advisory Committee member elected by the Human Rights Council at its twenty-fifth session**

<i>Member</i>	<i>Expiry of term</i>
Karla Hananía de Varela	30 September 2016



## Annex V

### **Special procedure mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its organizational meeting of 8 May 2014**

**Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights**

Juan Bohoslavsky (Argentina)

**Independent Expert on the enjoyment of all human rights by older persons**

Rosa Kornfeld-Matte (Chile)

**Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Somalia**

Bahame Nyanduga (United Republic of Tanzania)

**Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and the right to non-discrimination in this context**

Leilani Farha (Canada)

**Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery, including its causes and consequences**

Urmila Bhoola (South Africa)

**Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights**

Philip Alston (Australia)

**Special Rapporteur on the right to food**

Hilal Elver (Turkey)

**Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples**

Victoria Lucia Tauli-Corpuz (Philippines)

**Special Rapporteur on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography**

Maud de Boer-Buquicchio (Netherlands)

**Special Rapporteur on the situation on human rights defenders**

Michel Forst (France)

**Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar**

Yanghee Lee (Republic of Korea)

**Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967**

Makarim Wibisono (Indonesia)

**Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (member from Asia-Pacific States)**

Edtami Mansayagan (Philippines)

**Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (member from Western European and other States)**

Wilton Littlechild (Canada)

**Working Group on Arbitrary Detention (member from African States)**

Sètondji Roland Jean-Baptiste Adjovi (Benin)

**Working Group on Arbitrary Detention (member from Latin American and Caribbean States)**

José Guevara (Mexico)

**Working Group Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances (member from African States)**

Houria Es Slami (Morocco)

**Working Group on the issue of discrimination against women in law and in practice (member from Latin American and Caribbean States)**

Alda Facio (Costa Rica)

**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 Asia-Pacific States)**

Saeed Mokbil (Yemen)

---