



General Assembly

Seventy-seventh session

Official Records

Distr.: General
20 April 2023

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 48th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 11 November 2022, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Blanco Conde (Dominican Republic)

Contents

Agenda item 57: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

Agenda item 68: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

Agenda item 109: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Management Section (dms@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org/>).

22-25513 (E)



Please recycle



The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Agenda item 57: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (continued) (A/C.3/77/L.49)

Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.49: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

1. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

2. **Mr. Holknekt** (Sweden), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), said that the draft resolution represented multilateralism and the spirit of compromise at their best. All Member States were urged to join consensus, given that humanitarian needs kept growing as the number of displaced persons had surpassed 100 million worldwide.

3. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, El Salvador, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Serbia, Türkiye and Zambia.

4. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Djibouti, Kiribati, Palau and Papua New Guinea.

5. *Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.49 was adopted.*

6. **Mr. Sahraei** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that by providing assistance to a large number of refugees, the Islamic Republic of Iran had played a vital role in reducing refugee problems in the region. However, the responsibility of assisting refugees must not be the sole burden of a few countries or regions. There was no reason for others to shirk their responsibilities, particularly when some developing countries were hindered by unilateral coercive measures.

7. His delegation reiterated the adverse effects on the situation of refugees in Iran of unilateral coercive measures taken by the United States. Those sanctions were unlawful, illegitimate and inhuman in nature, as they were intentionally devised to affect the most vulnerable segments of the population including children, the elderly, refugees, and those in need of medical treatment.

8. Recent developments in Afghanistan had led to a massive influx of refugees, with over five million refugees and migrants still residing in Iran. Countries that neighboured Afghanistan should not be the only ones receiving Afghan refugees. Given an absence of meaningful support, the sustainability of current services was threatened.

9. **Mr. Grenier** (Canada) said that the role of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) was more important than ever, given high levels of displacement, food insecurity and conflict. The unjustifiable Russian aggression against Ukraine had moreover led to unprecedented rates of forced displacement in Europe, underscoring the importance of inter-State coordination to protect refugees and respond to their humanitarian assistance needs. The undue pressures on host countries were evidence of the need to strengthen collective efforts and enhance responsibility sharing. It was also important to advance durable solutions, including through the implementation of the Secretary-General's Action Agenda on Internal Displacement. Support for the draft resolution also underscored the support of the international community for the protection mandate of the UNHCR and its critical role in responding to the needs of increasingly high numbers of asylum-seekers, refugees and other forcibly displaced persons.

10. **Mr. Kulháněk** (Czechia), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that his delegation welcomed the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution, given record high rates of forced displacement. The approach of minimizing changes and prioritizing the preservation of agreed-upon language had been crucial for the consensual adoption of the text.

11. The draft resolution reaffirmed the support of the international community for global solutions to address the global issue of forced displacement. The European Union acknowledged that new factors were driving forced displacement and thus welcomed the new substantive language added to address the effects of global food crises and climate change. The draft resolution should always retain its humanitarian nature and objectives. It was crucial to safeguard the efficiency and functionality of asylum systems for those in need of international protection and prevent any abuse, including for political motives.

12. **Ms. Al-mehaid** (Saudi Arabia), speaking also on behalf of Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman and Qatar, said that her delegation had joined consensus but wished to note that it interpreted paragraphs 48 and 49 of the draft

resolution referring to sexual and reproductive health in accordance with its cultural and societal values and within the context of its national system.

13. **Mr. Ivanyi** (Hungary) said that his delegation reaffirmed its commitment to the full implementation of the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and its associated Protocol. However, Hungary had only joined consensus in the spirit of compromise, as it dissociated itself from paragraphs 21 through 25 and paragraph 51 mentioning the Global Compact on Refugees and the Global Refugee Forum, which his country had not accepted or implemented. International efforts must tackle the root causes of migratory flows by providing assistance to third countries, creating stable and secure conditions locally, and fighting against irregular migration and human trafficking. It remained the prerogative of individual States to define their migration policies.

14. **Ms. Teo** (Singapore) said that the draft resolution deplored the denial of asylum access without taking into account the different contexts faced by States, which retained the sovereign right to control their borders and manage migratory flows in accordance with their domestic laws, policies, and circumstances. As a small country with limited available land and a high population density, Singapore could not accept any refugee or asylum-seekers, regardless of their background or origin. However, her country would collaborate with the international community and support the work of UNHCR wherever else possible. Despite not agreeing with certain elements of the text, therefore, Singapore had joined consensus in the spirit of compromise.

15. **Mr. Buop** (Kenya) said that although his delegation had joined consensus on the draft resolution, it took exception to the blanket reference to integrating refugees contained in paragraph 28. Kenya reiterated that the housing modalities for refugees remained the sovereign right and prerogative of hosting States and must not be determined, prescribed or imposed by any other State. Refugees within a country must also be treated in accordance with traditional humanitarian practices and all national laws of the host country. The Global Compact on Refugees clearly stipulated that local integration was a sovereign decision to be exercised by States, guided by their treaty obligations and human rights principles. Consequently, his delegation took issue with the narrow focus on socioeconomic challenges and stretched resources when integrating refugees, and called for a broader

consideration of other factors that reflected the different lived realities of States.

