



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
21 November 2019

Original: English

---

## Human Rights Council

Thirty-first session

Agenda item 1

Organizational and procedural matters

## Report of the Human Rights Council on its thirty-first session

*Vice-President and Rapporteur:* Bertrand de Crombrughe (Belgium)



## Contents

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
Part One: Resolutions, decisions and President's statement adopted by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-first session.....	4
I. Resolutions.....	4
II. Decisions.....	5
III. President's statement.....	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.....	8
D. General segment.....	12
E. Agenda and programme of work.....	12
F. Organization of work.....	12
G. Meetings and documentation.....	13
H. Visits.....	13
I. Selection and appointment of mandate holders.....	13
J. Adoption of the report of the session.....	13
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.....	15
A. Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.....	15
B. Reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General.....	16
C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals.....	17
III. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development.....	19
A. Panel discussions.....	19
B. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders.....	24
C. Interactive dialogue with special representatives of the Secretary-General.....	33
D. Open-ended intergovernmental working group on transnational corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights.....	35
E. General debate on agenda item 3.....	35
F. Consideration of and action on draft proposals.....	38
IV. Human rights situations that require the Council's attention.....	63
A. Interactive dialogue with the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic.....	63
B. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders.....	63
C. General debate on agenda item 4.....	65
D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals.....	67
V. Human rights bodies and mechanisms.....	72
A. Forum on Minority Issues.....	72

B.	Special procedures .....	72
C.	General debate on agenda item 5 .....	72
VI.	Universal periodic review .....	74
A.	Consideration of the universal periodic review outcomes .....	74
B.	General debate on agenda item 6 .....	146
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	147
VII.	Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories .....	149
A.	Interactive dialogue with the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967 .....	149
B.	Reports of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General .....	149
C.	General debate on agenda item 7 .....	150
D.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	150
VIII.	Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action .....	154
A.	General debate on agenda item 8 .....	154
IX.	Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action .....	156
A.	Panel discussions .....	156
B.	Debate on the state of racial discrimination worldwide .....	157
C.	General debate on agenda item 9 .....	157
D.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	158
X.	Technical assistance and capacity-building .....	159
A.	Annual thematic panel discussion on technical cooperation in the promotion and protection of human rights .....	159
B.	Enhanced interactive dialogue on the situation of human rights in Burundi .....	160
C.	Interactive dialogue on cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights .....	161
D.	Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders .....	161
E.	General debate on agenda item 10 .....	163
F.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals. ....	164
Annexes		
I.	Attendance .....	166
II.	Agenda .....	175
III.	Documents issued for the thirty-first session .....	176
IV.	Special procedure mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-first session .....	207

## Part One

### Resolutions, decisions and President's statement adopted by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-first session

#### I. Resolutions

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
31/1	Composition of staff of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights	23 March 2016
31/2	Integrity of the judicial system	23 March 2016
31/3	Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism: mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism	23 March 2016
31/4	Commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Right to Development	23 March 2016
31/5	Question of the realization in all countries of economic, social and cultural rights	23 March 2016
31/6	The rights of persons with disabilities in situations of risk and humanitarian emergencies	23 March 2016
31/7	Rights of the child: information and communications technologies and child sexual exploitation	23 March 2016
31/8	Human rights and the environment	23 March 2016
31/9	Adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and the right to non-discrimination in this context	23 March 2016
31/10	The right to food	23 March 2016
31/11	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	23 March 2016
31/12	Promotion of the enjoyment of the cultural rights of everyone and respect for cultural diversity	23 March 2016
31/13	Rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities	23 March 2016
31/14	The role of good governance in the promotion and protection of human rights	23 March 2016
31/15	The right to work	23 March 2016
31/16	Freedom of religion or belief	23 March 2016
31/17	The human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic	23 March 2016
31/18	Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea	23 March 2016
31/19	Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran	23 March 2016
31/20	Situation of human rights in South Sudan	23 March 2016
31/21	Human rights education and training	24 March 2016

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
31/22	The negative impact of the non-repatriation of funds of illicit origin on the enjoyment of human rights, and the importance of improving international cooperation	24 March 2016
31/23	Promoting human rights through sport and the Olympic ideal	24 March 2016
31/24	Situation of human rights in Myanmar	24 March 2016
31/25	Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan	24 March 2016
31/26	Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping and stigmatization of, and discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against, persons based on religion or belief	24 March 2016
31/27	Technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in Libya	24 March 2016
31/28	Technical assistance and capacity-building for Mali in the field of human rights	24 March 2016
31/29	Strengthening technical cooperation and advisory services for Guinea	24 March 2016
31/30	Effects of terrorism on the enjoyment of all human rights	24 March 2016
31/31	Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment: safeguards to prevent torture during police custody and pretrial detention	24 March 2016
31/32	Protecting human rights defenders, whether individuals, groups or organs of society, addressing economic, social and cultural rights	24 March 2016
31/33	Right of the Palestinian people to self-determination	24 March 2016
31/34	Human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem	24 March 2016
31/35	Ensuring accountability and justice for all violations of international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem	24 March 2016
31/36	Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan	24 March 2016
31/37	The promotion and protection of human rights in the context of peaceful protests	24 March 2016

## II. Decisions

<i>Decision</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
31/101	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Federated States of Micronesia	16 March 2016
31/102	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Lebanon	16 March 2016
31/103	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Mauritania	16 March 2016
31/104	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Nauru	16 March 2016
31/105	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Rwanda	16 March 2016
31/106	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Nepal	16 March 2016

---

<i>Decision</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
31/107	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Austria	16 March 2016
31/108	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Australia	17 March 2016
31/109	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Georgia	17 March 2016
31/110	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Saint Lucia	17 March 2016
31/111	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Oman	17 March 2016
31/112	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Myanmar	17 March 2016
31/113	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Saint Kitts and Nevis	17 March 2016
31/114	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Sao Tome and Principe	18 March 2016
31/115	High-level panel discussion on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Human Rights Council	23 March 2016
31/116	Commencement of the third cycle of the universal periodic review	23 March 2016

---

### **III. President's statement**

---

<i>President's statement</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
PRST/31/1	Situation of human rights in Haiti	24 March 2016

---

## Part Two

### Summary of proceedings

#### I. Organizational and procedural matters

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

1. The Human Rights Council held its thirty-first session at the United Nations Office at Geneva from 29 February to 24 March 2016. The President of the Council opened the session.
2. At the 1st meeting, on 29 February 2016, the President of the General Assembly, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Federal Councillor and Head of the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Didier Burkhalter, addressed the plenary.
3. At the 21st meeting, on 8 March 2016, the Human Rights Council observed International Women's Day. At the same meeting, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Canada (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, the Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen and Zambia) made a statement. The statement was also supported by the following non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, International Service for Human Rights, Make Mothers Matter, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Women's World Summit Foundation.
4. At the 57th meeting, on 22 March 2016, the representative of Belgium made a statement about the attack that had occurred on the same day in Brussels.
5. 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 thirty-first session was held on 15 February 2016.
6. The thirty-first session consisted of 66 meetings over 19 days (see para. 39 below).

##### B. Attendance

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

### C. High-level segment

8. At its 1st and 2nd meetings, held on 29 February 2016, and its 5th to 10th meetings, held on 1 and 2 March, the Human Rights Council held a high-level segment, during which 96 dignitaries, including 2 heads of State, 2 vice-presidents, 7 deputy prime ministers, 51 ministers, 26 other dignitaries and 8 representatives of observer organizations, addressed the plenary.

9. The following dignitaries, listed in the order in which they spoke, addressed the Human Rights Council during the high-level segment:

(a) At the 1st meeting, on 29 February 2016: President of Togo, Faure Essozimna Gnassingbe; Captains Regent of the Republic of San Marino, Lorella Stefanelli and Nicola Renzi; Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Portugal, Augusto Santos Silva; Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Belgium, Didier Reynders; Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign and European Affairs of Slovakia, Miroslav Lajčák; Deputy Prime Minister of Turkey, Lütfi Elvan; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Paraguay, Eladio Ramón Loizaga Lezcano; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Qatar, Sheikh Mohammed bin Abdulrahman bin Jassim Al Thani; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Argentina, Susana Mabel Malcorra; Minister for Foreign Affairs of France, Jean-Marc Ayrault; Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, Bert Koenders; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Liechtenstein, Aurelia Frick; Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Helen Clark; Secretary-General of the International Organization of la Francophonie, Michaëlle Jean; Director General of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), Irina Bokova;

(b) At the 2nd meeting, on the same day: Deputy Prime Minister of Kyrgyzstan, Gulmira Kudaiberdieva; Vice-President and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Panama, Isabel de Saint Malo de Alvarado; Minister for Justice of Iraq, Hyder Natiq Jasim; Minister for Foreign Trade and Development of Finland, Lenita Toivakka; Minister for Women, Racial Equality and Human Rights of Brazil, Nilma Lino Gomes; Minister for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation of Monaco, Gilles Tonelli; Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, Bert Koenders, on behalf of the European Union; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Armenia, Edward Nalbandyan; Minister for Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Nikola Poposki; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Georgia, Mikheil Janelidze; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Luxembourg, Jean Asselborn; Vice-Minister for Human Rights and Multilateral Affairs of Mexico, Miguel Ruiz Cabañas; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Lithuania, Linas Antanas Linkevičius; State Secretary and Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Norway, Tore Hattrem; Executive Director of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), Babatunde Osotimehin;

(c) At the 5th meeting, on 1 March 2016: Minister for Foreign Affairs of the State of Palestine, Riyad al-Malki; Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Sergey Lavrov; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria, Ramtane Lamamra; Minister for Justice and Human Rights of Angola, Rui Carneiro Mangureira; Minister for Human Rights, Equal Opportunities and Legislation of the Czech Republic, Jiří Dienstbier; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Albania, Ditimir Bushati; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Kristian Jensen; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Canada, Stéphane Dion; Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Botswana, Pelonomi Venson-Moitoi; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Igor Crnadak; Minister for Justice of Jordan, Bassam Talhouni; Federal Government Commissioner for Human Rights Policy and Humanitarian Aid of Germany, Bärbel Kofler; Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cyprus, Alexandros N. Zenon; President of the International Committee of the Red Cross, Peter Maurer; Secretary-General of the Council of Europe, Thorbjørn Jagland; Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece, Ioannis Amanatidis; Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Slovenia, Dragoljuba Benčina;

(d) At the 6th meeting, on the same day: Vice-President and Minister for Justice, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs of Zimbabwe, Emmerson D. Mnangagwa; Deputy Prime Minister for Human Rights of Equatorial Guinea, Alfonso Nsue Mokuy; Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs and European Integration of Montenegro, Igor



Lukšić; Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ri Su-yong; Minister for Justice of the Central African Republic, Saïd Paguindji; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nigeria, Geoffrey Onyema; Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Congo, Jean-Claude Gakosso; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Uruguay, Rodolfo Nin Novoa; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Maldives, Dunya Maumoon; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Eritrea, Osman Mohammed Saleh; Deputy Attorney-General and Minister for Justice of Ghana, Dominic Ayine; Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Emirates, Anwar Mohamad Gargash; Minister and President of the Human Rights Commission of Saudi Arabia, Bandar bin Mohammed al-Aiban; State Minister, Ministry of Justice of the Sudan, Tahani Ali Mohamed; Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Viet Nam, Ha Kim Ngoc;

(e) At the 7th meeting, on the same day: Minister for Culture and Democracy of Sweden, Alice Bah Kuhnke; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine, Pavlo Klimkin; Minister Delegate for the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Mauritania, Khadijetou Mbareck Fall; Secretary of the High Council for Human Rights and Adviser to the Chief of the Judiciary of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mohammad Javad Ardeshtir Larijani; Deputy Minister for International Relations and Cooperation of South Africa, Luwellyn Landers.

(f) At the 8th meeting, on 2 March 2016: Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mongolia, Lunde Purevsuren; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Chile, Heraldo Muñoz; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Poland, Witold Waszczykowski; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Guatemala, Carlos Raúl Morales Moscoso; Minister for Justice and Human Rights of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Alexis Tambwe Mwamba; Minister of State for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Sierra Leone, Mohammed Gibril Sesay; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Uganda, Okello Henry Oryem; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Colombia, María Angela Honguín; Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, Evan P. Garcia; Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan, Alexei Volkov; Deputy State Secretary for International Cooperation of Hungary, Ádám Zoltán Kovács; Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Thailand, Virasakdi Futrakul; Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Delcy Rodríguez Gómez; Special Envoy for Human Rights of Australia, Philip Ruddock; Parliamentary Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, Masakazu Hamachi; Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Juan Carlos Alurralde; Deputy Secretary of State of the United States of America, Anthony Blinken; Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Italy, Benedetto Della Vedova;

(g) At the 9th meeting, on the same day: Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Libya, Hassan A.M. Alsg hayr; Assistant Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bahrain, Abdulla Faisal al-Doseri; Vice-President of the National Council for the Equality of Persons with Disabilities of Ecuador, Xavier Torres; Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Spain, Ignacio Ybáñez; Minister Delegate for the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Morocco, Mbarka Bouaïda; Minister for National Unity and Citizenship of Guinea, Khalifa Gassama Diaby; State Secretary of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Serbia, Roksanda Ninčić; Director General of the Multilateral Affairs and International Law Division of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Cuba, Pedro Núñez Mosquera; Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea, Yun Byung-se; Secretary-General of the Commonwealth, Kamallesh Sharma; Assistant Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, Laila Bahaa el Din.

10. At the 7th meeting, on 1 March 2016, the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Japan, Myanmar, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic and Turkey made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

11. At the same meeting, the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Syrian Arab Republic and Saudi Arabia made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

12. At the 9th meeting, on 2 March 2016, the representatives of Albania, Chile, China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Myanmar, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Serbia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

13. At the same meeting, the representatives of Albania, 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 discussion on human rights mainstreaming**

14. At its 3rd meeting, on 29 February 2016, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 16/21, a high-level panel discussion to interact with heads of United Nations agencies within their respective mandates on specific human rights themes, with the objective of promoting the mainstreaming of human rights throughout the United Nations system, with a focus on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and human rights, with an emphasis on the right to development.

15. The Secretary-General of the United Nations, the President of the General Assembly and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made opening statements for the panel. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights moderated the discussion.

16. At the same meeting, the panellists Zamir Akram, Helen Clark, Babatunde Osotimehin, Yannick Glemarec and Jan Beagle made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Botswana, Georgia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Bahrain, Brazil, Denmark (also on behalf of Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), Norway, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation);

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of Association Points-Coeur, 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, the International Catholic Migration Commission, the International Movement of Apostolate in the Independent Social Milieus, Pax Christi International and the World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations), Save the Children International (also on behalf of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches, EuroChild, Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant, the International Catholic Child Bureau, the International Federation of Social Workers, the International Lesbian and Gay Association, the International Movement ATD Fourth World, Make Mother Matter, Plan International, Terre des hommes fédération internationale and the Consortium for Street Children).

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

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, India (also on behalf of Brazil, China, the Russian Federation and South Africa), Mexico, Namibia, Portugal, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Libya, United States of America;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Pacific Disability Forum.

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

**High-level panel discussion on the fiftieth anniversary of the adoption and the fortieth anniversary of the entry into force of the International Covenants on Human Rights**

21. At its 4th meeting, on 1 March 2016, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 29/1, a high-level panel discussion on the topic “The fiftieth anniversary of the International Covenants on Human Rights: universality, indivisibility, interdependence and interrelatedness of all human rights”, in order to give the fiftieth anniversary of the International Covenants on Human Rights attention commensurate with its historical significance.

22. The High Commissioner and the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Gennady Gatilov, made opening statements for the panel.

23. At the same meeting, the panellists Fabián Omar Salvioli, Waleed Sadi, Catarina de Albuquerque, Andrey Klishas and Sakiko Fukuda-Parr made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Botswana, Kyrgyzstan, Russian Federation (also on behalf of Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Philippines, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Uganda and Zimbabwe), Slovenia (also on behalf of Austria, Liechtenstein and Switzerland), South Africa (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Brazil, Finland (also on behalf of Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), Greece, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation);

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: European Union;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Centre pour les droits civils et politiques, Human Rights House Foundation.

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

26. During the discussion for the second slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Ecuador, France, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Namibia, Netherlands, Philippines, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Colombia, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nepal, Pakistan, Romania, Sudan;

(c) Observer for a national human rights institution: Commission nationale des droits de l’homme of Mauritania;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Espace Afrique International, Pacific Disability Forum, Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom.

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

## **D. General segment**

28. At the 10th meeting, on 2 March 2016, a general segment was held, during which the following addressed the Human Rights Council:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: China, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic<sup>1</sup> (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations), Namibia, Timor-Leste<sup>1</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Belarus, Croatia, Estonia, Fiji, Iceland, Malaysia, Mozambique, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Yemen;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf, International Development Law Organization, Organization of Islamic Cooperation;

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

(e) Invited members of civil society: Patrick Taran, Mandeep Tiwana, Flavio Luiz Schieck Valente, Snaliah E.G. Mahal (by video message).

29. At the same meeting, the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Saudi Arabia made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

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

31. At its 12th meeting, on 3 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted the agenda and programme of work of the thirty-first session.

## **F. Organization of work**

32. At the 3rd meeting, on 29 February 2016, the President outlined the modalities for the panel discussions, which were summarized in the concept notes. The speaking time limits would be two minutes for statements by States members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.

33. At the 10th meeting, on 2 March 2016, the President outlined the modalities for the general segment. The speaking time limits 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.

34. At the 27th meeting, on 10 March 2016, the President outlined the modalities for the interactive dialogue on the annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. The speaking time limits would be three minutes for States members of the Human Rights Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

35. At the 10th meeting, on 2 March 2016, the Vice-President of the Human Rights Council outlined, pursuant to the practice introduced at the twenty-seventh session of the Council, the modalities for the clustered interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders under agenda item 3. The total duration of each clustered interactive dialogue would not exceed four hours. Each special procedure mandate holder in a cluster would introduce his or her reports within 15 minutes and respond to questions and make concluding remarks within 15 minutes. As soon as the list of speakers would be available following electronic registration, the secretariat would calculate the estimated time needed to complete the

---

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

clustered interactive dialogue with the mandate holders. Should the total duration of a given interactive dialogue be estimated to last less than four hours, the speaking time limits would be five minutes for States members and three minutes for observer States and other observers. However, if it would be estimated to be more than four hours, the speaking time limits would be reduced to three minutes for States members and two minutes for observer States and other observers. Should this measure be deemed insufficient to ensure that the total duration not exceed four hours, the speaking time limit would be further reduced, but to no less than 1.5 minutes per speaker.

36. At the 31st meeting, on 11 March 2016, the President outlined the modalities for the general debates. The speaking time limits would be three minutes for States members of the Human Rights Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

37. At the 34th meeting, on 14 March 2016, the President outlined the modalities for the individual interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders. The speaking time limits would be three minutes for States members of the Human Rights Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

38. At the 42nd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the President outlined the modalities for the consideration of the outcomes of the universal periodic review under agenda item 6. The speaking time limits would be 20 minutes for the State concerned to present its views; where appropriate, 2 minutes for the national human rights institution with A status of the State concerned; up to 20 minutes for States members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and United Nations agencies to express their views on the outcome of the review, with varying speaking times according to the number of speakers in accordance with the modalities set out in the appendix to the annex to 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**

39. The Human Rights Council held 66 fully serviced meetings during its thirty-first session.

40. The list of the resolutions, decisions and President's statement adopted by the Human Rights Council is contained in part one of the present report.

## **H. Visits**

41. At the 34th meeting, on 14 March 2016, the Minister for Justice of New Zealand, Amy Adams, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

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

42. At its 66th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the Human Rights Council appointed, in accordance with Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21 and its decision 6/102, four special procedure mandate holders (see annex IV).

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

43. At the 66th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representatives of Australia, Canada, Egypt, Japan, Myanmar, New Zealand, Pakistan and the United States of America made statements on the adopted resolutions.

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

45. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted ad referendum the draft report on the session (A/HRC/31/2) and entrusted the Rapporteur with its finalization.

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

- (a) Representative of a State member of the Human Rights Council: Ghana;
- (b) Representative of an observer State: Haiti;
- (c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Human Rights Watch and the International Federation for Human Rights).

47. 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

48. At the 27th meeting, on 10 March 2015, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement on his annual report (A/HRC/31/3).

49. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 27th, 28th and 29th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the High Commissioner questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Dominican Republic (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ecuador, Egypt (also on behalf of Algeria, Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, the Sudan, the United Arab Emirates, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe), El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of) (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Kuwait (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco (on behalf of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands (also on behalf of the European Union, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Sudan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America and Uruguay), Nigeria, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf), Slovenia, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America (also on behalf of Australia, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Benin, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominican Republic, Djibouti, Egypt, Fiji, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mozambique, Nepal, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Senegal, South Sudan, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United States of America, Uruguay (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Colombia), Uzbekistan;

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

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

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

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: American Association of Jurists, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Arab Commission for Human Rights, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Human Rights Watch, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (also on behalf of Franciscans International), 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 (also on behalf of 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), International-Lawyers.Org.

50. At the 28th meeting, on the same day, the High Commissioner answered questions and made comments.

51. At the 29th meeting, on the same day, the High Commissioner answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

52. At the 31st meeting, on 11 March 2016, the representatives of Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Burundi, China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Georgia, Malaysia, Morocco, Myanmar, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation and the Syrian Arab Republic made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

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

54. At the 31st meeting, on 11 March 2016, the Director of the Research and Right to Development Division of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) presented thematic reports prepared by OHCHR and the Secretary-General under agenda items 2 and 3.

55. At its 31st, 32nd and 33rd meetings, on the same day, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on the thematic reports presented by the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights (see chap. III, sect. E below).

56. At the 39th meeting, on 15 March 2016, the Deputy High Commissioner presented the reports prepared by OHCHR under agenda items 2 and 4 (see chap. IV, sect. C below).

57. At the 51st meeting, on 21 March 2016, the Deputy 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 below).

58. At the 58th meeting, on 22 March 2016, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights presented the report of the High Commissioner on the assessment mission by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to improve human rights, accountability, reconciliation and capacity in South Sudan (A/HRC/31/49). In accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 29/13, the presentation was followed by an interactive dialogue.

59. At the same meeting, the Minister for Justice of South Sudan, Paulino Wanawilla Unango, made a statement as the State concerned.

60. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 58th meeting, on 22 March 2016, and the 59th meeting, on 23 March, the following made statements and asked the Assistant Secretary-General questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Botswana, China, France, Germany, Ghana, Mexico, Portugal, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Denmark, Egypt, Luxembourg, Mozambique, New Zealand, Norway, Sudan, United States of America;

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

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



(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project (also on behalf of CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation), Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Service for Human Rights.

61. At the 59th meeting, on 23 March 2016, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

62. At the 60th meeting, on the same day, the Deputy High Commissioner introduced the country-specific reports submitted by the Secretary-General and the High Commissioner under agenda item 2 (A/HRC/31/3/Add.1 and Add.2, A/HRC/31/21 and A/HRC/31/26).

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

64. During the ensuing general debate, at the 60th and 61st meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Deputy High Commissioner questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Germany, Netherlands (also on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia and Ukraine), Switzerland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Canada, Greece, Honduras, Ireland, Norway, Spain, Turkey, United States of America;

(c) Observer for a national human rights institution: Defensoría del Pueblo de Colombia;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Association for the Prevention of Torture, Centre Europe-tiers monde, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Colombian Commission of Jurists, Comité Permanente por la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos, Corporación para la Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos – Reiniciar, Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries, Human Rights Watch, Indian Council of South America, International Catholic Child Bureau, International Commission of Jurists, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of the Colombian Commission of Jurists), Iraqi Development Organization, Peace Brigades International Switzerland (also on behalf of ODHACO, Bureau international des droits humains – action Colombie), United Nations Watch, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, World Organization against Torture.

65. At the 61st meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Cyprus, South Sudan and Turkey made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

66. At the same meeting, the Deputy High Commissioner presented the reports prepared by the High Commissioner under agenda items 2 and 10 (see chap. X, sect. E).

## C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

### Composition of staff of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

67. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.15, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, Egypt, Malaysia, Namibia, Nicaragua, the Philippines, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Belarus, China, the Congo, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Maldives, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

68. At the same meeting, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made a general comment on the draft resolution.

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

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

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, France, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Mexico

71. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 33 votes to 13, with 1 abstention (resolution 31/1).

### 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 climate change and the right to health

72. At its 11th meeting, on 3 March 2016, the Human Rights Council held a panel discussion on the adverse impact of climate change on States' efforts to progressively realize the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health and related policies, lessons learned and good practices.

73. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Director General of the World Health Organization made opening statements for the panel. The Permanent Representative of Viet Nam to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Trung Thanh Nguyen, moderated the discussion.

74. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, Dainius Pūras; Undersecretary of the Department of Health of the Philippines, Lilibeth C. David; Adjunct Associate Professor at the University of California Los Angeles, Cristina Tirado; Coordinator at the Association for Indigenous Women and Peoples of Chad, Hindou Oumarou Ibrahim. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Dominican Republic<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), France, Philippines (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, the Comoros, Costa Rica, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Kenya, Kiribati, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, the Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, the Niger, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Tuvalu, the United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Viet Nam and Yemen) Portugal, Slovenia (on behalf of Costa Rica, Maldives, Morocco and Switzerland), South Africa;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Egypt, Iceland (on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden), Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Samoa, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: American Association of Jurists, Franciscans International, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

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

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Bangladesh, China, El Salvador, Georgia, Maldives, Panama, Paraguay, Russian Federation, South Africa (also on behalf of the Group of African States), United Arab Emirates;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Brazil, Chile, Ireland, Italy, Malawi, Peru, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Spain, Tunisia;

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

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, Indian Council of South America, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture.

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

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

79. At its 14th meeting, on 4 March 2015, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to resolution 28/4, its annual interactive debate on the rights of persons with disabilities in the form of a panel discussion. The focus of the discussion was on article 11 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, on situations of risk and humanitarian emergencies.

80. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel.

81. At the same meeting, the panellists Catalina Devandas Aguilar, Diane Kingston, Kirstin Lange, Myroslava Tataryn and Setareki Macanawai made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: China, Dominican Republic<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), France, India, Kuwait<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Mexico, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Thailand<sup>2</sup> (also on behalf of Belgium, Colombia and Senegal), United Arab Emirates;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Israel, Senegal;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Canners International Permanent Committee, Human Rights Watch, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

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

84. During the discussion for the second slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Ecuador, Georgia, Indonesia, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Japan, Libya, Nepal, New Zealand, Spain, Sudan, Tunisia;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, Pan African Union for Science and Technology.

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

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

86. An annual full-day meeting on the rights of the child was held on 7 March 2016, in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 28/19. The meeting was focused on the theme “Information and communications technology and child sexual exploitation” and was informed by the report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (A/HRC/31/34 and Corr.1). The Council divided the meeting into two panel

discussions. The first panel discussion was held at the 17th meeting, on 7 March 2016, and the second panel discussion was held at the 19th meeting, on the same day.

87. At the first panel discussion, at the 17th meeting, on the same day, the Deputy High Commissioner made an opening statement for the panel. The Human Rights Council then watched the video entitled “Messages of children victims”. The founding Director of the Internet Watch Foundation, John Carr, moderated the discussion.

88. For the first panel discussion, at the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Chair of the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child; Special Rapporteur on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, Maud de Boer-Buquicchio; Chair of the International Advisory Board of WePROTECT, and founder, former President and Chief Executive Officer of the International Centre for Missing and Exploited Children, Ernie Allen; the acting head of the Corporate Strategy Division at the International Telecommunication Union. The Human Rights Council divided the first panel discussion into two slots, both held at the 17th meeting, on the same day.

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: China, Dominican Republic<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kuwait<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Mexico, Russian Federation, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Estonia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation, Human Rights Advocates, Terre des hommes fédération internationale.

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

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Canada<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Ecuador, Georgia, India, Netherlands, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Egypt, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Libya, Peru, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden (on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Norway), Tunisia;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: International Organization of la Francophonie;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International-Lawyers.Org, Plan International (also on behalf of Save the Children International).

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

93. The second panel discussion was held at the 19th meeting, on the same day. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children, Marta Santos Pais, moderated the discussion.

94. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Deputy Director of Private Sector Engagement at UNICEF; Senior Feature Writer at Verdens Gang, Håkon Fostervold Høydal; Assistant Director of Vulnerable Communities, International Criminal Police Organization, Michael Moran; EU Policy Lead for Child Safety, Google Inc., Brittany Smith; Founder and Director of Asociación Crecer en Red, Peru, Gaby Reyes. The Human

Rights Council divided the second panel discussion into two slots, both held at the 19th meeting, on the same day.

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Congo, France, Maldives, Mexico, Slovenia;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Israel, Italy, Uruguay;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa culture internationale, International Catholic Child Bureau.

96. At the end of the first slot of the second panel discussion, at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Kyrgyzstan, Portugal, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Argentina, Belarus, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Monaco, Montenegro, Pakistan, Sudan, Thailand;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, European Centre for Law and Justice European, Union of Public Relations.

98. At the same meeting, the panellists of the second panel discussion answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

**Panel discussion on the progress in and challenges of addressing human rights issues in the context of efforts to end the HIV/AIDS epidemic by 2030**

99. At its 30th meeting, on 11 March 2016, the Human Rights Council held, in accordance with Council resolution 30/8, a panel discussion on the progress in and challenges of addressing human rights issues in the context of efforts to end the HIV/AIDS epidemic by 2030.

100. The Deputy High Commissioner made an opening statement for the panel. The Human Rights Council then watched the video entitled “15 years of the AIDS response, 2000–2015”.

101. At the same meeting, the Deputy Executive Director of the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS made a keynote statement. The Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Pedro Afonso Comissário, moderated the discussion.

102. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Public Campaign Officer at Indonesia AIDS Coalition, Ayu Oktariani; Minister for Gender, Children and Social Protection of Ghana, Nana Oye Lithur; Vice-President of Health Production and Innovation, Fiocruz, Ministry of Health of Brazil; member of the Secretary-General’s High-Level Panel on Access to Medicines, Jorge Bermudez; Executive Director of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, Mark Dybul; Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, Dainius Pūras. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Brazil<sup>2</sup> (also on behalf of Colombia, Mozambique, Portugal and Thailand), Dominican Republic<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), India, Kuwait<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Morocco, Pakistan<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Portugal (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Colombia, Egypt, Poland, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric AIDS Foundation (also on behalf of Caritas Internationalis), International Harm Reduction Association, Center for Reproductive Rights.

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Namibia, Panama, Paraguay, Switzerland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malawi, Monaco, Saint Kitts and Nevis, United States of America, Uruguay;

(c) Observers for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: International Labour Organization, World Food Programme;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, International HIV/AIDS Alliance (also on behalf of the Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network, the Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries, the International AIDS Society, the Grandmothers Advocacy Network, the International Lesbian and Gay Association, the International Council of AIDS Service Organizations, the International Planned Parenthood Federation and the Global Network of People Living with HIV/AIDS), World Young Women's Christian Association.

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

#### **Panel discussion on the human rights dimensions of preventing and countering violent extremism**

106. At its 47th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 30/15, a panel discussion on the human rights dimensions of preventing and countering violent extremism.

107. The Secretary-General of the United Nations (by video message) and the Deputy High Commissioner made opening statements for the panel. The Permanent Representative of Colombia to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Beatriz Londoño Soto, moderated the discussion.

108. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Member of the Board of Trustees of the Universal Rights Group and Associate Professor at the University of Oxford, Nazila Ghanea; Professor at the Pontifical Catholic University of Peru and former Chair of the National Bureau for the Fight against Poverty, Gastón Garatea; Senior Fellow at the World Organization for Resource Development and Education, Mehreen Farooq; Secretary-General of La rabita mohammadia des oulémas and Professor at Cadi Ayyad University of Marrakesh, Ahmed Abbadi. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Albania (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Cameroon, Colombia, France, Iraq, Mali, Morocco, Peru, Tunisia, Turkey and the United States of America), Australia<sup>2</sup> (also on behalf of Indonesia,

Mexico, the Republic of Korea and Turkey), Ecuador, Kuwait<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Morocco (also on behalf of Costa Rica, Italy, Morocco, the Philippines, Senegal, Slovenia, Switzerland and Thailand), Nigeria, Pakistan<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Norway (also on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Sweden), Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship (also on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union, the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, the Association for Progressive Communications, the Center for Inquiry, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Human Rights Watch, the International Center for Not-for-Profit Law, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues and the International Humanist and Ethical Union).

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

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: China, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Morocco, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Croatia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Pakistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Tunisia, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Association Miraisme International, Global Network for Rights and Development, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme (also on behalf of the Al-Hakim Foundation and the Women's Federation for World Peace International), World Jewish Congress.

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

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

### **Special Rapporteur on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment**

113. At the 12th meeting, on 3 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur 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/31/52 and A/HRC/31/53).

114. 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, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Dominican Republic<sup>3</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan<sup>3</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Philippines, Slovenia, South Africa (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Egypt, Spain, Tunisia;

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



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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Franciscans International, Friends World Committee for Consultation, Global Network for Rights and Development, International-Lawyers.Org, Sisters of Mercy of the Americas (also on behalf of Edmund Rice International, Franciscans International, the International Presentation Association, the Loretto Community, Food and Water Watch, the Temple of Understanding and VIVAT international), Villages unis.

115. Also at the same meeting, 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**

116. At the 12th meeting, on 3 March 2016, 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, Leilani Farha, presented her report (A/HRC/31/54 and Add.1-2).

117. At the same meeting, the representatives of Cabo Verde and Serbia made statements as the States concerned.

118. Also at the same meeting, the Protector of Citizens (Ombudsman) of Serbia made a statement (by video message).

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, China, Cuba, Dominican Republic<sup>3</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, Georgia, Germany, India, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan<sup>3</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Qatar, South Africa (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Brazil, Egypt, Finland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Spain, Tunisia;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Caritas Internationalis, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales, Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers, Espace Afrique International, Human Rights Now, International Lesbian and Gay Association (also on behalf of Allied Rainbow Communities International, Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland and the Swedish Federation of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights), Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development.

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

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

121. At the 13th meeting, on 3 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, Michel Forst, presented his report (A/HRC/31/55 and Add.1-2).

122. At the same meeting, the representative of Burundi made a statement as the State concerned.

123. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 13th meeting, on 3 March 2016, and at the 15th meeting, on 4 March, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Belgium, Botswana, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Morocco, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Slovenia, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Honduras, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, United States of America, Uruguay, State of Palestine;

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

(d) Observers for national human rights institutions: International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights (by video message), Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain (also on behalf of the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission and the Scottish Human Rights Commission (by video message));

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Human Rights House Foundation, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Service for Human Rights, Iraqi Development Organization, Liberation, Social Service Agency of the Protestant Church in Germany.

124. At the 15th meeting, on 4 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

125. At the 13th meeting, on 3 March 2016, a statement in exercise of the right of reply was made by the representative of China.

#### **Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities**

126. At the 15th meeting, on 4 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities, Catalina Devandas Aguilar, presented her report (A/HRC/31/62 and Add. 1-2).

127. At the same meeting, the representative of the Republic of Moldova made a statement as the State concerned.

128. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 15th and 16th 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, Belgium, Botswana, China, Congo, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Georgia, Germany, India, Kenya, Kuwait<sup>3</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan<sup>3</sup> (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Panama, Paraguay, Qatar, South Africa (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belarus, Brazil, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Malaysia, Myanmar, New Zealand, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Tunisia, United States of America;

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

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

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

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Development Association (also on behalf of 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 and the Victorious Youths Movement), Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Association Miraisme International, International Catholic Child Bureau, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Pacific Disability Forum, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

129. At the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

#### **Independent Expert on the enjoyment of human rights by persons with albinism**

130. At the 15th meeting, on 4 March 2016, the Independent Expert on the enjoyment of human rights by persons with albinism, Ikponwosa Ero, presented her report (A/HRC/31/63).

131. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 15th and 16th 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, Belgium, Botswana, Burundi, China, Cuba, France, Kenya, Nigeria, Portugal, South Africa (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Djibouti, Egypt, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Malawi, Mozambique, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Swaziland, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Espace Afrique International, Global Network for Rights and Development, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, United Nations Watch.

132. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made her 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**

133. At the 18th meeting, on 7 March 2016, 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, Juan Pablo Bohoslavsky, presented his reports (A/HRC/31/60 and Add. 1-2, and A/HRC/31/61).

134. At the same meeting, the representatives of China and Greece made statements as the States concerned.

135. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Greek National Commission for Human Rights made a statement (by video message).

136. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 18th meeting, on 7 March 2016, and the 20th meeting, on 8 March, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Dominican Republic<sup>3</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), India, Kuwait<sup>3</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan<sup>3</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), South Africa (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Egypt, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Tunisia, Holy See;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, International Commission of Jurists, International-Lawyers.Org, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Temple of Understanding (also on behalf of the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, Franciscans International, the Sisters of Charity Federation, the Sisters of Mercy of the Americas and the Society of Catholic Medical Missionaries).

137. At the 20th meeting, on 8 March 2016, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

138. At the 18th meeting, on 7 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the right to food, Hilal Elver, presented her report (A/HRC/31/51 and Add.1-2).

139. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Philippines and Morocco made statements as the States concerned.

140. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of the Commission on Human Rights of the Philippines and the Conseil national des droits de l'homme du Maroc made statements.

141. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 18th meeting, on 7 March 2016, and the 20th meeting, on 8 March, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Dominican Republic<sup>3</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, France, India, Indonesia, Kuwait<sup>3</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Kyrgyzstan, Mexico, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan<sup>3</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), South Africa, Switzerland, Togo, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Burkina Faso, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Libya, Luxembourg, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey;

(c) Observer for a United Nations entity, specialized agency and related organization: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Asian Legal Resource Centre, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Espace Afrique International, Foodfirst Information and Action Network, Human Rights Advocates, International Commission of Jurists, International-Lawyers.Org, International Muslim Women's Union, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Liberation, Temple of Understanding (also on behalf of the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, Franciscans International, the Sisters of Charity Federation, the Sisters of Mercy of the Americas and the Society of Catholic Medical Missionaries), Villages unis, World Barua Organization.

142. At the 20th meeting, on 8 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

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

143. At the 21st meeting, on 8 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, Juan Ernesto Mendez, presented his report (A/HRC/31/57 and Add. 1-4).

144. At the 22nd meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Brazil, Georgia and Ghana made statements as the States concerned.

145. At the same meeting, the representative of the Office of the Public Defender (Ombudsman) of Georgia made a statement (by video message).

146. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 22nd meeting, on 8 March 2016, and the 23rd meeting, on 9 March, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria, Bangladesh, China, Cuba, Ecuador, France, Nigeria, Pakistan<sup>3</sup> (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Luxembourg, Sierra Leone, Spain, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukraine, United States of America, Uruguay;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement, Alsalam Foundation, American Civil Liberties Union, Associação Brasileira de Gays, Lésbicas e Transgeneros, Association for the Prevention of Torture, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Defence for Children International, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Lesbian and Gay Association (also on behalf of Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland and the Swedish Federation for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights), United Schools International, World Organization against Torture.

147. At the 23rd meeting, on 9 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

148. At the 22nd meeting, on 8 March 2016, the representative of Egypt made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

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

149. At the 21st meeting, on 8 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, Maud de Boer-Buquicchio, presented her report (A/HRC/31/58 and Add. 1-2).

150. At the 22nd meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Armenia and Japan made statements as the States concerned.

151. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 22nd meeting, on 8 March 2016, and at the 23rd meeting, on 9 March, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria, Bangladesh, Botswana, China, Cuba, Dominican Republic<sup>3</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, France, Latvia, Nigeria, Pakistan<sup>3</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Chile, Croatia, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Monaco, Sierra Leone, Spain, Tunisia, United States of America;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Canners International Permanent Committee, Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd (also on behalf of the Sisters of Mercy of the Americas), International Organization for the

Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Pan African Union for Science and Technology.

152. At the 23rd meeting, on 9 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

#### **Special rapporteur on the right to privacy**

153. At the 23rd meeting, on 9 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the right to privacy, Joseph Cannataci, presented his report (A/HRC/31/64).

154. 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: Albania, Algeria, Belgium, Brazil<sup>4</sup> (also on behalf of Austria, Germany, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Norway and Switzerland), China, Cuba, Dominican Republic<sup>4</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ecuador, Georgia, Latvia, Paraguay, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Brazil, Denmark, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Norway, Spain;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Privacy International.

155. At the 24th meeting, on 9 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

156. At the 23rd meeting, on 9 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, Heiner Bielefeldt, presented his report (A/HRC/31/18 and Add.1-2).

157. At the same meeting, the representatives of Bangladesh and Lebanon made statements as the States concerned.

158. 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: Albania, Algeria, Belgium, Botswana, China, Cuba, France, Georgia, Germany, Indonesia, Kuwait<sup>4</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Kyrgyzstan, Morocco, Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Libya, Montenegro, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United States of America, Holy See;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Khoei Foundation, Alliance Defending Freedom, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Association Miraisme International, British Humanist Association, Center for Inquiry, European Union of Public Relations, International Fellowship of Reconciliation,

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

International Humanist and Ethical Union, Iraqi Development Organization, Jubilee Campaign, Shia Rights Watch, World Barua Organization, World Evangelical Alliance.

159. At the 24th meeting, on 9 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

160. At the 25th meeting, on the same day, the representative of the Russian Federation made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

**Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, and Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions**

161. At the 24th meeting, on 9 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, Maina Kiai, and the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, Christof Heyns, presented their joint compilation report (A/HRC/31/66).

162. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 24th and 25th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteurs questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Belgium, Botswana, China, Cuba, Ecuador, France, Georgia, India, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, South Africa, Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Libya, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Spain, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Centre Europe-tiers monde (also on behalf of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers), Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Franciscans International, Human Rights House Foundation, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Women's Human Rights International Association.

163. At the 25th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteurs answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

164. At the same meeting, the representative of Ethiopia made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

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

165. At the 26th meeting, on 10 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, Ben Emmerson, presented his report (A/HRC/31/65).

166. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 26th and 27th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria, Belgium, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, Georgia, Indonesia, Kuwait<sup>4</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Afghanistan, Benin, Brazil, Egypt, Estonia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia,

Mali, New Zealand, Pakistan, Serbia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alulbayt Foundation, American Civil Liberties Union, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Global Network for Rights and Development, Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, Human Rights Now, Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'homme, International Commission of Jurists, International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations, People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy, World Muslim Congress.

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

167. At the 26th meeting, on 10 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, Karima Bennouna, presented her report (A/HRC/31/59 and Corr.1 and Add.1).

168. At the same meeting, the representative of Botswana made a statement as the State concerned.

169. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 26th and 27th 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, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, Georgia, Morocco, Namibia, Panama, Paraguay, Qatar, Russian Federation, South Africa, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Benin, Brazil, Cyprus, Egypt, Estonia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Serbia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukraine;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Khoei Foundation, Alsalam Foundation, Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland, International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education.

### **Special Rapporteur on minority issues**

170. At the 41st meeting, on 15 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on minority issues, Rita Izsák, presented her report (A/HRC/31/56 and Add.1).

171. At the same meeting, the representative of Brazil made a statement as the State concerned.

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Bangladesh, China, Georgia, India, Latvia, Mexico, Namibia, Nigeria, Russian Federation, South Africa, Switzerland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Austria, Azerbaijan, Hungary, Iraq, Mauritania, Nepal, Norway, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sri Lanka, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alliance Defending Freedom (also on behalf of the Syriac Universal Alliance), Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order



of Preachers, Friends World Committee for Consultation, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, Japanese Workers Committee for Human Rights, Minority Rights Group (also on behalf of Human Rights Watch), Shia Rights Watch, World Jewish Congress.

173. At the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

174. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan and China made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

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

175. At the 13th meeting, on 3 March 2016, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 28/34, an interactive dialogue with the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide, on the progress made in discharging his duties, which include, inter alia, liaising with the United Nations system on activities for the prevention of genocide and working to enhance the capacity of the United Nations to analyse and manage information relating to genocide or related crimes. An opening statement was delivered by the Special Adviser, Adama Dieng.

176. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 13th meeting, on 3 March 2016, and at the 15th meeting, on 4 March, the following made statements and asked the Special Adviser questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, China, Cuba, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Ghana, Latvia, Morocco, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Rwanda<sup>4</sup> (also on behalf of the European Union, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Sudan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay), Slovenia, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Chile, Denmark, Egypt, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Myanmar, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alliance Defending Freedom, Arab Commission for Human Rights, United Schools International.

177. At the 15th meeting, on 4 March 2016, the Special Adviser answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

178. At the 13th meeting, on 3 March 2016, the representatives of Armenia and Turkey made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

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

180. At the 20th meeting, on 8 March 2016, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children, Marta Santos Pais, presented her report (A/HRC/31/20).

181. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 20th and 21st meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Representative questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil<sup>4</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries), China, Croatia<sup>4</sup> (also on behalf of Austria and Slovenia), Cuba, Dominican Republic<sup>4</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Germany, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Afghanistan, Angola, Australia, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Egypt, Estonia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Liechtenstein, Malawi, Malaysia, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Spain, Thailand, Tunisia, United States of America, Zambia;

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

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

(e) Observer for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, European Union;

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Defence for Children International, Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, International Catholic Child Bureau, International Humanist and Ethical Union, Iraqi Development Organization, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco (also on behalf of the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development), Liberation.

182. At the 21st meeting, on the same day, the Special Representative answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

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

183. At the 20th meeting, on 8 March 2016, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, Leila Zerrougui, presented her report (A/HRC/31/19).

184. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 20th and 21st meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Representative questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil<sup>4</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries), China, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia<sup>4</sup> (also on behalf of Austria and Slovenia), Cuba, Dominican Republic<sup>4</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), France, Georgia, Germany, Kuwait<sup>4</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan<sup>4</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Qatar, South Africa, Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Afghanistan, Australia, Azerbaijan, Benin, Colombia, Egypt, Estonia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Spain, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United States of America, State of Palestine;

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

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

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

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

(g) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Khoei Foundation, Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, Association Miraisme International, Child Foundation, Colombian Commission of Jurists, Global Network for Rights and Development, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence.

185. At the 21st meeting, on the same day, the Special Representative answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

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

#### **D. Open-ended intergovernmental working group on transnational corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights**

187. At the 31st meeting, on 11 March 2016, the Chair-Rapporteur of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on transnational corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights, with the mandate of elaborating an international legally binding instrument, María Fernanda Espinosa, presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 26/9, the report of the working group on its first session, held from 6 to 10 July 2015 and dedicated to conducting constructive deliberations on the content, scope, nature and form of the future international instrument (A/HRC/31/50).

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

188. At its 31st, 32nd and 33rd meetings, on 11 March 2016, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on thematic reports under agenda items 2 and 3, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China (also on behalf of Algeria, Angola, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, the Congo, Cuba, Denmark, Egypt, Fiji, France, Greece, India, Indonesia, Italy, Kyrgyzstan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malawi, Mexico, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Panama, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Serbia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam), Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Denmark<sup>4</sup> (also on behalf of Chile, Ghana, Indonesia and Morocco), Ecuador, Egypt<sup>4</sup> (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Ecuador, Greece, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Paraguay, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Sri Lanka and the Sudan), El Salvador, Georgia, Ghana, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of)<sup>4</sup> (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mexico (also on behalf of Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Indonesia, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay), Namibia, Netherlands (also on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, the Republic of Moldova, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Pakistan<sup>4</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay,

Poland, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, the Sudan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Turkey, Uruguay and Yemen), Qatar, Russian Federation (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Mauritania, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia and Uganda), South Africa, Switzerland, United States of America<sup>4</sup> (also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Chile, Costa Rica, Egypt, Greece, Iraq, Ireland, Mozambique, Norway (also on behalf of Turkey), Pakistan, Spain, Sudan, Tajikistan, Tunisia, United States of America, State of Palestine;

(c) Observer for a United Nations entity, specialized agency and related organization: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees;

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

(e) Observer for a national human rights institution: ICC Working Group on Business and Human Rights (by video message);

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, African Development Association, African Regional Agricultural Credit Association, Alliance Defending Freedom (also on behalf of the Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, the Howard Center for Family, Religion and Society, and Pure in Heart America), Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Asian Legal Resource Centre (also on behalf of Franciscans International), Association apprentissage sans frontières, Association Dunenyó, Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of Association Points-Coeur, the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, the International Catholic Child Bureau, the International Federation of Catholic Medical Associations, the International Movement of Apostolate in the Independent Social Milieus, Pax Romana, the Teresian Association and the World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations), Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace, Canners International Permanent Committee, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, Center for Inquiry, Centre Europe-tiers monde (also on behalf of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers), Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Chant du guépard dans le désert, Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims, Child Foundation, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Colombian Commission of Jurists (also on behalf of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom), Comisión Jurídica para el Autodesarrollo de los Pueblos Originarios Andinos "Capaj", Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, European Centre for Law and Justice, European Union of Public Relations, Family Health Association of Iran, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Foodfirst Information and Action Network, France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Friends of the Earth International, Friends World Committee for Consultation, Global Helping to Advance Women and Children, Global Network for Rights and Development, Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant (also on behalf of Defence for Children International, Plan International, Save the Children International and SOS Kinderdorf International), Hazrat Javad-al-Aemeh Cultural Charity Institute, Human Rights Advocates, Human Rights Watch, Il Cenacolo, Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, Indian Council of Education, Indian Council of South America, Institute for Policy

Studies, Integrated Youth Empowerment – Common Initiative Group, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Career Support Association, International Catholic Migration Commission, International Commission of Jurists, International Educational Development, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (also on behalf of the World Organization against Torture), International Federation of University Women (also on behalf of Association Points-Coeur, the Foundation for GAIA, the International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education, Make Mothers Matter, the Planetary Association for Clean Energy, Servas International, Sovereign Military Order of the Temple of Jerusalem and the Teresian Association), International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Institute for Non-Aligned Studies, International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations, International Muslim Women’s Union, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Iraqi Development Organization, Japanese Workers Committee for Human Rights, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Kiyana Karaj Group, Liberation, Make Mothers Matter, Minority Rights Group, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Pan African Union for Science and Technology, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Peivande Gole Narges Organization, Prahar, Prevention Association of Social Harms, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l’homme, Reporters sans frontières international, Save the Children International (also on behalf of Defence for Children International, Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l’enfant and Plan International), Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of the Environment, Society for Recovery Support, Terre des hommes fédération internationale, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, United Network of Young Peacebuilders (also on behalf of Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, the Center for Global Nonkilling, Conscience and Peace Tax International, the International Fellowship of Reconciliation and Servas International), United Schools International, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Women’s Human Rights International Association (also on behalf of International Educational Development), World Barua Organization, World Environment and Resources Council, World Evangelical Alliance, World Future Council Foundation, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress, World Union of Catholic Women’s Organizations (also on behalf of the International Association of Charities).

189. At the 33rd meeting, on the same day, the representatives of India and Pakistan made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

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

190. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.1, sponsored by Belarus, Cuba, the Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Burkina Faso, China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Morocco, Sierra Leone and Sri Lanka joined the sponsors.

191. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

192. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 31/2).

193. At the 66th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of India made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

### **High-level panel discussion on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Human Rights Council**

194. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Switzerland introduced draft decision A/HRC/31/L.2, sponsored by Belgium, Gabon, Germany, Mexico, Nigeria, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Switzerland, Thailand and Uruguay, and co-sponsored by Armenia, Georgia and Portugal. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Azerbaijan, Botswana, Cabo Verde, the Congo, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritius, Mongolia, San Marino and Sierra Leone joined the sponsors.

195. 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.

196. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation, also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Myanmar, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the Sudan, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe, made general comments on the draft decision.

197. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft decision without a vote (decision 31/115).

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

198. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Mexico introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.3, sponsored by Mexico and co-sponsored by Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay. Subsequently, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Egypt, Italy, Lithuania, Maldives, Poland, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Sierra Leone and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

199. 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.

200. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 31/3).

### **Commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Right to Development**

201. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.6, sponsored by the Islamic Republic of Iran, on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, and co-sponsored by Brazil and China. Subsequently, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Paraguay joined the sponsors.

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

203. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

204. 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, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Belgium, France, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

205. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 34 votes to none, with 13 abstentions (resolution 31/4).

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

206. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Portugal introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.7/Rev.1, sponsored by Portugal and co-sponsored by Angola, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Ukraine and Uruguay. Subsequently, Algeria, Armenia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Georgia, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, New Zealand, the Philippines, Rwanda, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia and Viet Nam joined the sponsors.

207. At the same meeting, the representative of South Africa made a general comment on the draft resolution.

208. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 31/5).

**The rights of persons with disabilities in situations of risk and humanitarian emergencies**

209. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representatives of Mexico and New Zealand introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.8, sponsored by Mexico and New Zealand, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, the United States of America and Uruguay. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, the Niger, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Togo, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

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

211. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Cuba made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

212. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 31/6).

**Rights of the child: information and communications technologies and child sexual exploitation**

213. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representatives of the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union) and Uruguay (on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.9/Rev.1, sponsored by Argentina, Austria, the Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Angola, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Egypt, Georgia, Ghana, Iceland, Israel, Kazakhstan, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, the Philippines, Qatar, the Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Serbia, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey and Ukraine. Subsequently, Algeria, Benin, Botswana, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mongolia, Namibia, Portugal, Rwanda, Sierra Leone and Sri Lanka joined the sponsors.

214. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands orally revised the draft resolution.

215. Also at the same meeting, the President announced that amendment A/HRC/31/L.88 to draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.9/Rev.1 as orally revised had been withdrawn.

216. At the same meeting, the representative of South Africa made a general comment on the draft resolution as orally revised.

217. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 31/7).

**Human rights and the environment**

218. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representatives of Costa Rica, Maldives and Slovenia introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.10, sponsored by Costa Rica, Maldives, Morocco, Slovenia and Switzerland, and co-sponsored by Angola, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Fiji, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, Slovakia, Spain, Tunisia and Yemen. Subsequently, Andorra, Australia, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chad, Chile, the Congo, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Libya, Lithuania, Namibia, New Zealand, the Niger, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, the Sudan, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

219. At the same meeting, the representative of Slovenia orally revised the draft resolution.

220. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Bolivia (Plurinational State of) and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

221. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 31/8).

222. At the 66th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.



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

223. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Finland introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.11, sponsored by Brazil, Finland, Germany and Namibia, and co-sponsored by Andorra, Angola, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, France, Georgia, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Turkey and Uruguay. Subsequently, Algeria, Belarus, Benin, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Haiti, Ireland, Morocco, Qatar, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Ukraine and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

224. At the same meeting, the representative of South Africa made a general comment on the draft resolution.

225. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 31/9).

**The right to food**

226. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.14, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Ecuador, Egypt, Honduras, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, South Africa, Thailand, Turkey, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cabo Verde, China, the Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, the Dominican Republic, France, Georgia, Greece, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Monaco, the Niger, Pakistan, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Switzerland and the Syrian Arab Republic joined the sponsors.

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

228. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Plurinational State of Bolivia made a general comment on the draft resolution as orally revised.

229. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 31/10).

**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**

230. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.16, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, Namibia, Nicaragua, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Belarus, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, the Congo, Egypt, Greece, Honduras, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

231. At the same meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

232. 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, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, France, Germany, Latvia, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Georgia, Mexico

233. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 33 votes to 12, with 2 abstentions (resolution 31/11).

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

234. At the 63rd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.17, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, Egypt, Honduras, Malaysia, Namibia, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Cabo Verde, Chile, China, Cyprus, the Dominican Republic, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Mexico, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

235. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 31/12).

**Rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities**

236. At the 63rd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Austria, also on behalf of Senegal and Slovenia, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.18, sponsored by Austria, Senegal and Slovenia, and co-sponsored by Armenia, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Croatia, Denmark, Finland, Georgia, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Subsequently, Albania, Benin, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, the Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Latvia, Lithuania, Morocco, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Ukraine and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

237. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 31/13).

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

238. At the 63rd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Poland introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.19, sponsored by Australia, Chile, Poland, the Republic of Korea and South Africa, and co-sponsored by Albania, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, the Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the

Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Yemen. Subsequently, Afghanistan, Brazil, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Kazakhstan, Maldives, Myanmar, Pakistan, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Sri Lanka and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

239. 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.

240. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 31/14).

### **The right to work**

241. At the 63rd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representatives of Egypt and Greece introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.32, sponsored by Egypt, Greece, Indonesia, Mexico and Romania, and co-sponsored by Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, China, the Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, Georgia, Italy, Luxembourg, Maldives, Montenegro, Nigeria, Paraguay, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Spain, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cabo Verde, Costa Rica, Finland, France, Germany, India, Kyrgyzstan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Rwanda, Serbia, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Togo, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

242. At the same meeting, the representatives of Indonesia and Mexico made general comments on the draft resolution.

243. 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.

244. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 31/15).

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

245. At the 63rd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of the Netherlands, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.35, sponsored by the Netherlands and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay. Subsequently, Argentina, Cabo Verde, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, France, Guatemala, Honduras, Japan, New Zealand, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Switzerland and Thailand joined the sponsors.

246. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation made a general comment on the draft resolution.

247. 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.

248. At the same meeting, the representative of Saudi Arabia made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

249. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 31/16).

#### **Human rights education and training**

250. At the 64th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of Morocco introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.12, sponsored by Costa Rica, Italy, Morocco, the Philippines, Senegal, Slovenia, Switzerland and Thailand, and co-sponsored by Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Libya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mali, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia and Turkey. Subsequently, Albania, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Mexico, Mongolia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), the United Arab Emirates, Ukraine and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

251. At the same meeting, the representative of Morocco orally revised the draft resolution.

252. Also at the same meeting, the President announced that amendment A/HRC/31/L.80 to draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.12 as orally revised had been withdrawn.

253. At the same meeting, the representative of South Africa made a general comment on the draft resolution.

254. 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.

255. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 31/21).

#### **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**

256. At the 64th meeting on 24 March 2016, the representative of South Africa, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.24/Rev.1, sponsored by South Africa, on behalf of the Group of African States. Subsequently, Bangladesh, Honduras, Indonesia and Sri Lanka joined the sponsors.

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

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

##### *In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

##### *Abstaining:*

Albania, Belgium, France, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Mexico, Netherlands, Panama, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

259. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 32 votes to none, with 15 abstentions (resolution 31/22).

#### **Promoting human rights through sports and the Olympic ideal**

260. At the 64th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of Greece (also on behalf of Brazil, China, the Congo, Cyprus, Japan, Lebanon, Morocco, the Republic of Korea and the Russian Federation) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.29, sponsored by Brazil, China, the Congo, Cyprus, Greece, Japan, Lebanon, Morocco, the Republic of Korea and the Russian Federation, and co-sponsored by Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Chile, Cuba, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Germany, Ghana, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Montenegro, Namibia, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Serbia, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Timor-Leste, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Austria, Azerbaijan, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Croatia, the Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, Guatemala, Haiti, Indonesia, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Monaco, Mongolia, New Zealand, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Moldova, Slovenia, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

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

262. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 31/23).

#### **Effects of terrorism on the enjoyment of all human rights**

263. At the 64th meeting on 24 March 2016, the representative of Egypt introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.13/Rev.1, sponsored by Angola, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco and Saudi Arabia, and co-sponsored by Algeria, Bahrain, Cameroon, Chad, the Congo, Cuba, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Nigeria, Oman, the Philippines, Senegal, Somalia, South Sudan, the Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela withdrew co-sponsorship of the draft resolution. Subsequently, Cabo Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Maldives, the Niger, the Russian Federation and Togo joined the sponsors.

264. At the same meeting, the representative of Morocco made general comments on the draft resolution.

265. 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.

266. At the same meeting, the representatives of Belgium, Ecuador, Mexico, the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), South Africa and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution. In her statement, the representative of Ecuador disassociated the member State from the consensus on the eighth preambular paragraph and paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

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

##### *In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Paraguay, Philippines,

Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, France, Germany, Latvia, Mexico, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, South Africa, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nigeria, Panama

268. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 28 votes to 14, with 5 abstentions (resolution 31/30).

**Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment: safeguards to prevent torture during police custody and pretrial detention**

269. At the 64th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of Denmark introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.26/Rev.1, sponsored by Denmark and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Djibouti, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay. Subsequently, Guatemala, Indonesia, Japan, Maldives, Mongolia, the Netherlands, Rwanda, Serbia and Sierra Leone joined the sponsors.

270. At the same meeting, the representative of Denmark orally revised the draft resolution.

271. Also at the same meeting, the President announced that amendment A/HRC/31/L.82 to draft resolution A/HRC/31/26/Rev.1 as orally revised had been withdrawn.

272. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and Switzerland made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

273. 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.

274. At the same meeting, the representative of Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of Bahrain, Egypt, Kuwait, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, the Sudan and the United Arab Emirates) made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

275. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 31/31).

**Protecting human rights defenders, whether individuals, groups or organs of society, addressing economic, social and cultural rights**

276. At the 65th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of Norway introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.28, sponsored by Norway and co-sponsored by Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Djibouti, France, Georgia, Ghana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia and Uruguay. Subsequently, Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Israel, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Morocco, the Netherlands, Peru,

Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Ukraine and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

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

278. Also at the same meeting, the President announced that amendment A/HRC/31/L.52 to draft resolution A/HRC/31/28 as orally revised had been withdrawn.

279. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced amendments A/HRC/31/L.41, A/HRC/31/L.42, A/HRC/31/L.43, A/HRC/31/L.44, A/HRC/31/L.45, A/HRC/31/L.46, A/HRC/31/L.47, A/HRC/31/L.48, A/HRC/31/L.49, A/HRC/31/L.50, A/HRC/31/L.51, A/HRC/31/L.53, A/HRC/31/L.54, A/HRC/31/L.55, A/HRC/31/L.56, A/HRC/31/L.57, A/HRC/31/L.58, A/HRC/31/L.59, A/HRC/31/L.60, A/HRC/31/L.61, A/HRC/31/L.62, A/HRC/31/L.63, A/HRC/31/L.64, A/HRC/31/L.65, A/HRC/31/L.66, A/HRC/31/L.67, A/HRC/31/L.68, A/HRC/31/L.69, A/HRC/31/L.70 and A/HRC/31/L.71 to draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.28 as orally revised.

280. Amendments A/HRC/31/L.41, A/HRC/31/L.43 and A/HRC/31/L.62 were sponsored by China, Cuba, Egypt, Pakistan and the Russian Federation, and co-sponsored by the Islamic Republic of Iran. Subsequently, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors. Amendments A/HRC/31/L.42, A/HRC/31/L.44, A/HRC/31/L.47, A/HRC/31/L.48, A/HRC/31/L.49, A/HRC/31/L.50, A/HRC/31/L.55, A/HRC/31/L.56, A/HRC/31/L.59, A/HRC/31/L.60, A/HRC/31/L.61, A/HRC/31/L.64, A/HRC/31/L.66, A/HRC/31/L.67, A/HRC/31/L.68, A/HRC/31/L.69, A/HRC/31/L.70 and A/HRC/31/L.71 were sponsored by China, Cuba, Egypt, Pakistan and the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors. Amendments A/HRC/31/L.45, A/HRC/31/L.51, A/HRC/31/L.54, A/HRC/31/L.57 and A/HRC/31/L.63 were sponsored by China, Cuba, Egypt, Pakistan and the Russian Federation, and co-sponsored by the Islamic Republic of Iran. Subsequently, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors. Amendments A/HRC/31/L.46, A/HRC/31/L.53 and A/HRC/31/L.58 were sponsored by China, Cuba, Egypt, Pakistan and the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.65 was sponsored by China, Egypt, Pakistan and the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors.

281. At the same meeting, the representatives of Belgium, France, Germany, Latvia, Namibia and Panama (also on behalf of Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay) made general comments on draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.28 as orally revised and on the proposed amendments.

282. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council took action on amendments A/HRC/31/L.41, A/HRC/31/L.43, A/HRC/31/L.46 and A/HRC/31/L.58 (see also paras. 283–285 below).

283. At the same meeting, the representatives of Germany, Panama and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendments A/HRC/31/L.41, A/HRC/31/L.43, A/HRC/31/L.46 and A/HRC/31/L.58.

284. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendments A/HRC/31/L.41, A/HRC/31/L.43, A/HRC/31/L.46 and A/HRC/31/L.58. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former

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

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

285. The Human Rights Council rejected amendments A/HRC/31/L.41, A/HRC/31/L.43, A/HRC/31/L.46 and A/HRC/31/L.58 by 14 votes to 22, with 10 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>

286. At the same meeting, the representatives of Georgia and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.42.

287. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.42. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Morocco, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

288. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.42 by 20 votes to 14, with 12 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>

289. At the same meeting, the representatives of Latvia, Mexico and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.44.

290. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.44. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Namibia, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

291. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.44 by 21 votes to 14, with 11 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>

292. At the same meeting, the representatives of Georgia and the Netherlands made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.45.

---

<sup>5</sup> The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.



293. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.45. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Namibia, Philippines, South Africa, Togo

294. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.45 by 20 votes to 13, with 13 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>

295. At the same meeting, the representatives of Belgium and Latvia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.47.

296. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.47. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Maldives, Namibia, Philippines, South Africa, Togo

297. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.47 by 21 votes to 15, with 10 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>

298. At the same meeting, the representatives of Georgia and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.48.

299. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.48. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, India, Kenya, Namibia, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

300. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.48 by 23 votes to 12, with 11 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>

301. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico and the Netherlands made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.49.

302. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.49. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Namibia, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

303. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.49 by 22 votes to 13, with 11 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>

304. At the same meeting, the representatives of Portugal and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.50.

305. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.50. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

306. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.50 by 22 votes to 13, with 11 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>

307. At the same meeting, the representatives of France and Latvia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.51.

308. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.51. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Namibia, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

309. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.51 by 21 votes to 12, with 13 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>

310. At the same meeting, the representatives of Albania and Slovenia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.53.

311. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.53. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

312. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.53 by 22 votes to 14, with 10 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>

313. At the same meeting, the representative of Belgium made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.54.

314. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.54. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Namibia, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

315. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.54 by 20 votes to 13, with 13 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>

316. At the same meeting, the representatives of France and Latvia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.55.

317. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.55. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Nigeria, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

318. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.55 by 20 votes to 15, with 11 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>

319. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.56.

320. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.56. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

321. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.56 by 21 votes to 13, with 12 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>

322. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.57.

323. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.57. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Indonesia, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Maldives, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

324. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.57 by 22 votes to 13, with 11 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>

325. At the same meeting, the representatives of Georgia and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.59.

326. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.59. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

327. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.59 by 21 votes to 13, with 12 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>

328. At the same meeting, the representatives of Albania and Mexico made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.60.

329. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.60. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

330. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.60 by 21 votes to 11, with 14 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>

331. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.61.

332. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.61. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay,

Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Namibia, Philippines, South Africa, Togo

333. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.61 by 21 votes to 15, with 10 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>

334. At the same meeting, the representatives of France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.62.

335. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.62. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Philippines, South Africa, Togo

336. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.62 by 22 votes to 13, with 11 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>

337. At the same meeting, the representatives of Panama and Slovenia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.63.

338. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.63. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Philippines, South Africa, Togo

339. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.63 by 21 votes to 13, with 12 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>

340. At the same meeting, the representatives of Albania and Latvia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.64.

341. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.64. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Philippines, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

342. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.64 by 20 votes to 12, with 14 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>

343. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.65. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, India, Nigeria, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

344. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.65 by 20 votes to 12, with 13 abstentions.<sup>6</sup>

345. At the same meeting, the representatives of Albania and Mexico made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.66.

346. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.66. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

<sup>6</sup> The delegations of Cuba and Mongolia did not cast a vote.

347. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.66 by 21 votes to 13, with 12 abstentions.<sup>7</sup>

348. At the same meeting, the representatives of Slovenia and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.67.

349. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.67. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Congo, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

350. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.67 by 22 votes to 13, with 11 abstentions.<sup>7</sup>

351. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.68.

352. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.68. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Congo, Cuba, India, Nigeria, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

353. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.68 by 21 votes to 13, with 12 abstentions.<sup>7</sup>

354. At the same meeting, the representative of France made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.69.

355. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.69. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Congo, Cuba, India, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

<sup>7</sup> The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.



Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

356. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.69 by 22 votes to 12, with 12 abstentions.<sup>7</sup>

357. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.70.

358. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.70. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Congo, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

359. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.70 by 20 votes to 17, with 9 abstentions.<sup>7</sup>

360. At the same meeting, the representative of Latvia made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.71.

361. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.71. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Congo, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Namibia, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

362. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.71 by 20 votes to 14, with 12 abstentions.<sup>7</sup>

363. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Botswana, China, Cuba, Ecuador, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Viet Nam made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

364. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the Russian Federation, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.28 as orally revised. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Albania, Algeria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, South Africa, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), El Salvador, Kenya, Namibia, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela

365. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.28 as orally revised by 33 votes to 6, with 8 abstentions (resolution 31/32).

366. At the 66th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representatives of Côte d'Ivoire and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

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

367. At the 66th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representatives of Costa Rica, Switzerland and Turkey introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.21, sponsored by Costa Rica, Switzerland and Turkey, and co-sponsored by Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Ghana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Tunisia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Croatia, Cyprus, Djibouti, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Japan, Morocco, the Netherlands, Panama, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

368. At the same meeting, the representative of Switzerland orally revised the draft resolution.

369. Also at the same meeting, the President announced that amendments A/HRC/31/L.73 and A/HRC/31/L.77 to draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.21 as orally revised had been withdrawn.

370. At the same meeting, the representative of China introduced amendments A/HRC/31/L.72, A/HRC/31/L.74, A/HRC/31/L.75, A/HRC/31/L.76, A/HRC/31/L.78 and A/HRC/31/L.79 to draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.21 as orally revised.

371. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.72 was sponsored by China, Cuba, Iran (Islamic Republic of) and the Russian Federation, and co-sponsored by Egypt. Subsequently, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.74 was sponsored by China, Egypt and the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Bangladesh, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.75 was sponsored by China, Cuba, Iran (Islamic Republic of) and the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Bangladesh, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors. Amendments A/HRC/31/L.76 and A/HRC/31/L.78 were sponsored by China, Cuba, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of) and the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.79 was sponsored by China,

Cuba, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Pakistan and the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors.

372. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Switzerland made a statement on the proposed amendments to draft resolution A/HRC/L.21 as orally revised.

373. At the same meeting, the representatives of France, Namibia, the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and South Africa made general comments on draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.21 as orally revised and on the proposed amendments.

374. At the same meeting, the representatives of Panama and Slovenia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.72.

375. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.72. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Congo, Cuba, India, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Algeria, Belgium, Botswana, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Nigeria, Qatar, Togo

376. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.72 by 23 votes to 12, with 11 abstentions.<sup>7</sup>

377. At the same meeting, the representatives of Albania and Belgium made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.74.

378. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.74. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, India, Kyrgyzstan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Algeria, Belgium, Botswana, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Namibia, Nigeria, Togo

379. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.74 by 23 votes to 12, with 10 abstentions.<sup>8</sup>

380. At the same meeting, the representatives of Georgia, the Netherlands and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.75.

<sup>8</sup> The delegations of Cuba and Mongolia did not cast a vote.

381. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.75. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

*Against:*

Albania, Algeria, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Congo, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Nigeria, Togo, Viet Nam

382. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.75 by 23 votes to 17, with 6 abstentions.<sup>9</sup>

383. At the same meeting, the representatives of Paraguay and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.76.

384. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.76. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Congo, Cuba, India, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Algeria, Belgium, Botswana, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Nigeria, Togo

385. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.76 by 24 votes to 13, with 9 abstentions.<sup>9</sup>

386. At the same meeting, the representatives of Georgia and the Netherlands made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.78.

387. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.78. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Kenya, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Algeria, Belgium, Botswana, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former

<sup>9</sup> The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.

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

*Abstaining:*

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

388. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.78 by 23 votes to 13, with 10 abstentions.<sup>9</sup>

389. At the same meeting, the representatives of Germany and Latvia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.79.

390. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.79. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Kyrgyzstan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Algeria, Belgium, Botswana, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Namibia, Nigeria, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

391. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/31/L.79 by 22 votes to 13, with 11 abstentions.<sup>9</sup>

392. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, China, Cuba, India, Morocco, the Russian Federation and Viet Nam made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

393. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of China, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.21 as orally revised. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Albania, Algeria, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Namibia, Nigeria, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam

394. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.21 as orally revised by 31 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions<sup>10</sup> (resolution 31/37).

395. At the 66th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

<sup>10</sup> The delegation of the Congo did not cast a vote.

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

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

396. At the 38th meeting, on 15 March 2016, the Chair of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic, Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro, presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 28/20, the report of the Commission (A/HRC/31/68).

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

398. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, also at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Chair questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria, Belgium, China, Cuba, Ecuador, France, Germany, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf), Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Estonia, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Malaysia, New Zealand, Romania, Senegal, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden (also on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Norway), Tunisia, Turkey, United States of America, Holy See;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alliance Defending Freedom, Allied Rainbow Communities International (also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association), Arab Commission for Human Rights, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Child Foundation, Ecumenical Alliance for Human Rights and Development, Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

399. At the same meeting, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic made final remarks as the State concerned.

400. Also at the same meeting, the Chair answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

#### Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

401. At the 34th meeting, on 14 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Marzuki Darusman, presented his report (A/HRC/31/70 and Corr.1).

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Botswana, China, Cuba, France, Germany, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belarus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic,

Lithuania, New Zealand, Norway, Slovakia, Spain, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, People for Successful Corean Reunification, United Nations Watch.

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

#### **Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea**

404. At the 34th meeting, on 14 March 2016, the Human Rights Council heard an oral update of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea, Sheila B. Keetharuth.

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

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

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

(b) Representatives of observer States: Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Norway, Sudan, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project (also on behalf of Reporters sans frontières international), Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'homme, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, United Nations Watch, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

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

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

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

409. At the 35th meeting, on 14 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ahmed Shaheed, presented his report (A/HRC/31/69).

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

411. 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: Belgium, China, Cuba, France, Germany, Russian Federation, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belarus, Canada, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Iraq, Israel, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Allied Rainbow Communities International, Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, Baha'i International

Community, Child Foundation, Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Prevention Association of Social Harms, Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

412. At the same meeting, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran made final remarks as the State concerned.

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

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

414. At the 36th meeting, on 14 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, Yanghee Lee, presented her report (A/HRC/31/71).

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

416. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 36th and 37th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Belgium, China, Cuba, France, Ghana, India, Netherlands, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam (also on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belarus, Cambodia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Estonia, Ireland, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Human Rights Now, Human Rights Watch, International Bar Association (also on behalf of the International Commission of Jurists), International Educational Development, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Jubilee Campaign.

417. At the 37th meeting, on the same day, the representative of Myanmar made final remarks as the State concerned.

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

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

419. At the 39th meeting, on 15 March 2016, the Deputy High Commissioner presented, in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 28/22, the comprehensive report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the role and achievements of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights with regard to the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (A/HRC/31/38).

420. At the same meeting, the Deputy High Commissioner provided, pursuant to Human Rights Council Resolution 29/18, an oral update on progress in the cooperation between Eritrea and OHCHR.

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

422. At its 39th and 40th meetings, on 15 March 2016, 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: Belgium, Canada<sup>11</sup> (also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America), China, Cuba, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of)<sup>11</sup> (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Myanmar<sup>11</sup> (also on behalf of Belarus, China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, India, Nicaragua, the Sudan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe), Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union), Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Canada, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Eritrea, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Japan, Montenegro, Norway, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sudan, Ukraine, United States of America;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Africa culture internationale, African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, African Development Association, African Regional Agricultural Credit Association, Agence internationale pour le développement, Al-Hakim Foundation, Alliance Defending Freedom, Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Association Dunenyo, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Baha'i International Community, British Humanist Association, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Canners International Permanent Committee, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, Center for Global Nonkilling (also on behalf of Conscience and Peace Tax International), Centre Europe-tiers monde, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Chant du guépard dans le désert, Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims, Child Foundation, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations (also on behalf of B'nai B'rith International), European Union of Public Relations, Family Health Association of Iran, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Freedom House, Helios Life Association, Human Rights Watch, Il Cenacolo, Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, Indian Council of Education, Indian Council of South America, Institute for Women's Studies and Research, Institute on Human Rights and the Holocaust, Integrated Youth Empowerment – Common Initiative Group, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Association of Democratic Lawyers (also on behalf of Centre Europe-tiers monde), International Commission of Jurists, International Educational Development, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Institute for Non-Aligned Studies, International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations, International Lesbian and Gay Association, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (also on behalf of the Shimin Gaikou Centre), International Muslim Women's Union, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Service for Human Rights, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Iranian Elite Research Center (also on behalf of Agence pour les droits de l'homme), Iraqi Development Organization, Islamic Women's Institute of Iran, Liberation, Minority Rights Group, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Pan African Union for Science and Technology, Peivande Gole Narges Organization, Prahaz, Presse emblème campagne, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme (also on behalf of Espace Afrique International, Solidarité

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

Suisse-Guinée and the Women's Federation for World Peace International), Society for Development and Community Empowerment, Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of the Environment, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, United Schools International, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Victorious Youths Movement, Women's Human Rights International Association, World Barua Organization, World Environment and Resources Council, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress.

423. At the 41st meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Bahrain, Burundi, China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Indonesia, Japan, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, Uzbekistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

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

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

425. At the 63rd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representatives of Japan and the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.25, sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Canada, Georgia, Iceland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Maldives, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine and the United States of America. Subsequently, Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica, Honduras, Micronesia (Federated States of), New Zealand, Palau, San Marino and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

426. At the same meeting, the representative of Indonesia made general comments on the draft resolution.

427. 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.

428. At the same meeting, the representatives of Bangladesh, China, Cuba, Ecuador, the Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela disassociated the member State from the consensus on the draft resolution.

429. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 31/18).

### **The human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic**

430. At the 63rd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (also on behalf of France, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and the United States of America) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.5, 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, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Liechtenstein, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

and Ukraine. Subsequently, Bahrain, Canada, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Honduras, Norway, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Switzerland and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors.

431. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Ecuador, the Netherlands, the Russian Federation and Switzerland made general comments on the draft resolution.

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

433. 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.