16. Despite his country's generous hospitality over the years, the humanitarian and civilian nature of camps for displaced persons had regrettably been violated in the past. References to integrating refugees in the draft resolution should consider feasibility and the sovereign right of States. Kenya therefore dissociated itself from the references to integration in paragraph 28. It would, however, call for continued burden- and responsibility-sharing in line with the Global Compact. Kenya would also continue upholding its obligations pursuant to the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and remained committed to rules-based multilateralism and international solidarity.

17. **Mr. Altarsha** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his country was affected by tragic events and faced huge numbers of refugees. In past years, his delegation had requested a vote on the draft resolution. Given the good engagement and practices observed during the negotiations, it had chosen not to call for a vote during that session.

18. **Mr. Gueye** (Senegal) said that his delegation had joined consensus in the spirit of compromise, but nonetheless dissociated itself from references to sexual and reproductive health, mentioned throughout the text and especially in paragraphs 48 and 49. Such matters must be interpreted in accordance with the sociocultural realities of individual States.

19. **Monsignor Murphy** (Observer for the Holy See) said that offering concrete aid and protection to refugees, asylum-seekers, internally displaced persons, and other people of concern to the UNHCR was a high priority for the Holy See. His delegation welcomed the attention in the draft resolution to the unprecedented scale of the global food security and nutrition crisis; the call for coordinated and immediate action to save lives and reduce suffering in countries at risk of famine, food insecurity, hunger, and acute malnutrition was a crucial addition to the text. The Holy See also welcomed the recognition of the contributions of refugees in host countries and countries of resettlement and the call for further international cooperation in support of host communities, particularly in traditional refugee-hosting countries.

20. The Holy See expressed two reservations with regard to the text. First, his delegation considered sexual and reproductive health and sexual and reproductive health-care services as applying to a holistic concept of

health and did not consider abortion, access to abortion, or access to abortifacients as a dimension of those terms. Second, his delegation understood the term “gender” as grounded in biological sexual identity that was male or female.

Agenda item 68: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) ([A/C.3/77/L.41](#), [A/C.3/77/L.42](#) and [A/C.3/77/L.43](#))

Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.41: Missing persons

21. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

22. **Mr. Aliyev** (Azerbaijan), introducing the draft resolution, said that the text called upon States parties to armed conflict to strictly observe and respect the rules of international humanitarian law and take all appropriate measures to prevent people from going missing, to determine the identity and fate of persons reported missing in connection with armed conflicts, and to provide family members with all relevant information, paying special attention to cases of missing children. Several additions had been made to the text from previous years. The draft resolution had always been adopted by consensus since its introduction during the fifty-seventh session of the General Assembly in 2002; his delegation hoped that it would be adopted by consensus again, thus translating the provisions of international humanitarian law into tangible action.

23. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Japan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zambia.

24. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Equatorial Guinea, Jordan, Papua New Guinea, Tajikistan and Zimbabwe.

25. **Mr. Galstyan** (Armenia) said that international cooperation was essential to elucidate the fate of persons missing in connection with armed conflict, and to develop appropriate national, regional, and international mechanisms to protect civilian populations during armed conflict. However, Azerbaijan, one of the facilitators of the draft resolution, hypocritically continued to pursue a policy of use of force, violence and destruction in the region, which not only undermined the efforts of the international community to determine the fate of missing persons, but led to further gross violations of international humanitarian and human rights law. Armenia, on the contrary, had never attempted to politicize the issue at the expense of the immense suffering of the families of those gone missing due to conflict.

26. The International Committee of the Red Cross had noted that the escalation in the hostilities in and around Nagorno-Karabakh in 2020 had resulted in an increase in the number of missing persons. As of 11 May 2022, in addition to the over 4,500 persons missing from the beginning of the 1990s, over 200 new cases had been added following the 2020 hostilities; since aggression in September 2022, 29 more persons had gone missing from Armenian soil. It was noteworthy that Azerbaijan had expressed no intent to adhere to the Additional Protocols to the 1949 Geneva Conventions, which specifically prescribed and regulated search and information-gathering modalities, as well as the rights of families of missing persons. Azerbaijan was not acting in good faith, as it refused to adhere to core documents on the issue of missing persons, but also contributed to rising numbers of missing persons as a result of its military actions in the region. His delegation reiterated that strict observance of international humanitarian law and the effective protection of civilians trapped in conflict and post-conflict situations was key to avoiding increases in the number of missing persons.

27. *Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.41 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.42: Extrajudicial, Summary or Arbitrary Executions

28. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution and the amendment contained in [A/C.3/77/L.66](#) had no programme budget implications.

29. **Ms. Kalkku** (Finland), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), said that the text sought to protect individuals from unlawful executions and to promote the inherent right to life of all people. The draft resolution focused on two key elements: the right to life and the fight against impunity. Everyone should be able to live freely without the fear of being illegally executed on any grounds.