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

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

*In favour:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Bangladesh, Burundi, Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Nigeria, Philippines, South Africa, Viet Nam

436. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 27 votes to 6, with 14 abstentions (resolution 31/17).

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

437. At the 63rd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Sweden (also on behalf of the Republic of Moldova, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.27, sponsored by 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, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, New Zealand, San Marino and Seychelles joined the sponsors.

438. Also at the same meeting, in accordance with rule 116 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela moved the adjournment of the consideration of the draft resolution.

439. Subsequently, the representatives of China and the Russian Federation made statements in favour of the motion. The representatives of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements against the motion.

440. Under the same rule, a recorded vote was taken on the motion to adjourn the consideration of the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, El Salvador, France, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Burundi, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Togo

441. The Human Rights Council rejected the motion to adjourn the consideration of the draft resolution as orally revised by 23 votes to 14, with 9 abstentions.<sup>12</sup>

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

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

444. 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.

445. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, China, Cuba, Mexico, Paraguay, the Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

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

*In favour:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, El Salvador, France, Germany, Latvia, Mexico, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Against:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Abstaining:*

Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Ghana, Maldives, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Philippines, Togo

447. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 20 votes to 15, with 11 abstentions<sup>12</sup> (resolution 31/19).

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

448. At the 63rd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representatives of Albania (also on behalf of Paraguay, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America), Paraguay and the United States of America introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.33, sponsored by Albania, Paraguay, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, and co-sponsored by Australia, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia and Spain. Subsequently, Andorra, Austria, Bosnia and

<sup>12</sup> The delegation of Georgia did not cast a vote.

Herzegovina, Chile, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, San Marino, Senegal, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

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

450. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria and the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

451. At the same meeting, the representative of South Sudan made a statement as the State concerned.

452. 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 Programme Support and Management Services of OHCHR made a statement on the budgetary implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

453. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Cuba, Ecuador and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution. In their statements, the representatives of China, Ecuador and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) disassociated their respective member States from the consensus on the draft resolution as orally revised.

454. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 31/20).

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

455. At the 64th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of the Netherlands, on behalf of the European Union, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.30/Rev.1, sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Costa Rica, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and the United States of America. Subsequently, Israel, the Republic of Korea, Serbia and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

456. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Indonesia, the Philippines and Viet Nam made general comments on the draft resolution.

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

458. 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.

459. At the same meeting, the representatives of Cuba, Ecuador, India, the Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution. In their statements, the representatives of Ecuador, the Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) disassociated their respective member States from the consensus on the draft resolution.

460. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 31/24).

## V. Human rights bodies and mechanisms

### A. Forum on Minority Issues

461. At the 42nd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on minority issues, Rita Izsák, presented the recommendations adopted by the Forum on Minority Issues at its eighth session, convened on 24 and 25 November 2015 (A/HRC/31/72).

### B. Special procedures

462. At the 42nd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Chair of the Coordination Committee of Special Procedures, Michael K. Addo, presented the report of the twenty-second annual meeting of special rapporteurs and representatives, independent experts and working groups of the special procedures of the Human Rights Council, including updated information on the special procedures, which was held in Geneva from 8 to 12 June 2015 (A/HRC/31/39).

### C. General debate on agenda item 5

463. At its 42nd meeting, on 15 March 2016, and its 49th meeting, on 18 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: Belgium, China, Cuba, Ghana, Netherlands (also on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), Russian Federation, Uruguay<sup>13</sup> (also on behalf of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Austria, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Pakistan, Republic of Moldova, Spain, Tunisia;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa culture internationale, African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, Agence internationale pour le développement, Alliance Defending Freedom, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Canners International Permanent Committee, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, European Union of Public Relations, Friends World Committee for Consultation, Fundación Latinoamericana por los Derechos Humanos y el Desarrollo Social, Global Network for Rights and Development, Indian Council of South America, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Association of Democratic Lawyers (also on behalf of Centre Europe-tiers monde), International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations, International Service for Human Rights, Iraqi Development Organization, Kham Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Minority Rights Group, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Pan African Union for Science and Technology, Prahar, World Barua Organization, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress.

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

## VI. Universal periodic review

464. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 60/251, Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, Council decision 17/119 and President's statements PRST/8/1 and PRST/9/2 on modalities and practices for the universal periodic review process, the Council considered the outcome of the reviews conducted during the twenty-third session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, held from 2 to 13 November 2015.

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

### A. Consideration of the universal periodic review outcomes

466. 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.

#### Federated States of Micronesia

467. The review of the Federated States of Micronesia was held on 2 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by the Federated States of Micronesia in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/FSM/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/FSM/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/FSM/3).

468. At its 42nd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the Federated States of Micronesia (see sect. C below).

469. The outcome of the review of the Federated States of Micronesia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/4), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/31/4/Add.1).

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

470. The delegation of the Federated States of Micronesia, which was led by the Permanent Representative of the Federated States of Micronesia to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Jane J. Chigiyal, stated that the Federated States of Micronesia had supported 2 recommendations during its review in November 2015 and had taken back the remaining 93 recommendations, which had been shared with the task force on the universal periodic review.

471. Many of the recommendations from the second cycle of the universal periodic review were the same as those that had been made during the first cycle, which was an indication of the challenges that the Federated States of Micronesia faced and would continue to face in their implementation.

472. The head of the delegation assured the Human Rights Council that the task force on the universal periodic review had undertaken a number of consultative activities to raise awareness about the State's commitments, as reflected in the addendum (A/HRC/31/4/Add.1), and what needed to be done and how it needed to be done, and to chart a way forward.

473. The head of the delegation emphasized the fact that the Government had supported 63 of the 95 recommendations, and that the remaining 32 recommendations that it had noted formed part of a workplan that would involve many public-awareness activities and a reassessment of the Government's human and institutional capacities so that it would be able to harmonize its policies and mainstream a people-centred approach. She further stated that such an approach would take into consideration the State's internal process on treaty ratification/accession and implementation, and constitutional reform.

474. The head of the delegation also stressed the importance of taking ownership of the process to ensure that the Federated States of Micronesia lived up to its commitments and to ensure that the process was sustainable.

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

475. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Federated States of Micronesia, eight delegations made statements.

476. Fiji welcomed the commitment of the Federated States of Micronesia to remove the reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, as recommended by States during its second review, and its work towards completing its national gender policy. At the same time, it urged the State to take concrete and rapid measures to address issues relating to domestic violence and gender inequalities, and it offered to provide assistance or partnership on such matters.

477. Nigeria commended the Federated States of Micronesia for its ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict and for its continued efforts to review the remaining core human rights treaties for ratification. It welcomed the Government's efforts, along with those of the four States in the country, to work towards enacting laws to implement its human rights obligations and to strengthen the existing human rights mechanisms, including institutions that would further promote children's rights and address violence against women.

478. Pakistan noted with appreciation the commitment of the Federated States of Micronesia to develop socioeconomic plans that take human rights concerns into consideration. Despite the challenges, the State was committed to engaging with the United Nations and development partners to promote and strengthen human rights protection in the country.

479. Sierra Leone was encouraged by the establishment of a task force on human rights and the universal periodic review to assist in the implementation processes relating to the ratification of international instruments. It had noted the Government's intention to seek assistance from and to collaborate with development partners to devise viable strategies for preventing violence against women and for empowering women. It commended the State for its ongoing efforts to protect the rights of the child, including by having drafted its second periodic country report with a view to submitting it to the Committee on the Rights of the Child in the near future. However, Sierra Leone encouraged the Government to raise the minimum age of consent to 18 years.

480. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela noted that the Federated States of Micronesia had made progress in fulfilling its human rights obligations despite the challenges of geographical dispersion and climate change. The State had ratified several international human rights instruments and enacted important laws, such as the law against trafficking in persons. It encouraged the Government to continue to strengthen its successful social policies in favour of its people, especially the most vulnerable.

481. China welcomed the fact that the Federated States of Micronesia had supported most of the recommendations received, including the one made by China on reducing violence



against women. China encouraged the State to gradually implement the recommendations it had supported and urged the international community to provide the Federated States of Micronesia with the necessary technical assistance and support.

482. Cuba highlighted the progress made by the Federated States of Micronesia in the area of human rights, including the policy on disability, the ratification of several international human rights instruments and the approval of the law against trafficking in persons. It urged the international community to respond positively to the State's request for assistance to coordinate its initiatives on human rights. The Federated States of Micronesia had accepted two recommendations made by Cuba on continuing to work towards the creation of a national gender policy and on continuing to fight the consequences of climate change.

483. Estonia welcomed the positive approach of the Federated States of Micronesia, as the latter had supported most of the recommendations. They were on a wide range of issues, including on ratifying core human rights treaties. Estonia had also positively noted the Government's commitment to tackle issues relating to trafficking in persons and to strengthen gender equality and the empowerment of women, including by having completed its national gender policy. At the same time, Estonia regretted that various recommendations on domestic violence and violence against women and the removal of reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women had not enjoyed the support of the Government, while it took note of the State's assurance that it would continue to implement measures to address those issues.

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

484. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Federated States of Micronesia, two other stakeholders made statements.

485. United Nations Watch stated that respect for human rights and the founding principles of the Charter of the United Nations were manifest not only by a government's domestic policy and practice but also by the degree to which it supported the promotion and protection of human rights in the international arena. The Federated States of Micronesia had taken firm and principled positions in support of peace, human rights and equality principles. While noting that, due to its small size, the Federated States of Micronesia had no delegation in Geneva, United Nations Watch expressed concern that a State Member of the United Nations was effectively denied the right to participate in the vital day-to-day mechanisms of the United Nations human rights system, including the Human Rights Council and the treaty bodies. On the tenth anniversary of the Human Rights Council, United Nations Watch invited the host country and the United Nations as a whole to find ways and means to ensure the full participation of all States Members of the United Nations in fulfilling the Charter's promise of equality for all nations, large and small.

486. United Schools International noted that the law of the Federated States of Micronesia provided effective means of addressing reported human rights abuses. In recent years, only judicial delays, incidences of domestic violence, child neglect and allegations of government corruption had been reported. There were neither reports of government actions affecting constitutional guarantees on the free exercise of religion nor those of significant societal actions affecting religious freedom.

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

487. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 95 recommendations received, 63 had enjoyed the support of the Federated States of Micronesia and 32 had been noted.

488. The head of the delegation of the Federated States of Micronesia thanked all the delegations and non-governmental organizations for their constructive comments. She stressed that the exercise held that day was not only about what the Federated States of Micronesia was striving to do, but also about learning from each other with regard to best practices. The forum provided the venue for States to forge partnerships in order to help each other to advance, promote and safeguard the rights of their people.

489. The universal periodic review had provided the Federated States of Micronesia with an opportunity to review and take stock of its work, and also to work with other States to help lift each other towards the same goals.

490. The head of the delegation emphasized the fact that one could not talk about human rights without talking about the greatest challenge for the Federated States of Micronesia, namely the adverse impacts of climate change, which spoke to the country's right to develop and exist as a people.

### **Lebanon**

491. The review of Lebanon was held on 2 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Lebanon in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/LBN/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/LBN/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/LBN/3).

492. At its 43rd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Lebanon (see sect. C below).

493. The outcome of the review of Lebanon comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/5), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/31/5/Add.1).

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

494. The delegation, which was led by the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Najla Riachi Assaker, presented the position of Lebanon on the recommendations: out of the 219 recommendations Lebanon had received, it had accepted 128, partially accepted 2 and noted 89. In sum, Lebanon had accepted approximately 60 per cent of the recommendations received. The delegation emphasized the fact that Lebanon was faithful to all of its international obligations, especially in the field of human rights, despite the exceptional, difficult and sensitive times Lebanon was experiencing with fighting terrorism, as well as with the impacts of the unprecedented number of refugees and Syrian displaced persons on the social, political, financial and economic stability of the country. The delegation affirmed the commitment of Lebanon to the universal periodic review mechanism, which was an important part of promoting human rights in all States. It also confirmed the commitment of Lebanon to all human rights treaties and mechanisms; it considered that the continuous cooperation with them was essential to strengthen the human rights situation in the country. Lebanon saw that commitment within a wider frame of credibility and transparency, which had pushed the State to accept the recommendations that could actually be implemented before its next review, to be held in 2020.

495. The delegation clarified that a high percentage of the recommendations that Lebanon had noted could have been accepted, and that it would have been easier for Lebanon to have accepted them, if it were not for the insistence that the State's commitments should always be affiliated with credibility. In that context, Lebanon would not hesitate to contact the secretariat of OHCHR, responsible for the universal periodic review mechanism, concerning any other additional recommendations that could be applicable, even if they had not originally been accepted. Furthermore, the delegation clarified that the majority of the

recommendations that Lebanon had noted had not been accepted because their implementation could not be ensured in the upcoming years. Thus, Lebanon had decided to accept those recommendations that it could implement.

496. Lebanon saw the universal periodic review as a mechanism that encouraged and stimulated the strengthening of the human rights situation, which had been the State's aim since its first universal periodic review. However, the difficult situation in the region, in addition to the challenges that Lebanon in particular was facing, had undoubtedly had a negative impact on attempts to improve the human rights situation in the country.

497. Lebanon was a unique model of diversity and an oasis of coexistence for all different religions and sects, which was needed more than ever in a region where violence, extremism and wars were increasing. Additionally, the report of the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, on his visit to Lebanon (A/HRC/31/18/Add.1), which had been presented before the Human Rights Council the previous week, was additional proof of the fact that there was space for religious freedom in the country despite the difficult circumstances. That was an important matter for Lebanon; it was known as a country that upheld freedom. Indeed, the principles of human rights were enshrined in the Constitution of Lebanon, and the State had incorporated the Universal Declaration of Human Rights – the draft of which Lebanon was a key contributor – into the preamble of its Constitution. Moreover, freedom of expression, protected constitutionally, was manifest in Lebanese political life and in the various activities of political parties and unions and was reflected in the large number and variety of the media, where freedom of political expression was guaranteed.

498. Lebanon was well aware that a number of matters affecting the lives of its citizens needed further improvement. The Government of Lebanon did not spare any effort to try to tackle the situation, despite the fact that those matters did not represent the overall environment that prevailed in the country. There, the important role played by civil society organizations, as well as human rights activists, was most evident. The flourishing of those organizations and their active role were additional proof of the freedoms they enjoyed, and of the aspirations of the Government to promote the culture of human rights and to monitor and highlight human rights violations.

499. Lebanon had never closed its borders to any person fleeing persecution despite the fact that the State had not ratified the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and despite its limited resources. It highlighted the fact that the world had recently witnessed the dangerous challenges that were faced by Europe, even with its economic and political stability and its vast geography, caused by the flow of thousands of refugees. The delegation asked how a country as small as Lebanon could endure such a situation and confirmed that the State was committed to respecting the principles of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, despite not having signed it, in a better way than most countries that had ratified it but had never abided by its contents.

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

500. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Lebanon, 17 delegations made statements.<sup>14</sup>

501. Afghanistan appreciated the strong commitment of Lebanon to spread the culture of human rights through its educational curriculum, awareness-raising campaigns and continued efforts to strengthen human rights for all citizens without distinction. It also appreciated the attention given by the Government of Lebanon to refugees and to the recommendations on that matter in order to strengthen the legal framework by promoting the human rights, security and well-being of refugees and migrants in Lebanon.

502. Albania was satisfied with the steps taken by Lebanon to implement the national human rights plan and the law to protect women against domestic violence. It appreciated the

<sup>14</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/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx>.

efforts made in response to the Syrian refugee situation and acknowledged the challenges affecting Lebanon, including the influx of refugees and the threat of terrorism. It encouraged Lebanon to step up its work on implementing all of the recommendations from States, including those on making continued efforts to improve the functioning of the educational system and taking the measures necessary to ensure the effective protection against discrimination of all migrant domestic workers.

503. Algeria congratulated Lebanon on its progress in different areas of human rights, particularly in promoting economic, social and cultural rights, the legislative measures it had taken regarding women rights, the drafting of a bill to establish a national human rights institution, the adoption of a national plan to integrate persons with disabilities and the amendments to the legislation to criminalize torture. It appreciated the State's submission of its overdue reports to the human rights treaty bodies. Despite all of the difficulties, Lebanon continued to make maximum efforts to promote and protect human rights.

504. Armenia appreciated the positive engagement of Lebanon with the Human Rights Council in the universal periodic review process and commended the State for having accepted a significant number of recommendations, including those made by Armenia, which indicated the commitment of Lebanon to the protection and promotion of human rights in the country. It highly appreciated the promotion of diversity and tolerance between different ethnic groups living in Lebanon.

505. Belgium commended Lebanon for having accepted the recommendation on criminalizing torture, pursuant to article 1 of the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and on fighting impunity in that area. It regretted that the three other recommendations made by Belgium had not been accepted. Lebanon should commit to the abolition of the death penalty for all crimes and consider a de jure moratorium on executions. It acknowledged the burden on Lebanon and expressed its solidarity with the people that had generously welcomed an amazing number of refugees who were the victims of the Syrian conflict. It recommended that Lebanon ratify and implement the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its Protocol. Certain forms of discrimination continued to exist against women and refugees from Palestine, and Belgium recommended that the Government of Lebanon continue its efforts to rectify that issue.

506. China appreciated the constructive engagement of Lebanon with the universal periodic review. It thanked the State for having accepted its recommendations on fighting terrorism in order to provide a security guarantee for the enjoyment of human rights, on positively considering the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and on protecting the rights of persons with disabilities in education, employment and participation in public and political life. It was concerned about the challenges currently faced by Lebanon, such as terrorist threats and the presence of Syrian refugees, and it called upon the international community to provide Lebanon with support.

507. Côte d'Ivoire welcomed the interest shown by Lebanon in all the recommendations made during the universal periodic review and it thanked the State for having accepted the recommendations made by Côte d'Ivoire. It was convinced that the implementation of the recommendations would contribute effectively to the strengthening of measures to promote the enjoyment of all human rights in the country. It welcomed the measures taken by the Government to strengthen security in the country and it encouraged Lebanon to continue its efforts and cooperation with all the human rights mechanisms.

508. Cuba recognized the progress made by Lebanon in human rights and particularly the establishment of a national plan for the integration of persons with disabilities and the adoption of a national law on domestic violence. It appreciated the fact that the country had borne in mind the two recommendations made by Cuba, through which it had invited Lebanon to continue to implement the programme to support the poorest families, and to explore measures to reduce the elevated health-care costs and the discrepancies in the quality of the provision of those services.

509. Egypt commended Lebanon for having cooperated with the human rights mechanisms and congratulated the State for having accepted 128 recommendations. It also commended the State for its continuous efforts to promote human rights, particularly through the hosting of more than a million and a half Syrian refugees – about half of its population – in addition

to having hosted half a million Palestinian refugees since 1948. Lebanon was a model for others to learn from. Egypt appreciated the national human rights plan 2014–2019 and the efforts to provide security and military forces with human rights training and awareness programmes, and the adoption of a large number of laws and the 10-year national strategy for women.

510. Gabon welcomed the commitment of Lebanon to follow up on the universal periodic review recommendations the State had supported during the review. It noted the efforts to improve human rights, and particularly those to improve the institutional and normative framework despite the difficult political and economic context. It paid tribute to the actions taken for migrants and the efforts made to combat terrorism, trafficking in persons and torture in places of detention. It encouraged Lebanon to continue its efforts pursuant to the universal periodic review recommendations.

511. Indonesia was honoured to be a member of the troika for the review of Lebanon and commended the State for its commitment during the process. It appreciated the acceptance by the State of the recommendations Indonesia had made on redoubling efforts to finalize the establishment of an independent national human rights institution in accordance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles), and on continuing efforts to adopt various national human rights policies based on the national human rights plan 2014–2019 and providing the budgetary requirements necessary for the actual implementation of those policies.

512. The Islamic Republic of Iran stated that Lebanon had actively participated in the universal periodic review process, which demonstrated the State's commitment to the work of the Human Rights Council. Two of the recommendations made by the Islamic Republic of Iran during the review of Lebanon had been accepted, which was a clear demonstration of the State's commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights.

513. Iraq commended Lebanon for having abided by its obligations under international treaties, its cooperation with the human rights mechanisms and its acceptance of most of the universal periodic review recommendations, including those made by Iraq. It welcomed the measures taken on policy issues relating to freedom of the press, freedom of expression, freedom of religion and belief, education, health and housing, combating domestic violence and combating trafficking in persons. It also commended the State for its efforts to strengthen women's rights and gender equality, democracy and the independence of the judiciary.

514. Jordan appreciated the acceptance by Lebanon of most of the recommendations made during the universal periodic review, including those made by Jordan. That reflected the State's continuous commitment to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms, despite the crises and great challenges that Lebanon was facing economically and financially as a result of having received Syrian refugees. Jordan was confident that Lebanon would continue to intensify its efforts during the coming years to implement the recommendations it had accepted.

515. Kuwait appreciated the position of Lebanon on the universal periodic review recommendations. Through its intellectual, cultural and religious diversity, Lebanon was a model to follow in promoting and protecting human rights. That was despite the economic and political challenges and exceptional circumstances, and the fact that the State had received more than 1.5 million Syrians since 2011. It noted the State's commitment to cooperate with all the United Nations human rights procedures and mechanisms. Lebanon had shown its readiness to continue its international cooperation and positive dialogue on all human rights issues.

516. Libya thanked Lebanon for its active participation in the universal periodic review. It commended the State for its efforts to promote and protect human rights and to confront all the challenges it faced despite the difficult circumstances the State was enduring. Libya appreciated the State's acceptance of many of the recommendations that had been made, and it wished the State success.

517. Malaysia recognized the humanitarian assistance Lebanon offered to people fleeing conflict and persecution, despite the many economic, social and security challenges the State faced. It encouraged Lebanon to continue its endeavours to promote and protect human rights

in the country. Malaysia was pleased that Lebanon had accepted its recommendations on continuing its positive efforts to ensure the effective implementation of its national human rights plan, including by seeking the necessary technical and financial assistance.

### 3. General comments made by other stakeholders

518. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Lebanon, nine other stakeholders made statements.<sup>15</sup>

519. United Nations Watch pointed out that the purpose of the review was to make a difference on the ground by holding Governments to account. It asked if human rights activists supported or objected to the report on the human rights record of Lebanon. It quoted six paragraphs from the report that commended or acknowledged the progress and commitment of Lebanon to human rights issues, and said the truth was the opposite, which was that the State's human rights record received a negative rating, including on civil liberties and political rights, and, as reported, it denied Palestinians their universal human rights, including the freedom to work in numerous professions and to earn a living. For all of those reasons, it believed that the victims of human rights abuse and terrorism around the world objected to the adoption of the report.

520. The Arab Commission for Human Rights commended Lebanon for its acceptance of the recommendations on ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, as well as the recommendations on preventing and criminalizing torture, and amending the State's legislation in accordance with the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. It called upon Lebanon to accelerate the establishment of the national mechanism for the prevention of torture, under the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. It expressed concern about the fact that Lebanon had noted the recommendations relating to Palestinian refugees, particularly the recommendations contained in paragraphs 132.40 and 132.167, and 132.154 on registering refugee children born in Lebanon and issuing the necessary documents. It hoped that Lebanon would submit its periodic reports to the treaty bodies and establish a national system for reporting and follow-up on the implementation of the recommendations, in accordance with the recommendations it had accepted. It urged Lebanon to report on the progress of the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted and present a midterm report.

521. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland, also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association, noted that Lebanon had received seven different recommendations relating to sexual orientation and gender issues. It was not satisfied with the State's response to the calls for the decriminalization of homosexuality, calling it ambiguous with no moral or reasonable justification. It questioned the continued arrests, if article 534 was indeed enforced lightly and court rulings were being acknowledged, and how it justified the continued utilization of illegal methods to prove homosexuality. It urged Lebanon to uphold human rights and dignity. The LGBTQ community was frequently facing discrimination, with limited safeguards in the absence of laws and procedures. It reported police abuse and the deprivation of health and work rights with impunity for perpetrators. They called for the immediate end of aggression towards and harassment of Syrian lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender refugees.

522. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom recognized that Lebanon had been facing deep sociopolitical turmoil but still had international obligations to adhere to with respect to women's rights. It was alarmed that Lebanon had not explicitly accepted any of the recommendations on lifting its reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women or on amending its discriminatory personal

---

<sup>15</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/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx>.

status laws. It urged Lebanon to develop a national action plan according to Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) and regretted that no recommendations had been made by member States on that issue, even though Lebanon was greatly affected by the Syrian conflict. It highlighted the fact that women held only 3.1 per cent of parliamentary seats and that there were no women ministers in the Cabinet. It recommended that Lebanon reach a gender quota of at least 33 per cent. It was concerned about the number of violations to Palestinian and Syrian refugee women and urged that they be protected from gender-based violence and that they be able to seek redress.

523. Action Canada for Population and Development was concerned that the recommendations on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons had been noted. Lebanon had stated that its law didn't criminalize homosexuality, but Action Canada had found that police forces still carried out abuse, citing article 534 of the Penal Code. While Lebanon had accepted recommendations on promoting gender equality, the State had not accepted specific recommendations on domestic violence, rape, adultery, abortion, personal status or nationality, among others. Action Canada urged Lebanon to impose criminal penalties appropriate for violence relating to the aforementioned issues, to criminalize marital rape, to decriminalize seeking and providing abortions, to approve a reproductive health education and gender programme in schools, and to take the measures necessary to allow non-governmental organizations working on the human rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons and of women to register and cooperate with the Government.

524. The International Association for Democracy in Africa stated that, since its independence, Lebanon had been a fundamental actor in the Middle East and in the international community. Tolerance and the encouragement of diversity, as well as a strong political culture, had confirmed the prominence of Lebanon globally. Separation between the branches of the State was a constitutional principle. Lebanon was now in its fifth year of the worst humanitarian crisis since the Second World War, and the number of refugees had stabilized partly as a result of the adoption of border restrictions. The authorities had stepped forward in hosting refugees, but the State could not shoulder that responsibility alone; international support had helped but Lebanon still had many humanitarian needs to fulfil.

525. Amnesty International was disappointed that Lebanon had rejected the recommendations on enforcing the law on the protection of women and family members from domestic violence, on criminalizing marital rape, on withdrawing reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, and on amending the personal status laws to enable women to obtain a divorce and the custody of their children. It recognized the State's efforts in having hosted over a million Syrian refugees, but it rejected the policies the State had implemented on the renewal of residence permits, the State's unwillingness to ratify the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its Protocol, and the violation of the principle of non-refoulement by having forcibly returned Syrian refugees. Amnesty International regretted the rejection by Lebanon of the recommendations on amending the Labour Code and the visa sponsorship system to ensure the legal protection of migrant workers from abuse by their employers.

526. The Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development noted that Lebanon had not withdrawn its reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, which included granting women equal rights with men regarding the nationality of their children and concerned equality in marriage and family relationships to guarantee women's rights to property and inheritance and to freely dispose of their own financial resources. It called upon the Government to amend legislative provisions in order to criminalize marital rape. It urged Lebanon to comply with article 7 of the Convention in order to increase the number of women who could be elected to public office, including through temporary special measures in accordance with article 4 (1) of the Convention.

527. The Kham Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture regretted that Lebanon had not supported the recommendations on abolishing the death penalty and lamented the fact that the State had accepted the same recommendations it had done during its universal periodic review in 2010, most of which remained unimplemented. The Syrian refugee crisis was not an acceptable excuse, and the political instability was due to the differences and

conflicts between politicians and sectarian interests. The human rights situation in Lebanon was verging on a disaster. It called for the Government to establish a timetable for the implementation of and follow up on the recommendations, to start a serious dialogue with civil society and to create a national mechanism or body to ensure the follow-up on the recommendations.

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

528. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 221 recommendations received, 128 had enjoyed the support of Lebanon and 91 had been noted. Additional clarification had been provided on another 2 recommendations, indicating which part of the recommendation had been supported and which part had been noted.

529. In conclusion, the delegation thanked the secretariat for its efforts in preparing the report on Lebanon, and the efforts made by the troika – composed of Indonesia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland – on the day of the review. It also thanked all the delegations that had participated in the universal periodic review, whether in their reports or their recommendations, and those that had showed support.

#### **Mauritania**

530. The review of Mauritania was held on 3 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Mauritania in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/MRT/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/MRT/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/MRT/3).

531. At its 43rd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Mauritania (see sect. C below).

532. The outcome of the review of Mauritania comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/6), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/31/6/Add.1).

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

533. Mauritania reiterated its commitment to cooperate with the universal periodic review mechanism, which allowed for an objective evaluation of the situation of human rights in all countries.

534. Mauritania highly appreciated the fruitful dialogue that had resulted in 200 recommendations, which the State had seriously considered. During its review, Mauritania had accepted 136 recommendations. Some of them had been effectively implemented or were in the process of implementation. It had noted 58 recommendations and postponed its position on 6 recommendations. After careful consideration and consultation with stakeholders, Mauritania had decided to support four and note two of the pending recommendations.

535. The recommendations on ratifying international conventions in line with the Constitution and domestic legislation had been supported.



536. The recommendation on reforming the nationality law to provide women with the capacity to transmit citizenship on an equal basis with men (para. 127.5) had not been supported. The current legislation did not allow women to transmit citizenship to their children automatically.

537. The recommendation on fully implementing the recommendations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (para. 128.6) had also been noted, taking into account the State's reservations to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

538. Mauritania was committed to effectively implementing the recommendations it had supported. The recommendations that it had not supported were in contradiction with the Constitution and could not be implemented.

539. Mauritania had ratified most of the core international human rights instruments and treaties in the field of humanitarian law. Some of the recommendations had not been accepted because they were repetitive, such as those on ratifying the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

540. Mauritania had accepted the majority of the recommendations relating to the protection of women and children. The Government was currently working on implementing a number of policies and strategies to protect women and children, such as the family policy and national strategy for the promotion of the rights of women. In that context, Mauritania referred to preventive measures provided by criminal law and the law on the protection of children.

541. Mauritania had paid particular attention to finishing the drafting of the law on gender-based violence and was also working on establishing an increased number of centres for the reintegration of children. The age of criminal responsibility was set at 15 years and the Labour Code prohibited children from working under that age.

542. Mauritania had also accepted a number of recommendations on cooperating with international human rights mechanisms and had agreed to visits by the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery and, recently, the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. During the current year, the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights and the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences would visit the country.

543. Regarding civil and political rights, the Government was working to implement the recommendations it had supported, particularly to provide an environment of freedom of expression and the prosperity of civil society.

544. Concerning economic and social rights, the third national strategy on poverty reduction had been implemented and had allowed for an improvement in the living conditions of the population and had helped the population to deal with food crises. In the context of the growth and prosperity strategy for 2016–2030, real estate reforms had been implemented. Regarding the right to health, the Government's health policy had been focused on fighting maternal mortality. In the field of education, several programmes had been adopted, particularly to help poor and rural sectors of the population, with a focus on vulnerable groups such as older persons.

545. Moreover, Mauritania would continue to implement the action plan to combat all forms of slavery. In 2015, legislative measures had been adopted to criminalize slavery, and special courts had been established.

546. Mauritania also referred to the action plan to fight racial discrimination, xenophobia and intolerance, and to the two legal frameworks to combat trafficking in persons and trafficking in migrants. In addition, a national committee for human rights had been established in 2012.

547. Lastly, Mauritania expressed its commitment to continue its positive interaction with all of the human rights mechanisms, and was looking forward to establishing a national plan

of action, in cooperation with OHCHR and other partners, aimed at implementing the recommendations it had supported.

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

548. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Mauritania, 17 delegations made statements.<sup>16</sup>

549. Togo thanked Mauritania for having accepted its recommendation calling for the separation of minors from adults in places of detention. It regretted, however, that its recommendation on abolishing the death penalty had not enjoyed the State's support.

550. Tunisia noted the outcome of the universal periodic review and the recommendations that Mauritania had accepted. It welcomed the State's determination to strengthen human rights, the rule of law and the country's institutions. It recommended the adoption of the report of the Working Group and wished Mauritania every success.

551. The United Arab Emirates congratulated Mauritania on its commitment to the universal periodic review and on having accepted a number of recommendations. It highly appreciated the measures taken, in particular regarding economic, social and cultural rights, with a view to guaranteeing sustainable development and social justice. It hoped that Mauritania would take up all the challenges and pursue efforts to carry out reforms to guarantee human dignity and to strengthen the rule of law.

552. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela was pleased that Mauritania had submitted reports to the treaty bodies and had ratified most of the international human rights instruments. It noted with satisfaction that the National Human Rights Commission of Mauritania was in conformity with the Paris Principles and had thus been granted A status. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela acknowledged the efforts made by Mauritania to implement the universal periodic review recommendations it had accepted.

553. Yemen welcomed the efforts of Mauritania to strengthen human rights despite the difficulties it faced. It noted with satisfaction that the State had accepted a large number of recommendations and actively promoted human rights, which proved its determination to improve human rights in all areas. It also welcomed the progress made by Mauritania.

554. Algeria commended Mauritania for its commitment to promote and protect human rights and thanked the State for the additional information provided. It noted progress in Mauritania at several levels, despite the lack of financial resources. It thanked the State for having accepted its recommendations.

555. Angola appreciated the fact that Mauritania had ratified several human rights instruments, particularly the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and that it had adhered to the mechanisms of the African Union. Angola encouraged Mauritania to continue its institutional and legal reforms by adopting measures to facilitate access to justice for all, to further integrate women into the country's social and political life, and to eliminate slavery. Mauritania had adopted effective measures to combat female genital mutilation and to provide equal opportunities for women.

556. Bahrain welcomed the positive and transparent manner in which Mauritania had addressed the different phases of the universal periodic review. It welcomed the State's efforts to provide health-care coverage and to promote and protect the rights of women. It also welcomed the State's attention to issues relating to children, particularly compulsory primary education, and the fight against trafficking in persons. Bahrain appreciated the fact that Mauritania had accepted its two recommendations and it encouraged the State to continue to make additional efforts to implement the recommendations from the universal periodic review.

---

<sup>16</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/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx>.

557. Belgium regretted the fact that none of its recommendations had been accepted by Mauritania, including those on the death penalty. While Belgium welcomed the continued moratorium on executions, it recommended that Mauritania take additional steps to abolish capital punishment de jure. It noted the commutation of all death sentences to prison sentences. It had hoped that the State would have accepted its recommendation on protecting freedom of expression, particularly regarding journalists and human rights defenders. It recommended that Mauritania commit to abolish apostasy from its national legislation.

558. Botswana noted with satisfaction that Mauritania had accepted the majority of the recommendations received during its second universal periodic review. According to Botswana, with international cooperation and capacity-building, Mauritania could do more to address the challenges of implementation. It reiterated its call for support to Mauritania to encourage its efforts in the promotion and protection of human rights.

559. Burundi noted with satisfaction that Mauritania had drafted a national strategy for the protection of children and a national plan of action on female genital mutilation. Burundi commended Mauritania for its cooperation with all the human rights mechanisms and for the creation of a national human rights institution. It welcomed the establishment of the interministerial standing committee to prepare reports for international mechanisms.

560. Chad commended Mauritania for its commitment to the second universal periodic review, and in particular its efforts to implement the recommendations it had accepted during its first universal periodic review. Mauritania had a legal and institutional human rights framework that was constantly improving. It noted in particular that slavery and torture were considered crimes against humanity. The National Human Rights Commission was recognized by the Constitution, and the reservation to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women had been withdrawn.

561. China commended Mauritania for having accepted the majority of the recommendations, and in particular its recommendations on continuing to fight against slavery and on implementing the third national strategy on poverty reduction in order to improve the living conditions of its population. It congratulated Mauritania on its achievements relating to the Millennium Development Goals, in particular regarding the right to food. It called upon the international community to continue to provide Mauritania with financial assistance in order for the country to improve its human rights situation.

562. The Congo thanked Mauritania for having accepted most of recommendations made during its previous universal periodic review. Mauritania faced major challenges, including economic and climate challenges, which could have a negative impact on the implementation of some of those recommendations and thus required coordinated joint international action. The Congo called upon the international community and development partners to continue to increase their assistance to Mauritania.

563. Cote d'Ivoire encouraged Mauritania to implement the recommendations in order to ensure the full enjoyment of human rights in the country. It invited the State to consolidate its efforts to promote gender equality and to fight against discrimination stereotypes. It encouraged Mauritania to continue its fruitful cooperation with human rights mechanisms.

564. Cuba congratulated Mauritania on its progress in the area of human rights, including its accession to a number of international human rights instruments. It appreciated the fact that Mauritania had accepted its recommendation on continuing measures to eradicate contemporary forms of slavery. It wished Mauritania success in the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted.

565. Djibouti welcomed the fact that Mauritania had accepted most of the recommendations made during the universal periodic review. It noted with satisfaction that its recommendations on women's rights had enjoyed the support of Mauritania. Djibouti welcomed the State's efforts to promote and protect human rights, in particular those on combating racial discrimination.

### 3. General comments made by other stakeholders

566. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Mauritania, 12 other stakeholders made statements.<sup>17</sup>

567. The National Human Rights Commission of Mauritania commended the State for its acceptance of many recommendations. It acknowledged the project for a national action plan. It also commended the State for its recent adoption of a draft law on gender-based violence and for the establishment of a mechanism to prevent torture. It recommended that Mauritania continue the ongoing process of harmonizing domestic legislation and international instruments to reinforce the capacities of the National Human Rights Commission and civil society. It also recommended that Mauritania be provided with technical and financial assistance to promote and protect human rights and to fight against terrorism and extremism.

568. United Nations Watch expressed concern about the persistence of slavery in Mauritania and the lack of sufficient measures taken by the State to end that practice, and its reluctance to recognize the reality. It was also concerned about attacks against human rights defenders, a lack of respect for freedom of expression, including of the media, and discriminatory practices.

569. Comité international pour le respect et l'application de la charte africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples welcomed the implementation by Mauritania of several recommendations from its first universal periodic review and its commitments in crucial sectors, including free mandatory education, the national strategy for food security and the fight against corruption and poverty. It noted high-priority initiatives taken by Mauritania, such as the adoption of a consolidated road map to combat trafficking in persons and all contemporary forms of slavery. It further noted the State's significant advances in the promotion of economic and social rights, such as the expansion of health coverage and access to employment for the most vulnerable sectors of the population.

570. The Arab Commission for Human Rights welcomed the acceptance by Mauritania of the recommendations on ratifying the Convention against Discrimination in Education. It congratulated the State on its intention to continue to improve human rights. It regretted, however, that Mauritania had not supported the recommendation on implementing the recommendations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women and on protecting children in detention. It noted that Mauritania had ratified the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and called upon the State to implement a national mechanism to fight against torture. It recommended that Mauritania reconsider its position on the recommendations it had noted.

571. Minority Rights Group welcomed the adoption by Mauritania of the recommendations on strengthening the legal framework to combat violence against women and it hoped that tangible follow-up measures would be taken. It regretted that the State had refused to abolish the discriminatory provisions against women in the Personal Status Code. Although there had been positive steps, such as the criminalization of slavery in 2015, no sufficient measures had been taken to combat slavery. Minority Rights Group particularly regretted that no cases of slavery submitted to the courts had been processed. It also regretted that the State had never considered taking actions to identify and liberate slaves en masse.

572. The Indian Council of South America welcomed the recognition in the Constitution of the country's cultural and linguistic diversity, and the fact that slavery and torture were considered crimes against humanity. It regretted that some discriminatory reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women had not been removed. It recommended that Mauritania continue its efforts to submit its overdue reports to the treaty bodies. It also recommended that Mauritania construct a viable road map to address slavery, work with the special procedures and strengthen its judicial system. Moreover, it recommended that Mauritania seek assistance to implement the

---

<sup>17</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/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx>.

recommendations on education, human rights and poverty. Lastly, it recommended that Mauritania introduce a human rights-based approach to all climate change policies and programmes.

573. The International Humanist and Ethical Union was deeply concerned about the embedded nature of slavery in Mauritania. It highlighted the situation faced by anti-slavery activists and noted in particular the case of Mr. M’Kheitar, a writer who had been sentenced to death in December 2014 for apostasy after having published an article highlighting and criticizing indentured servitude in Mauritanian society. The International Humanist and Ethical Union recommended that Mauritania respect the work of anti-slavery activists. It called upon Mauritania to cease its harassment, intimidation and ill-treatment of anti-slavery campaigners, to remove the crime of apostasy from national legislation and to release Mr. M’Kheitar immediately.

574. The African Development Association noted the adoption by Mauritania of a national strategy to combat discrimination against women in order to better integrate women into social society by incorporating a gender perspective into public policy. It also acknowledged the implementation of pertinent economic programmes aimed at empowering women in the spheres of work and family. It noted the efforts of Mauritania to facilitate women’s access to health care, education and public services, with the age of retirement being set at 60 years. It also noted the establishment of free and mandatory education for children of school age. It called upon the Human Rights Council to assist Mauritania in its courageous and innovative initiatives to outlaw slavery practices.

575. The Victorious Youth Movement noted the concrete initiatives taken by Mauritania to prioritize the promotion of human rights, such as the creation of Tadamoun, the national agency to end slavery, the establishment of a national day for the struggle against slavery and the third national strategy on poverty reduction. There were several areas deserving of support from the State’s institutional partners, such as the programmes aimed at fighting youth unemployment, at ending disparities between urban and rural areas, and at promoting information and communications technology. It referred to progress in sectors relating to economic, social and cultural rights.

576. Amnesty International expressed concern about the gap between the law and its implementation. Despite the law of 2015, there had been delays in slavery cases being brought before the public prosecutor. While Mauritania had committed to investigating allegations of torture and ill-treatment and the excessive use of force by the police, it had not supported a recommendation on doing so through an independent process and on bringing those responsible to justice. It urged Mauritania to reconsider the recommendations on preventing the arbitrary arrest, detention and release of human rights defenders, and on creating a safe and enabling environment in which human rights defenders could operate safely and freely. It called upon Mauritania to immediately and unconditionally release all prisoners of conscience and to ensure that human rights defenders, journalists and other civil society activists could carry out their legitimate activities without intimidation, hindrance or harassment.

577. Association jeunesse action développement welcomed the implementation by Mauritania of the recommendations from the first universal periodic review on repatriating and reintegrating Mauritanian displaced persons. It commended the State for the organized return of more than 24,000 Mauritians as part of the operations on 25 March 2012, in the presence of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. It noted the State’s continued efforts to combat torture and particularly the specific mention of the protection of minors and juvenile justice. It recommended that Mauritania continue its efforts aimed at reinforcing national cohesion and discourage extremist views.

578. Agir en faveur de l’environnement welcomed the recent visit by the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. The visit had demonstrated the openness of the Government of Mauritania and its real willingness to cooperate with all international mechanisms, including the universal periodic review. It recommended that Mauritania strengthen the capacities of civil society in promoting and protecting human rights, that technical and financial support be provided to Mauritania in order to accelerate the implementation of the road map for the eradication of the legacy and

the contemporary forms of slavery, and that Mauritania accelerate the adoption of the law on gender-based violence.

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

579. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 200 recommendations received, 140 had enjoyed the support of Mauritania and 60 had been noted.

580. Responding to comments and questions relating to the death penalty, Mauritania referred to the de facto moratorium. Since 1995, no death penalty sentence had been carried out in Mauritania. Slavery had been abolished and was considered as a crime against humanity. The Government was working, jointly with OHCHR, to implement the road map on the recommendations of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery. Mauritania confirmed its determination to fight against the vestiges of that phenomenon.

581. Human rights activists had been detained as a result of a judicial decision and they were being held in very good conditions. Mauritania confirmed its commitment regarding respect for civil and political rights.

582. Mauritania confirmed the importance of the universal periodic review. It thanked the Working Group, the troika and all States for their comments and recommendations. It also thanked the National Committee for Human Rights and non-governmental organizations for their contributions.

583. Mauritania reaffirmed its determination to implement all the recommendations that had been accepted. Because the universal periodic review was an ongoing process, Mauritania would continue to consider the recommendations that had not been supported.

#### **Nauru**

584. The review of Nauru was held on 3 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Nauru in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/NRU/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/NRU/2 and Corr.1);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/NRU/3).

585. At its 43rd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Nauru (see sect. C below).

586. The outcome of the review of Nauru comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/7), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/31/7/Add.1).

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

587. The delegation of Nauru, led by senior government lawyer on human rights and gender at the Department for Justice and Border Control, Filipo Masaurua, provided responses to the recommendations received during the review.

588. At the outset, Nauru had supported the recommendation contained in paragraph 87.30 of the report of the Working Group and would ensure that minors had access to education in

a safe environment in line with its obligations under the Convention on the Rights of the Child and other international human rights instruments.

589. The Government of Nauru had supported the recommendations on ratifying the core human rights instruments and would prepare strategies for treaty ratification and accession with advice and support from the working group on treaties. Nauru would hold consultations and awareness programmes on treaties with communities and relevant stakeholders before taking steps towards ratification.

590. To date, Nauru had sought and received support for capacity-building from the OHCHR Pacific regional office. Nauru would continue to seek assistance from United Nations agencies and regional partners in fulfilling its human rights obligations.

591. The Government was committed to ensuring that the treaties ratified, particularly the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, were incorporated into national laws. To that end, the Government was working with relevant government departments and offices to ensure that the principles contained in the ratified treaties were incorporated into national policies and laws, and it was also working with its regional partners on the development of specific stand-alone legislation on domestic violence and disability.

592. Nauru had supported the recommendation on the working group on treaties. The Department for Justice and Border Control and the Department for Foreign Affairs and Trade were currently supporting the work of the working group on treaties.

593. Nauru had supported the recommendations on establishing a national human rights institution and was holding discussions with regional and international partners for that purpose. The model of the institution would also depend on the outcomes of discussions with local communities, relevant partners and stakeholders, which would probably begin in the second quarter of 2016. Partners identified for the development of the national human rights institution included OHCHR and the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat.

594. The Government had supported the recommendations on women's rights and domestic violence. In partnership with the UNDP multi-country office, it had recently completed a one-week meeting on a practice Parliament for women with the aim of encouraging more women to stand in the upcoming elections. Currently, discussions and consultations were being held on the development of stand-alone domestic violence legislation. Further, the women's plan of action, aimed at improving the quality of women's lives, had identified 16 thematic issues, with the key theme of eliminating violence against women. In addition, the new Criminal Code would contain provisions that were aimed at reducing violence in any form or manner, including gender-based violence.

595. Nauru had extended an open invitation to all special procedure mandate holders to visit Nauru and thus it had supported the recommendations in that regard. Representatives of the Government had met with assistants of special procedure mandate holders in 2015. To date, Nauru had received requests for invitations from the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants and the Chair-Rapporteur of the 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.

596. The Government had supported the recommendations on children's rights. Additional work and support would ensure that the principles of the Convention on the Rights of the Child were incorporated into national laws and policies. A division of Child Protection Services, established in 2015, was aimed at providing stronger and efficient technical, policy and support services for children's issues in Nauru. That newly established division – currently resourced and housed by the Ministry of Home Affairs – had the mandate of establishing national systems and processes to respond effectively to cases of child abuse and neglect.

597. Nauru had supported the recommendations on disability. Discussions were ongoing with the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat and the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific on the development of specific stand-alone disability legislation.

598. The Government had supported the recommendations on health and education and would continue to work with the Department of Education and the Department of Health to strengthen its programmes and social policies, including on nutrition, giving priority to the neediest sectors of the population. It would also ensure that proper human and financial resources were provided for the implementation of those recommendations.

599. Nauru had supported the recommendations on climate change and would continue to work with the relevant department to ensure that its commitment to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change was facilitated and that a human rights dimension was added to the ongoing and future work on climate change. The Government was committed to ensuring that adequate human and financial resources were provided to enable the Climate Change Unit to function effectively and to provide quality services on national activities.

600. The Government had noted the recommendation on the report of the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and would make public the report upon discussions with the Cabinet and relevant government departments.

601. Nauru had noted the recommendations on decriminalizing sexual behaviour between consenting adults of the same sex. Nauru was a Christian State and as such it would maintain its religious doctrines when dealing with issues relating to that kind of recommendation. However, it should be noted that the Criminal Code did not criminalize sexual behaviour between consenting adults of the same sex in private. Internal discussions and consultations on the revision of the Criminal Code were being planned with the relevant stakeholders in order to consider those issues and to ensure that the citizens of Nauru were properly informed and educated.

602. The Government had noted the recommendations on abolishing the death penalty and would continue to work with the relevant authorities and departments on the progressive removal of the death penalty, following the regular constitutional process and national consultations between the Government and the relevant stakeholders. The new Criminal Code did not recommend death as a penalty for any crime.

603. Nauru had supported the recommendation on the Regional Processing Centre and informed the Human Rights Council that the Centre was compliant with international norms, standards and guidelines. Places of detention currently available in Nauru, including prisons and police detention centres, followed the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules).

604. Nauru had noted the recommendations on the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association, and it assured the Human Rights Council that Nauruans enjoyed such rights. The Government was aware of the controversy surrounding section 244A of the Criminal Code and reiterated that further consultations would be needed before amendments could be made. The laws of Nauru would take precedence and be in line with national commitments to create a safe and protective environment for the nation and its people.

605. Nauru had noted the recommendations on access to the Internet and informed the Human Rights Council that the Internet was free and was made available to the people of Nauru, including foreigners.

606. The Government of Nauru had noted the recommendation on visa fees for foreign journalists.

607. The Government had noted the recommendation on the legislative framework protecting activists in civil society against reprisals, in particular journalists and human rights defenders, and called upon the international community to provide support in that area.

608. The Government had noted the recommendations on the independence of the judiciary and wished to inform the Human Rights Council that the judiciary was independent and functioning. The judiciary, headed by a Chief Justice supported by two judges and a resident magistrate, functioned independently with its own staff. The daily functions, mandate and



work of the judiciary were the responsibility of the Chief Registrar. The Chief Justice acted and functioned independently and in accordance with his constitutional duties.

609. The Government of Nauru had noted the recommendations on asylum seekers, refugees and migrants and had informed the Human Rights Council that refugees currently living in Nauru were provided with protection and support. The Community Liaison Office acted as a conduit between the Government, communities and the refugee community. Social support was also provided by the Government and other contracted social service organizations, which had been ongoing since the inception of the Regional Processing Centre. The Government wished to reiterate that it operated the Regional Processing Centre as an open centre, whereby asylum seekers and refugees were able to move freely in Nauru.

610. In that context, the Government had received visits from the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture and had allowed visits to the centres by representatives of the OHCHR Pacific regional office. The Government was expecting more visits from special procedure mandate holders in 2016 and 2017.

611. The Government, together with Transfield Services, provided and maintained improvements to the conditions of housing and adequate security at all the places of accommodation for refugees and asylum seekers. Both refugees and asylum seekers were free to move within the community, had also been employed in local businesses and had started operating their own businesses.

612. The Transfield Services welfare team provided education, recreation, cultural programmes and activities within Regional Processing Centre 2 and more recently at Regional Processing Centre 3. The delivery within Regional Processing Centre 3 was supplementary to the current programmes and activities that were on offer by Save the Children. One of the purposes of the case management and meaningful activities programme was to ensure that transferees could remain engaged with their status resolution process. Those services formed part of a holistic, integrated approach to maintaining the well-being of the centres and its people.

613. Unaccompanied minors were under the guardianship and protection of the Minister for Justice and Border Control. Children were enrolled in and attended local schools in Nauru. They were afforded the same treatment as other Nauruan children in relation to education, health, sports and other related activities.

614. Additionally, protection for women from gender-based violence was provided through the Nauru police force with support from the Australian police force and other service providers. The Government was committed to ensuring that women refugees were given the same priority as Nauruan women in relation to gender-based violence. Refugee women had access to the women's shelter that was currently housed under the Department for Women.

615. Lastly, the delegation thanked the President and all those delegations and stakeholders that had provided comments during the universal periodic review of Nauru. The Government also thanked regional partners for their assistance in the State's ongoing human rights endeavours, and it called upon the international community to provide technical and financial assistance with regards to the implementation of its human rights commitments.

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

616. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Nauru, seven delegations made statements.

617. Fiji acknowledged the commitment of Nauru to ensure that a human rights dimension was added to the ongoing and future work on climate change, with adequate human and financial resources. Nauru had noted the recommendation made by Fiji on guaranteeing human rights for asylum seekers, in particular women and girls at risk of gender-based violence. Fiji urged Nauru to intensify efforts to ensure the protection of women and girls and a zero-tolerance approach to gender-based violence.

618. Maldives appreciated the fact that Nauru had supported both of its recommendations and it was encouraged by the State's commitment to further the rights of persons with disabilities through, inter alia, the recent ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and its steps to create specific, stand-alone legislation.

619. Pakistan commended the Government of Nauru for having accepted the majority of the recommendations made during the universal periodic review and it appreciated the State's efforts to promote and protect the rights of its citizens, including women, children and persons with disabilities. It recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review of Nauru with a consensus.

620. Samoa welcomed the acceptance of a large number of recommendations and the strides taken by Nauru in becoming a party to the core human rights treaties. The visit of the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture reaffirmed the notion of State accountability of Nauru and its commitment to its human rights obligations. It encouraged Nauru to, inter alia, continue efforts in the training of public officials on the rights of asylum seekers and refugees.

621. Sierra Leone was encouraged by the commitment of Nauru to engage with partners to face common challenges, such as climate change. It was pleased to note that most of the recommendations it had made had enjoyed the support of Nauru. However, it hoped that the State would still consider constitutional amendments, with the aim of abolishing the death penalty in the near future. It joined the support for the adoption of the report of the Working Group.

622. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela noted the progress in school enrolment and the strategy against school dropout through the application of the annual operative plan on education. In spite of current economic challenges, Nauru had made efforts to respect its commitments to human rights, and the international community should show its support for those efforts and provide its cooperation. It recommended the adoption of the report of the Working Group.

623. Cuba acknowledged the priority that Nauru was giving to the enjoyment of human rights, including through national policies for the protection of persons with disabilities, youth and women. It appreciated the State's acceptance of the majority of the recommendations, including two made by Cuba on drafting specific legislation on the elimination of discrimination against women and on disabilities. It recommended the adoption of the report of the Working Group.

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

624. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Nauru, six other stakeholders made statements.

625. Edmund Rice International, in a joint statement with Franciscans International, expressed concern about the fact that Nauru had noted the recommendations on safeguarding the rights of asylum seekers and refugees, including women and children. The organizations had received reports of allegations of physical and sexual abuse occurring in certain facilities and recommended that Nauru, inter alia, properly investigate and prosecute allegations of sexual and other forms of assault against women and children.

626. The International Service for Human Rights stated that freedom of expression, the media, the independence of the judiciary and civil society had been under attack in Nauru over the previous three years, and it deeply regretted that the State had merely noted rather than supported most of the recommendations in that regard. It urged Nauru to embrace those recommendations, and States that had influence with Nauru to be guided by those principles.

627. Franciscans International stated that Nauru was a State vulnerable to climate change and that its existence was at stake due to the adverse impacts of climate change. It recommended that the Government of Nauru adopt a participatory approach in the discussion on mitigation policies by providing a platform for community-level involvement, especially for those – such as women – who were most vulnerable to the adverse impacts of climate change. It also recommended that the State enhance its efforts in international cooperation.

628. The International Association for Democracy in Africa stated that the Constitution of Nauru afforded women formal equality before the law, but that there was little documentation of domestic violence against women and children. Through a number of measures, the Government had been striving for women's empowerment. The United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women) was helping to better inform decision makers at national and local levels of government by providing them with technical assistance.

629. Amnesty International was disappointed that Nauru had noted the recommendation on allowing access of international media organizations and reducing visa fees. It had made two requests to visit the country since the session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review in November 2015, to no avail. It remained concerned about the safety and well-being of refugees and asylum seekers in light of credible reports of sexual violence and harassment against them, and it was disappointed that Nauru had noted the recommendations in that regard. Lastly, Amnesty International regretted that Nauru had noted the recommendations on the independence of the judiciary and access to the Internet and social media.

630. The International Lesbian and Gay Association was disappointed by the fact that Nauru had noted the recommendations on the decriminalization of same-sex sexual relations. The Nauru Criminal Code, in its sections 208, 209 and 211, criminalized sexual behaviour between consenting adults of the same sex in private with imprisonment with hard labour for up to 14 years. As a result, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons on the island were placed in a more vulnerable situation with regard to violence, as they were less willing to go to the police when they themselves would be open to scrutiny.

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

631. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 108 recommendations received, 80 recommendations had enjoyed the support of Nauru and 28 had been noted.

632. The delegation of Nauru thanked the Human Rights Council for the fruitful debate and for the constructive experience of the universal periodic review, and it stated that all valid recommendations and comments would be taken into consideration.

#### **Rwanda**

633. The review of Rwanda was held on 4 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Rwanda in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/RWA/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/RWA/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/RWA/3).

634. At its 44th meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Rwanda (see sect. C below).

635. The outcome of the review of Rwanda comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/8), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/31/8/Add.1).

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

636. The delegation stated that the universal periodic review mechanism was important to Rwanda as it presented a good opportunity for self-assessment in its holistic quest to continuously improve as a country. Rwanda was always happy to share its success stories and any challenges that it could face.

637. The delegation thanked the 89 States that had participated in the review and extended its gratitude to the troika – Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Nigeria and the United Arab Emirates – and the secretariat for their immense efforts in the preparation of the report of the Working Group. The delegation also thanked the members of civil society that had contributed constructively to the review of Rwanda.

638. Rwanda had reviewed the 83 distinct thematic clusters of recommendations that it had received during the review. The responses to the recommendations were contained in the addendum to the report. In accordance with the Constitution, national laws and international obligations already undertaken, Rwanda had accepted only those recommendations that it could implement within the next four years.

639. The recommendations that had enjoyed the support of Rwanda in full were those where both the spirit and the principle behind those recommendations had been supported and could be implemented.

640. Rwanda had also supported the recommendations on which actions had already been taken, or were being taken with the intension of those actions continuing, without in any way implying that the ongoing or prior efforts had been insufficient or that those actions were legally required.

641. The recommendations that had not enjoyed the support of Rwanda were generally those whose implementation the State was not currently able to commit to – whether or not the Government agreed with the principles behind those recommendations – or where the Government had recently reviewed its position on the issue in question, or where the assertions made had been rejected.

642. The Government had accepted 50 recommendations that it would endeavor to implement before the next review. Twenty-six recommendations had enjoyed the support of Rwanda in principle but could not be accepted for implementation at the present time because it was not possible to guarantee that the requirements necessary for their implementation would be readily available within the reporting period. Seven recommendations had not enjoyed the support of Rwanda as they were not compatible with the Constitution and national law.

643. The implementation of the recommendations accepted had already begun. A consultation with stakeholders had been held on 17 December 2015 on the outcome of the review in November 2015. The consultation was well attended, with representation from the Government, civil society and some of the States that had made recommendations.

644. A road map for the implementation of the 50 recommendations accepted was developed by a national task force on reporting to the treaty bodies, which was a platform that brought together Government and civil society organizations to jointly consider the implementation of the State's human rights obligations. All of the government institutions concerned had accepted responsibility to implement the recommendations in their domain.

645. To encourage greater civil society participation, the Government had made an open call to all civil society organizations working on human rights issues in Rwanda to partner with the Government in the implementation of the recommendations. That approach would go a long way in continuing to strengthen the interaction between the Government and civil society in the country.

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

646. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Rwanda, 16 delegations made statements.<sup>18</sup>

647. Pakistan expressed appreciation for the decision of Rwanda to accept the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Pakistan. It valued the constructive engagement of Rwanda with the human rights machinery. The commitment of Rwanda to human rights was evident from the positive measures that had been taken over the years.

648. Paraguay referred to the recommendation contained in paragraph 134.25 of the report of the Working Group on establishing a national system for monitoring human rights recommendations and it expressed its readiness to cooperate technically with Rwanda in order to establish that system. It welcomed the acceptance of the recommendation contained in paragraph 133.37 on ensuring an adequate standard of living for vulnerable children, which was a sign of the commitment of Rwanda to protect the human rights of persons in situations of vulnerability.

649. Senegal welcomed the steps taken by Rwanda to implement 63 of the 67 recommendations from the review in 2011, and the progress the State had made in combating poverty. It also welcomed the decision of Rwanda to become a party to eight international instruments promoting human rights.

650. Sierra Leone was pleased with the intention of the Government of Rwanda to consolidate efforts aimed at preventing the trafficking of child refugees. Rwanda should put in place measures and laws to eliminate child, early and forced marriages and expedite the ratification and domestication of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

651. South Africa commended Rwanda for its efforts to strengthen the institutional framework for human rights and it welcomed improvements in access to justice and the rule of law and to education. It encouraged Rwanda to ensure the effective application of gender equality legislation and the implementation of policy measures to achieve equality between men and women. It also encouraged the State to take measures to reduce the high rate of maternal mortality and to improve access to maternal health information and services.

652. The Sudan expressed appreciation for the efforts of Rwanda to promote and protect human rights and it thanked the State for having accepted the two recommendations made by the Sudan.

653. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland recognized the substantial progress made by Rwanda in delivering economic and social rights, but that progress was not matched by access to political and civil rights. It welcomed the acceptance of the recommendation it had made on detention and the use of transit and rehabilitation centres. It was disappointed that Rwanda had not supported its recommendation on ensuring the civilian nature of refugee camps.

654. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the implementation of the majority of the recommendations accepted by Rwanda. The State had ratified major human rights instruments and had submitted its reports to the treaty bodies. It noted major progress in education, with Rwanda having guaranteed access to universal primary education and having delivered 140,000 computers to schools. It encouraged the State to continue to promote its social policies with a view to achieving the full inclusion of the most vulnerable sectors of the population.

655. Albania noted the reforms in the media sector and an expansion of the rights and freedoms of association and assembly. It called for action to address the issues contained in the 77 recommendations that had not enjoyed the support of Rwanda, among them the two

<sup>18</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/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx>.

recommendations made by Albania on reducing the high rate of maternal mortality and on promoting the traditional and indigenous knowledge of the Batwa population.

656. Angola noted the efforts made by Rwanda to strengthen human rights, as well as the implementation of legislation and policies to protect children against exploitation and abuse. It further noted the steps taken to promote affordable education, to eradicate gender-based violence and to foster gender equality.

657. Armenia noted with appreciation that Rwanda had accepted a large number of recommendations, including those made by Armenia, which was an indication of the State's commitment to human rights. It commended Rwanda for its engagement in and contribution to the prevention of genocide.

658. Belgium stated that important results had been achieved in the areas of gender and economic rights. Additional efforts should be made to ensure the unhindered exercise of civil and political liberties by civil society and the media. Military and administrative detention centres should fully comply with legislation and international standards. Although the two recommendations made by Belgium in those areas had not been accepted, Rwanda should continue to work on those issues. It called for a forum comprising the Government and development partners to engage in dialogue on governance and human rights.

659. Botswana commended Rwanda for its commitment to human rights and the acceptance of a majority of the recommendations. It noted with appreciation the State's commitment to address human rights violations, including by ensuring accountability and redress for victims. It welcomed the fact that resources were channelled towards the development of a quality, independent and impartial judicial system.

660. Chad welcomed the outstanding efforts made by Rwanda to fulfil its international human rights obligations with a view to promoting and protecting human rights. It encouraged Rwanda to continue its cooperation with the human rights mechanisms and wished the State success in the implementation of the recommendations accepted.

661. China welcomed the constructive engagement of Rwanda with the universal periodic review process. It thanked the State for having accepted the recommendations made by China and it hoped that Rwanda would continue to develop its economy, ensure the employment of young people, improve working conditions and increase investment in education. As a developing country, Rwanda faced many challenges in the area of human rights. China hoped that the international community would provide Rwanda with assistance.

662. The Congo noted with satisfaction that Rwanda was a party to eight major international human rights instruments. The State had ratified the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. It welcomed the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations from the first review. Additional efforts were necessary for the social integration of minorities.

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

663. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Rwanda, 10 other stakeholders made statements.

664. The National Commission for Human Rights of Rwanda welcomed the positive developments since the State's first review, including the implementation of recommendations. It noted the progress made towards the passing of numerous laws to strengthen the right to information and the freedom of expression and association. It also noted the revision of the law on genocide ideology. It called upon Rwanda to abrogate the provisions in the Penal Code on defamation and on solitary confinement, to expedite the adoption of the draft bills on family, matrimonial regimes and succession that were before Parliament, and to accelerate the adoption of the national human rights action plan.

665. The International Service for Human Rights noted the degrading situation in which human rights defenders were harassed, arbitrarily arrested or even murdered with impunity. Journalists and the political opposition suffered legal intimidation through the use of overly

broad laws, and laws for non-governmental organizations were abused to interfere with and undermine human rights organizations. While welcoming amendments to the law on the media and commitments to ensure that the law on genocide was not misused, it urged Rwanda to review its legal framework to ensure that all laws conformed with international standards.

666. Franciscans International encouraged Rwanda to reconsider the recommendation made by Latvia on ensuring that children with disabilities, children belonging to minority groups, children of indigenous peoples and refugee children also enjoyed their right to education. It noted that the current national education system lacked the infrastructure and resources necessary for effective teaching and learning, and it urged the Government to increase funding in education to uphold the right to free, universal and quality education of all children. It strongly encouraged Rwanda to ensure the registration of all children immediately after birth.

667. The East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project and CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation denounced the systematic campaign to substitute the leaders of human rights organizations with others favourable to the Government. Few organizations worked freely and independently, and they faced intimidation and reprisals, including administrative harassment and public discredit and denunciation through pro-Government media.

668. Action Canada for Population and Development called upon Rwanda to eliminate all barriers to safe abortion and raised the issue of poor women and girls being victims of sexual torture and oppression. They called upon Rwanda to ensure women's freedom of opinion and expression, to address the issue of unfair trials in courts and the harassment and reprisals that human rights defenders faced, and to develop and implement a national human rights action plan.

669. Article 19: International Centre against Censorship commended Rwanda for its new policy to strengthen media self-regulation. However, the State's legal framework was still used to illegitimately restrict the right to freedom of expression, and many provisions of the law on the media failed to meet international standards, and it must be amended. It called upon Rwanda to create a safe and enabling environment where human rights defenders, journalists and civil society could operate freely and unhindered.

670. Human Rights Watch noted that civil society groups, opposition parties and the independent media had limited space to operate freely. Opposition parties struggled to carry out their activities and several opposition leaders were in prison. It welcomed the acceptance of the recommendation on conducting investigations into cases of alleged arbitrary arrest, detention and enforced disappearances. It drew attention to the fact that Rwanda had recently withdrawn its declaration allowing individuals and non-governmental organizations direct access to the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights.

671. The Canners International Permanent Committee noted that the parliamentary elections in 2013 had seen 64 per cent of the seats taken by female candidates. It commended Rwanda for the development of Vision 2020, a document that provided the general objectives and policy goals to move towards agricultural development and industrialization. Rwanda was on track to meet most of the Millennium Development Goals by the end of 2015.

672. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme expressed concern about the lack of freedom of expression and the threats that political opponents outside the country faced. It urged the authorities to create an inclusive social dialogue with a view to instituting a genuine democracy. It encouraged Rwanda to respect the right to peaceful demonstration and to ensure the separation of powers. It called upon Rwanda to immediately and unconditionally release all political prisoners.

673. Africa culture internationale commended Rwanda for having developed the country's infrastructure and economy and for having made a number of positive reforms, especially in the justice sector. However, there were breaches in the fulfilment of the State's international human rights obligations, particularly with regard to freedom of expression, association and assembly. It encouraged Rwanda to prioritize the development and promotion of human rights and the protection of women and children in the country.

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

674. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 229 recommendations received, 152 had enjoyed the support of Rwanda and 77 had been noted.

675. The delegation thanked all of the stakeholders that had engaged with Rwanda during its review. The Government was grateful for the expression of interest in Rwanda.

676. Rwanda had much to be proud of and the Government had enthusiastically welcomed the opportunity to share its success stories. The State's achievements in the previous 22 years were a direct result of the country's deliberate policy and practice of holistically guaranteeing all fundamental human rights. The human rights journey was always a journey towards perfection.

677. Rwanda did what it promised to do and the Government intended to fully implement within the next four years the 50 recommendations it had accepted. Those recommendations included commitments to improve the civil and political, as well as the economic, social and cultural, rights situation in Rwanda. They were equal, indivisible, universal and inalienable. Rwanda had learned from experience that real development must be inclusive of the development and enjoyment of all of the fundamental human rights.

678. Rwanda was always happy to engage with the Human Rights Council on human rights issues. However, the primary reason Rwanda continued to deliver on its human rights obligations was not because the Council made recommendations every four years. The State undertook and delivered on its human rights obligations because the Rwandan people did not deserve less than any other people around the world, and the Government needed no prompting to take the necessary actions.

679. The Government was constantly engaging with the population in order to jointly deliver on what was right and legal and in the best interest of the country for the present and for the future. The achievements recorded in the areas of, inter alia, civil, political, social, economic and cultural rights in the previous two decades testified to the tenacity of the mutual engagement between the Government and the citizens.

#### Nepal

680. The review of Nepal was held on 4 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Nepal in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/NPL/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/NPL/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/NPL/3).

681. At its 44th meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Nepal (see sect. C below).

682. The outcome of the review of Nepal comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/9 and Corr.1), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/31/9/Add.1).



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

683. During the opening remarks, the Chief Secretary of the Government of Nepal, Somlal Subedi, introduced the Nepalese delegation and presented additional information on the State's human rights situation.

684. The delegation shared its views on the recommendations received during its review in November 2015 and an update on the subsequent progress made.

685. Nepal had held extensive discussions with national human rights institutions, civil society organizations and the media in respect of the recommendations received during the interactive dialogue. Relevant government institutions had also been consulted.

686. Nepal had supported 32 recommendations, which were listed under paragraph 121 of the report of the Working Group. A total of 115 recommendations, listed under paragraph 122 of the report, had also enjoyed the State's support because they had either already been implemented or were in the process of implementation. Nepal had noted the recommendations listed under paragraph 124 of the report.

687. In relation to the 30 recommendations listed under paragraph 123 of the report of the Working Group, Nepal had supported 5 recommendations and noted 25.

688. Hence, of the 195 recommendations received, Nepal had accepted 152 recommendations and noted the rest.

689. Nepal had considered all of the recommendations received. With regard to the recommendations on ratifying additional international treaties, Nepal had pursued the strategy of developing the requisite policy, legal and institutional infrastructures, and building and strengthening implementation capacity, before taking up additional treaty obligations. It believed that the effective implementation of treaty obligations was as important as ratification. The State's focus was therefore on building capacity for their effective implementation.

690. Nepal was now engaged in creating a legal infrastructure to give effect to the Constitution of Nepal promulgated in 2015. The Constitution was founded on inclusive democratic norms and values and included such distinguished features as multiparty democracy, fundamental rights, periodic elections, an independent judiciary and the rule of law. The Constitution envisioned a federal democratic republican system of governance, with inclusive and proportional participation to develop Nepal as a prosperous nation.

691. The Parliament of Nepal had adopted the first amendment to the Constitution on 23 January 2016 to address the concerns of Madhesh-based political parties, which had wished that it be made more inclusive. The amendment further ensured the proportional inclusion of women, Dalits, indigenous peoples, Madheshis, Tharus, Muslims, minorities, persons with disabilities, and marginalized and disadvantaged people in State structures. It also ensured the delineation of electoral constituencies based on population and geography. The remaining issues, if any, would be addressed through political dialogue and consensus. They would also be further addressed in the course of the implementation of the Constitution through different tiers of government. The amendment addressed the issues underlying a number of recommendations made by member and observer States.

692. A comprehensive set of civil and political, and economic, social and cultural rights guaranteed by the Constitution formed the core fundamental rights, guaranteeing the principles of equality and non-discrimination.

693. The realization of the ideals and aspirations embodied in the Constitution, which were in line with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the human rights treaties to which Nepal was a party, depended on its effective implementation. That was challenging for a resource and capacity constrained country like Nepal.

694. Now that Nepal had a federal structure of government, with inclusive State restructuring to end discrimination and inequality in any form, it was putting in place legislative and institutional frameworks that ensured a gender responsive and inclusive approach to the implementation of the Constitution.

695. A steering committee, with a mandate of coordination among relevant ministries, had reviewed the existing laws to find legal gaps and to identify laws that were inconsistent with constitutional provisions and areas requiring new laws under the Constitution. A preliminary assessment indicated that a number of federal, state and local laws should be enacted to give effect to the Constitution. That called for expeditious legal reforms to almost all existing legislation.

696. Nepal was fully committed to ensuring transitional justice. Two separate rules for the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the Commission on Investigation on Enforced Disappeared Persons had been approved by the Council of Ministers, in line with the ruling of the Supreme Court of 26 February 2015. The rules that specifically elaborated measures for the effective implementation of the transitional justice mechanisms included: (a) cases sub judice in courts of law were not to be transferred to the Commissions; (b) reconciliation between the victim and the perpetrator could be made only with the informed prior consent of the victim; (c) recommendation for amnesty could be made only with the prior consent of the victim; and (d) the Commissions were empowered to forward cases directly to the Office of the Attorney General for prosecution against the offenders.

697. In relation to the remaining issues, if any, Nepal would take action as necessary and appropriate, including the revision of the Enforced Disappearances Enquiry, Truth and Reconciliation Commission Act of 2014. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission had organized consultations in 52 districts and the Commission on Enforced Disappeared Persons in 40 districts to receive feedback from victims and stakeholders. They were currently in the process of receiving complaints regarding the enforced disappearances and human rights violations committed during the conflict period.

698. The National Reconstruction Authority formed to address post-earthquake reconstruction and rebuilding had already integrated and carried forward the State's previous efforts and had started its operations. It would do everything in its capacity to address the needs of the victims and to rebuild damaged infrastructure.

699. Nepal reiterated the importance of strict adherence to the principles of universality, objectivity and non-selectivity of all the United Nations human rights mechanisms. Furthermore, Nepal was committed to the universal periodic review mechanism and to constructive engagement with the United Nations human rights system so as to respect the universal values of human rights and their protection and promotion.

700. Nepal was always open to constructive comments, observations and suggestions. It had embarked upon the process of implementing the high ideals and values of the human rights embodied in the Constitution.

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

701. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Nepal, 14 delegations made statements.<sup>19</sup>

702. Maldives expressed its appreciation for the constructive engagement of Nepal in the universal periodic review process. It appreciated the State's support for both of its recommendations. It was encouraged by the country's commitment to continue the improvements in health and education. Given the resource and capacity constraints of least-developed countries, Maldives encouraged Nepal to avail itself of the assistance of OHCHR and its bilateral partners for the implementation of the recommendations.

703. Sri Lanka acknowledged the constructive spirit in which Nepal had engaged in its second universal periodic review. Nepal had supported the recommendations made by Sri Lanka. It recognized that the promulgation of the new Constitution and the action taken

---

<sup>19</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/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx>.

through a task force to introduce amendments to 93 acts had paved the way to strengthening the national mechanisms for human rights.

704. Paraguay valued the fact that Nepal had accepted its recommendation on establishing a system to follow up on international recommendations as a tool to promote and protect human rights. It was willing to provide technical cooperation. It further welcomed the acceptance of the recommendations on human rights education programmes for the police and on developing public policies aimed at the implementation of the law against discrimination based on caste and untouchability.

705. Sierra Leone commended Nepal for its disaster response efforts after the earthquake and its collaboration with international partners to develop adapted prevention strategies. Sierra Leone noted that three of its recommendations had enjoyed the support of Nepal, which was a demonstration of the State's willingness to promote human rights standards nationally.

706. Singapore welcomed the acceptance by Nepal of two recommendations made by Singapore on continuing to implement policy measures to ensure that quality health care was accessible to all, and on continuing to pursue policies aimed at increasing enrolment in schools, particularly of girls, indigenous children and minorities. It encouraged Nepal to continue its efforts to improve the lives of its citizens and to protect and promote their rights.

707. Pakistan appreciated the acceptance by Nepal of 152 recommendations, including those made by Pakistan. It valued the constructive engagement of the State with the human rights machinery, including with the treaty bodies and the universal periodic review mechanism. Nepal had made concerted efforts to promote and protect the rights of its citizens despite the challenges posed by natural disasters.

708. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland noted that the adoption of the new Constitution was a milestone in Nepal and the recent amendments were a step towards resolving differences relating to the Constitution. It welcomed the progress on implementing its previous recommendations on torture and transitional justice, and it urged the State to adopt legislation in line with the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. It was disappointed that Nepal had not accepted its recommendation on forming an independent complaints commission to investigate cases against security forces.

709. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the cooperation of Nepal with the universal periodic review mechanism. It was pleased with the progress made during the previous five years in the area of poverty reduction, both in urban and rural areas. It congratulated Nepal on its second review and encouraged the State to continue to work in favour of the most vulnerable people through its public policies.

710. Afghanistan thanked Nepal for its positive engagement with the universal periodic review. It appreciated the progress made in the area of strengthening the institutional structure for the protection and promotion of human rights. It congratulated the State on its acceptance of a large number of recommendations, including the recommendation of Afghanistan on accelerating the process of the consideration of the bill on education. It encouraged Nepal to continue its efforts, including in the implementation of the recommendations from the universal periodic review.

711. Botswana noted with satisfaction the measures taken to criminalize gender-based violence, child marriage and racial discrimination, among others. It commended Nepal for the conclusion of the peace process and its political transition, which had led to the adoption of a new Constitution. It was encouraged by the State's commitment to uphold and implement the new Constitution despite economic and development challenges.

712. China welcomed the constructive engagement of Nepal with the universal periodic review mechanism and commended the State for its positive response to the recommendations received. It welcomed the State's acceptance of the recommendations made by China on prioritizing poverty reduction within the national development plan. It called upon the international community to use the opportunity of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development to provide the country with increased humanitarian development assistance.

713. Cuba highlighted the acceptance by Nepal of the recommendations received, which reflected the State's commitment to and engagement with the universal periodic review mechanism. It welcomed the State's acceptance of the two recommendations made by Cuba on reducing poverty and implementing the national human rights action plan. It reiterated its call to the international community to continue to support Nepal in its development and human rights efforts, in particular following the earthquake.