30. The draft resolution had added language regarding, among other elements, the potential role of new technologies vis-à-vis the realization of human rights and their interlinkages to extrajudicial executions and the promotion of human rights overall, as well as the recognition of persons with disabilities, and the use of forensic experience in investigations of extrajudicial executions. Those new elements accommodated both concerns and suggestions from various delegations, and ensured the protection of the inherent right to life of all persons, without discrimination of any kind. By adopting the draft resolution, the Committee would highlight the crucial need to combat extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions in all their forms.

[A/C.3/77/L.66](#): *proposed amendment to draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.42*

31. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the proposed amendment to the draft resolution: Andorra, Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Liberia, Marshall Islands, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Switzerland.

32. He then noted that Colombia also wished to become a sponsor.

33. **Ms. Rizk** (Egypt), introducing the proposed amendment also on behalf of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Cameroon, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Libya, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sudan, Uganda, and Yemen, as well as the other sponsors of the text, said that while negotiations had tried to reflect the concerns of various delegations, they had not heeded the calls made by many States asking for the deletion of controversial references in paragraph 7(b) or their replacement with more acceptable language. Her delegation therefore submitted for consideration an amendment to the text of paragraph 7(b), asking for the deletion of “sexual orientation or gender identity” and its replacement with “sex” instead.

34. Her delegation fully supported all actions to eliminate extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions against all persons. It had therefore requested the deletion of the specific persons and groups listed in paragraph 7(b), as that language sought to accord protection to certain groups to the exclusion of all others. However, with a view to reflecting its willingness to move forward, her delegation was submitting this amendment which reflected language from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and many subsequent human rights instruments. Her delegation urged all to vote in favour of the amendment.

35. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the amendment: Brunei Darussalam, China, Malaysia, Oman, Qatar and United Arab Emirates.

36. He then noted that Djibouti and Niger also wished to become sponsors.

37. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on the draft amendment as contained in document [A/C.3/77/L.66](#).

38. **Mr. Kulhánek** (Czechia), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Türkiye and Ukraine; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, said that his delegation strongly supported the draft resolution, whose objective was to promote the protection of individuals against unlawful killings, and to investigate and bring the perpetrators of such killings to justice. His delegation therefore deeply regretted the decision of certain Member States to present a draft amendment on long-established language at the last moment, as that ran contrary to the principles of effective multilateralism, as well as to the purpose of the United Nations and its core values.

39. The paragraph that had come under attack focused on the obligation of States to conduct prompt, exhaustive, and impartial investigations into the killings of individuals belonging to vulnerable groups that were more likely to be the victims of extrajudicial, summary and arbitrary executions than others. The text placed no obligation on States to change their domestic laws regarding those specific groups, but rather to investigate all killings in a prompt, exhaustive, and impartial manner. It was crucially important for that paragraph and the list containing the most vulnerable groups to be retained in the draft resolution, as it had been in previous

years. His delegation would therefore vote against the proposed draft amendment.

40. **Ms. Kalkku** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), said that her delegation rejected the proposal to amend paragraph 7(b). The Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial executions had consistently reported that certain groups of persons were more vulnerable to unlawful executions and impunity than others, including those targeted by racially motivated killings, persons belonging to national, ethnic, religious, and linguistic minorities, victims of terrorism, refugees, internally displaced persons, migrants, street children, members of Indigenous communities, lawyers, journalists, and demonstrators. In addition, unlawful executions were also committed on account of the real or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of individuals. In fact, data showed that sexual orientation and gender identity were sources of a very high incidence of violence resulting in death.

41. Such vulnerable groups had been explicitly mentioned in the text for twenty years, as all persons had the right to live freely and to be protected from extrajudicial killings. Including references to specific vulnerable groups did not mean that those persons were more privileged or that new rights were being created for those individuals. Keeping the list in full simply recognized that all persons were entitled to the right to life and that States must fully investigate when members of those groups were victims of extrajudicial killings. The list in the draft resolution was factual and mirrored reality. Removing it would send a dangerous signal that some vulnerable groups no longer merited attention, despite living under increased threat. Her delegation would therefore vote against the draft amendment.

42. **Ms. Squeff** (Argentina) said that the application of international human rights law was governed by the principles of universality and non-discrimination enshrined in Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which stipulated that all human beings were born free and equal in dignity and rights. There were no exceptions to universality: all persons must enjoy the protections of human rights law, in particular the right to life which must be guaranteed by States without discrimination. The list of specific vulnerable groups in paragraph 7(b) was essential to urge States to ensure greater protection for individuals who were exposed to greater risk and violence. That list had been included in the text for the previous ten years. Choosing not to include sexual orientation and gender identity as

a motivation for extrajudicial killings would weaken the draft resolution and entail a significant setback for the international community. It would also send the message that such groups were not worthy of protection. Her delegation would therefore vote against the draft amendment.