714. India noted with appreciation that Nepal had accepted nearly 80 per cent of the total number of recommendations. The right to development was a fundamental human right and a climate of political stability, consensus and predictability was a prerequisite for the socioeconomic development of the State, particularly in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake in 2015. India viewed the two recent constitutional amendments, passed by Parliament in January 2016, as positive developments and hoped that the other remaining issues would be similarly addressed in a constructive spirit and a defined time frame.

715. The Lao People's Democratic Republic noted the strong commitment of Nepal, as reflected by the State's acceptance of a large number of recommendations, including two made by the Lao People's Democratic Republic on implementing ongoing policies to guarantee quality education for multi-ethnic people, and on enhancing measures to protect the rights of children, women and other vulnerable groups. It commended the progress made in enhancing gender equality, promoting education, providing access to medical and health-care services, addressing domestic violence and combating trafficking in persons.

### 3. General comments made by other stakeholders

716. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Nepal, 11 other stakeholders made statements.<sup>20</sup>

717. The National Human Rights Commission of Nepal believed that the full implementation of the recommendations and the consideration of the observations and comments made by United Nations human rights bodies would be instrumental for the situation in Nepal to move in a positive direction. The recommendations from the universal periodic review should be implemented and the issues of the victims of the conflict and transitional justice should be addressed. Nepal should ratify, without reservations, the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

718. The Lutheran World Federation reiterated that it would collaborate with Nepal in implementing the recommendations accepted. It would continue to provide platforms for governmental and non-governmental stakeholders to come together, discuss key challenges and implement solutions collectively.

719. The World Evangelical Alliance and Pax Romana drew attention to the continued restrictions on freedom of religion in Nepal despite the new progressive Constitution of 2015. They called upon Nepal to amend article 26 (3) of the new Constitution to ensure that every citizen had full freedom of religion, and to form an interreligious commission to address practical complexities on the ground, with members nominated by communities.

720. The International Commission of Jurists was concerned that Nepal had yet to implement the recommendations it had accepted during its first review, including several that reflected its international legal obligations regarding the new Constitution, the investigation and prosecution of serious crimes and the establishment of credible transitional justice mechanisms. It called upon Nepal to reconsider its position and implement the recommendations on amending, inter alia, the Enforced Disappearances Enquiry, Truth and Reconciliation Commission Act of 2014, in line with international standards and Supreme

<sup>20</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/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx>.

Court orders; to establish a credible transitional justice process to prevent, investigate and respond effectively to any use of excessive force by security forces; and to ensure prompt, independent and impartial investigations, and, in cases of unlawful killings, prosecution.

721. Save the Children International, in a statement on behalf of Plan International and World Vision International, regretted the rejection by Nepal of the recommendations on ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure. Children should also benefit from the possibility to make complaints. Children's issues were best addressed by a specialized body. It appreciated the willingness of Nepal to consult with civil society in the universal periodic review process and looked forward to continued cooperation during the follow-up.

722. The International Lesbian and Gay Association welcomed the inclusion in the Constitution of the right to equality, including specific protection for sexual and gender minorities. Despite advances in recent years, sexual and gender minorities still faced marginalization in laws. It urged Nepal to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the recommendations on sexual orientation and gender identity issues. It was ready to work with the Government to implement those recommendations.

723. The World Organization against Torture and the Redress Trust valued the commitment of Nepal to implement a zero-tolerance policy against torture and ill-treatment in any form. However, torture was still widespread and had not been made a specific crime under the State's criminal law. They urged Nepal to reconsider its decision to reject the recommendation on ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. The transitional justice process remained deeply flawed. They called upon Nepal to cooperate fully with the United Nations mechanisms and to issue standing invitations to the relevant special procedures.

724. The Jubilee Campaign expressed concern that the recommendations encouraging Nepal to amend the section of the Constitution that curtailed religious freedom had not enjoyed the State's support. It noted that section 26 (3) of the Constitution was inconsistent with international human rights law, as it limited the freedom of the individual to convert from one faith to another and the freedom to peacefully express and share one's faith with others, and it urged Nepal to amend it. It further encouraged Nepal to extend a standing invitation to the special procedures.

725. The Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development regretted that Nepal had not supported the recommendations on ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. It expressed concern about the failure of the State to accept the recommendations on setting up an independent mechanism to investigate and prosecute security forces. It urged Nepal to heed the recent call by the High Commissioner for Human Rights to conduct an independent investigation into violence in the Terai region. It expressed concern about the lack of political will to expedite progress towards a credible transitional justice process.

726. The International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism voiced concern about the human rights of Dalits in Nepal. Although Nepal had accepted the recommendations relating to caste, all nine of those recommendations had been categorized as already implemented or in the process of implementation, and Dalits were yet to enjoy their basic human rights. They were systematically excluded from emergency aid and recovery efforts. It urged Nepal to ensure the full implementation of all nine of those recommendations through the effective enforcement of the law and the inclusion of Dalits in the earthquake recovery efforts.

727. Action Canada for Population and Development noted that, while women in Nepal had had the right to access safe abortion services since 2002, that right remained unfulfilled due to a lack of knowledge about the law among the general population; a lack of human resources, including certified doctors and nurses, particularly in rural and remote areas; financial obstacles; cultural taboos and stigma; and geographical barriers, among others.

Despite the instructions of the Supreme Court, a comprehensive safe abortion law had not been enacted.

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

728. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 195 recommendations received, 152 had enjoyed the support of Nepal and 43 had been noted.

729. The delegation thanked all the member and observer States and stakeholders for their meaningful participation. It would take the invaluable concerns, suggestions and recommendations into consideration.

730. Nepal considered the universal periodic review as a constructive mechanism to review the overall human rights situation of a country on an equal footing in a participatory and transparent manner. It believed in continuous and constructive engagement with the United Nations human rights mechanisms and compliance with international human rights norms and standards.

731. Nepal reiterated that, in the process of implementing the new Constitution, it was engaged in reviewing and revising the existing laws, as well as framing new legislation. Hence, the interactive dialogue had been valuable in providing meaningful insights into more effective legislation, policies and programmes. The State's efforts would be further concentrated on making development more sustainable and people-oriented.

732. Nepal was implementing the fourth national human rights action plan and would continue to update and implement it in the days to come.

733. Lastly, the delegation requested that all stakeholders, including the United Nations and development partners, extend their constructive support for capacity-building and economic development, which would help in the full implementation of the recommendations.

#### **Austria**

734. The review of Austria was held on 9 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Austria in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/AUT/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/AUT/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/AUT/3).

735. At its 44th meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Austria (see sect. C below).

736. The outcome of the review of Austria comprises the report of the Working Group on the universal periodic review (A/HRC/31/12), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/31/12/Add.1).

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

737. The delegation stated that the engagement of Austria in the area of human rights at the international level had always been guided by a spirit of cooperation and dialogue. Austria had continued to see the universal periodic review as an opportunity to demonstrate its

commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights at the international, regional and national levels. The review had provided the Government with a unique opportunity to re-examine the human rights situation in the country. Austria had ensured a high standard in the protection of human rights. At the same time, the full realization of human rights for all persons had remained a goal, an aspiration and a constant struggle.

738. Austria was facing a tremendous challenge to its human rights situation by the influx of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants. The delegation expressed the commitment of Austria to its obligations under the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees. The State was in a situation where its capacities for processing asylum applications effectively and for providing asylum seekers with shelter had been stretched to the limit, sometimes forcing the Government to take temporary measures to restrict the influx to a manageable size. Those measures had been taken in conformity with the international obligations of Austria. It was hoped that the Council of the European Union would comprehensively address ways to tackle the migration crisis at its meeting in March. Austria would continue to show solidarity and contribute considerable financial aid to reduce the human suffering, as well as increase protection for the most vulnerable persons, particularly women and children.

739. The national report had been prepared through an open and transparent process steered by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, in close coordination with the Federal Chancellery and with the participation of human rights coordinators of the other federal ministries and the provinces, and with the full involvement of non-governmental organizations and other independent institutions. The draft report was published on the website of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, and civil society organizations were able to present their comments concerning the draft report. The Government appreciated the critical assessment it had received and was committed to continuing the open dialogue in the area of human rights.

740. The review by the Working Group, during which there were questions, comments and recommendations, had created an opportunity for an assessment of the human rights situation by other States and it had thus provided the Government with another perspective on the strengths and weaknesses of the current situation.

741. During the interactive dialogue, Austria had received a total of 229 recommendations on various human rights issues. It had accepted 135 recommendations, but it had not been able to support 23 recommendations. The Government had held extensive consultations on the 71 recommendations that had been pending for the position of Austria. The consultations had suggested that Austria was in a position to support an additional 27 recommendations. The Government had provided written comprehensive explanations of its position on all of the remaining 71 recommendations.

742. The delegation provided additional clarifications on seven recommendations. Concerning four of those recommendations on reservations made by Austria to several international human rights conventions, the delegation reiterated that those reservations had been made in accordance with the object and purpose of those conventions. At the same time, the competent authorities were continuously reviewing the possibility of withdrawing some of the reservations. However, a withdrawal of the reservations to article 10 and article 14 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights was not envisaged, the reasons for which were provided in the addendum to the report of the Working Group. Nevertheless, Austria aimed to support all the recommendations calling for a withdrawal of reservations, while taking into account the above-mentioned clarification concerning the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

743. The delegation then provided clarification on the remaining three of those recommendations, including those on ratifying the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. As the ratification of the former was not currently envisaged, the part of those recommendations relating to the Optional Protocol could not be accepted. At the same time, Austria had accepted the part of those recommendations calling for the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure.

744. The Government considered the universal periodic review to be an ongoing process, which did not end at the adoption of the outcome of the review. Austria had been continuously

engaged in the follow-up to the recommendations since its first review in 2011. A group of human rights coordinators from all the federal ministries and from the governments of the nine Austrian provinces had been in place to follow up on the implementation of the recommendations. Since the first review, a dialogue with representatives of civil society had continued and intensified. A steering group on the universal periodic review, consisting of representatives of the Government and some non-governmental organizations, had also been created to evaluate the implementation of the recommendations.

745. The delegation expressed the commitment of Austria to continue the transparent and inclusive follow-up process for its second review and expressed appreciation for the constructive contribution expected from representatives of civil society in the process. Austria would submit a midterm report to provide an update on the implementation of the recommendations, as it had done during its first review.

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

746. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Austria, 14 delegations made statements.

747. The Sudan thanked Austria for its comprehensive presentation and the additional information provided. It appreciated the fact that Austria had accepted two out of the three recommendations made by the Sudan.

748. Tajikistan noted the commitment of Austria to take strategic measures to strengthen the national human rights protection mechanism. It noted the State's cooperation with civil society and the national plan of action for human rights, as well as efforts to integrate asylum seekers and refugees.

749. Afghanistan commended Austria for having accepted recommendations on ensuring the full inclusion of children belonging to minorities, asylum seekers and migrants by providing them with equal access to health, education and social services. It noted with appreciation the commitment of Austria to further strengthen the rights of children.

750. Albania, in view of the current influx of refugees, expressed hope that Austria would contribute to the coordination efforts of European countries to face that humanitarian, economic and security challenge. It noted with appreciation that Austria had accepted the recommendations made by Albania on building an equal and adequate pension system for women and on improving the situation of asylum seekers.

751. Botswana noted the acceptance by Austria of the majority of the recommendations received during the review. It commended the State for the measures it had taken to address the challenges faced by the influx of refugees and asylum seekers from countries affected by conflicts. It also appreciated the measures taken in the areas of criminal responsibility and juvenile justice.

752. China welcomed the acceptance by Austria of the majority of the recommendations, including those made by China. It expressed its hope that Austria would attach great importance to the implementation of the recommendations on increasing its official development assistance to the internationally agreed target of 0.7 per cent of gross national income in order to help developing countries to eliminate poverty and achieve sustainable development. It hoped that Austria would strengthen its anti-discrimination policies and legislation in order to prevent racism, racial discrimination and xenophobia.

753. The Council of Europe reiterated some of the challenges faced by Austria that had been highlighted by the various monitoring bodies of the Council of Europe, notably the discrimination of minorities, the curtailed rights of asylum seekers and racist rhetoric. It called upon Austria to ratify the Additional Protocol to the Convention on Cybercrime, concerning the criminalization of acts of a racist and xenophobic nature committed through computer systems, and the Additional Protocol to the Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism.

754. Cuba thanked Austria for having accepted the two recommendations made by Cuba on combating racism, xenophobia, violence against women and domestic violence.



755. Greece thanked Austria for having supported the recommendation made by Greece on protecting victims of trafficking in persons. It expressed concern that measures taken by the State had resulted in refugees being stranded along the Western Balkans migratory route. Those measures could obstruct refugees from applying for international protection according to the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees.

756. The Islamic Republic of Iran expressed concern about discrimination in law and practice against religious and ethnic minorities, in particular against Muslims. It highlighted the need to improve the investigation into alleged human rights violations by law enforcement officials, including by establishing an independent mechanism to investigate allegations of human rights violations.

757. Iraq commended Austria for having accepted the majority of the recommendations made during the review. It welcomed the measures taken by Austria to harmonize its national legislation with its international commitments, to promote gender equality and the rights of women and of persons with disabilities, and to combat racial discrimination, hate speech and incitements to violence.

758. Libya noted with satisfaction the acceptance by Austria of the majority of the recommendations made during the review. It commended Austria for the numerous important steps taken that would contribute to the translation of human rights concepts into reality, and it expressed hope that the country would enjoy further progress and prosperity.

759. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe welcomed the recent legal amendments to address some of the recommendations made by the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe in its electoral observation report, but it reminded the State that several of those recommendations had yet to be addressed. It encouraged Austria to engage in a constructive dialogue on its law on the recognition of adherents to Islam as a religious society, which contained discriminatory provisions.

760. Sierra Leone noted with appreciation that Austria had revised and domesticated its laws relating to the criminalization of hate crimes, in line with international instruments. It hoped that the country would develop anti-trafficking strategies and continue to work with other countries to end trafficking in persons.

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

761. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Austria, three other stakeholders made statements.

762. The Canners International Permanent Committee stated that all citizens were equal before the law in Austria. The basic rights and freedoms guaranteed in the Constitution had been first accorded more than a century ago. The European Convention on Human Rights supplemented the State's constitutional law. Austria was a developed nation with impressive indicators.

763. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme highlighted the importance of improving the situation of asylum seekers and of consolidating the status of refugees in view of the intensification of the migratory influx and an increase in hatred, violence and racism. It welcomed the legal measures taken to combat hate speech and the incitement of hatred. It encouraged the State to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

764. Africa culture internationale commended Austria for the progress it had made in closing the gender gap in the labour market, for the diversification of opportunities, and for having reduced the pay gap between women and men. It recommended that Austria make further efforts to eliminate discrimination based on migration status and to protect the rights of migrants and their children in Austria.

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

765. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 229 recommendations received, 158 had enjoyed the support of Austria and 64 had been noted.

Additional clarification had been provided on another seven recommendations, indicating which part of those recommendations had been supported and which part had been noted.

766. In conclusion, the delegation of Austria thanked all the participants in the review for their constructive and informative discussions, and in particular civil society for their interventions. The Government would closely consider their comments in the follow-up process.

767. Austria had taken the universal review process seriously and considered the recommendations to be an important input for its ongoing efforts to improve the human rights situation. The State had had many achievements. However, it still faced many challenges, especially considering the current refugee crisis. Austria had already received a large number of refugees and provided financial and other assistance to other affected countries, such as Greece. It had not closed its borders. At the same time, the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees did not contain a provision on the right to choose freely the country of asylum while passing through other safe countries on the way.

768. The Government intended to maintain high standards of human rights and thus would continue to work hard to succeed in its endeavour. The universal periodic review process would continue to play a pivotal role in that process.

### **Australia**

769. The review of Australia was held on 9 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Australia in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/AUS/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/AUS/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/AUS/3).

770. At its 45th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Australia (see sect. C below).

771. The outcome of the review of Australia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/14), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/31/14/Add.1).

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

772. The delegation of Australia stated that the State viewed the universal periodic review as an important opportunity to reflect on its human rights record and that it had carefully considered each of the 290 recommendations received, consulting with relevant departments and ministers at federal, state and territory levels to the extent possible. It thanked civil society for their involvement in its review. Australia had also actively engaged with civil society, having held a forum for that purpose on 9 December 2015 and having invited public submissions.

773. The delegation emphasized that the response of Australia to the universal periodic review recommendations was an ongoing process and dialogue. The 290 recommendations received touched on a wide range of human rights, with a focus on immigration and asylum seeker issues, the rights of indigenous Australians, gender and the rights of persons with disabilities. Australia had accepted 150 recommendations in its formal response and had

noted other recommendations. In some instances, recommendations had been noted by Australia for further consideration. Any future actions would be presented in its ongoing reporting.

774. Australia would fulfil its voluntary commitment to work with the Australian Human Rights Commission to develop a public and accessible process to monitor progress in implementing the universal periodic review recommendations. It would include, on behalf of the Government, a periodic statement on the progress made on the recommendations.

775. Australia had accepted recommendations in two broad circumstances: on the basis that new action would be taken to implement them; and where existing law, policy or action already addressed the substance of a recommendation. Highlighting two new actions, the delegation stated that Australia would undertake a national consultation on the implementation of the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights in 2016, and would move to withdraw its reservation to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women concerning the exclusion of women from combat roles, and repeal the related exemption from Australian anti-discrimination legislation.

776. The delegation highlighted the ongoing commitment of Australia to promote and protect the rights of older persons domestically and internationally. In February 2016, the Government had announced a new Australian Law Reform Commission inquiry into laws and frameworks to safeguard older Australians from abuse.

777. The delegation referred to the appointment by the Government in February 2016 of Kate Jenkins as the new Sex Discrimination Commissioner, a statutory appointment within the Australian Human Rights Commission.

778. The delegation reported on the Government's commitment to address the scourge of family violence with the launching in March 2016 of the South West Sydney Domestic Violence Unit, the first of 12 specialist domestic violence units to include targeted assistance to indigenous women and those facing cultural and linguistic barriers, as part of the Government's \$A 100 million Women's Safety Package.

779. Australia referred to the announcement in March 2016 of the Government's commitment to women holding 50 per cent of Australian government board positions overall, with at least a 40 per cent representation of women and a 40 per cent representation of men on individual boards. The new target would commence on 1 July 2016.

780. Reporting on another important development, Australia referred to its recent appointment of Member of Parliament Philip Ruddock as the State's new Special Envoy for Human Rights. Mr. Ruddock was an experienced parliamentarian and minister and part of the delegation of Australia to the universal periodic review. He would promote the State's candidacy for a seat on the Human Rights Council for 2018–2020.

781. Australia had accepted recommendations where existing law, policy or action already addressed the substance of the recommendation, such as those relating to trafficking in persons. Additionally, the national anti-racism partnership strategy and the Racial Discrimination Act were examples of actions to combat racial discrimination. Australia was committed to building a unified nation, acknowledging the unique contributions of indigenous cultures and the contributions of all Australians, both migrant and Australian-born, to its social cohesion and economic prosperity.

782. Many of the recommendations accepted called for Australia to continue or to strengthen its ongoing efforts to reduce the gender pay gap, strengthen women's roles in leadership and managerial positions, and implement the national plan to reduce violence against women and their children.

783. Australia continually reviewed its disability legislation, standards and policies to ensure they were robust and effective in upholding the rights of persons with disabilities. An independent review of the national disability insurance scheme legislation had been tabled in Parliament in March 2016 and would be considered by the Government.

784. Regarding the challenges that Australia continued to face, the delegation noted that Australia had accepted 37 recommendations on protecting and promoting the human rights of indigenous Australians. In February 2016, the Prime Minister of Australia, Malcolm

Turnbull, had delivered the Closing the Gap report for 2016, which had highlighted the commitment of Australia to close the gap between outcomes for indigenous and non-indigenous Australians and to report on progress in an objective, measurable and publicly accessible way.

785. The delegation indicated that it had endeavoured to make clear the reasons why Australia had noted particular recommendations. Some recommendations had been noted for further consideration. Australia would continue to consider those recommendations and would provide updates through its ongoing monitoring processes and its midterm report to the Human Rights Council. For example, the Government supported the principles of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and was considering its ratification. As the States and territories managed most Australian places of detention, their support was required and they were being consulted on the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture.

786. Australia had noted other recommendations where the response was dependent on future decisions of the Australian public through a referendum concerning the recognition of indigenous Australians in the Constitution and a plebiscite on legalizing same-sex marriage.

787. Australia had noted other recommendations that would not be considered further at the present time, such as those on ratifying international instruments on migrant workers' rights or on protection from enforced disappearance. The Government considered that the laws and policies of Australia were generally consistent with the obligations in those conventions.

788. Additionally, Australia did not propose to alter its federal model of parliamentary supremacy through the introduction of a judicially enforceable human rights act.

789. Australia had noted the recommendations on ceasing mandatory immigration detention, turning back boats where it was safe to do so and transferring people who arrived illegally by boat to other countries for processing and settlement. The Australian Government remained committed to its immigration and border protection policies, which protected the integrity of its regular and safe global migration programme – the largest per capita in the world – and severely damaged the insidious people smuggling trade.

790. Concerning the recommendations Australia had noted relating to children in immigration detention, the delegation stated that it was the position of the Australian Government that children were not held in immigration detention centres but were accommodated in alternative places of detention. As of 17 March 2016, there were 35 children accommodated in alternative places of detention, and that number was down from a peak of almost 2,000 children in mid-2013.

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

791. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Australia, 16 delegations made statements.<sup>21</sup>

792. The Lao People's Democratic Republic appreciated the fact that Australia had extended its aid programme to support capacity-building on human rights issues. It welcomed the State's achievements in promoting the rights of persons with disabilities and gender equality and its commitment to promote the rights of indigenous people.

793. Libya commended Australia for its commitment to render the country fairer and more inclusive, particularly with the implementation of the Closing the Gap initiative to overcome the deprivation experienced by the indigenous population.

794. Malaysia noted the commitment of Australia, and particularly that it had held a referendum to recognize Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians and had offered humanitarian support and assistance to people affected by war in the Syrian Arab Republic

<sup>21</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/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx>.

and in Iraq. Malaysia hoped that Australia would favourably consider its recommendations on closing the gap between indigenous and non-indigenous Australians in health, education, employment opportunities and access to justice, as well as on combating racial discrimination, xenophobia and prejudices against members of religious and ethnic minorities.

795. Maldives was pleased that Australia had accepted most of the recommendations made by Maldives and it welcomed the appointment of the new Special Envoy for Human Rights.

796. Nigeria thanked Australia for having provided an update on the recommendations received. It appreciated the fact that most of the recommendations had been accepted.

797. Paraguay welcomed the commitment of Australia to set up a public and accessible follow-up system on the implementation of the universal periodic review recommendations, including the setting up of a permanent national mechanism to strengthen its cooperation with the United Nations human rights system. Paraguay expressed its availability to provide technical cooperation on the basis of its own experience. It acknowledged the State's commitment to the promotion and protection of the human rights of indigenous peoples, including the right to consultation, and the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

798. Sierra Leone commended Australia for having established a national plan to reduce violence against women and their children, which would have an independent evaluation mechanism. The State's substantial financial commitment to end domestic violence and to assist victims and indigenous women was noteworthy. While it was encouraging that Australia would provide humanitarian assistance to over 240,000 refugees, Sierra Leone hoped that Australia would consider reassessing its border protection policies and offshore procedures for asylum seekers.

799. Sri Lanka noted the initiatives taken by Australia in securing the rights of indigenous peoples by having provided constitutional recognition. It encouraged the State to continue to promote and protect the human rights of migrants, refugees and asylum seekers in accordance with its international commitments, particularly with efforts to enhance policies and procedures to protect affected children.

800. Tajikistan welcomed the measures taken by Australia to improve legislative reform, including by having strengthened measures to protect older persons and the regional normative basis to combat trafficking in persons and transnational crime.

801. Viet Nam appreciated the fact that Australia had supported the majority of the universal periodic review recommendations, including the two recommendations made by Viet Nam.

802. Afghanistan acknowledged that many of the recommendations made had enjoyed the support of Australia. It wished the State well in their implementation, particularly that of the recommendations relating to immigration and asylum seekers.

803. Albania commended Australia for, inter alia, the appointment of a full-time Human Rights Commissioner and the measures taken towards ensuring multiculturalism. It strongly encouraged the State to continue to improve the human rights of indigenous peoples, to ratify the protocols of the core human rights conventions and to take relevant safe measures for migrants trying to reach Australia.

804. Armenia appreciated that Australia had accepted a large number of recommendations, including the recommendation made by Armenia. It appreciated in particular the State's engagement in and contribution to efforts at the international level relating to the prevention of genocide.

805. Botswana commended Australia for the legislative and policy measures it had taken to address trafficking of persons, slavery and family violence. It appreciated the fact that Australia continued to cooperate with special procedures and other human rights mechanisms. It welcomed the State's efforts to empower persons with disabilities, including through the establishment of the National Disability Scheme.

806. China welcomed the commitment of Australia to combat trafficking in persons effectively and to eliminate contemporary forms of slavery, and it hoped for the speedy implementation of its recommendation. Regretting that several recommendations on the rights of indigenous peoples had not enjoyed the support of Australia, China hoped that the State would implement the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and develop a national strategy to eliminate discrimination against indigenous people. It called upon Australia to properly deal with all refugees, migrants and asylum seekers arriving in the country and effectively guarantee their rights, and to engage in international cooperation for human rights so as to address the root causes of illegal migration.

807. Fiji urged Australia to address the shortcomings relating to the situation of migrants identified by both the Australian Human Rights Commission and OHCHR, so that it would fully meet its international obligations. Although Australia had not accepted the recommendation made by Fiji on climate change, it urged the State to take a fair share of responsibility in climate mitigation efforts.

### 3. General comments made by other stakeholders

808. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Australia, 11 other stakeholders made statements.<sup>22</sup>

809. The Australian Human Rights Commission acknowledged the Government's engagement with the Commission and civil society throughout the universal periodic review process and its commitment to a transparent mechanism to monitor future progress. Noting that the Government had accepted 150 recommendations on the grounds that its laws already addressed the human rights at issue, the Commission stated that current approaches were inadequate in, for example, reducing the overrepresentation of indigenous peoples in the criminal justice system. It urged the State to adopt targeted strategies and to have full consultation with indigenous Australians to close the gap in incarceration rates. The detention of those with cognitive and other disabilities, juveniles, asylum seekers and indigenous peoples was a common concern in the universal periodic review recommendations. The Commission urged Australia to ratify and implement the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. It stated that the single issue prompting most of the recommendations concerned the State's asylum seeker laws, and the offshore processing centres in particular, and that approximately 3,000 remained in mandatory indefinite detention, which violated the human rights obligations of Australia. The Commission reiterated its call for strict time limits on detention and for access to judicial review.

810. Edmund Rice International, presenting a joint statement, expressed deep concern about the announcement of Australia that it had no plans to cease its policies of mandatory detention. Australia was the only country in the world to detain children arriving on its shores as a first option. It referred to the personal experiences of refugees and reported on concerns about the welfare and safety of asylum seekers, especially women and children, in offshore detention centres. It urged Australia to stop refoulement, cease financing offshore processing centres, establish more humane alternatives to detention for children and their families arriving by boat, and ensure faster processing of asylum claims in accordance with international human rights standards.

811. The International Service for Human Rights, presenting a joint statement with the Human Rights Law Centre, welcomed the commitment of Australia to elaborate a national action plan on business and human rights and to develop a process to monitor progress in the implementation of the universal periodic review recommendations. It regretted that Australia had noted or would not consider further a range of recommendations, which appeared inconsistent with the pillars of the State's Human Rights Council candidacy for 2018, and it urged the State to develop a human rights act, extend the mandate of the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Human Rights and ratify the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant

<sup>22</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/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx>.

on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. It expressed concern about regression in respect of freedoms of expression and assembly and called for the consideration and implementation of the recommendations contained in the Human Rights Law Centre's report on safeguarding democracy.

812. Sisters of Mercy of the Americas, presenting a joint statement, expressed particular concern about the devastating human rights impacts reportedly experienced due to coal seam gas mining in Chinchilla, including damage to potable water and the failure to monitor the safety of locally grown food. It called upon the Government to reconsider its refusal to adopt an enforceable human rights act. It called for improved federal legislation to require corporate due diligence and ensure access to justice, and it urged Australia to heed the testimony of the community in Chinchilla at a recent Senate inquiry on that issue to inform domestic legislation and policy.

813. Franciscans International, presenting a joint statement with Centre Europe-tiers monde, welcomed the adoption of the recommendation made by Ecuador concerning human rights violations committed by Australian enterprises in its territories and in third States. The commitment of Australia to take the lead in the promotion of human rights worldwide was important, as there had reportedly been an increase in human rights violations resulting from the business activities of an Australian-based corporation. It recommended that Australia establish a clear mechanism to ensure effective access to justice, including a dispute mechanism for communities and peoples affected by Australian companies operating abroad, and officially respect the primacy of human rights over free trade agreements.

814. Save the Children International welcomed the commitment of Australia to increase the intake of refugees in response to the humanitarian crisis in the Syrian Arab Republic and its acceptance of the recommendations calling for an immediate end to the mandatory detention of migrant children and respect for the best interests of the child. It commented on the Government's response – that children were not held in immigration detention but rather in alternative places of detention – by stating that such places were often within closed centres and with restricted access to visitors, security guards and no right to move freely. It called upon the Government to release the 88 children held in all forms of immigration detention facilities in Australia and the 54 children held in Nauru. Save the Children International reported that sending children to offshore processing centres violated their rights and it urged the State to implement the recommendations calling for the transparent and independent monitoring of all offshore processing centres.

815. The International Lesbian and Gay Association, presenting a joint statement with the Human Rights Law Centre, welcomed the statement of Australia in support of the diversity of families, but it also called for the harmonization of laws relating to adoption and reproduction. It reported that marriage remained a key area of inequality and they were concerned that a plebiscite on that issue was costly and unnecessary. A parliamentary vote could end the discrimination entrenched in the law. It urged Australia to take action against non-therapeutic sterilization without consent, with reference to people with intersex variations. It called upon Australia to ensure that States and territories allowed change of sex on birth certificates without invasive and unnecessary surgery.

816. Human Rights Watch reported that, during the second universal periodic review of Australia, member States from every corner of the globe had criticized the State's asylum laws and refugee policies and especially the abuses relating to the State's offshore processing centres. Sending people seeking asylum to remote detention camps in the Pacific did not outsource the legal obligations of Australia under the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees. While welcoming the State's increased acceptance of Syrian refugees, Human Rights Watch stated that the Australian Government must remain committed to ensuring all people were treated fairly and in accordance with its international obligations.

817. Amnesty International noted two dominant human rights issues: pervasive discrimination experienced by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, and the State's treatment of refugees and asylum seekers. It reported that indigenous young people were greatly overrepresented in juvenile detention, which was caused by the ongoing disadvantage that had its origins in colonial Australia. Amnesty International stated that Australia should set measurable targets to significantly reduce indigenous incarceration rates and it was deeply

concerned that the State had rejected the recommendations on raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility to 12 years and on repealing mandatory sentencing. Australia had rejected all the recommendations calling for an end to offshore processing and had claimed that those places were fit for purpose. International human rights organizations and journalists must be granted access to offshore processing centres that were financed and effectively controlled by Australia.

818. The Pan African Union for Science and Technology stated that Australia had a system of Government that embraced religious tolerance and freedom of speech and association. Australia had shown impressive economic growth and was high on the human development index, and had reduced gender disparities through government measures.

819. The National Association of Community Legal Centres welcomed the Government's acceptance of 150 recommendations. It was concerned, however, that some recommendations had been accepted on the basis that they were consistent with existing law, policy or action and that that would mean no meaningful action would be taken to fully implement the recommendations. The State's response did little to indicate new and meaningful engagement or action to address the overrepresentation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in the justice system or proper funding of or consultation with national Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander bodies. It expressed concern about the lack of willingness to implement the recommendations, highlighting grave concerns about the approach of Australia to refugees and asylum seekers, mandatory sentencing and access to services. It welcomed the Government's commitment to address family violence and called for substantial increases in funding for domestic and family violence services. It welcomed the State's commitments, especially those relating to a monitoring mechanism for the recommendations, and it acknowledged the Government's engagement with civil society during the universal periodic review process.

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

820. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 290 recommendations received, 150 had enjoyed the support of Australia and 140 had been noted.

821. The delegation thanked all of the participants and highlighted the ongoing engagement of Australia with the universal periodic review process. It reiterated the voluntary commitment of Australia to work with the Australian Human Rights Commission to develop a public and accessible process to monitor the State's progress in the implementation of the recommendations, and to make a periodic statement on that progress.

#### **Georgia**

822. The review of Georgia was held on 10 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Georgia in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/GEO/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/GEO/2 and Corr.1);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/GEO/3).

823. At its 45th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Georgia (see sect. C below).

824. The outcome of the review of Georgia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/15 and Corr.1), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues



that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/31/15/Add.1).

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

825. The delegation of Georgia stated that, after a careful review of all 203 recommendations, it had supported 191 of them. Georgia had ratified most of the United Nations human rights treaties and had supported all of the recommendations on acceding to the remaining international human rights instruments.

826. All of the recommendations on cooperating with human rights mechanisms had been supported. Georgia was committed to fulfilling its reporting obligations and had developed an inclusive national reporting process. It also planned to include the recommendations from the universal periodic review and the treaty bodies in a national action plan on human rights for 2016–2017, which was being finalized in consultation with civil society representatives and international organizations.

827. Georgia had accepted the recommendations on engaging with the international community to ensure that international human rights monitoring mechanisms had access to Abkhazia and the Tskhinvali region/South Ossetia. The delegation emphasized the increasingly acute need for effective human rights monitoring in those occupied regions, given the imminent threat of a further deterioration in the human rights situation there.

828. Georgia had supported the recommendations on strengthening measures for the protection of internally displaced persons. While internally displaced persons from the State's occupied regions continued to be denied their right to return to their homes, the Government had been working hard to provide them with adequate housing. An action plan and strategy on internally displaced persons for 2015–2016 had been developed in consultation with the internally displaced persons themselves and with non-governmental organizations.

829. Georgia had supported the recommendations on equality and non-discrimination. A new anti-discrimination law, which explicitly prohibited all forms of discrimination, had been enacted with wide consultations. The budget of the Office of the Public Defender (Ombudsman) of Georgia, whose tasks included monitoring the implementation of the law, had been considerably increased. Georgia would also reinforce the equality provisions in the new national action plan on human rights for 2016–2017, with a particular focus on minority groups. The action plan reaffirmed the State's commitment to address violence and hate speech against minorities and provided for the effective implementation of the equality legislation. Georgia also planned to appoint and train specialized police officers for the investigation of hate crimes in all areas of police departments.

830. Georgia supported all the recommendations concerning freedom of religion or belief, freedom of expression and the right to peaceful assembly. It would promote interreligious and intercultural dialogue and tolerance, and it had already taken steps to safeguard freedom of the media.

831. All of the recommendations relating to women's rights, combating domestic violence and violence against women had been supported. Efforts to promote gender equality and the political participation of women had been strengthened through the new national action plan on human rights for 2016–2017. Georgia would soon ratify the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention), and a new action plan on violence against women and domestic violence was being developed. Provisions allowing marriage from 16 years of age with the consent of parents or guardians had been removed; the minimum age for marriage in Georgia was now 18 years.

832. The delegation referred to reforms to prevent and punish acts of torture and ill-treatment. Georgia had supported the recommendations on establishing an independent investigative mechanism and was currently engaging in consultations with stakeholders to discuss various models. Its commitments had been reaffirmed in its newly adopted anti-torture action plan.

833. All of the recommendations relating to the penitentiary system had been supported. Comprehensive reforms were aimed at improving the relevant legislation and management systems. Significant progress had also been made towards eliminating overcrowding, and internal monitoring mechanisms had been strengthened. The reforms had also included the juvenile justice system. Prison infrastructure for female convicts had been upgraded, and a special mother and child unit had been established.

834. Georgia had also supported the recommendations concerning the fight against trafficking in persons. The delegation reiterated the State's policies and provided more details on the related measures. In relation to the prevention of trafficking in children, especially those in a street situation, Parliament had begun discussing a legislative package aimed at creating a legal framework to provide children with identification documents and at strengthening other protection measures.

835. Georgia had supported the recommendations on strengthening the independence of the judiciary. In 2015, a third phase of reforms had been launched, and new set of legislative amendments was being considered by Parliament. Pretrial detention was now only being used in exceptional cases, and legislative amendments passed in July 2015 had introduced the regular judicial review of pretrial detention decisions. In relation to prosecutorial reform, the measures implemented included the appointment of a new Chief Prosecutor in November under new procedures with increased transparency.

836. Georgia was finalizing its initial State report under the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and had supported all of the recommendations relating to persons with disabilities. Further work was proceeding to strengthen the relevant institutional mechanisms and to harmonize legislation and practices with the Convention.

837. Georgia had supported the recommendation on strengthening social dialogue and ensuring the protection and promotion of the economic rights of the labour force through, for example, the establishment of an efficient labour inspection mechanism. A universal health-care programme had been introduced in 2013. Ninety per cent of the population, including women, were current beneficiaries of the programme. Other relevant measures had been taken to protect patients' rights and to promote maternal and child health. Recommendations were also being considered regarding the State financing of programmes for the supply of contraceptives and the provision of respective counselling services.

838. Georgia had supported the recommendations relating to ethnic and religious minorities. The new strategy and action plan for civic equality and integration for 2015–2020 had been built upon earlier experiences and had introduced various new approaches. The strategy paid special attention to the social and economic integration of the Roma population of Georgia.

839. The recommendations on the right to education had been supported and were either implemented or were in the process of implementation. Georgia enumerated the relevant provisions in legislation and policy and noted that the Government was carrying out all the steps necessary to encourage the school attendance of girls.

840. Georgia had supported the recommendations on repatriating persons who had been forcibly displaced in the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the 1940s, and had finished drafting an action plan on the implementation of the State strategy for the repatriation of forcibly exiled persons. Regarding persons holding refugee or humanitarian status, the relevant legislation had been strengthened and aligned with international standards, and the migration strategy and action plan for 2016–2020 detailed the measures being taken.

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

841. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Georgia, 16 delegations made statements.

842. China thanked Georgia for having accepted its recommendations and it hoped that the State would further improve access to, and the quality of, education and raise the enrolment rate of vulnerable children, including girls and those from ethnic minorities. China also hoped

that Georgia, through the implementation of its national strategy, would promote interreligious and cultural dialogue and inclusion.

843. The Council of Europe recalled some of the issues raised by its monitoring bodies. Those included a lack of independence of the judicial system, as well as deficiencies in its functioning, and the excessive use of force by the police and alleged abuses, including ill-treatment, in some prisons. It invited Georgia to accede to the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages and the Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism and it requested information on the prospects for ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure.

844. Libya welcomed the efforts of Georgia to promote and protect human rights, in particular the legislative amendments adopted. It thanked the State for its acceptance of many of the recommendations made during the review, which reflected its positive commitment to the universal periodic review and its determination to improve human rights.

845. Malawi applauded Georgia for its continued cooperation with the Human Rights Council and for its promotion of good practices, as demonstrated by its submission of a midterm report and the extension of a standing invitation to the special procedures. It welcomed the State's written responses to the recommendations and believed that that practice should be encouraged. It also encouraged Georgia to remain steadfast and redouble its efforts to implement all of the outstanding recommendations that it had supported in the first two reviews and to reconsider, if appropriate, those that it had noted.

846. Nigeria appreciated the fact that most of the recommendations had been supported by Georgia, including its own, which further demonstrated the State's commitment to continue to strengthen its efforts in the promotion and protection of the human rights of all of its citizens.

847. The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe noted that in January 2016 the Georgian Parliament had adopted amendments on redrawing constituency boundaries, which had addressed one of its long-standing recommendations. It had concerns, however, about the lack of transparency in the process. It recommended the reform of the National Communications Commission in relation to the regulation of media coverage during elections. It welcomed its fruitful cooperation with Georgian institutions and recommended that the State take note of a number of recommendations contained in its Trial Monitoring Report of 2014.

848. Paraguay appreciated the fact that Georgia had supported all of the recommendations it had made. It highlighted in particular the recommendation on setting up a national system for follow-up on the recommendations from international human rights bodies, which it considered to be particularly important. It expressed its willingness to offer assistance in the implementation of that recommendation.

849. The Russian Federation was deeply concerned that, for political reasons, Georgia had again ignored the recommendations it had made during the universal periodic review. Those recommendations concerned such important issues as combating torture, discrimination, racism and hate speech, ensuring the rights of minorities and investigating serious violations of human rights. It emphasized that that demonstrated that Georgia was continuing on the path of politicization and confrontation to the detriment of the rights and interests of its own population.

850. Sierra Leone noted that Georgia had supported a large majority of the recommendations it had received and that some of them had already been implemented. It commended Georgia for having recently enacted legislation that had set the minimum age for marriage at 18 years and had thus effectively ended child marriage.

851. Tajikistan welcomed the activities that had been completed during the review, which would contribute to furthering the achievements of Georgia in the protection and promotion of human rights. The national report again demonstrated the country's constructive participation, including its cooperation with civil society and the special procedures. It noted the adoption of legislation relating to non-discrimination, legal reform, societal integration and the promotion of tolerance.

852. UN-Women commended the improvements in legislation concerning violence against women and girls, including domestic violence, and the improvements in the response to violence against women. It called upon Georgia to ratify the Istanbul Convention and to intensify efforts to provide services to victims of gender-based violence and domestic violence. It urged Georgia to tackle discriminatory practices, such as gender-biased sex selection, and to take concrete measures for the political and economic empowerment of women.

853. UNICEF welcomed the adoption of the Juvenile Justice Code and improvements to the benefit system, which were projected to reduce the number of children living in extreme poverty. It encouraged the State to accelerate improvements in the quality of perinatal and primary health care for mothers and children, and it expressed concern about the significant levels of malnutrition that affected them. It called upon Georgia to introduce such actions as the enrichment of flour, the promotion of breastfeeding and the provision of micronutrient supplementation for infants, and it offered its assistance in those measures. It welcomed the State's support for the recommendation on ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure and urged that it be done as a matter of priority.

854. Albania commended Georgia for its commitments to advance the protection and promotion of human rights and its positive engagement with the universal periodic review and the special procedures. It also commended the State for the recent progress in improving legislation, building institutional democracy and changing institutional cultures. It was pleased to note that Georgia had supported a large number of recommendations, including the two recommendations made by Albania.

855. Algeria noted that Georgia had adopted the National Human Rights Strategy (2014–2020), initiated significant reforms to the judiciary and the prison system since 2012, and taken steps to combat trafficking in persons and torture. It noted the acceptance by Georgia of most of the recommendations.

856. Armenia appreciated the fact that Georgia had accepted most of the recommendations, including its own. It also highly appreciated the mutual cooperation between the two countries in promoting and protecting human rights at the national and international levels. It hoped that their cooperation in promoting the rights of the Armenian minorities in Georgia would expand further in the same constructive manner.

857. Botswana welcomed the adoption by Georgia of the national action plan on human rights and the anti-discrimination law. It commended Georgia for its efforts to address women's rights through the adoption of the law on gender equality and the action plan on violence against women and domestic violence. It also welcomed the State's continued cooperation with human rights mechanisms.

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

858. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Georgia, eight other stakeholders made statements.

859. The Office of the Public Defender (Ombudsman) of Georgia was glad to note that the Government had actively collaborated with it during the whole universal periodic review process. It noted that the majority of the recommendations had immediately been supported, but it highlighted a number of points for consideration. First, there was a need to establish an independent investigatory mechanism for any instances of torture or inhuman or degrading treatment committed by law enforcement officers, including in penitentiaries. Second, an efficient labour inspection mechanism needed to be created to ensure safe working conditions and national legislation needed to be harmonized with international standards. Third, there needed to be a fair process for the appointment and promotion of judges. Lastly, Georgia still needed to make efforts to fight successfully against domestic and gender-based violence, to strengthen anti-discrimination legislation and to take all possible measures for the protection of human rights in the occupied territories.

860. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland commended Georgia for having supported most of the recommendations

concerning sexual orientation and gender identity and expression. However, it disagreed with the view that some had already been implemented or were in the process of implementation. It welcomed the State's commitment to assign and train police officers who would specialize in the investigation of hate crimes, but it urged the State to include non-governmental organizations in the process. It noted that no significant improvements had been made to the anti-discrimination law, and it expected Georgia to consider feedback from civil society to improve and include a legally binding implementation mechanism. It called for the establishment of a swift, transparent and accessible mechanism for legal gender recognition and for Georgia to support public campaigns to combat hate speech and the stigmatization of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons.

861. Action Canada for Population and Development noted that Georgia had accepted a wide range of recommendations relating to sexual and reproductive health and rights. It encouraged the Government to work closely with civil society organizations on their implementation and to ensure that the areas of the recommendations that were crucial to protect and respect the rights of women and girls relating to sexual and reproductive health were implemented. Those areas included the provision of comprehensive sexuality education in formal and informal settings; the improvement of data collection on the access of women and girls to quality health services; the decriminalization of drug use and the establishment of sustainable harm reduction services for women; the liberalization of laws and policies on sex work; and the provision of access to sustainable prevention and treatment of, and care services for those affected by, sexually transmitted or blood-borne diseases.

862. The International Catholic Child Bureau appreciated the cooperation of Georgia with the universal periodic review. It was concerned about recent information showing that there was a high public tolerance towards violence against children and a high rate of such violence. It commended Georgia for its efforts to respond to previous universal periodic review recommendations in that field, but it was concerned that hidden sexual abuse existed, including through the use of information and communications technology. It had therefore made recommendations to the State, including that it modify its legislation so as to be in conformity with the Council of Europe Convention on the Protection of Children against Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse, that it increase public awareness of violence against children and child sexual abuse with a special emphasis on children with disabilities, and that it strengthen the capacities and expertise of law enforcement officials in child-friendly investigations.

863. Amnesty International welcomed the acceptance by Georgia of the recommendation on establishing an institution to investigate and prosecute human rights abuses and violations committed by law enforcement and security forces, as it considered that the current practice lacked independence and impartiality. It noted the acceptance of the recommendations on implementing international fair trial standards and limiting the use of pretrial detention, but it was concerned about reports of political interference in the judiciary, including the concerns identified by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. It urged Georgia to adhere fully to international fair trial standards and to ensure that prolonged detention or other custodial measures were used only when justified in law. Noting that Georgia had reported that the related recommendations had been "already implemented or in the process of being implemented", it urged the State to take immediate and effective steps to ensure full respect for and protection of the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons.

864. The Pan African Union for Science and Technology noted that Georgia had made progress in sustaining democracy, human rights and fundamental freedoms, including through the adoption of the national action plan on human rights, improvements to the prison system and the protection of children's rights. It also noted the human rights commitments contained in the State's Association Agreement with the European Union and the fact that the European Union had acknowledged progress, but it highlighted the need to ensure judicial independence and to increase accountability and the democratic oversight of law enforcement agencies. It referred to the adoption of an anti-discrimination law in 2014, but it noted that some had criticized the law for a lack of efficient implementation mechanisms. It also noted the progress in improving health care in prisons and the halving of the prison population through pardons and an amnesty.

865. The Swedish Association for Sexuality Education welcomed the commitments of Georgia, including its acceptance of the recommendations concerning sexual and reproductive health and rights, and it urged the State to ensure their effective implementation. It was particularly concerned about the effective protection of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons in Georgia. It encouraged the State to prevent discrimination further by combating hate speech in public service and by promoting secular, evidence-based education on gender relations, sexuality and equality. It also encouraged Georgia to effectively address the major economic and social obstacles hindering the access of women and girls to information and family planning services, including contraception and safe abortion, and to HIV/AIDs prevention and treatment.

866. The Human Rights House Foundation noted the active participation of civil society in the review. It welcomed the steps taken by Georgia to address cases of torture and other inhuman and degrading treatment, but it considered that Georgia must undertake additional efforts to ensure the efficiency and impartiality of investigations conducted in the penitentiary system. Georgia must create an independent investigative mechanism for the prompt, unbiased and competent investigation of such allegations and ensure protection for victims during the investigation process. It welcomed the adoption of the anti-discrimination plan, but Georgia should further improve its anti-discrimination legislation in order to ensure adequate protection against discrimination in practice and create and implement a strategy to prevent and effectively investigate politically motivated dismissals from public service. It was also concerned about widespread cases of discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons in Georgia.

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

867. The Vice-President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 203 recommendations received, 191 had enjoyed the support of Georgia and 12 had been noted.

868. The delegation of Georgia thanked the delegations for their valuable recommendations and noted that some steps had already been taken to address the issues described by the participants.

869. Georgia also expressed its gratitude to everyone involved in the universal periodic review process in Georgia, particularly the Office of the Public Defender (Ombudsman) and various non-governmental organizations. It also thanked the United Nations for its presence.

870. In closing, the delegation expressed the determination of Georgia to continue to work to comply with its international human rights obligations and to pursue close cooperation with all actors, including non-governmental organizations, in its efforts to fulfil its commitments. It stated that the universal periodic review would continue to constitute an important element in those efforts and it pledged to submit a midterm report to provide information on the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations.

#### Saint Lucia

871. The review of Saint Lucia was held on 5 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Saint Lucia in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/LCA/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/LCA/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/LCA/3).

872. At its 45th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Saint Lucia (see sect. C below).

873. The outcome of the review of Saint Lucia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/10), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/31/10/Add.1).

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

874. The delegation of Saint Lucia presented the response of its Government to the recommendations made by member States during the universal periodic review in November 2015. During the review, all of the 121 recommendations received would be considered by the relevant stakeholders with the aim of accepting those that seemed readily attainable by the State.

875. The Government had accepted 91 recommendations, partially accepted 1 and noted 29. The Government believed it could implement the 91 recommendations it had accepted within the four-and-a-half-year period prior to the next review. The rationale was twofold: first, the Government believed that it had a head start in certain areas where progress had already been made; second, some of the recommendations fell firmly in line with the Government's vision for the country, and the policies necessary for their implementation would therefore not be far removed from the State's established mandate.

876. Regarding the recommendations that had been noted, the Government believed that Saint Lucia would find it difficult to take action to implement those recommendations within the same four-and-a-half-year period for various reasons. However, the Government had not determined that those recommendations were unachievable, and in fact some could well be acted upon within the aforementioned time frame. Nevertheless, a definitive stance could not be taken on them at the moment of the adoption of the report by the Human Rights Council.

877. The Government believed that it was already on its way to meeting its obligations in several areas covered in the recommendations. An example was the issue of gender equality, about which the delegation recalled that, according to a report released by the International Labour Organization in 2015, 52.3 per cent of managerial positions in Saint Lucia were held by women. Such an achievement did not occur by accident, but rather as a result of the introduction of progressive policies and initiatives that supported the advancement of Saint Lucian women.

878. Yet the Government realized that that was no reason to rest on its laurels, as women were still faced with issues that hindered their general well-being. Domestic violence was one such issue that Saint Lucia was tackling with the current revamp of its domestic violence legislation. The result of such a revamp was likely to be harsher penalties for perpetrators of such crimes and the ability of the State to prosecute such incidences without the need for a victim complaint.

879. The delegation informed the Human Rights Council about further changes to the State's legislation. Family law legislation was currently being examined, with amendments likely addressing some of the recommendations made, such as those on removing the legal distinction between children born within and outside of marriage. Also, instruments of ratification had been drafted and should be deposited shortly for the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

880. In conclusion, in an effort to bolster the capacity of Saint Lucia not only to ratify human rights instruments but also to integrate them into domestic legislation, the Government had doubled the number of legislative drafters within the drafting unit.

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

881. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Saint Lucia, 11 delegations made statements.

882. Maldives noted that Saint Lucia was a fellow member of the Alliance of Small Island States, acknowledged the work of the Government in its commitment to the universal periodic review and applauded the commendable progress made. It was pleased to see that the Government had accepted 92 recommendations, including the 2 made by Maldives, and it expressed its understanding of the challenges and constraints faced by Saint Lucia as a small island developing State.

883. Nigeria commended Saint Lucia for its engagement with the universal periodic review, including its update on the recommendations received. Nigeria noted the efforts of the Government to strengthen the promotion and protection of the human rights of its citizens, despite numerous challenges. It urged Saint Lucia to maintain its cooperation with the Human Rights Council and its commitment to promote and protect the human rights of its people.

884. Pakistan valued the constructive engagement of Saint Lucia with the human rights machinery, including the universal periodic review mechanism, which reflected the commitment of the Government to the promotion and protection of the human rights of its citizens. Pakistan acknowledged the efforts of the Government despite the various challenges the State was facing, and it appreciated the State's decision to make every effort to implement the recommendations made during the universal periodic review.

885. Paraguay recognized the willingness of the Government to accept most of the recommendations made by Paraguay and it considered that such acceptance would contribute to guaranteeing human rights in Saint Lucia. It drew attention to the recommendation contained in paragraph 88.52 of the report of the Working Group on establishing a system for monitoring the implementation of international human rights recommendations; it was certain that its establishment would strengthen the State's capacity to report to the various international human rights mechanisms. Paraguay expressed its readiness to provide Saint Lucia with technical cooperation on the basis of its national experience.

886. Saint Kitts and Nevis applauded Saint Lucia for its efforts to enhance human rights on the ground, to fulfil its obligations under the human rights instruments to which it was a party and to report to the treaty bodies. It admired the State for the formation of the Constitutional Reform Committee and the progress it had achieved. It welcomed the State's will and dedication of resources to the overall cause of enhancing the standard of living of all of its citizens and its accomplishments in having incorporated some aspects of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development into its domestic plan. It encouraged Saint Lucia not to waver in seeking out and accessing available technical and other assistance from willing partners in order to bolster its own national endeavours.

887. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines commended Saint Lucia for having accepted a substantive number of recommendations. It welcomed in particular the fact that the Government had accepted the recommendations on ratifying the core international human rights treaties to which it was not yet a party and on aligning its national legislation to give effect to its international human rights obligations. It also recognized the efforts of Saint Lucia to strengthen the national legislative framework to combat domestic and gender-based violence. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines encouraged the Government to bolster its approach to human rights, fostering coordination and promoting the inclusivity of civil society and other key stakeholders.

888. Sierra Leone considered that Saint Lucia, as a relatively young nation, had made good progress in promoting human rights nationally, and it was encouraged by the commitment shown to the universal periodic review process and by the State's active engagement with States during the review in 2015. It commended Saint Lucia for the various measures it had taken to protect fundamental freedoms, as evidenced by the acceptance of recommendations. It encouraged Saint Lucia, however, to ratify and domesticate international human rights instruments, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The Government remained committed to addressing international partnerships in order to establish sustainable methodologies to mitigate climate change.

889. UN-Women noted with appreciation that during the interactive dialogue Saint Lucia had accepted all of the recommendations made on fighting poverty and social inequality and on expanding its social programmes to the most disadvantaged persons, especially women



and children. The Government had conducted a gender-aware beneficiary analysis of its Public Assistance Programme, with support from the United Nations Joint Programme on Social Protection. UN-Women encouraged the Government to implement the recommendations made in order to make the Public Assistance Programme more gender responsive. It welcomed the State's commitment to the full implementation of all the provisions enshrined in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, as affirmed during the universal periodic review.

890. Cuba welcomed the additional information provided by Saint Lucia on all the recommendations. It noted the country's progress in empowering women and its efforts to promote and protect the rights of vulnerable groups such as persons with disabilities and older persons. Cuba had made two recommendations on health and social protection, which it considered would contribute to improving the promotion and protection of economic, social and cultural rights in Saint Lucia.

891. The Bahamas commended Saint Lucia for having supported 92 of the 121 recommendations received, including the one it had made on bilateral and international partnerships. It trusted that the full implementation of that recommendation would yield opportunities for technical cooperation and assistance, which could support the efforts of the Government in implementing other key recommendations. It encouraged the Government to continue to build its capacities to identify areas of need, such as legislative drafting. The Bahamas was pleased with the significant progress achieved by Saint Lucia in the area of human rights protection and by the notable commitments made during the review, notwithstanding existing challenges and vulnerabilities.

892. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela recalled that Saint Lucia had participated in a frank and constructive dialogue during its second universal periodic review, which clearly set out the achievements and challenges of the country in the field of human rights. The successful policy of social sensitivity shown by the Government had been reflected in public assistance programmes that provided more than 2,400 poor households with financial support and medical care. It encouraged Saint Lucia to further strengthen its successful social policies in favour of its people, especially the neediest sectors, with the international assistance and cooperation that the country might require.

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

893. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Saint Lucia, three other stakeholders made statements.

894. Action Canada for Population and Development welcomed the fact that the Government had accepted a recommendation calling for the enactment of comprehensive legislation that fully guaranteed the application of the principle of non-discrimination and that ensured the full enjoyment of all human rights by every member of society. It also acknowledged that the Government had strengthened its efforts to prevent discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity and continued its engagement with civil society organizations representing lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons to implement further anti-discrimination and awareness-raising programmes. It regretted, however, that Saint Lucia had noted all of the recommendations on repealing laws and Penal Code provisions that prohibited and punished sexual relations between consenting adults of the same sex. Those provisions not only generated many forms of discrimination, exclusion and violence but also served as an impediment for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons in accessing their fundamental rights, including health, education and justice. It reminded the Government that human rights were universal, inalienable, indivisible, interdependent and interrelated, and it urged the Government to repeal the laws that criminalized persons based on their gender identity or sexual orientation and to affirm the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons.

895. Amnesty International welcomed the fact that the Government had accepted the recommendations on ratifying a number of core international human rights treaties, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and its Optional Protocol, as well as the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and its

Optional Protocol. It noted, however, that Saint Lucia had accepted similar recommendations during its first review and had failed to implement them; it urged the Government to act promptly to ratify those core international human rights standards. It was pleased to note that Saint Lucia had accepted the recommendations on enacting comprehensive legislation to guarantee the principle of non-discrimination and to ensure the full enjoyment of all human rights by every member of society. It was concerned, however, by reports from local lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex activists on continued acts of violence and discrimination. While Saint Lucia had observed a de facto moratorium on the use of the death penalty for 20 years, the Government had failed to draw attention to the very serious human rights concerns inherent in the death penalty and to promote its abolition. In that context, Amnesty International was disappointed by the decision of the Government to reject the recommendations on establishing a moratorium on executions with a view to abolishing the death penalty and on ratifying the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty.

896. The Pan African Union for Science and Technology recalled that Saint Lucia was a multiparty, parliamentary democracy and that its Constitution guaranteed basic freedoms such as life, liberty, security of the person, equality before the law, and freedom of conscience, expression, assembly and association. The Government generally respected religious freedom in law and practice. Saint Lucia had one of the lowest levels of corruption in the West Indies and the country had taken a number of measures directed at improving the use of natural resources. Agriculture was the main economic activity of the island but tourism had recently become an equally important economic activity.

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

897. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 121 recommendations received, 91 had enjoyed the support of Saint Lucia and 29 had been noted. Additional clarification had been provided on another recommendation, indicating which part of that recommendation had been supported and which part had been noted.

898. The delegation thanked all the speakers for their worthwhile contributions and stated that Saint Lucia would undertake to meet its obligations with fervour, as the Government understood that achieving them would not only please the Human Rights Council but also be of great importance to its people.

899. In meeting its obligations, the Government understood that a formal structure was needed to monitor its human rights objectives. Although Saint Lucia was unable to commit to establishing a national human rights institution due to financial constraints, it was more than willing to accept assistance from the international community to aid with the creation of an efficient human rights management system. UNDP had agreed to hold a workshop in Saint Lucia and to meet with the relevant stakeholders with the hope of introducing such a structure.

900. In conclusion, the delegation thanked all those who had contributed to making its participation possible, and it assured the Human Rights Council that its trust in an island nation meeting its obligations had not been displaced.

#### **Oman**

901. The review of Oman was held on 5 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Oman in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/OMN/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/OMN/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/OMN/3).

902. At its 46th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Oman (see sect. C below).

903. The outcome of the review of Oman comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/11), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/31/11/Add.1).

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

904. The delegation of Oman stated that, due to its deep belief in the viability of the universal periodic review and the importance of that mechanism for the development of human rights, Oman had been keen since its first review to engage positively with the universal periodic review. Oman had therefore always assigned the necessary means and expertise to engage fully with the universal periodic review. The Oman Human Rights Commission had assigned a part of its voluntary contributions to develop the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council.

905. The amendment made to the national Constitution in 2011 was the outcome of the State's positive engagement with the universal periodic review.

906. The Government had established specialized national committees to consult on, debate and prepare for accession to the conventions to which Oman had agreed to accede, and to lift reservations when possible. Oman has taken steps to accede to the International Covenant on Social, Economic and Cultural Rights, the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. Furthermore, Oman had made progress towards the withdrawal of its reservation to article 15 (4) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

907. During its review, Oman had received 233 recommendations, all of which had been examined carefully and discussed in a participatory manner, whether through the legal committee established for that purpose or through liaison officers in ministries, administrations and departments, as well as with civil society organizations and the Oman Human Rights Commission.

908. Oman had accepted fully or partially 169 recommendations, had not supported 36 and had noted 28. It had accepted 30 recommendations on acceding to international human rights instruments, showing that the State was on its way, slowly but surely, to acceding to many more treaties and conventions.

909. Oman had supported the recommendations on the rights of women and children, and the efforts made in that field had been highlighted during the discussion on the State's third and fourth periodic reports on the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC/C/OMN/3-4) in January 2015.

910. Keen to strengthen the rights of persons with disabilities, Oman had accepted seven recommendations on that issue.

911. Oman had accepted 17 recommendations relating to development. The authorities were studying the possibility of acceding to the Convention against Discrimination in Education and were willing to cooperate with UNESCO in that regard.

912. Regarding the recommendations on human rights organizations and rights to freedom of assembly, association and expression, and on the participation of women in political life, Oman had supported 23 recommendations, which demonstrated that the Government was keen to provide political rights, freedom of expression and support to civil society organizations.

913. Oman had accepted five recommendations on good governance, crime control and the fight against terrorism.

914. The delegation reiterated the State's respect and actions in the humanitarian field, respect of privacy, the enjoyment of labour rights and religious tolerance.

915. Oman had not been able to accept seven recommendations relating to the International Criminal Court and eight recommendations on abolishing the death penalty. The State applied the provisions of international law regarding guarantees relating to capital punishment and had postponed executions. The death sentence was rarely used and only for major crimes.

916. Making reservations was a right guaranteed to all States and many of the reservations made by Oman concerned the detailed formulation of certain recommendations. The majority of those reservations concerned recommendations that contravened the policies or culture of the State or were considered premature.

917. Oman was continuing to develop human rights. It had achieved much progress in that respect and was keen to reach the highest level possible in the promotion and protection of human rights. The recommendations accepted were in conformity with the Constitution, the teachings of Islamic law and Omani society and culture.

918. In conclusion, the delegation stated that the question of human rights and respect for the dignity, religion and beliefs of others were issues of great importance for Oman, which would spare no effort to achieve further freedoms and rights. The delegation added that the regional challenges were beyond the responsibility and capabilities of Oman and that there was a collective responsibility to deal with them, affirming the important role played by Oman in establishing peace through quiet diplomacy and dialogue.

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

919. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Oman, 17 delegations made statements.<sup>23</sup>

920. Malaysia acknowledged the continuous efforts made by Oman to improve the overall situation of human rights in the country. It positively noted the judicial reforms undertaken and welcomed the various messages put in place to ameliorate the rights of women and children. Malaysia encouraged the Government to continue its positive measures in the advancement of the rights of women and children in the country, including by ensuring the effective implementation of its policies and programmes, and to strengthen its awareness-raising campaign to combat negative stereotypes of women and prohibit violence against women. Finally, Malaysia urged Oman to accept and implement the recommendations of the review in the endeavour to promote and protect the rights of its citizens.

921. Mauritania appreciated the fact that Oman would accede to certain instruments, such as the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. It expressed its full confidence that Oman would redouble its efforts to implement the recommendations that it had accepted.

922. Pakistan appreciated the decision of Oman to accept the majority of the recommendations that had been made during the review, including those made by Pakistan. It highly valued the constructive engagement of Oman with the human rights mechanisms. Pakistan also commended the Government for the achievements made in economic and social development that would further contribute to the promotion and protection of the rights of its citizens.

923. Qatar stated that the interactive dialogue in November had demonstrated that the promotion and protection of human rights were among the most important political priorities

---

<sup>23</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/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx>.

that Oman aimed to achieve. It applauded the State's positive interaction with the universal periodic review mechanism and its cooperation with the other mechanisms of the Human Rights Council, as well as its respect for its international human rights obligations. That was reflected by the acceptance of Oman of the majority of the universal periodic review recommendations, in particular those made by Qatar.

924. Saudi Arabia praised the various efforts made by Oman to protect human rights and it appreciated the State's continuous cooperation with the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council. It noted the accomplishments of Oman in the field of human rights and in its policies and laws. Saudi Arabia commended Oman for its acceptance of 169 recommendations out of 233 and it called for the continuation of its efforts to promote and protect human rights at all levels.

925. Singapore appreciated the acceptance by Oman of the recommendations that Singapore had made on improving access to education for persons with disabilities and on strengthening the delivery of health-care services. It encouraged Oman to continue to make every effort to implement the accepted recommendations in the coming years and to remain steadfast in its efforts to improve the lives and welfare of its citizens.

926. The Sudan praised Oman for its efforts to promote and protect the human rights of its citizens, particularly the institutional and legislative developments it had made during the first universal periodic review.

927. Swaziland congratulated Oman on the great strides that it had made to implement the universal periodic review recommendations from its first review. According to Swaziland, it was obvious that Oman was fully committed to upholding, observing and respecting all the fundamental principles of human rights. In 2012, the Government had established several ministerial steering committees with the primary objective of implementing all the recommendations of the Human Rights Council. Furthermore, Oman had ratified almost all the international human rights treaties and integrated the provisions of those treaties and conventions into national legislation. Lastly, Oman had amended its Constitution so as to be in line with United Nations human rights standards.

928. Tajikistan noted the measures taken by Oman to strengthen human resources through human rights training and the development of a human rights culture. That was reflected in the improvement of the educational system and in the status of women in society, the strengthening of international cooperation to combat trafficking in persons and the support and protection given to victims of trafficking, and the financial support provided after national disasters.

929. Togo welcomed the numerous measures taken by Oman in the promotion and protection of human rights. It noted with satisfaction that Oman had accepted the majority of the universal periodic review recommendations made by the delegations.

930. Tunisia commended Oman for its spirit of cooperation and its positive interaction with the Working Group and it welcomed the firm determination of the State to make further efforts to promote and protect human rights.

931. The United Arab Emirates commended the hard work of Oman to promote fundamental freedoms and the cultural of human rights, and the measures it had taken to protect the dignity of individuals and the principle of equal opportunity. It welcomed the commitment made by Oman to promote social justice in all spheres and to consolidate good governance and the rule of law. The United Arab Emirates also welcomed the political determination of Oman to implement the recommendations.

932. Uzbekistan stated that the national report of Oman demonstrated that the State paid serious attention to the universal periodic review mechanism. It commended Oman for its constructive cooperation with the Human Rights Council and was pleased to note the steady improvement and development of the legislative and institutional basis in the area of human rights, including for the promotion and protection of the rights of children, women, persons with disabilities and older persons.

933. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela commended Oman for the clear achievements in the education of girls and women. The enrolment of girls in school had increased to 50 per

cent, and 55 per cent of students in universities were female, while women represented 43 per cent of civil servants and 20 per cent of the workforce in the private sector. In addition, Oman had made efforts to promote measures for the most vulnerable groups.

934. Yemen appreciated the achievements of Oman in the field of human rights and the State's acceptance of a large number of recommendations. That reflected the commitment of Oman to the promotion and protection of human rights in civil, political, economic, social and cultural areas.

935. Afghanistan welcomed the fact that many of the universal periodic review recommendations had enjoyed the support of Oman and that the State had accepted the recommendation made by Afghanistan on ratifying the Convention against Discrimination in Education. It commended Oman for its commitment to build a dialogue between various stakeholders on human rights issues. It appreciated the continued efforts of Oman to empower women and to provide them with equal access to education and the labour market.

936. Algeria welcomed the legal reforms that had led to the guarantee of the independence of the judiciary and the fight against corruption, to the advancement of the protection of the provisions of international humanitarian law, and to the strengthening of labour rights and the rights of the child. It encouraged Oman to continue to implement its plan for the year 2025 regarding the rights of children, women and persons with disabilities. Algeria noted that Oman had accepted the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Algeria, and wished that the State would accelerate its accession to international conventions.

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

937. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Oman, five other stakeholders made statements.

938. The Arab Commission for Human Rights commended Oman for its acceptance of the recommendations on ratifying the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. Oman should take all legislative measures in order to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. It praised Oman for its positive interaction with the universal periodic review process and for its introduction of various amendments to its Constitution in 2011. It expressed concern about the fact that Oman had noted some recommendations and about the lack of clarity in the State's response to some recommendations. Oman should establish a national system to follow up on the implementation of the recommendations.

939. Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain expressed concern about the human rights situation in Oman. Since 2011, authorities had arrested a documented number of 216 persons relating to freedom of assembly, on the charge of disturbing the public peace. The judiciary regularly violated due process, imposing arbitrary sentences on individuals. Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain was also concerned about the increasing restrictions on freedom of assembly, freedom of expression and access to information in Oman. Human rights defenders, journalists and bloggers were among the most vulnerable; they faced arrest and arbitrary imprisonment for expressing their disappointment with the human rights situation and the repressive practices of security forces. It urged Oman to guarantee under all circumstances the freedom of human rights defenders to carry out their legitimate activities without fear of reprisals. Lastly, it called upon Oman to ratify the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

940. Human Rights Watch stated that the concerns regarding freedom of expression and assembly raised during the first universal periodic review in 2011 remained in 2016. It had documented a pattern in which Omani security forces harassed activists and prosecuted pro-reform activists and critics on vague charges. Omani laws continued to criminalize insulting the "Sultan's rights or authority" and undermining the "prestige of the State", charges that were often used by courts to prosecute activists. The previous February, Omani courts had sentenced two online activists to prison for their social media posts. Human Rights Watch was also concerned that all public gatherings required advance official approval, and the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association had

echoed many of those concerns. It regretted that the Omani Citizenship Law, which allowed Omani women married to non-Omani men to confer citizenship to their children, continued to impose discriminatory restrictions. It was also concerned that migrant workers in Oman remained vulnerable to exploitation and abuse, due in part to the visa sponsorship system.

941. Amnesty International welcomed the cooperation of Oman with the universal periodic review process. It was disappointed by the State's decision to reject the recommendations on guaranteeing the rights to freedom of expression, association and assembly, on investigating cases of excessive use of force against demonstrators and on supporting civil society organizations. The fact that Oman had both accepted and rejected recommendations on reviewing current legislation that failed to protect those rights sent a mixed message. Amnesty International had documented a pattern of harassment of activists, journalists and bloggers by the authorities. It urged the Government to guarantee the exercise of the right to freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly and to release all prisoners of conscience. It regretted the State's negative responses to the recommendations on implementing the recommendations of the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association. It was also disappointed that Oman had rejected the recommendations on establishing a moratorium on the death penalty with a view to its abolition in law.

942. Africa culture internationale commended Oman for the positive substantial advancement made in the transformation of the country and for having developed the country's infrastructure and economy according to the previous universal periodic review. It thanked Oman for having made a number of positive reforms in various sectors, and especially for its engagement with the United Nations mechanisms. It also thanked the State for having considered the promotion of human rights through the adoption of some of the recommendations from the previous review, by having improved the infrastructure of the judicial system and by having enacted legal reforms aimed at promoting free trials. Africa culture internationale referred to the continuous existence of breaches in the State's international human rights obligations, particularly with regard to freedoms of expression, association and assembly, and the continuous suppression of women's rights. It encouraged Oman to prioritize the development and promotion of human rights, women's participation in political activities and child protection in the country.

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

943. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 233 recommendations received, 169 had enjoyed the support of Oman and 64 had been noted.

944. The delegation of Oman reiterated its thanks to all who had participated in the session and for all of the support and interest that the State had received.

945. The delegation also extended its thanks to the international non-governmental organizations, whose opinions would be examined. It noted, however, that some non-governmental organizations lacked accuracy in their description of the situation in Oman due to a lack of knowledge of the system and legislation in the country. For example, the rights to freedom of expression and to peaceful assembly were granted in the Constitution and no laws in the country restricted those rights. The right to peaceful assembly did not permit the undermining of the rights of others or the destruction of infrastructure.

946. The delegation was keen to shed more light on the reality in Oman in order to show a true picture of the State. The Government was open to all objective and honest opinions that would improve the well-being of its citizens or those of other countries. Oman exerted all possible efforts, provided all necessary means and resources, and listened to regional and international experts in the area of human rights with regard to their experiences. No country had achieved perfection in that field; it was a work in progress.

947. In conclusion, the delegation reiterated the willingness of Oman to implement the recommendations. It recalled that the State had accepted 169 recommendations out of 233, equal to 73 per cent. That did not necessarily mean that the other recommendations had been rejected; they needed further examination in order for Oman to be sure that none clashed with the State's legislation and culture.

## Myanmar

948. The review of Myanmar was held on 6 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Myanmar in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/MMR/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/MMR/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/MMR/3).

949. At its 46th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Myanmar (see sect. C below).

950. The outcome of the review of Myanmar comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/13), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/31/13/Add.1).

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

951. The delegation of Myanmar underlined the fact that Myanmar firmly believed that, among several mechanisms designed to promote and protect human rights situations in member States, only the universal periodic review mechanism provided equal treatment to all member States.

952. During the review of Myanmar in November 2015, 93 member States had made a total of 281 recommendations, out of which 124 recommendations had enjoyed the immediate support of Myanmar, while 69 had not. Myanmar had taken 88 recommendations back home for further consideration.

953. Many of the recommendations had been made on ratifying the core international human rights instruments, strengthening the national human rights institution, the advancement of women, eliminating all forms of discrimination, abolishing the death penalty, strengthening religious tolerance, access to health care and education, and other human rights issues.

954. Myanmar had given serious consideration to all the recommendations, which would largely contribute to the reinforcement of its endeavours in promoting and protecting human rights. The delegation stressed that many of the recommendations were already in the process of implementation.

955. Reporting on the 88 deferred recommendations, the delegation stated that they had been given very careful consideration on the basis of their merit, objective and principle. Myanmar had also examined them against the situation on the ground, taking into consideration the historic, social, cultural and traditional values of the people of Myanmar, as well as State sovereignty. Many of the recommendations fell within the domestic jurisdiction of the State. Some of the recommendations needed to be prioritized in their implementation because of capacity constraints. Against that backdrop and after careful consideration, Myanmar had decided to accept 42 additional recommendations.

956. According to the delegation, Myanmar had accepted the recommendation contained in paragraph 144.31 of the report of the Working Group, as the National Human Rights Commission and the Myanmar Press Council functioned as independent entities with the objective of defending and safeguarding the rights of citizens and journalists.



957. Furthermore, Myanmar had also accepted the recommendations contained in paragraphs 144.73 and 144.74 on guaranteeing in law and in practice that lawyers and judges could perform their professional functions without improper interference. Those duties and functions were already stipulated in the Union Judiciary Law.

958. The new law on the media and the law on printing and publishing of 2014 served the interests of the people; however, they must respond to the advancement of information technology, international standards and future challenges. Myanmar had therefore accepted the related recommendations, namely those contained in paragraphs 144.80 and 144.81 of the report of the Working Group.

959. Regarding the protection of human rights defenders and journalists, the delegation informed the Human Rights Council that the State Constitution already guaranteed the fundamental rights of all citizens. As such, Myanmar had accepted the recommendations on creating and maintaining a safe and enabling environment for civil society, human rights defenders and journalists. Those recommendations were contained in paragraphs 144.82–144.84 of the report of the Working Group. Myanmar believed that there was merit in reviewing the relevant laws so that they responded to present day requirements and international norms and practices.

960. All in all, Myanmar had accepted 42 additional recommendations.

961. Myanmar had been unable to accept the remaining 46 recommendations because they were in contradiction with the State Constitution. They infringed upon national sovereignty and conflicted with national legislation. However, the delegation stressed that, as things were changing in the right direction in the country, a window of opportunity to revisit those recommendations might arise in the future.

962. In summary, the delegation stated that Myanmar had accepted a total of 166 recommendations out of the 281 recommendations that it had received during its second universal periodic review.

963. The delegation then informed the Human Rights Council about the preparations being made by the current Government to transfer the responsibilities of State to the new Government. The new President had just been elected, and the present Government had laid down a firm foundation for the promotion and protection of human rights in the interests of the people. In spite of human rights challenges common to all, Myanmar was committed to addressing those issues in the best interests of its people and in line with its international obligations.

964. In conclusion, the delegation thanked all of the States that had engaged with Myanmar objectively and constructively during the session of the Working Group the previous November.

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

965. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Myanmar, 17 delegations made statements.<sup>23</sup>

966. Brunei Darussalam commended Myanmar for its intention to implement an action plan under the early childhood care and development policy to ensure sustainable development of children with disabilities. It was also encouraged by the ratification by Myanmar of core international human rights instruments. It looked forward to continuing to work closely with Myanmar to promote and protect human rights through the regional framework of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations.

967. Cambodia appreciated the continuous efforts and commitments of Myanmar to promote and protect human rights by strengthening the rule of law, governance and public administration. It commended the State for the advancements it had made in political, administrative, social and judicial reforms. Cambodia welcomed the State's acceptance of the majority of the recommendations, including its own on strengthening peace, development and democracy.

968. China thanked Myanmar for having accepted its recommendations on continuing efforts to preserve national, cultural and religious diversity so as to promote harmony among ethnic groups and religions, and on increasing the amount of spending on health, with special attention paid to women and children so as to achieve the relevant Millennium Development Goals as soon as possible. It hoped that economic growth would allow social and economic progress and improve people's livelihoods.

969. Cuba noted that measures had been introduced to move forward in areas such as employment, education and food. It invited Myanmar to continue the momentum on reforms to meet the socioeconomic needs of the population, to adopt measures to ensure that economic growth was consistent across regions and to tackle corruption effectively.

970. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea was encouraged by the continued commitment of Myanmar to the promotion and protection of human rights since the twenty-third session of the Working Group. It welcomed the acceptance by Myanmar of many recommendations, including those it had made, which demonstrated the will of Myanmar to pursue efforts in the field of human rights.

971. Ethiopia noted with satisfaction the acceptance by Myanmar of a significant number of recommendations, including its own on continuing peace talks among the people to avoid ethnic and religious conflicts and scaling up the national reconciliation process, and on focusing on economic development to bring about sustainable peace and to ensure the enjoyment of human rights in the country. It commended Myanmar for the improvements made in the areas of economic and social reforms.

972. India commended Myanmar for the constructive manner in which it had engaged with the universal periodic review, which had witnessed a high degree of participation, and for having accepted 166 recommendations. It also commended the State for its remarkable democratic transition with the elections in 2015. It believed that Myanmar deserved acknowledgement for its steadfast will and its constructive engagement with the United Nations mechanisms.

973. Indonesia congratulated Myanmar for having held credible, transparent and democratic elections in 2015. It noted the acceptance by Myanmar of its recommendation on continuing efforts to promote tolerance, harmony and respect for human rights among all communities in Myanmar, including through the possible review of legal frameworks, human rights education, interfaith dialogue and cooperation involving all segments in society.

974. The Islamic Republic of Iran commended Myanmar for its active participation in the universal periodic review mechanism. It noted the efforts of Myanmar in legislative reforms. It appreciated the fact that Myanmar had considered its recommendations in a constructive manner relating to their implementation.

975. Japan commended Myanmar for its efforts to have a smooth transition to the new Government following the historic election in the previous November, for having signed the ceasefire agreement with eight ethnic minority groups and for having released political prisoners. It noted the remaining challenges, including the situation of ethnic and religious minorities, particularly those in Rakhine State. It encouraged Myanmar to ensure that specific groups were not legally or socially marginalized.

976. The Lao People's Democratic Republic commended Myanmar for having amended and enacted a number of domestic laws and regulations, and for having ratified some core international human rights conventions, including the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, thus having created favourable conditions and platforms for people to exercise their fundamental rights and freedoms. It also welcomed socioeconomic developments, including in access to health-care services and in education and the strengthening of gender equality.

977. Latvia urged Myanmar to ensure respect for human rights and democratic space in the post-election environment in order to protect those wishing to work with the new Government. It also urged the State to ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. Latvia welcomed the commitment of Myanmar to engage closely with the treaty bodies and special procedure mandate holders. However, it regretted that Myanmar had not accepted its recommendation on extending a standing invitation to all special procedures.

978. Malaysia noted the progress made by Myanmar towards inclusive development through the empowerment of women, the adoption of policies and programmes for universal and free education, and the increase in public health resources. It welcomed the acceptance by Myanmar of its recommendations on increasing its efforts to combat trafficking in persons and on promoting inter-ethnic and interfaith harmony. It urged Myanmar to take all actions to end discrimination against the Rohingya and other minorities.

979. Mongolia welcomed the acceptance by Myanmar of recommendations to ratify key international human rights instruments and it commended Myanmar for its commitment to deepen democratic reforms further, to protect the rights of women, children and persons with disabilities, to eliminate all forms of discrimination and to combat trafficking in persons. It also commended Myanmar for its willingness to promote dialogue among all groups and segments of society. It suggested that Myanmar reconsider other recommendations, including those on abolishing the death penalty.

980. The Philippines noted the advances and reforms made by Myanmar, including the holding of free, fair, transparent and multiparty general elections, the establishment of social laws to counter violence against women, and the implementation of free and universal primary education. It appreciated the acceptance by Myanmar of its recommendation on considering accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

981. The Russian Federation noted that the recent political change in Myanmar was facilitating progress on a number of human rights fronts. The review in November 2015 had confirmed once again the State's openness and willingness to discuss sensitive issues and to cooperate with the global community.

982. Sierra Leone commended Myanmar for the landmark national reconciliation process following the ceasefire in 2015 and for its continued commitment to engage in political dialogue with various stakeholders. It encouraged the State to pursue efforts aimed at inclusive dialogue, political stability and establishing legitimate accountability. It hoped that Myanmar would, in the near future, consider establishing a moratorium on the death penalty.

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

983. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Myanmar, 11 other stakeholders made statements.<sup>24</sup>

984. United Nations Watch was alarmed by the treatment of the Rohingya community, and it called upon Myanmar to repeal the discriminatory Citizenship Law of 1982 and grant the Rohingya citizenship. It also regretted that Myanmar had rejected the recommendation made by Ireland on granting the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar unrestricted access to Rakhine State. Furthermore, it was concerned about the unequal and discriminatory treatment of minorities in general, exemplified by the recent passing of the so-called "protection of race and religion" laws. It was also dismayed that Myanmar had rejected the recommendations on ending violence and bigotry against minorities and the multiple recommendations from countries, including Australia, Canada, the Czech Republic and Denmark, on repealing those unjust laws.

985. The Lutheran World Federation reiterated its support and its desire to collaborate with the Government of Myanmar in implementing the recommendations accepted on improving the human rights situation, particularly those on strengthening the rule of law, improving the protection of all, promoting religious and ethnic harmony and understanding, improving women's rights, enhancing access to clean and safe water, improving access to land and land rights, ensuring all acquired birth registration and resolving key issues relating to the right to nationality. It called upon Myanmar to continue to work closely with all national stakeholders on the implementation and monitoring of the universal periodic review recommendations.

<sup>24</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/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx>.

986. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues welcomed the acceptance by Myanmar of the recommendations on ratifying key international human rights instruments and on reforming the National Human Rights Commission. It noted, however, that those recommendations had been made during the first universal periodic review and had remained unaddressed. It regretted that Myanmar had refused to acknowledge the ongoing discrimination against ethnic and religious minorities and to accept all 27 recommendations with specific reference to the Rohingya Muslims. It also noted that Myanmar had not accepted the recommendations calling for the amendment of the law on peaceful gathering and demonstration, the release of all political prisoners, the issuance of a standing invitation to the special procedures, the opening of an OHCHR country office and the abolition of the death penalty.

987. Franciscans International, while presenting a joint statement, expressed concern about the rejection of the recommendations on the human rights of minorities, and it drew particular attention to the four “protection of race and religion” laws. It stated that those laws were discriminatory towards women and religious minorities and it called upon the new Government of Myanmar to repeal those laws without further delay. It also expressed concern about the situation of internally displaced persons due to conflicts, particularly in Rakhine and Kachin States. It urged the new Government of Myanmar to establish policies and to take concrete measures to address internal conflicts while promoting and protecting human rights for all, including ethnic and religious minorities.

988. The International Lesbian and Gay Association stated that Myanmar had not accepted the recommendations made by Australia and Spain on repealing or revising the “protection of race and religion” laws and section 377 of the Criminal Code to ensure that the rights of women, religious minorities and the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex community were protected. Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons in Myanmar were subject to discrimination based on their sexual orientation, gender identity and expression. It therefore called upon Myanmar to amend section 377 of the Criminal Code, stop abusing the Police Act of 1945, stop police operations that targeted gay men and transgender women, and provide awareness-raising programmes to law enforcement officials.

989. The International Bar Association’s Human Rights Institute, while presenting a joint statement, called upon Myanmar to implement the recommendations on reforming the Bar Council Act to allow for the Bar Council to become a truly independent and self-governing association. It called for the right of lawyers and judges to join self-governing associations to be enshrined in law, and that the right of the first Independent Lawyers Association of Myanmar to register as an association be respected. Furthermore, it called upon Myanmar to engage in a consultation process with representatives of the legal profession and other stakeholders in relation to the revision of the Bar Council Act. It also urged Myanmar to improve legal education and continue legal professional development.

990. The Jubilee Campaign was concerned that Myanmar had not accepted the recommendations addressing the rights of the Rohingya minority. Since 2012, hate speech and violence against the Rohingya Muslims and other religious minorities had increased, forcing thousands of Rohingya to flee the country, risking their lives in boats on the open sea. The Citizenship Law of 1982 had continued to strip the Rohingya of their citizenship rights. The Jubilee Campaign urged Myanmar to repeal discriminatory legislation. The ethnic conflict against Kachin and Shan peoples had left at least 140,000 civilians displaced. It urged Myanmar to declare a nationwide ceasefire and to halt violations of human rights by security forces.

991. The Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development reiterated its call for the release of all political prisoners, the amendment of repressive laws and civil society space. It noted the failure of Myanmar to accept the recommendations on ending violence and discrimination against ethnic and religious minorities, including the Rohingya, and it urged Myanmar to amend or repeal the Citizenship Law of 1982 and the four laws on the “protection of race and religion”. It called upon Myanmar to ensure an inclusive peace process with greater representation of women, to submit reports due to the treaty bodies and to immediately accept the pending requests for country visits by the Special Rapporteur. It also called for a comprehensive action plan for the implementation of the universal periodic review

recommendations, in full consultation and cooperation with independent rights-based civil society.

992. Article 19: International Centre against Censorship urged the new Government to ratify the main international human rights treaties, particularly the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. It remained alarmed by the arrests and arbitrary detention of protesters, human rights defenders, Internet users and journalists. It was disappointed that Myanmar had not supported many of the recommendations on reforming existing and newly adopted laws that illegitimately restricted the right to freedom of expression. It urged the new Government to initiate reforms to its legal framework, in particular the Penal Code. Myanmar should do much more to address the advocacy of national, racial and religious hatred that constituted incitement to discrimination. Women faced particular obstacles in exercising their rights to freedom of expression and public participation.

993. Human Rights Watch acknowledged the significant reforms Myanmar had made since its previous universal periodic review. It noted, however, that numerous rights-abusing laws remained and the judiciary was corrupt. The military was above civilian control and continued to enjoy impunity. There were about 100 political prisoners in the country, while another 400 people faced criminal charges for having asserted their freedom of expression. The signing of a partial nationwide ceasefire in October 2015 with eight ethnic armed groups had not ended armed conflict. The so-called “protection of race and religion” laws imperilled the rights of religious minorities. The Rohingya Muslim minority had been disenfranchised during the elections of November 2015, and the Citizenship Law of 1982 denied them citizenship. There was a need for a full OHCHR office in the country with a reporting and technical assistance mandate.

994. Amnesty International expressed its profound concern about the rejection by Myanmar of all 27 recommendations relating to the situation of the Rohingya. While Myanmar had accepted one recommendation to “continue to release” prisoners of conscience, Amnesty International was disappointed that Myanmar had rejected seven other recommendations calling for the release of all remaining prisoners of conscience. Nearly 100 prisoners of conscience were in prison despite recent amnesties, and hundreds of human rights activists were on trial, charged solely for the peaceful exercise of their rights. It urged Myanmar to implement, without delay, the recommendations on amending laws restricting freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly. It welcomed the acceptance of the recommendations on providing redress to victims of land confiscations, and it urged Myanmar to enact and enforce legislation to prohibit forced evictions and to strengthen environmental safeguards to protect against any infringements of human rights caused by the extractive and manufacturing industries.

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

995. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 281 recommendations received, 166 had enjoyed the support of Myanmar and 115 had been noted.

996. The delegation of Myanmar thanked the States and stakeholders for the enthusiasm and active participation and stated that, in their interventions, Myanmar recognized the common objective of the promotion and protection of human rights for the people of Myanmar. In response to their interventions, the delegation made the observations listed below.

997. First, when Myanmar spoke about and worked on human rights issues, respect for State sovereignty must be observed at all times.

998. Second, national circumstances should be taken into careful consideration. Historic, social, cultural and traditional values played an important role in advancing human rights. There was no one-size-fits-all formula.

999. Third, capacity constraints posed a real challenge for many developing countries, including Myanmar. For instance, with regard to considering joining the remaining core human rights treaties, Myanmar had to prioritize and sequence its objectives simply because the State was greatly preoccupied with democratic reforms and development priorities.

1000. Fourth, Myanmar would study and consider all the views and issues expressed during the review as it implemented the recommendations it had accepted.

1001. Fifth, Myanmar had come a long way to bring about better human rights for its people. However, more needed to be done. It would continue to work to address the remaining challenges. Towards that end, Myanmar would continue to cooperate with its international partners and all other stakeholders, including civil society organizations in the country.

1002. Lastly, Myanmar was committed to the promotion and protection of human rights. That commitment and spirit would always prevail in its society.

### **Saint Kitts and Nevis**

1003. The review of Saint Kitts and Nevis was held on 11 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Saint Kitts and Nevis in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/KNA/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/KNA/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/KNA/3).

1004. At its 46th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Saint Kitts and Nevis (see sect. C below).

1005. The outcome of the review of Saint Kitts and Nevis comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/16), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/31/16/Add.1).

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

1006. The delegation of Saint Kitts and Nevis stated that it felt privileged to participate in the universal periodic review, which encouraged an increased focus on human rights nationally, greater accountability of, and within government, and a more consolidated approach to the provision and monitoring of human rights as prescribed by international legal instruments.

1007. The presentation of Saint Kitts and Nevis constituted its formal response to the recommendations made during the interactive dialogue for its second review, held during the twenty-third session of the Working Group.

1008. Of a total of 133 recommendations, Saint Kitts and Nevis had accepted 58, which pertained to programmes and initiatives already being implemented or those that could be feasibly implemented over a relatively reasonable period of time, and well in advance of the third cycle. Saint Kitts and Nevis had noted 75 recommendations due to the fact that they would require a greater commitment of resources, a prolonged assessment of the implications for the overall national agenda and consultation with multiple stakeholders before the next cycle.

1009. The delegation emphasized that, although Saint Kitts and Nevis was not always able to comply with internationally accepted practices due to fiscal and human resource constraints, it remained willing, and it had therefore accepted the recommendations that it had deemed attainable so that the achievements of the second review would surpass those of the first.

1010. Of the recommendations proposed during the twenty-third session of the Working Group, the majority pertained to the scope of the international obligations of Saint Kitts and Nevis. In fact, 43 of the 133 recommendations (32 per cent) called for the ratification of core human rights instruments and their respective protocols. That percentage highlighted not only the importance of those instruments to the international community, but also the significance of that single act of ratification. Saint Kitts and Nevis was also cognizant of the relevance of the instruments and their ratification. The delegation emphasized that the stark reality was, however, that Saint Kitts and Nevis on its own was unable to comply and was in need of international technical assistance.

1011. The delegation added, though, that a submission for approval regarding the State's ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities was currently with the Cabinet, and it hoped that it would be concluded within the second quarter of 2016.

1012. Additional recommendations concerned the implementation of international human rights obligations, cooperation with human rights mechanisms, including the treaty bodies, and the creation of an institutional and human rights infrastructure. The delegation stated that Saint Kitts and Nevis recognized that a proper structure must be created to follow up on, monitor and implement the recommendations, and it highlighted the State's participation in a training activity on treaty body reporting sponsored by OHCHR and UNDP. The State would conduct sensitization workshops following that workshop.

1013. It was envisaged that Saint Kitts and Nevis would formulate a multisectoral core group to be responsible specifically for following up on the recommendations and monitoring their implementation, and also research, consult on and, as appropriate, recommend the ratification of core human rights instruments. That group would also be responsible for increasing awareness about not only the universal periodic review process but also reporting to treaty bodies. The sensitization seminar and the formulation of the group would take place within the next two months. The delegation also emphasized that the Bahamian experience offered some best practices, which would be modelled when formulating the core body in Saint Kitts and Nevis.

1014. The delegation encouraged member States and non-State bodies to partner with Saint Kitts and Nevis in its efforts to realize the full implementation of the recommendations from its second review.

1015. In principle, Saint Kitts and Nevis did not object to issuing open and standing invitations to the special procedures. It believed, however, that, after the core group was institutionalized, the special procedures could be invited to evaluate and assess its programme of work and assist that body with further improvements in its mandate and work.

1016. Regarding the recommendations on gender equality, Saint Kitts and Nevis continued to make significant strides in ensuring that both men and women were afforded equal rights in, for example, areas of work, education, and access to health and social services. However, the legal framework should continue to be strengthened and more initiatives should be implemented, especially in the area of equal pay for equal work.

1017. The delegation drew the attention of the Human Rights Council to the paragraphs on that issue in its addendum to the report of the Working Group, which included a reference to the domestic and sexual violence complaint and response protocol. Following approval by the Cabinet, the protocol was now being fully implemented.

1018. According to the most recent census of Saint Kitts and Nevis, done in 2011, females accounted for 51 per cent of the total population of 47,196. Of the total number of households (15,680), 43 per cent were headed by females. Further, provisional employment data for 2015 showed that, of a total labour force of 25,866 workers, a total of 13,530 were females, representing 52 per cent of the workforce.

1019. The delegation emphasized that the head of Government had reiterated his Administration's commitment to continue to foster a dynamic environment that would accelerate the economic, educational, social and political advancement of women in Saint Kitts and Nevis.

1020. The delegation highlighted, among other issues, the increase in staff of the Department of Gender Affairs, and the fact that domestic violence continued to be an area of focus for the Government, and that men were becoming more aware through training on gender-based violence.

1021. Surveys in 1999/00 and 2007/08 had revealed that Saint Kitts and Nevis had significantly reduced its level of poverty. Whereas the country poverty assessment of 1999/00 had revealed that 30.5 per cent of nationals in Saint Kitts and 32 per cent of those in Nevis were poor, by 2007/08, the poverty rate for the State had fallen by almost 10 per cent.

1022. The delegation emphasized that Saint Kitts and Nevis had been successful in achieving its Millennium Development Goal in having significantly reduced poverty levels, and, through its robust social protection strategies, it had continued to decrease the number of persons living below the poverty line.

1023. The delegation was pleased to state that the national child protection protocol was now operational and being implemented in order to provide an effective and efficient framework to protect children who were, or who were likely to be, victims of abuse and neglect. It provided the minimum standards for the prevention, investigation and reporting of, and judicial intervention, care, treatment and support relating to, each case of child abuse and neglect. The protocol also provided guidance to the agencies and professionals involved in child abuse cases.

1024. Although public sector workers enjoyed a national health scheme, many citizens did not, and it was the Government's desire to be able to introduce a national health scheme in the near future. To that end, a committee had been formalized to devise a plan for comprehensive health coverage. A health management information system was now operationalized at public health institutions in the State. The delegation referred to the health smart card and stated that the country would soon have access to a state-of-the-art cancer treatment centre.

1025. Spanning a five-year period from 2013 to 2107, the national social protection strategy was being implemented, and the social protection bill would soon be tabled in Parliament.

1026. Saint Kitts and Nevis had established all-inclusive education, health and social security systems beginning in the late 1960s that had resulted in relatively high average rates of human and social development. It had made major progress in the provision of education services to its population, particularly with regard to primary and secondary education. UNESCO was currently undertaking an education policy review of the State's education sector. The review, which would soon be completed, would assist Saint Kitts and Nevis in developing a meaningful competency-driven curriculum that had at its centre twenty-first century skills.

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

1027. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Saint Kitts and Nevis, 11 delegations made statements.

1028. Malawi noted the efforts made by the Government of Saint Kitts and Nevis to improve its economy by having implemented stringent fiscal measures aimed at reducing debt and creating conditions for sustainable economic growth, higher standards of living and poverty alleviation. It further recognized the policy and legislative reforms initiated with the aim of complying with the recommendations. It encouraged the Government to continue to pursue efforts aimed at fully implementing the recommendations it had accepted, and to continue to pay attention and to consider the recommendations it had noted.

1029. Maldives thanked the Government for having supported 58 recommendations and noted 75, out of the 133 recommendations that had been made. It appreciated the support of Saint Kitts and Nevis of all three of its recommendations and it was greatly encouraged by the country's commitment to further the development of health, education and gender equality within its borders. It encouraged the Government to continue its efforts to promote human rights in the country.



1030. Pakistan stated that, despite the paucity of resources and challenges posed by the global financial crises and its spillover effects, Saint Kitts and Nevis had accepted 58 recommendations from its review. Pakistan highly valued the constructive engagement of the State with the Working Group and wished Saint Kitts and Nevis success in the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted.

1031. Paraguay valued the acceptance by Saint Kitts and Nevis of the recommendations made by its country, namely the recommendation contained in paragraph 91.17 of the report of the Working Group on strengthening cooperation with the treaty bodies and submitting pending national reports, and the recommendation contained in paragraph 91.16 on considering the possibility of establishing a national system to follow up on international recommendations. Paraguay considered that the implementation of both recommendations, and particularly the one on the national system to follow up on the recommendations, would contribute significantly to the continuing process of promoting and protecting human rights and to compliance with the State's international obligations. It expressed its willingness to provide technical cooperation to implement that recommendation.

1032. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines applauded the Government of Saint Kitts and Nevis for having accepted the recommendations on increasing its efforts in human rights education and training. It further commended the State for having agreed to adopt legislative measures on gender equality. Understanding the challenges that the State faced in the fulfilment of its human rights obligations as a result of the global economic crisis, it encouraged Saint Kitts and Nevis to continue to take steps to strengthen its national human rights framework. It called upon the international community and OHCHR to grant the request for assistance to Saint Kitts and Nevis, as expressed in its universal periodic review report, in order to enable it to meet its human rights obligations.

1033. Samoa was pleased with the progress made by the Government of Saint Kitts and Nevis and commended the State for having aligned its national legislation with its current international treaty obligations. It also recognized the Government's measures to combat and eliminate all forms of discrimination and violence against women and girls, despite the many economic and social challenges Saint Kitts and Nevis faced.

1034. Sierra Leone highlighted the fact that only one of its three recommendations had enjoyed the support of Saint Kitts and Nevis. While it understood the many financial and technical constraints faced by the State, it encouraged the Government to implement into national legislation those recommendations that would further promote the enjoyment of human rights at all levels of society. It urged Saint Kitts and Nevis once again to increase the age of criminal responsibility to 18 years and to institute a moratorium on the death penalty.

1035. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the openness and willingness shown by the Government of Saint Kitts and Nevis during the review process, with having given concrete answers to the questions asked. That brother country had promoted important initiatives in favour of the most needy, carrying out plans, programmes and social projects focused on family welfare. Saint Kitts and Nevis had successfully completed its second review, having shown an undeniable commitment to human rights. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela encouraged the Government of Saint Kitts and Nevis to continue to boost and strengthen its successful social policies in favour of its people, with a special emphasis on the most vulnerable sectors.

1036. The Bahamas commended Saint Kitts and Nevis for its recent accomplishments, as highlighted in the addendum to the report of the Working Group. It underscored the efforts being made to build capacity in the area of human rights reporting, as well as the regional and bilateral engagements and public-private partnerships that were serving to bolster the efforts of the Government to promote equality, non-discrimination and the right to education. The Bahamas was pleased to note that Saint Kitts and Nevis had supported 58 of the 133 recommendations it had received, including the recommendation made by the Bahamas. It trusted that the full implementation of that recommendation would serve to further strengthen the existing framework of human rights protection in the country. It also welcomed the acceptance of the recommendations on the right to security and an adequate standard of living, the right to health, the right to education and the rights of persons with disabilities. It

acknowledged the significant progress made by Saint Kitts and Nevis, despite the inherent challenges and vulnerabilities it faced.

1037. Cuba recognized the efforts of the Government of Saint Kitts and Nevis to improve the quality of life of its citizens through the implementation of social programmes in the areas of construction, health and social security, as well as the adoption of legislation that favoured the welfare of its population. It highlighted the number of recommendations accepted, including two made by Cuba, in which it had invited Saint Kitts and Nevis to persist in the full application of the law on equal pay in order to guarantee equal remuneration between men and women, and to implement the national strategy of social protection in order to effectively provide social services to its citizens.

1038. Gabon welcomed the efforts made by the Government of Saint Kitts and Nevis to ensure the promotion and protection of human rights and the rule of law. It particularly welcomed the reforms at the legal and administrative levels, as well as the creation of human rights promotion and protection bodies. Gabon welcomed, among others, measures taken by the State to improve the living standards of its citizens, and to prohibit corporal punishment as a disciplinary tool for children enrolled in public schools.

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

1039. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Saint Kitts and Nevis, two other stakeholders made statements.

1040. Allied Rainbow Communities International welcomed the acceptance by the Government of Saint Kitts and Nevis of the recommendation on ratifying the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, including the Optional Protocols. This was a positive step towards ensuring the country was fully compliant with international standards. However, Saint Kitts and Nevis had noted all of the recommendations calling for the repeal of the law that criminalized same sexual activity between consenting adults and penal provisions that discriminated against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people, which also included the prohibition of discrimination on any basis inclusive of sexual orientation and gender identity. It was concerned that the Government had noted the recommendation on enacting comprehensive legislation that fully guaranteed the application of the principle of non-discrimination and ensured the full enjoyment of all human rights by every member of society, with no indication of commitment or will to ensure equality and justice for all. It called upon Saint Kitts and Nevis to honour the commitment it made in 2011 regarding a consultative process to engage the public on that issue. It asked the Government to engage in legislative reform to guarantee non-discrimination against persons on the basis of health, gender, disability or sexual orientation, and to collaborate with civil society organizations, such as the Saint Kitts and Nevis Association of Persons with Disabilities and the Saint Kitts and Nevis Alliance for Equality, in order to reach populations that were most affected. It called upon the Government to recognize that a popular mandate was not needed to ensure security, justice and equality for all, in particular its lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex community and persons with disabilities.

1041. The European Union of Public Relations asserted that Saint Kitts and Nevis was an electoral democracy. The federal Government consisted of the Prime Minister, the Cabinet, and the unicameral National Assembly. Saint Kitts and Nevis had generally implemented its anti-corruption laws effectively. The Financial Intelligence Unit investigated financial crimes, such as money-laundering and the financing of terrorism. Constitutional guarantees of freedom of expression were generally respected. It affirmed that the Government owned the sole local television station, to which the opposition faced some restrictions on access. In addition to both government and private radio stations, there was one privately owned daily newspaper, and political parties published weekly newspapers. Internet access was not restricted. Freedom of religion was constitutionally protected and academic freedom was primarily honoured. The right to form civic organizations was generally respected, as was the freedom of assembly. Workers could legally form unions, though a union could engage in collective bargaining only if more than 50 per cent of the company's employees were union members. The right to strike, while not specified by law, was recognized and primarily respected in practice. The judiciary was largely independent, and legal provisions for a fair

and speedy trial were generally observed. In 2015, macroeconomic conditions had improved significantly over those in 2013 and 2014, and the economy had recorded two years of strong growth, averaging about 6 per cent annually, the strongest in the region by far.

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

1042. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 133 recommendations received, Saint Kitts and Nevis had supported 58 recommendations and noted 75.

1043. In its concluding statement, the delegation thanked all for the recommendations made in the best interest of human rights in general. It expressed appreciation to OHCHR for its continued assistance and to other international agencies who would partner with the Government as it sought to implement the recommendations from the second review.

1044. The delegation reiterated the commitment of Saint Kitts and Nevis to the universal periodic review process. The State looked forward with renewed anticipation to sharing its achievements with the Human Rights Council over the next few years.

1045. Lastly, the delegation reminded the Human Rights Council of the State's pledge to submit a midterm report that would highlight the advances made to that date.

#### **Sao Tome and Principe**

1046. The review of Sao Tome and Principe was held on 11 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Sao Tome and Principe in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/STP/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/STP/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/23/STP/3).

1047. At its 49th meeting, on 18 March 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Sao Tome and Principe (see sect. C below).

1048. The outcome of the review of Sao Tome and Principe comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/17), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group.

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

1049. On the absence of the delegation of Sao Tome and Principe in the room, the President stated that, since all positions of the Government of Sao Tome and Principe regarding the recommendations it had received during its universal periodic review were clear, the Human Rights Council would proceed with the adoption of the outcome.

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

1050. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Sao Tome and Principe, 14 delegations made statements.

1051. Ethiopia noted with satisfaction the acceptance by Sao Tome and Principe of a significant number of recommendations, including those on reporting to the treaty bodies and

on improving the quality of education. It commended the State for the progress made in the areas of economic and social reforms to promote and protect human rights. It encouraged Sao Tome and Principe to continue its engagement with the Human Rights Council.

1052. Gabon noted the considerable efforts made by the Government to ensure the promotion and protection of human rights and to improve the institutional and normative framework. Gabon lauded Sao Tome and Principe for the measures taken to promote children's rights and gender equality. It commended the State for its full cooperation with the Human Rights Council mechanisms and procedures. It encouraged the State in its efforts to implement the universal periodic review recommendations.

1053. Maldives noted that 146 recommendations had been made during the interactive dialogue and Sao Tome and Principe had accepted the majority of them. It appreciated the commitments to further the rights of persons with disabilities, to address climate change and to improve the accessibility and quality of education. It encouraged the Government to continue its efforts to promote human rights in the country.

1054. Nigeria applauded Sao Tome and Principe for its continued engagement with the universal periodic review mechanism and for having strengthened its efforts to promote human rights through the acceptance of the majority of the recommendations. It wished the country every success in the implementation of all of the recommendations accepted.

1055. Pakistan commended Sao Tome and Principe for its work in addressing a number of human rights issues, especially with regard to the rights of the child. It appreciated the State's acceptance of the majority of the 146 recommendations. It praised Sao Tome and Principe for its constructive engagement with the Working Group.

1056. Sierra Leone appreciated the intention of Sao Tome and Principe to ratify several international conventions following the approval of the National Assembly, as well as the State's commitment to legal reform. It applauded the State for its efforts to improve the economic situation by developing strategies to attract foreign direct investments and by enhancing domestic growth and economic diversification. Sierra Leone reiterated its recommendation to raise the age of marriage to 18 years in conformity with the provisions of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

1057. Togo praised the full cooperation of the country with the universal periodic review mechanism. It thanked Sao Tome and Principe for having accepted the recommendation on ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography. It wished the State success in the implementation of the recommendations accepted.

1058. UNICEF welcomed the Government's decision to create a national human rights institution that would monitor the situation of children's rights and report to the Committee on the Rights of the Child. It stressed the need for a specialized, independent and multisectoral body to monitor respect for the rights of children. UNICEF welcomed the adoption of a national strategy and policy on child protection. It urged the State to finalize and approve the draft framework law on the reform of early education. It referred to the need to focus on neonatal mortality, as the rate had not decreased since 2009. Adolescents continued to have easy access to alcoholic beverages despite the prohibition of the sale of alcohol to minors. UNICEF welcomed the fact that Sao Tome and Principe had accepted the recommendations on ratifying the first two Optional Protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

1059. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela congratulated the Government of Sao Tome and Principe on its cooperation with the universal periodic review and on its acceptance of the majority of the recommendations it had received. It highlighted the ratification of important human rights instruments during the review period, as well as the fact that it had taken steps to create a national human rights institution in accordance with the Paris Principles.

1060. Angola commended Sao Tome and Principe for the progress it had made in the justice system, particularly in the context of judicial reform and the harmonization of national laws with international human rights norms. It welcomed the State's establishment of socioeconomic policies to diversify its economy to address the primary needs of citizens and

to guarantee their economic, social and cultural rights. Angola lauded Sao Tome and Principe for its commitment to ratify international human rights conventions to which it had not yet acceded.

1061. Brazil praised Sao Tome and Principe for its constructive participation in the second cycle of the universal periodic review; it was a sign of the State's engagement with the international human rights system. Brazil highlighted the progress made since the presentation of the State's first national report in 2011. It reiterated its traditional and long-standing willingness to cooperate with Sao Tome and Principe and to share experiences.

1062. Chad noted with appreciation the State's ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights. It wished the State every success in the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted.

1063. The Congo congratulated Sao Tome and Principe on its national report for its second universal periodic review and on its transparent policy for the promotion and protection of human rights. It highlighted the important challenges faced by Sao Tome and Principe and the State's reliance on international assistance from development partners.

1064. Cuba lauded Sao Tome and Principe for having accepted almost all of the 146 recommendations made during the review, including two made by Cuba on the right to food and the rights of persons with disabilities. It hoped that the implementation of those recommendations would help the country to continue its progress in promoting and protecting the human rights of all of its population.

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

1065. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Sao Tome and Principe, two other stakeholders made statements.

1066. The Commission to Study the Organization of Peace highlighted the commendable results achieved by Sao Tome and Principe in the field of social indicators, such as access to education. It referred to the project on quality education and the progress in the implementation of the planned activities. The project helped the Government to enhance the quality of education by improving the system of in-service teacher training and by strengthening human resources management in education. The Commission to Study the Organization of Peace praised the country's human rights record, particularly with regard to women's rights, religious freedom, free and fair elections, and the peaceful transfer of power.

1067. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme referred to the review of the Criminal Code in 2012, the reforms in the justice sector to improve the judicial system and the establishment of a 30 per cent female quota in Parliament as progress made by Sao Tome and Principe since its first national report in 2011. However, it deplored the gaps in the Family Code authorizing corporal punishment at home. It urged the State to make efforts to issue birth certificates to newborns without fees. It also stressed that Sao Tome and Principe had not ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Optional Protocol to the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the three Optional Protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. It called for the harmonization of domestic laws with international human rights standards. It concluded by encouraging the State to take measures to mitigate the effects of climate change.

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

1068. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 146 recommendations received, 144 recommendations had enjoyed the support of Sao Tome and Principe and 2 had been noted.

## B. General debate on agenda item 6

1069. At the 49th meeting, on 18 March 2016, 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, Georgia, Ghana, Indonesia, Kuwait<sup>25</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands (also on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), Pakistan<sup>25</sup> (also on behalf of Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, Nicaragua, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the United Arab Emirates and Viet Nam), South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Iran (Islamic Republic of), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Regional Agricultural Credit Association, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Colombian Commission of Jurists, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Foodfirst Information and Action Network, Global Network for Rights and Development, Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries, Indian Council of South America, International Bar Association (also on behalf of the International Commission of Jurists and Lawyers for Lawyers), International Educational Development, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Service for Human Rights, Iraqi Development Organization, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Prahar, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, United Nations Watch, UPR Info, World Barua Organization, World Environment and Resources Council.

1070. At the same meeting, the representative of Honduras made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

## C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

### Federated States of Micronesia

1071. At its 42nd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/101 without a vote.

### Lebanon

1072. At its 43rd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/102 without a vote.

### Mauritania

1073. At its 43rd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/103 without a vote.

### Nauru

1074. At its 43rd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/104 without a vote.

<sup>25</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

**Rwanda**

1075. At its 44th meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/105 without a vote.

**Nepal**

1076. At its 44th meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/106 without a vote.

**Austria**

1077. At its 44th meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/107 without a vote.

**Australia**

1078. At its 45th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/108 without a vote.

**Georgia**

1079. At its 45th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/109 without a vote.

**Saint Lucia**

1080. At its 45th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/110 without a vote.

**Oman**

1081. At its 46th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/111 without a vote.

**Myanmar**

1082. At its 46th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/112 without a vote.

**Saint Kitts and Nevis**

1083. At its 46th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/113 without a vote.

**Sao Tome and Principe**

1084. At its 49th meeting, on 18 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/114 without a vote.

**Commencement of the third cycle of the universal periodic review**

1085. At the 63rd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the President of the Human Rights Council introduced draft decision A/HRC/31/L.4, sponsored by the President of the Council.

1086. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft decision without a vote (decision 31/116).

## **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**

1087. At the 51st meeting, on 21 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967, Makarim Wibisono, presented his report (A/HRC/31/73).

1088. At the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made a statement as the State concerned.

1089. Also at the same meeting, the Independent Commission for Human Rights of the State of Palestine made a statement.

1090. 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, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Kuwait<sup>25</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan<sup>25</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Brazil, Chad, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, New Zealand, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Zimbabwe;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Adalah: Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel, Al-Haq (also on behalf of the Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights), Institute on Human Rights and the Holocaust, International-Lawyers.Org, Norwegian Refugee Council, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, World Jewish Congress.

1091. At the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made final remarks as the State concerned.

1092. Also at the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

1093. At the 51st meeting, on 21 March 2016, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights introduced the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the implementation of Human Rights Council resolutions S-9/1 and S-12/1 (A/HRC/31/40 and Add.1). The Deputy High Commissioner also presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 28/26, the report of the High Commissioner 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/31/42), 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/31/43). The Deputy High Commissioner also introduced, pursuant to Council resolution 28/27, the reports of the Secretary-General on the human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem (A/HRC/31/44), and, pursuant to Council resolution 28/24, on the matter of human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan (A/HRC/31/41).



1094. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and the State of Palestine made statements as the States concerned.

### C. General debate on agenda item 7

1095. At its 52nd meeting, on 21 March 2016, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 7, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Ghana, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)<sup>25</sup> (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Kuwait<sup>25</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Maldives, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan<sup>25</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Chile, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, Yemen;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Adalah: Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel, Al-Haq (also on behalf of the Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights), American Association of Jurists, Amuta for NGO Responsibility, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies (also on behalf of Al-Haq, the Al Mezan Center for Human Rights and the Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights), Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims, 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 International), European Union of Jewish Students, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Global Network for Rights and Development, Human Rights Now, Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'homme, International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International-Lawyers.Org, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Norwegian Refugee Council, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Palestinian Return Centre, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, World Jewish Congress.

### D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

#### Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan

1096. At the 64th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.31, sponsored by Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Namibia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Belarus, Cabo Verde, Chile, Costa Rica and Kuwait (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) joined the sponsors.

1097. At the same meeting, the representative of Cuba made a general comment on the draft resolution.

1098. At the same meeting, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

1099. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

1100. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the Netherlands, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

1101. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 31 votes to none, with 16 abstentions (resolution 31/25).

#### **Right of the Palestinian people to self-determination**

1102. At the 66th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.36, sponsored by Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Kuwait (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Namibia, Switzerland and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden joined the sponsors.

1103. At the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made a statement as the State concerned.

1104. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 31/33).

#### **Human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem**

1105. At the 66th meeting on 24 March 2016, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.37, sponsored by Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Kuwait (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Namibia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Cabo Verde, Chile, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, Portugal, Slovenia and Sweden joined the sponsors.

1106. At the same meeting, the representatives of Cuba, Paraguay, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates made general comments on the draft resolution.

1107. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made a statement as the State concerned.

1108. 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.

1109. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Paraguay, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Albania, Algeria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Georgia, Germany, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, South Africa, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Abstaining:*

Botswana, Ghana, Paraguay, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo

1110. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 42 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 31/34).

**Ensuring accountability and justice for all violations of international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem**

1111. At the 66th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.38, sponsored by Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Kuwait (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Chile, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, Namibia, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

1112. At the same meeting, the representatives of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates made general comments on the draft resolution.

1113. At the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made a statement as the State concerned.

1114. 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.

1115. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Paraguay, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, South Africa, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Botswana, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, India, Latvia, Netherlands, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

1116. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 32 votes to none, with 15 abstentions (resolution 31/35).

1117. At the 66th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of Germany (also on behalf of Latvia, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

**Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan**

1118. At the 66th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.39,

sponsored by Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Kuwait (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Namibia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Cabo Verde, Chile and Croatia joined the sponsors.

1119. At the same meeting, the representatives of Qatar and Saudi Arabia made general comments on the draft resolution.

1120. At the same meeting, the representative of Israel made a statement as the State concerned.

1121. 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.

1122. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

1123. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Paraguay, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Belgium, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

1124. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 32 votes to none, with 15 abstentions (resolution 31/36).