43. **Mr. Elizondo Belden** (Mexico) said that as a traditional sponsor of the draft resolution, his delegation welcomed the addition of new elements that strengthened the text with regard to human rights. It therefore rejected the amendment to eliminate the reference to investigate killings motivated by discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity from the list of vulnerable groups contained in paragraph 7(b). That list, which highlighted those groups that were at the greatest risk of violence, had been incorporated in the draft resolution for a decade. His delegation believed that paragraph 7(b) was governed by the principles of universality and non-discrimination enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and would therefore vote against the draft amendment.

44. **Ms. Buist-Catherwood** (New Zealand), speaking also on behalf of Australia, Canada, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland, said that extrajudicial killings of any kind were an appalling violation of the right to life. The draft resolution contained a list of people who were especially vulnerable to such egregious acts, including persons belonging to ethnic, religious, and linguistic minorities, internally displaced persons, persons living under foreign occupation, migrants, Indigenous Peoples, and those targeted owing to their sexual orientation or gender identity. That list must be preserved in its entirety, as those listed individuals were particularly vulnerable and more often the victims of impunity. A phenomenon well documented in the reports of human rights treaty bodies and special procedures, the targeted killings of individuals on account of their sexual orientation or gender identity must never be condoned. Efforts to erase sexual orientation and gender identity issues from United Nations documents would neither obfuscate their importance nor dissuade her delegation from advocating human rights for all. Her delegation believed that paragraph 7(b) of the draft resolution focused on the obligations of States to conduct prompt, exhaustive and impartial investigations into the killings of people belonging to the listed vulnerable groups; as such, it focused on the application of existing laws and did not require States to change domestic legislation. Eliminating that language would send a wrong and

dangerous message, which was why her delegation would vote against the amendment.

45. **Ms. Heifetz** (United Kingdom) said that her Government strongly condemned any instances of extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions and urged all States to fully investigate any allegations, prosecute those responsible and provide justice to victims and their families. All Governments should condemn arbitrary killings outside the context of their own system of justice and accountability, as such violence undermined authority and rule of law.

46. As an inclusive text, the draft resolution contained references to a wide range of people who were at particular risk, whether from racially-motivated violence or owing to their national, ethnic, religious, linguistic identity, or their sexual orientation or gender identity. Her delegation was therefore deeply concerned by the proposed amendment to remove “sexual orientation and gender identity” from the text, as that challenged long-accepted language and threatened the enjoyment of human rights by all on an equal basis. Her delegation strongly urged Member States to vote against the draft amendment.

47. **Ms. Korac** (United States of America) said that her delegation regretted the last-minute amendment presented by Egypt, as it believed that no one should be subjected to extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions. It had been widely reported that individuals belonging to the listed minorities in paragraph 7(b) experienced widespread intimidation, harassment, and violence, including on account of sexual orientation and gender identity. Deleting that reference would mean erasing longstanding agreed language that had also enjoyed consensus in other resolutions adopted by the Committee. It would be deeply troubling for a body charged with protecting and promoting human rights to remove one group from the listing; the United States would therefore vote against the amendment and urged others to do the same.

48. **Ms. Sánchez García** (Colombia) said that the draft amendment proposed to paragraph 7(b) brought an important question to mind: she wondered whether the amendment suggested that there were reasons that would in fact permit extrajudicial killings and deny a group their most fundamental human rights. Colombia strongly believed that the answer to that question was no, as extrajudicial killings were unacceptable in any case. It was regrettable that such a debate was occurring 75 years after the creation of the United Nations. No life was worth more than other, and no one had the right to

assassinate someone else. Colombia would therefore vote against the amendment.

49. **Mr. Al-kasawnih** (Jordan) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft amendment. However, it reaffirmed the right to life of all persons, especially those targeted because of their sexual orientation or gender identity. It was the duty of all States to ensure fair investigations for any attacks on persons, regardless of whether those occurred for reasons of religion, ethnicity, language, sexual orientation or gender identity.

50. **Mr. Altarsha** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that that when making a major change, the concerns, fears, traditions, and convictions of all counterparties should be considered. The draft amendment had only occurred because the concerns of various delegations had not been considered during the negotiations. Adopting the amendment or not did not mean that some groups were winning while others were losing, but simply that the chasm was expanding between delegations. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft amendment.

51. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on the proposed draft amendment to the draft resolution.

52. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal contained in document A/C.3/77/L.66 to amend draft resolution A/C.3/75/L.42.*

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia,

Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining:

Angola, Bahamas, Botswana, Central African Republic, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Eswatini, Guinea, Guyana, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Maldives, Mozambique, Namibia, Paraguay, Philippines, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Togo, Tunisia.

53. *The proposal was rejected by 88 votes to 51, with 26 abstentions.**

54. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on the draft resolution as a whole.

55. **Mr. Holknekt** (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden) and making a general statement before the voting, said that the draft resolution contained additional and improved language on new technologies, on persons with disabilities and, particularly, on the role that forensic expertise could play in investigating cases of extrajudicial killings. While there had been differences of opinion during the negotiations, they were fundamentally of a technical nature. Member States as a whole remained united in the fight against extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions. With the adoption of the draft resolution, the international community would call for effective action to prevent, combat and eliminate the phenomenon in all its forms and manifestations.

56. Given such broad agreement, his delegation was disappointed that a recorded vote had been requested for the draft resolution as a whole, especially since that decision appeared to be based on the presence of five words in a long and exhaustive list of groups that were statistically more likely to be victims of extrajudicial killings. Rather than fixating on the offending words themselves, his delegation urged all Member States to read the entirety of the paragraph in question, which merely called on Member States to conduct thorough investigations in instances where persons belonging to those vulnerable groups had been targeted by extrajudicial killings.

57. The draft resolution aimed to protect individuals from unlawful executions, promote the right to life, and fight against impunity. Its straightforward plea was that all individuals should be able to live freely without the fear of illegal execution on any grounds. For that reason, Sweden and the Nordic countries would vote in favour of the draft resolution and urged others to do the same, regardless of differences on word choice.

58. **Ms. Al-mehaid** (Saudi Arabia), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the draft resolution contained several positive new additions, such as references to disability in the preamble and to extrajudicial killings conducted by terrorist groups in paragraph 16. However, her delegation and others had expressed their concerns about paragraph 7(b) during the negotiations and in writing; it was therefore a well-known objection.

59. Saudi Arabia protected all individuals against all forms of violence, and also ensured the protection, shelter, and health care of all individuals regardless of identity, based on the principle of equality enshrined in its legal regime. National laws stipulated that there could be no distinctions made that would hamper the enjoyment of human rights. However, the concept of sexual orientation and gender identity ran counter to the constitutional principles and societal values of Saudi Arabia. Those concepts were also not covered by her country's commitments under international conventions. Forcing the acceptance of those concepts and related practices would not be in accordance with the laws of Saudi Arabia; her delegation would therefore abstain from voting.

60. **Mr. Sahraei** (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his

* The delegation of Mozambique withdrew its vote on the draft amendment.

delegation condemned extrajudicial killings and arbitrary executions of all kinds. All States had the responsibility to protect human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, and to take effective measures to combat all extrajudicial killings, including by punishing the perpetrators and investigating suspected cases. Iran was concerned that extrajudicial killings and arbitrary executions continued to happen with impunity in many parts of the world, and especially by the United States, as illustrated by the unlawful assassination of General Soleimani in a terrorist attack in Iraq.

61. Although his delegation had participated in some of the informal meetings, the draft resolution had been finalized in a meeting in which developing countries such as Iran were under-represented due to conflicting meetings. Iran regretted that many important suggestions had been rejected, leading to a lopsided text with non-consensual language that reflected a specific narrative. His delegation would therefore abstain from voting and dissociated itself from all non-consensual and controversial language in the text.

62. **Mr. Balobaid** (Yemen), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his country did not tolerate discrimination based on religion. His delegation regretted the use of non-consensual language and the rejection of the draft amendment it had proposed. It would therefore abstain from voting on the draft resolution.

63. His country did not possess definitions beyond the category of sex: that did not mean that it was in favour of executing those people, if they existed in Yemeni society. Such individuals would be protected in accordance with their sexual identity: namely, their belonging to the category of men or women.

64. Certain delegations had not taken into account the concerns voiced by Yemen and other countries and had accused them of calling for executions of specific people and groups. However, his delegation was merely calling for the respect of national constitutions, traditions, cultures, and identities. Yemen dissociated itself from all non-consensual language in the draft resolution. While it respected the countries that wished to take such orientations into account, that choice must not be imposed on other countries.

65. **Ms. Rizk** (Egypt), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that time and again, the Committee regrettably failed to reach consensus on the important topic of extrajudicial, summary and arbitrary executions. Although her delegation recognized several

positive elements and reiterated its support for the facilitators, it lamented that its consistently communicated position was being treated as a surprise. All human rights were universal, interdependent, and indivisible, based on the principle of non-discrimination on any grounds and proceeding from the right to life. States had the responsibility and obligation to ensure that no person or group of persons were subject to violence and arbitrary executions. Her delegation condemned all such cases of violence and emphasized the imperative of establishing accountability, bringing justice to victims, and guaranteeing non-recurrence.

66. However, certain delegations had consistently attempted to focus on special groups of persons outside the purview of international human rights law, in order to accord them specific protections in a discriminatory manner. Singling out such groups occurred to the detriment of the universality of human rights and undermined collective efforts to promote and protect such rights by sowing division. The draft resolution should have been adopted by consensus, but consistent disregard for the concerns of a substantial number of delegations had prevented that outcome. Consequently, her delegation would abstain and called on others to do the same.

67. **Mr. Brans** (Netherlands), making a general statement before the voting, said that his delegation strongly supported the draft resolution and was therefore saddened that it had been called to a vote after the unsuccessful introduction of a draft amendment at the last minute. It would vote in favour of the draft resolution and called on all Member States to do the same.

68. **Mr. Kashaev** (Russian Federation), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that many of the comments made by his and other delegations had unfortunately been ignored. His delegation therefore had reasonable concerns about a number of provisions of the draft resolution, namely, the wording in paragraph 7(b) that did not enjoy consensus, the creation of an artificial hierarchy within civil society, the granting of special status and special rights to a certain category of persons on the basis of their professional activities and the attempts to loosely interpret the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions. His delegation was particularly concerned about paragraphs containing unduly positive assessments of the work of the International Criminal Court, which was not fit to administer justice. The Court should restore its credibility and refrain from double

standards, politicized investigations and far-fetched accusations. His delegation did not support the reference to the “responsibility to protect”, a concept that was not recognized by many countries. In view of the above, his delegation would abstain from voting on the draft resolution.

69. **Ms. Korac** (United States of America), making a general statement before the voting, said that her delegation welcomed the strengthened references to the linkages between arbitrary deprivation of life and systemic discrimination, such as gender-based and racial discrimination, and the disproportionate targeting of Indigenous women and girls; women and girls with disabilities; and those singled out on account of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

70. However, the United States continued to have concerns regarding the language related to the use of force and the application of international humanitarian law, in addition to other legal concerns. Further clarification of those concerns would be articulated in a statement submitted to the United Nations. The issue of extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions should enjoy consensus in the Committee; the United States would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution and encouraged all others to do so.

71. **Mr. Pedroza** (Peru), making a general statement before the voting, said that the draft resolution was focused on fighting impunity and protecting the right to life, as enshrined in Article 3 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. However, it was always important to contextualize that article with regard to Articles 1 and 2, which emphasized that humans right should be ensured without distinction owing to race, ethnicity, sex, nationality, or other factors. The right to life was therefore universal and could not be denied to anyone. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution and encouraged others to do the same.

72. **Mr. Saeed** (Pakistan), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation condemned extrajudicial killings and arbitrary executions of all kinds. All States had the responsibility to protect human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, including by taking effective measures to combat extrajudicial killings, punish the perpetrators, and investigate suspected cases. However, his delegation was concerned that extrajudicial killings happened with impunity in many parts of the world, in particular in situations of armed conflict and foreign occupation. In addition, it agreed that the use of less-lethal weapons could also result in risk to life or serious injury in some

circumstances; in particular, the use of metal pellets against peaceful protestors had resulted in numerous deaths and injuries in recent years. Therefore, the draft resolution rightly underscored the need to develop mechanism for regulating the use of so-called less-lethal weapons.

73. While his delegation supported the fundamental premise of the draft resolution, it remained concerned about certain elements in the text which had thus far eluded consensus in the Committee: references to “sexual and gender identity” and references to capital punishment. While the right to life must be protected for all persons, the text must not be used by some countries to impose their value systems on others. Therefore, the inclusion of categories and terminology which did not enjoy universal recognition must be avoided. Pakistan had thus voted in favour of the draft amendment. With regard to capital punishment, his delegation clarified that Article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights stipulated the sovereign right of all Member States to use the death penalty, so long as it was applied in a manner consistent with international obligations and domestic law. It therefore rejected any conflation of the legitimate use of capital punishment with extrajudicial killings.

74. *At the request of the delegations of China and Egypt, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.42.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand,

Nicaragua, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against:

Burundi.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Belarus, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Togo, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

75. *The draft resolution was adopted by 131 votes to 1, with 45 abstentions.*

76. **Mr. Jaiteh** (Gambia) said that the draft resolution was a balanced text that represented a plurality of values. His country was committed to the protection of human rights as well as maintaining the rule of law. His delegation had voted in favour of the draft amendment and expressed its disagreement with paragraph 7(b), but it had also voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, dissociating itself from the non-consensual language in paragraph 7(b).

77. **Mr. Gueye** (Senegal) said that his country was committed to respecting human rights in accordance with the principles contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The right to life must be guaranteed for all persons under international law. However, the Committee never seemed to consider why, every year, certain delegations proposed a draft amendment objecting to non-consensual language in the draft resolution. Just because language had existed in

the text for years did not mean it was accepted by all delegations. His delegation had supported the draft amendment but also wished to demonstrate its strong commitment to the protection of all persons by voting in favour of the draft resolution as a whole. It therefore dissociated itself from use of the term "sexual orientation and gender identity" in the text.

78. **Ms. Wagner** (Switzerland) said that her delegation welcomed the incorporation of concerns relating to protests in the fifteenth preambular paragraph and paragraph 12 of the text; nevertheless, it felt that the language used in resolution 50/21 of the Human Rights Council on the promotion and protection of human rights in the context of peaceful protests should have been reproduced in full in paragraph 12. Consequently, the meaning of paragraph 12 was not identical to that which had been championed in Geneva.

79. With regard to paragraph 18, her delegation noted that an approach that respected human rights obligations was not the same thing as a human rights-based approach, as the latter also encompassed commitments with regard to human rights. Such commitments were in fact particularly important in relation to the use of force by law enforcement and police. Her delegation hoped that when next discussing the subject of the draft resolution, there would be more consultations upstream.

80. **Mr. Coulibaly** (Mali) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a reflection of its commitment to combating extrajudicial killings of all kinds in accordance with its obligations under international law. However, it dissociated itself from the controversial provisions in paragraph 7(b).

81. **Mr. Mohd Zim** (Malaysia) said that extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions were a violation of human rights, including the inherent right to life. Impunity for such acts undermined accountability and the rule of law. Malaysia continued to undertake efforts to enhance the promotion and protection of human rights domestically, including by abolishing the mandatory death penalty and improving custodial health services. Malaysia would also collaborate with the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions for training and capacity-building on the use of the Minnesota Protocol.

82. Given the importance of the issue, his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. It had also, however, voted in favour of the proposed draft amendment to paragraph 7(b). As the phrase "sexual orientation and gender identity" had been retained,

Malaysia dissociated itself from the phrase and its use in the draft resolution.

83. **Mr. Pilipenko** (Belarus) said that it was deeply disappointing that the author of the draft resolution, despite being well aware that it was unacceptable to use terminology that many Member States did not endorse, had deliberately included such terminology in the final text of the draft resolution. The firm position of Belarus and many other countries on the wording in question was well known and unambiguous. The Committee had unfortunately failed to adopt the amendment put forward by a group of countries with a view to finding compromise, which would have made the text mutually acceptable. As a demonstration of his country's opposition to the controversial terminology that remained in the text, his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution and wished to dissociate itself from paragraph 7(b).

84. **Mr. Jiménez** (Nicaragua) said that despite having agreed to the consensus, Nicaragua reiterated that it was not covered by the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and therefore dissociated itself from all references to the latter. Nicaragua believed that international criminal justice must be impartial, non-selective, and complementary to national systems of justice; it should not be subject to politicization or double standards.

85. **Ms. Fangco** (Philippines) said that her delegation dissociated itself from the seventeenth preambular paragraph and paragraphs 15(a) and 15(b) of the draft resolution which referred to the International Criminal Court. The Philippines had withdrawn from the Rome Statute and no longer recognized the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court, in a principled stand against those who politicized human rights and disregarded its independent and well-functioning organs and agencies. Notwithstanding its withdrawal from the Rome Statute, the Philippines had joined consensus in line with its position on enhancing the enjoyment of human rights for all citizens based on the rule of law and respect for due process.

86. **Ms. Zhu Jiani** (China) said that China was committed to protecting human rights in general and the right to life in particular. Chinese law prohibited arbitrary executions without a trial and expressly provided for judicial trial processes that respected the lawful rights of defendants.

87. Her delegation had taken constructive part in consultations on the draft resolution and had put forward

multiple text proposals that would have helped the Committee to reach consensus. Regrettably, its proposals had not been taken on board, and the draft resolution had included non-consensual language such as "human rights defenders" and references to the Rome Statute and the International Criminal Court. The sponsors of the draft resolution had expanded at will the mandate of the Special Rapporteur. China had thus abstained from voting.

88. **Ms. Monica** (Bangladesh) said that Bangladesh supported all actions suggested in the draft resolution to prevent extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions and to end impunity. It had therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution. However, her delegation regretted that text had ultimately retained language regarding sexual orientation and gender identity as grounds for vulnerability in paragraph 7(b). That provision had been consistently opposed by many delegations including her own; it was therefore unsurprising that Bangladesh had supported the proposed draft amendment to replace that term with the word "sex".

89. Although the draft amendment had been rejected, Bangladesh stood by its objections. According to its Constitution, all persons were equal before the law, and all incidents of extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions were condemned irrespective of the identity of the victims. Her delegation did not recognize minorities based on sexual orientation and gender identity and therefore dissociated itself from paragraph 7(b) owing to its inconsistency with national laws.

90. **Ms. Pella** (Indonesia) said that her delegation had taken practical measures to end impunity and protect the right to life, including by providing anti-torture training to law enforcement officials at the local and national levels. Indonesia regretted that the draft resolution had been compromised by a reference to non-consensual language and had thus abstained from voting. Recognizing that all people must be protected without discrimination from extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, her delegation had voted in favour of the proposed draft amendment. It did not find sexual orientation and gender identity to be relevant to the issue at hand.

91. **Ms. Tambwe** (United Republic of Tanzania) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution due to its commitment to protecting life. It had also voted in favour of the proposed draft amendment, however. Given that the draft amendment had been rejected, her delegation dissociated itself from

the references to “sexual orientation and gender identity” in paragraph 7(b).

92. **Mr. Nze** (Nigeria) said that his delegation had raised its concerns regarding controversial language at the beginning of consultations, as had other delegations; it was therefore disappointing and inaccurate for others to refer to the draft amendment as last-minute or surprising. It was regrettable that the draft resolution had not been adopted by consensus owing to the retention of the aforementioned controversial language. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights made no mention of sexual identity or gender orientation; the addition of such controversial concepts was therefore counterproductive and infringed on sociocultural sensitivities. His delegation had abstained from voting and dissociated itself from paragraph 7(b) of the draft resolution. It would not accept attempts to coerce, blackmail or intimidate certain Member States through the introduction of non-consensual concepts and language.

93. **Mr. González Behmaras** (Cuba) said that Cuba had voted in favour of the draft resolution out of commitment to its noble objectives, despite having concerns about some of its elements. His delegation dissociated itself from references to the Rome Statute, of which Cuba was not a State Party, and to the International Criminal Court, whose jurisdiction it did not recognize.

94. Cuba likewise did not support the so-called “responsibility to protect,” which was a form of political manipulation easily used to justify violations against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, particularly in the Global South. When adopting General Assembly resolution [60/1](#), Cuba had expressed its reservations regarding paragraph 139 of the text.

95. Similarly, the draft resolution attributed a prevention role to the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions that was not outlined in the resolution establishing that mandate. Preventing such acts of violence and protecting individuals from them, as well as from any other human rights violations, was the exclusive purview of States, on the basis of their national legislations and obligations stemming from the international instruments to which they were a party.

96. The aforementioned concerns had been communicated in a transparent and timely fashion, but had not been considered. His delegation was therefore forced to dissociate itself from the seventeenth

preambular paragraph and paragraphs 15 and 23 of the text. Cuba remained committed to collective efforts to promote and protect all human rights, including the elimination of extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions.

97. **Mr. Altarsha** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation would dissociate itself from the same paragraphs as those cited by the delegation of Cuba.

98. **Monsignor Murphy** (Observer for the Holy See) said that the Holy See viewed the deliberate killing of individuals, including extrajudicial executions, as a violation of the fundamental right to life. The Holy See appreciated that the draft resolution addressed the extrajudicial executions of persons exercising their right to freedom of religion of belief, as well as the need to keep accurate records to allow for the identification of dead bodies and human remains, with a view to avoiding the use of mass graves.

99. However, it regretted the retention in paragraph 7 of controversial and ambiguous terminology. The Holy See understood the term “gender” and its derivatives to be grounded in male or female biological sexual identity. Although all persons were to be fully respected in their human dignity, it was necessary to elaborate a framework that corresponded to the full truth of the human person, manifested in the gift of man and woman in their complementarities. For the Holy See, gender identity was not independent of personal sexual identity. The inclusion of such language unfortunately impeded the possibility of achieving consensus around that important text.

Draft resolution [A/C.3/77/L.43](#): Freedom of religion or belief

100. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

101. **Mr. Kulháněk** (Czechia), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that promoting and protecting freedom of thought, religion, or belief as a universal human right, and combating all forms of intolerance and discrimination on the basis of religion or belief, were key priorities of the European Union’s human rights policy. The draft resolution emphasized the importance of protecting freedom of religion in response to the rise of violent religious extremism in various parts of the world. Freedom of thought, conscience, and religion or belief also included the right not to believe and to change one’s religion or belief; such rights were

interdependent with the right to freedom of opinion and expression, the right to peaceful assembly, and the right to freedom of association.

102. With a view to encouraging States to focus on the implementation of the draft resolution, only technical updates had been introduced to the previous year's text. The European Union had taken several steps to advance implementation within its region and remained actively engaged in the Istanbul Process for Combating Intolerance, Discrimination and Incitement to Hatred and/or Violence on the Basis of Religion or Belief. His delegation hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus, thus sending a strong message regarding the importance of protecting freedom of religion or belief.

103. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Georgia, Guatemala, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Liechtenstein, Marshall Islands, New Zealand, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, San Marino, Serbia, Switzerland, Thailand, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay.

104. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Equatorial Guinea, Kiribati, Norway, Sierra Leone, Uganda, United States of America and Zimbabwe.

105. *Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.43 was adopted.*

Agenda item 109: Crime prevention and criminal justice (continued) (A/C.3/77/L.11/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.11/Rev.1: United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders

106. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

107. **Ms. Gurhan** (Uganda), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of African States, said that the United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders (UNAFRI) was a vital regional mechanism providing technical support in the areas of training, technical assistance, advisory services, research and policy development, information and documentation, in order

to strengthen national capacities to advance the regional crime prevention and criminal justice framework and promote the rule of law and human rights in the administration of justice across the continent. That work was undertaken in cooperation with partners such as the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and the United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute.

108. Deliberations on the draft resolution had focused primarily on technical updates and new proposals to reflect recent developments as outlined in the relevant report of the Secretary-General (A/77/164). The text contained concrete actions to improve the work of UNAFRI in supporting national mechanisms for crime prevention and criminal justice in African countries. Criminal justice systems in Africa had been negatively impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic; a strengthened and sufficiently resourced UNAFRI would support African countries in rebuilding and accelerating their efforts to combat crime, and ensuring a higher quality of justice. Her delegation hoped that the Committee would adopt the draft resolution by consensus, as in previous sessions.

109. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Austria, Cuba, France, Hungary, India, Italy, Pakistan, Slovenia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

110. *Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.11/Rev.1 was adopted.*
The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.