1125. At the 66th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representatives of Ecuador and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

## VIII. Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

### General debate on agenda item 8

1126. At its 52nd and 53rd meetings, on 21 March 2016, 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, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China (also on behalf of Bahrain, Belarus, Burundi, Cambodia, China, Cuba, Egypt, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Maldives, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and the State of Palestine), Cyprus<sup>26</sup> (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, the Comoros, the Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, the Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, the Netherlands, the Niger, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Swaziland, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe and the State of Palestine), El Salvador (also on behalf of Albania, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, France, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), El Salvador (also on behalf of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Ghana, India, Morocco, Netherlands (also on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine)<sup>26</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Portugal (also on behalf of Argentina, Belgium, Chile, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Mexico, Paraguay, Spain and Uruguay), Russian Federation, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland (also on behalf of Albania, Brazil, Colombia, Greece, Guatemala, Mexico, Norway, Paraguay and Uruguay), Ukraine<sup>26</sup> (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, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova,

<sup>26</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Greece, Ireland, Israel, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Spain, United States of America;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa culture internationale, African Development Association, African Regional Agricultural Credit Association, Agence internationale pour le développement, Al-Hakim Foundation, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace, 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 (also on behalf of Centro Regional de Derechos Humanos y Justicia de Género), Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Ecumenical Alliance for Human Rights and Development, Espace Afrique International, European Union of Public Relations, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Friends World Committee for Consultation, Human Rights Watch (also on behalf of the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues and the International Service for Human Rights), Indian Council of Education, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Institute for Non-Aligned Studies, International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations, International-Lawyers.Org, International Service for Human Rights, Iraqi Development Organization, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Pan African Union for Science and Technology, Prahar, United Schools International, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Victorious Youths Movement, United Nations Watch, World Environment and Resources Council, World Muslim Congress.

1127. At the 53rd meeting, on the same day, the representative of the Russian Federation made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

## **IX. Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action**

### **A. Panel discussions**

#### **Panel discussion on the incompatibility between democracy and racism**

1128. At its 48th meeting, on 18 March 2016, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 29/20, a panel discussion on the incompatibility between democracy and racism.

1129. The Deputy High Commissioner made opening statements for the panel. The Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Sierra Leone to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, Yvette Stevens, moderated the discussion for the panel.

1130. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Special Secretary for the Promotion of Racial Equality Policies, Brazil, Ronaldo Crispim Sena Barros; Professor at the Faculty of Law at Liège University, Belgium, Jerome Jamin; Member of the Board of Advisers of the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance and former Member of the European Parliament, Emine Bozkurt. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

1131. During the ensuing panel discussion for the first slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Belgium, Georgia, Pakistan<sup>26</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Uruguay<sup>26</sup> (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Egypt, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Friends World Committee for Consultation, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, Maarj Foundation for Peace and Development.

1132. At the end of the first slot, at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

1133. During the ensuing panel discussion for the second slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: China, Cuba, Dominican Republic<sup>26</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), France, Germany, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Panama, Portugal, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Chile, Colombia, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Pakistan, Spain;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Iraqi Development Organization (also on behalf of Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain), United Nations Watch.

1134. At the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

## B. Debate on the state of racial discrimination worldwide

1135. At its 50th meeting, on 18 March 2016, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 70/140, a debate on the state of racial discrimination worldwide, on the occasion of the commemoration of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

1136. The Deputy High Commissioner made an opening statement for the debate.

1137. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Elaboration of Complementary Standards and former Permanent Representative of South Africa to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, Abdul Samad Minty; Chair of the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience and former Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, Doudou Diène; Commissioner, Rapporteur on the Rights of Women and Rapporteur on the Rights of Afrodescendants of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, Margarette May Macaulay; Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent, Mireille Fanon Mendès-France. The Human Rights Council divided the debate into two slots.

1138. During the ensuing discussion for the first slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: China, Cuba, France, Namibia, Pakistan<sup>26</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Portugal, Dominican Republic<sup>26</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Russian Federation, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Brazil, United States of America;

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

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Office of the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights of Hungary;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Indian Council of South America, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations.

1139. At the end of the first slot, at the same meeting, the keynote speakers answered questions and made comments.

1140. During the discussion for the second slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Mexico, Nigeria, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Armenia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, International-Lawyers.Org, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Japanese Workers Committee for Human Rights, World Jewish Congress.

1141. At the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

## C. General debate on agenda item 9

1142. At the 53rd meeting, on 21 March 2016, the Chief of the Anti-Racial Discrimination Section of OHCHR presented, on behalf of the Chair-Rapporteur of the Intergovernmental Working Group on the Effective Implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme



of Action, Mohamed Siad Douale, the report of the Working Group on its thirteenth session, held from 5 to 15 October 2015 (A/HRC/31/75).

1143. At the same meeting, the Chair-Rapporteur of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Elaboration of Complementary Standards, Abdul Samad Minty, presented the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on its seventh session, held from 13 to 24 July 2015 (A/HRC/31/74).

1144. At its 53rd and 54th meetings, on the same day, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 9, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, China, Cuba, Dominican Republic<sup>26</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Georgia, Ghana, India, Kuwait<sup>26</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Montenegro, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), Pakistan<sup>26</sup> (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Azerbaijan, Brazil, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Turkey;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Regional Agricultural Credit Association, Agence internationale pour le développement, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace, Canners International Permanent Committee, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, Center for Inquiry, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, European Union of Jewish Students, European Union of Public Relations, Indian Council of Education, Institute on Human Rights and the Holocaust, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Institute for Non-Aligned Studies, International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (also on behalf of International-Lawyers.Org), International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Iraqi Development Organization, Liberation, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Pan African Union for Science and Technology, Prahar, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Sikh Human Rights Group, Society for Recovery Support, Tiye International, United Nations Watch, United Schools International, World Barua Organization, World Environment and Resources Council, World Muslim Congress.

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

### **Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping and stigmatization of, and discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against, persons based on religion or belief**

1145. At the 64th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.34, sponsored by Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) and Turkey, and co-sponsored by Australia. Subsequently, Argentina, Cabo Verde, Honduras and Sri Lanka joined the sponsors.

1146. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, made general comments on the draft resolution.

1147. Also at the same meeting, the Chief of the Programme Support and Management Services of OHCHR made a statement on the budgetary implications of the draft resolution.

1148. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 31/26).

## X. Technical assistance and capacity-building

### A. Annual thematic panel discussion on technical cooperation in the promotion and protection of human rights

1149. At its 56th meeting, on 22 March 2016, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 30/21, its annual thematic panel discussion on technical cooperation in the promotion and protection of human rights, with a focus on the theme “Technical cooperation and capacity-building to promote and protect the rights of all migrants, including women, children, older persons and persons with disabilities”. The panel discussion was informed by the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (A/HRC/31/80).

1150. The Deputy High Commissioner made an opening statement for the panel. The Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Thailand to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, Thani Thongphakdi, moderated the discussion for the panel.

1151. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Director of the Research and Right to Development Division at OHCHR, Peggy Hicks; Head of the International Migration Law Unit at the International Organization for Migration, Kristina Touzenis; Deputy Head of the Office for Migration Policy at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Italy, Paola Cogliandro; Director of the Bureau of International Health at the Ministry of Public Health of Thailand, Phusit Prakongsai; President of the Fondation Orient-Occident, Morocco, Yasmina Antonia Filali. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

1152. During the ensuing panel discussion for the first slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: China, Dominican Republic<sup>27</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ecuador, Germany, Kuwait<sup>27</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Morocco, Paraguay, Qatar;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Egypt, Greece, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (also on behalf of Centro Regional de Derechos Humanos y Justicia de Género), Human Rights Watch, Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l’homme.

1153. At the end of the first slot, at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

1154. During the discussion for the second slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Ghana, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Philippines, Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belarus, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Colombia, Libya, Myanmar, Peru, Sweden, Sudan, Turkey;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

1155. At the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

<sup>27</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

## **B. Enhanced interactive dialogue on the situation of human rights in Burundi**

1156. At its 55th meeting, on 22 March 2016, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 30/27 on technical cooperation and capacity-building for Burundi in the field of human rights and Council resolution S-24/1 on preventing the deterioration of the human rights situation in Burundi, an enhanced interactive dialogue on the situation of human rights in Burundi.

1157. At the same meeting, the United Nations Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights presented, in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 30/27, an oral update on the implementation of that resolution.

1158. Also at the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, Christof Heyns, presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution S-24/1, an oral update on the mission by existing independent experts to investigate the human rights situation in Burundi.

1159. Also at the same meeting, the following made statements: Minister of Human Rights, Social Affairs and Gender of Burundi, Martin Nivyabandi; Permanent Representative of the African Union in Geneva, Jean-Marie Ehouzou; President of the Association burundaise pour la protection des droits humains et des personnes détenues, Pierre Claver Mbonimpa.

1160. Also at the same meeting, the Commission nationale indépendante des droits de l'homme of Burundi made a statement.

1161. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 55th and 56th 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: Albania, Algeria, Belgium, China, France, Germany, Ghana, Mexico, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Austria, Canada, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Gabon, Greece, Ireland, Japan, Libya, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Rwanda, Senegal, Spain, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Centre indépendant de recherches et d'initiatives pour le dialogue, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers (also on behalf of Franciscans International), Espace Afrique International, Human Rights Watch, International Service for Human Rights, World Evangelical Alliance.

1162. At the 55th meeting, on 22 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

1163. At the 57th meeting, on the same day, the Minister of Human Rights, Social Affairs and Gender of Burundi, the Permanent Representative of the African Union in Geneva, and the President of the Association burundaise pour la protection des droits humains et des personnes détenues answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

## **C. Interactive dialogue on cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights**

1164. At the 58th meeting, on 22 March 2016, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights provided, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 29/23, an oral update on the situation of human rights in Ukraine.

1165. At the same meeting, the representative of Ukraine made a statement as the State concerned.

1166. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Belgium, China, France, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Ireland, Lithuania, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United States of America;

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

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights Watch, International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, Minority Rights Group, United Nations Watch, World Federation of Ukrainian Women's Organizations.

1167. At the same meeting, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

### **Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic**

1168. At the 54th meeting, on 21 March 2016, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic, Marie-Thérèse Keita Bocoum, presented an oral update to the Human Rights Council.

1169. At the same meeting, the representative of the Central African Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

1170. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 54th meeting, on 21 March 2016, and at the 55th meeting, on 22 March, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Belgium, Botswana, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Morocco, Netherlands, Portugal, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Chad, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Libya, Luxembourg, Mali, Mozambique, New Zealand, Norway, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Save the Children International, World Evangelical Alliance (also on behalf of Caritas Internationalis).

1171. At the 55th meeting, on 22 March 2016, the Independent Expert answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

**Independent expert on capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights**

1172. At the 57th meeting, on 22 March 2016, the Independent Expert on capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights, Mohammed Ayat, presented his report (A/HRC/31/78).

1173. At the same meeting, the representative of Côte d'Ivoire made a statement as the State concerned.

1174. 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, Belgium, Botswana, China, Congo, France, Ghana, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, Mali, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Catholic Child Bureau, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Service for Human Rights, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, World Organization against Torture.

1175. At the same meeting, the representative of Côte d'Ivoire made final remarks as the State concerned.

1176. Also at the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

**Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Haiti**

1177. At the 59th meeting, on 23 March 2016, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Haiti, Gustavo Gallón, presented his report (A/HRC/31/77).

1178. At the same meeting, the representative of Haiti made a statement as the State concerned.

1179. 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: Brazil<sup>27</sup> (also on behalf of Argentina, Canada, Chile, Colombia, France, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru, the United States of America and Uruguay), China, Cuba, Dominican Republic<sup>27</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), France, Morocco, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

(b) Representatives of observer States: Brazil, Chile, Spain, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Human Rights Watch, International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, United Nations Watch.

1180. At the same meeting, the representative of Haiti made final remarks as the State concerned.

1181. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

### **Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Mali**

1182. At the 59th meeting, on 23 March 2016, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Mali, Suliman Baldo, presented his report (A/HRC/31/76).

1183. At the 60th meeting, on the same day, the representative of Mali made a statement as the State concerned.

1184. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 59th and 60th 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, Belgium, Botswana, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Ghana, Morocco, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Benin, Chad, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, Estonia, New Zealand, Norway, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Catholic Child Bureau, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, United Nations Watch.

1185. At the 60th meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Mali made final remarks as the State concerned.

1186. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

## **E. General debate on agenda item 10**

1187. At the 61st meeting, on 23 March 2016, the Deputy High Commissioner introduced country-specific updates and reports of the High Commissioner submitted under agenda item 10 (A/HRC/31/46, A/HRC/31/47 and A/HRC/31/48).

1188. At the same meeting, the representatives of Afghanistan, Guinea, Libya and Yemen made statements as the States concerned.

1189. During the ensuing general debate, at the 61st and 62nd meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Deputy High Commissioner questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of Angola, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, South Africa, Timor-Leste, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zimbabwe), China, France, Germany, India (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Thailand, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zimbabwe), Maldives, Morocco (also on behalf of Bahrain, the Central African Republic, the Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Guinea, Jordan, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal and the United Arab Emirates), Netherlands (also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America), Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Qatar, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Canada, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Senegal, Thailand, United States of America;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies (also on behalf of CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Human Rights Watch, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues and the World Organization against Torture), Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Conseil de jeunesse pluriculturelle, Ecumenical Alliance for Human Rights and Development, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Human Rights Watch, Institute on Human Rights and the Holocaust, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Lesbian and Gay Association, Iraqi Development Organization, Liberal International, Liberation, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, United Nations Watch.

1190. At the 62nd meeting, on the same day, the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

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

### **Technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in Libya**

1191. At the 64th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of South Africa, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.20, sponsored by South Africa, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by Ecuador, France, Italy, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovakia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Japan, Kuwait (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

1192. At the same meeting, the representative of Libya made a statement as the State concerned.

1193. 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.

1194. At the same meeting, the representatives of Ecuador and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

1195. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 31/27).

### **Technical assistance and capacity-building for Mali in the field of human rights**

1196. At the 64th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of South Africa, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.22, sponsored by South Africa, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by Austria, France, Germany, New Zealand, Poland and Slovakia. Subsequently, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark,

Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

1197. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, made a general comment on the draft resolution.

1198. At the same meeting, the representative of Mali made a statement as the State concerned.

1199. 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.

1200. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 31/28).

1201. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

#### **Strengthening technical cooperation and advisory services for Guinea**

1202. At the 64th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of South Africa, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.23, sponsored by South Africa, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by France, Germany, New Zealand and Spain. Subsequently, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Haiti, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

1203. At the same meeting, the representative of South Africa, on behalf of the Group of African States, orally revised the draft resolution.

1204. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, made a general comment on the draft resolution as orally revised.

1205. At the same meeting, the representative of Guinea made a statement as the State concerned.

1206. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 31/29).

#### **Situation of human rights in Haiti**

1207. At the 64th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the President of the Human Rights Council introduced draft President's statement A/HRC/31/L.40 as orally revised.

1208. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Haiti made a statement as the State concerned.

1209. 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.

1210. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft President's statement as orally revised (PRST/31/1).



## Annex I

### Attendance

#### Members

Albania	Indonesia	Slovenia
Algeria	Kenya	South Africa
Bangladesh	Kyrgyzstan	Switzerland
Belgium	Latvia	The former
Bolivia	Maldives	Yugoslav
(Plurinational	Mexico	Republic of
State of)	Mongolia	Macedonia
Botswana	Morocco	Togo
Burundi	Namibia	United Arab
Congo	Netherlands	Emirates
Côte d'Ivoire	Nigeria	United
Cuba	Panama	Kingdom of
China	Paraguay	Great Britain
Ecuador	Philippines	and Northern
El Salvador	Portugal	Ireland
Ethiopia	Qatar	Venezuela
France	Republic of	(Bolivarian
Georgia	Korea	Republic of)
Germany	Russian	Viet Nam
Ghana	Federation	
India	Saudi Arabia	

#### States Members of the United Nations represented by observers

Afghanistan	Chad	Gabon
Andorra	Chile	Greece
Angola	Colombia	Guatemala
Argentina	Costa Rica	Guinea
Armenia	Croatia	Haiti
Australia	Cyprus	Honduras
Austria	Czech	Hungary
Azerbaijan	Republic	Iceland
Bahamas	Democratic	Iran (Islamic
Bahrain	People's	Republic of)
Belarus	Republic of	Iraq
Benin	Korea	Ireland
Bhutan	Democratic	Israel
Bosnia and	Republic of	Italy
Herzegovina	the Congo	Japan
Brazil	Denmark	Jordan
Brunei	Djibouti	Kazakhstan
Darussalam	Dominican	Kuwait
Bulgaria	Republic	Lao People's
Burkina Faso	Egypt	Democratic
Cambodia	Equatorial	Republic
Cameroon	Guinea	Lebanon
Canada	Eritrea	Lesotho
Central	Estonia	Libya
African	Fiji	Liechtenstein
Republic	Finland	Lithuania

Luxembourg	Republic of	Sweden
Madagascar	Moldova	Syrian Arab
Malawi	Romania	Republic
Malaysia	Rwanda	Tajikistan
Mali	Saint Kitts and	Thailand
Malta	Nevis	Timor-Leste
Mauritania	Saint Lucia	Tunisia
Micronesia	Saint Vincent and	Turkey
(Federated	the Grenadines	Turkmenistan
States of)	Samoa	Uganda
Monaco	San Marino	Ukraine
Montenegro	Sao Tome and	United
Mozambique	Principe	Republic of
Myanmar	Senegal	Tanzania
Nauru	Serbia	United States
Nepal	Sierra Leone	of America
New Zealand	Singapore	Uruguay
Nicaragua	Slovakia	Uzbekistan
Norway	South Sudan	Yemen
Oman	Spain	Zambia
Pakistan	Sri Lanka	Zimbabwe
Peru	Sudan	
Poland	Swaziland	

### **Non-Member States represented by observers**

Holy See  
State of Palestine

### **United Nations**

Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the United  
Nations  
Joint United Nations  
Programme on HIV/AIDS  
Office for the  
Coordination of  
Humanitarian Affairs  
Office of the United  
Nations High  
Commissioner for  
Refugees  
United Nations Children's  
Fund  
United Nations  
Development Programme

United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization  
United Nations Entity for  
Gender Equality and the  
Empowerment of Women  
United Nations  
Environment Programme  
United Nations High  
Commissioner for  
Refugees  
United Nations Office for  
Project Services  
United Nations Population  
Fund

### **Specialized agencies and related organizations**

International Labour  
Organization  
International Organization  
for Migration

International  
Telecommunication Union  
World Food Programme  
World Health Organization

## Intergovernmental organizations

African Union  
Commonwealth Secretariat  
Cooperation Council for  
Arab States of the Gulf  
Council of Europe  
European Union  
Global Fund to Fight  
AIDS, Tuberculosis and  
Malaria

International Development  
Law Organization  
International Organization  
of la Francophonie  
League of Arab States  
Organization for Security  
and Cooperation in Europe  
Organization of Islamic  
Cooperation

## Other entities

International Committee of the Red Cross  
Sovereign Military Order of Malta

## National human rights institutions, international coordinating committees and regional groups of national institutions

Afghan Independent  
Human Rights  
Commission  
Australian Human Rights  
Commission  
Commission nationale des  
droits de l'homme of  
Mauritania  
Commission nationale  
indépendante des droits de  
l'homme of Burundi  
Commission on Human  
Rights of the Philippines  
Conseil national des droits  
de l'homme du Maroc  
Defensor del Pueblo de la  
República de Colombia  
Equality and Human  
Rights Commission of  
Great Britain  
German Institute for  
Human Rights  
Greek National  
Commission for Human  
Rights  
Human Rights  
Commission of Malaysia  
ICC Working Group on  
Business and Human  
Rights  
Independent Commission  
for Human Rights of the  
State of Palestine

International Coordinating  
Committee of National  
Institutions for the  
Promotion and Protection  
of Human Rights  
National Commission for  
Human Rights of Rwanda  
National Committee for  
Human Rights of Qatar  
National Human Rights  
Commission of Nepal  
National Human Rights  
Commission of Nigeria  
National Human Rights  
Commission of the  
Republic of Korea  
Northern Ireland Human  
Rights Commission  
Office of Public Defender  
(Ombudsman) of Georgia  
Office of the  
Commissioner for  
Fundamental Rights of  
Hungary  
Office of the People's  
Advocate of Albania  
Protector of Citizens  
(Ombudsman) of Serbia  
Scottish Human Rights  
Commission  
Ukrainian Parliament  
Commissioner for Human  
Rights

## Non-governmental organizations

ACT Alliance – Action by Churches Together  
 Action Canada for Population and Development  
 Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs  
 Adalah: Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel  
 Africa culture internationale  
 African-American Society for Humanitarian Aid and Development  
 African Development Association  
 African Regional Agricultural Credit Association  
 Agence internationale pour le développement  
 Agence pour les droits de l’homme  
 Agir en faveur de l’environnement  
 Al-Hakim Foundation  
 Al-Haq  
 Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement  
 Al-Khoei Foundation  
 Alliance Defending Freedom  
 Allied Rainbow  
 Communities International  
 All-Russian Public Organization “Russian Public Institute of Electoral Law”  
 Alsalam Foundation  
 Alulbayt Foundation  
 Al Zubair Charity Foundation  
 American Association of Jurists  
 American Civil Liberties Union  
 Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain  
 Amnesty International  
 Amuta for NGO Responsibility  
 Anglican Consultative Council  
 Appui aux femmes démunies et enfants marginalisés au Kivu  
 Arab Commission for Human Rights  
 Arab NGO Network for Development  
 Arab Organization for Human Rights  
 Arab Penal Reform Organization  
 Article 19: International Centre against Censorship  
 Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact  
 Asian-Eurasian Human Rights Forum  
 Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development  
 Asian Legal Resource Centre  
 Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development  
 Association apprentissages sans frontières  
 Association burkinabé pour la survie de l’enfance  
 Association Dunenyo  
 Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism  
 Association for Progressive Communications  
 Association for the Prevention of Torture  
 Association jeunesse action développement  
 Association mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit  
 Association Miraisme International  
 Association “Paix” pour la lutte contre la contrainte et l’injustice  
 Association PANAFRICA  
 Association pour les victimes du monde  
 Association solidarité internationale pour l’Afrique  
 Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII

Badil Resource Center for  
 Palestinian Residency and  
 Refugee Rights  
 Baha'i International  
 Community  
 Bangwe et Dialogue  
 B'nai B'rith  
 Brahma Kumaris World  
 Spiritual University  
 British Humanist  
 Association  
 Cairo Institute for Human  
 Rights Studies  
 Cameroon Youths and  
 Students Forum for Peace  
 Cannons International  
 Permanent Committee  
 Caritas Internationalis  
 Center for Environmental  
 and Management Studies  
 Center for Global  
 Nonkilling  
 Center for Inquiry  
 Center for Reproductive  
 Rights  
 Centre de documentation,  
 de recherche et  
 d'information des peuples  
 autochtones  
 Centre Europe-tiers monde  
 Centre for Human Rights  
 and Peace Advocacy  
 Centre indépendant de  
 recherches et d'initiatives  
 pour le dialogue  
 Centre pour les droits  
 civils et politiques  
 Centro de Estudios  
 Legales y Sociales  
 Chant du guépard dans le  
 désert  
 Charitable Institute for  
 Protecting Social Victims  
 Child Development  
 Foundation  
 Child Foundation  
 China Association for  
 Preservation and  
 Development of Tibetan  
 Culture  
 China NGO Network for  
 International Exchanges  
 China Society for Human  
 Rights Studies  
 Chinese Association for  
 International  
 Understanding  
 CIVICUS: World Alliance  
 for Citizen Participation  
 Colombian Commission of  
 Jurists  
 Comisión Jurídica para el  
 Autodesarrollo de los  
 Pueblos Originarios  
 Andinos "Capaj"  
 Comisión Mexicana de  
 Defensa y Promoción de  
 los Derechos Humanos  
 Comité international pour  
 le respect et l'application  
 de la charte africaine des  
 droits de l'homme et des  
 peuples  
 Comité Permanente por la  
 Defensa de los Derechos  
 Humanos  
 Commission africaine des  
 promoteurs de la santé et  
 des droits de l'homme  
 Commission of the  
 Churches on International  
 Affairs of the World  
 Council of Churches  
 Commission to Study the  
 Organization of Peace  
 Company of the Daughters  
 of Charity of St. Vincent  
 de Paul  
 Congregation of Our Lady  
 of Charity of the Good  
 Shepherd  
 Conscience and Peace Tax  
 International  
 Conseil de jeunesse  
 pluriculturelle  
 Coordinating Board of  
 Jewish Organizations  
 Corporación para la  
 Defensa y Promoción de  
 los Derechos Humanos –  
 Reiniciar  
 Defence for Children  
 International  
 Dominicans for Justice and  
 Peace: Order of Preachers  
 Drepavie  
 East and Horn of Africa  
 Human Rights Defenders  
 Project  
 Eastern Sudan Women  
 Development Organization  
 Ecumenical Alliance for  
 Human Rights and  
 Development  
 Edmund Rice International  
 Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric  
 AIDS Foundation

Espace Afrique  
 International  
 European Centre for Law  
 and Justice  
 European Union of Jewish  
 Students  
 European Union of Public  
 Relations  
 Family Health Association  
 of Iran  
 Federación de  
 Asociaciones de Defensa y  
 Promoción de los  
 Derechos Humanos  
 Federatie van Nederlandse  
 Verenigingen tot Integratie  
 van Homoseksualiteit –  
 COC Nederland  
 Fondation des oeuvres  
 pour la solidarité et le  
 bien-être social  
 Fondation pour l'étude des  
 relations internationales et  
 du développement  
 Foodfirst Information and  
 Action Network  
 Forum Azzahrae pour la  
 femme marocaine  
 Forum réfugiés – Cosi  
 Foundation ECPAT  
 International  
 Foundation for Gaia  
 France Libertés: Fondation  
 Danielle Mitterrand  
 Franciscans International  
 Freedom House  
 Freedom Now  
 Friedrich Ebert Foundation  
 Friends of the Earth  
 International  
 Friends World Committee  
 for Consultation  
 Fundación  
 Latinoamericana por los  
 Derechos Humanos y el  
 Desarrollo Social  
 Geneva International  
 Model United Nations  
 Genève pour les droits de  
 l'homme: formation  
 internationale  
 Global Helping to  
 Advance Women and  
 Children  
 Global Network for Rights  
 and Development  
 Groupe des ONG pour la  
 Convention relative aux  
 droits de l'enfant  
 Hazrat Javad-al-Aemeh  
 Cultural Charity Institute  
 Helios Life Association  
 Helsinki Foundation for  
 Human Rights  
 Himalayan Research and  
 Cultural Foundation  
 Humanist Institute for  
 Cooperation with  
 Developing Countries  
 Human Rights Advocates  
 Human Rights House  
 Foundation  
 Human Rights Information  
 and Documentation  
 Systems International  
 Human Rights Information  
 and Training Center  
 Human Rights Now  
 Human Rights Watch  
 Il Cenacolo  
 Imam Ali's Popular  
 Students Relief Society  
 Inclusion International  
 Indian Council of  
 Education  
 Indian Council of South  
 America  
 Ingénieurs du monde  
 Institute for Planetary  
 Synthesis  
 Institute for Policy Studies  
 Institute for Women's  
 Studies and Research  
 Institute on Human Rights  
 and the Holocaust  
 Institut international pour  
 la paix, la justice et les  
 droits de l'homme  
 Integrated Youth  
 Empowerment – Common  
 Initiative Group  
 International Association  
 against Torture  
 International Association  
 for Democracy in Africa  
 International Association  
 of Democratic Lawyers  
 International Association  
 of Jewish Lawyers and  
 Jurists  
 International Bar  
 Association  
 International Career  
 Support Association  
 International Catholic  
 Child Bureau  
 International Catholic  
 Migration Commission

International Center for  
 Not-for-Profit Law  
 International Commission  
 of Jurists  
 International Committee  
 for the Indigenous Peoples  
 of the Americas  
 (Switzerland)  
 International Council of  
 Jewish Women  
 International Educational  
 Development  
 International Federation  
 for Human Rights Leagues  
 International Federation  
 for the Protection of the  
 Rights of Ethnic,  
 Religious, Linguistic and  
 Other Minorities  
 International Federation of  
 ACAT  
 International Federation of  
 University Women  
 International Fellowship of  
 Reconciliation  
 International Gay and  
 Lesbian Human Rights  
 Commission  
 International Harm  
 Reduction Association  
 International HIV/AIDS  
 Alliance  
 International Humanist and  
 Ethical Union  
 International Human  
 Rights Association of  
 American Minorities  
 International Institute for  
 Non-Aligned Studies  
 International Islamic  
 Federation of Student  
 Organizations  
 International-Lawyers.Org  
 International Lesbian and  
 Gay Association  
 International Movement  
 against All Forms of  
 Discrimination and Racism  
 International Movement  
 ATD Fourth World  
 International Movement  
 for Fraternal Union among  
 Races and Peoples  
 International Movement of  
 Apostolate in the  
 Independent Social  
 Milieus  
 International Muslim  
 Women's Union  
 International Organization  
 for the Elimination of All  
 Forms of Racial  
 Discrimination  
 International Organization  
 for the Right to Education  
 and Freedom of Education  
 International Peace Bureau  
 International Planned  
 Parenthood Federation  
 International Service for  
 Human Rights  
 International Solidarity  
 Africa  
 International Volunteerism  
 Organization for Women,  
 Education and  
 Development  
 International Youth and  
 Student Movement for the  
 United Nations  
 Iranian Elite Research  
 Center  
 Iraqi Development  
 Organization  
 Islamic Human Rights  
 Commission  
 Islamic Women's Institute  
 of Iran  
 Istituto Internazionale  
 Maria Ausiliatrice delle  
 Salesiane di Don Bosco  
 Ius Primi Viri International  
 Association  
 Japanese Workers  
 Committee for Human  
 Rights  
 Jossour forum des femmes  
 marocaines  
 Jubilee Campaign  
 Khiam Rehabilitation  
 Centre for Victims of  
 Torture  
 Kiyana Karaj Group  
 Korean Assembly for  
 Reunion of Ten Million  
 Separated Families  
 Korean Bar Association  
 La Brique  
 Liberal International  
 (World Liberal Union)  
 Liberation  
 Lutheran World Federation  
 Maarij Foundation for  
 Peace and Development  
 Make Mothers Matter  
 Maryam Ghasemi  
 Educational Charity  
 Institute

Migrants Rights  
 International  
 Minority Rights Group  
 National Association of  
 Community Legal Centres  
 Nazra for Feminist Studies  
 Nonviolent Radical Party;  
 Transnational and  
 Transparty  
 Norwegian Refugee  
 Council  
 Observatoire mauritanien  
 des droits de l'homme et  
 de la démocratie  
 Omega Research  
 Foundation  
 Organisation des jeunes  
 pour le monde d'avenir  
 Organisation internationale  
 pour les pays les moins  
 avancés  
 Organisation marocaine  
 des droits humains  
 Organisation pour la  
 communication en Afrique  
 et de promotion de la  
 coopération économique  
 internationale  
 Organization for  
 Defending Victims of  
 Violence  
 Pacific Disability Forum  
 Palestinian Return Centre  
 Pan African Union for  
 Science and Technology  
 Pasumai Thaayagam  
 Foundation  
 Pax Christi International  
 Pax Romana  
 Peace Brigades  
 International Switzerland  
 Peivande Gole Narges  
 Organization  
 People for Successful  
 Corean Reunification  
 People's Solidarity for  
 Participatory Democracy  
 Plan International  
 Prahar  
 Presse emblème campagne  
 Prevention Association of  
 Social Harms  
 Privacy International  
 Redress Trust  
 Rencontre africaine pour la  
 défense des droits de  
 l'homme  
 Reporters sans frontières  
 international

Réseau international des  
 droits humains  
 Save the Children  
 International  
 Save the Climate  
 Servas International  
 Shia Rights Watch  
 Sikh Human Rights Group  
 Sisters of Mercy of the  
 Americas  
 Social Service Agency of  
 the Protestant Church in  
 Germany  
 Society for Development  
 and Community  
 Empowerment  
 Society for Recovery  
 Support  
 Society for Threatened  
 Peoples  
 Society of Iranian Women  
 Advocating Sustainable  
 Development of the  
 Environment  
 Society Studies Centre  
 Soka Gakkai International  
 Solidarité Suisse-Guinée  
 SOS Kinderdorf  
 International  
 Susila Dharma  
 International Association  
 Swedish Association for  
 Sexuality Education  
 Temple of Understanding  
 Terre des hommes  
 fédération internationale  
 Tiye International  
 Union of Arab Jurists  
 United Nations for  
 Education, Universal  
 Science and Human Rights  
 United Nations Watch  
 United Network of Young  
 Peacebuilders  
 United Schools  
 International  
 UPR Info  
 Verein Südwind  
 Entwicklungspolitik  
 Victorious Youths  
 Movement  
 Villages unis  
 Women's Federation for  
 World Peace International  
 Women's Human Rights  
 International Association  
 Women's International  
 League for Peace and  
 Freedom



Women's World Summit  
Foundation  
World Barua Organization  
World Blind Union  
World Environment and  
Resources Council  
World Evangelical  
Alliance  
World Federation of  
Ukrainian Women's  
Organizations

World Future Council  
Foundation  
World Jewish Congress  
World Muslim Congress  
World Organization  
against Torture  
World Union of Catholic  
Women's Organizations  
World Young Women's  
Christian Association

## Annex II

### Agenda

- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| Item 1  | Organizational and procedural matters   |
| Item 2  | Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General           |
| Item 3  | Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development                      |
| Item 4  | Human rights situations that require the Council's attention  |
| Item 5  | Human rights bodies and mechanisms  |
| Item 6  | Universal periodic review   |
| Item 7  | Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories   |
| Item 8  | Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action   |
| Item 9  | Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action |
| Item 10 | Technical assistance and capacity-building  |

## Annex III

[English, French and Spanish only]

### Documents issued for the thirty-first session

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/31/1	1 Annotations to the agenda for the thirty-first session of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/31/1/Corr.1	1 Corrigendum
A/HRC/31/2	1 Report of the Human Rights Council on its thirty-first session
A/HRC/31/3	2 Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/3/Add.1	2 Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the activities of his office in Guatemala
A/HRC/31/3/Add.2	2 Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the situation of human rights in Colombia
A/HRC/31/4	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Federated States of Micronesia
A/HRC/31/4/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/31/5	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Lebanon
A/HRC/31/5/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/31/6	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Mauritania
A/HRC/31/6/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/31/7	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Nauru
A/HRC/31/7/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/31/8	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Rwanda
A/HRC/31/8/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/31/9	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Nepal
A/HRC/31/9/Corr.1	6 Corrigendum
A/HRC/31/9/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/31/10	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Saint Lucia
A/HRC/31/10/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/31/11	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Oman
A/HRC/31/11/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/31/12	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Austria
A/HRC/31/12/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/31/13	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Myanmar
A/HRC/31/13/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/31/14	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Australia
A/HRC/31/14/Corr.1	6 Corrigendum
A/HRC/31/14/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/31/15	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Georgia
A/HRC/31/15/Corr.1	6 Corrigendum
A/HRC/31/15/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/31/16	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Saint Kitts and Nevis
A/HRC/31/16/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/31/17	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Sao Tome and Principe

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/31/18	3 Report of the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief
A/HRC/31/18/Add.1	3 Mission to Lebanon
A/HRC/31/18/Add.2	3 Mission to Bangladesh
A/HRC/31/18/Add.3	3 Mission to Lebanon: comments by the State
A/HRC/31/18/Add.4	3 Mission to Bangladesh: comments by the State
A/HRC/31/19	3 Annual report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict
A/HRC/31/20	3 Annual report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children
A/HRC/31/21	2 Question of human rights in Cyprus: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/22	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/31/23	2 United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture: report of by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/31/24	2 Conclusions and recommendations of special procedures: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/31/25	2 Measures taken to implement Human Rights Council resolution 9/8 and obstacles to its implementation, including recommendations for further improving the effectiveness of, harmonizing and reforming the treaty body system: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/31/26	2 Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/31/27	2, 3 Rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities: annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/28	2, 3 Outcome of the panel discussion on a human rights-based approach to good governance in the public service: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/29	2, 3 Impact of the arbitrary deprivation of nationality on the enjoyment of the rights of children concerned, and existing laws and practices on accessibility for children to acquire nationality, inter alia, of the country in which they are born, if they otherwise would be stateless: report of the Secretary-General

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/31/30	2, 3	Thematic study on the rights of persons with disabilities under article 11 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, on situations of risk and humanitarian emergencies: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/31	2, 3	Question of the realization in all countries of economic, social and cultural rights: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/31/32	2, 3	Realization of the right to work: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/33	2, 3	Follow-up on investment on children's rights: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/34	2, 3	Information and communications technology and child sexual exploitation: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/34/Corr.1	2, 3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/31/35	2, 3	Situation of migrants in transit: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/36	2, 3	Analytical study on the relationship between climate change and the human right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/31/37	2, 3	Protection of the family: contribution of the family to the realization of the right to an adequate standard of living for its members, particularly through its role in poverty eradication and achieving sustainable development – report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/38	2, 4	Role and achievements of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights with regard to the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/39	2, 5	Report of the twenty-second annual meeting of special rapporteurs/representatives, independent experts and working groups of the special procedures of the Human Rights Council (Geneva, 8–12 June 2015), including updated information on the special procedures: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/31/40	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

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/31/40/Add.1	2, 7	Implementation of the recommendations contained in the reports of the independent commission of inquiry on the 2014 Gaza conflict and of the United Nations Fact-Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict
A/HRC/31/41	2, 7	Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/31/42	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: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/43	2, 7	Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the Occupied Syrian Golan: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/31/44	2, 7	Human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/31/45	2, 8	Outcome of the panel discussion on the impact of the world drug problem on the enjoyment of human rights: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/46	2, 10	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the situation of human rights in Afghanistan and on the achievements of technical assistance in the field of human rights in 2015
A/HRC/31/47	2, 10	Investigation by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on Libya: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/48	2, 10	Situation of human rights in Guinea: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/49	2	Assessment mission by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to improve human rights, accountability, reconciliation and capacity in South Sudan: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/50	3	Report on the first session of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on transnational corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights, with the mandate of elaborating an international legally binding instrument
A/HRC/31/51	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to food

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/31/51/Add.1	3 Mission to the Philippines
A/HRC/31/51/Add.2	3 Mission to Morocco
A/HRC/31/51/Add.3	3 Mission to the Philippines: comments by the State
A/HRC/31/51/Add.4	3 Mission to Morocco: comments by the State
A/HRC/31/52	3 Report of the Special Rapporteur on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment
A/HRC/31/53	3 Report of the Special Rapporteur on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment
A/HRC/31/54	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
A/HRC/31/54/Add.1	3 Mission to Cabo Verde
A/HRC/31/54/Add.2	3 Mission to Serbia and Kosovo <sup>1</sup>
A/HRC/31/54/Add.3	3 Mission to Cabo Verde: comments by the State
A/HRC/31/54/Add.4	3 Mission to Serbia and Kosovo: comments by the State
A/HRC/31/55	3 Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders
A/HRC/31/55/Add.1	3 Observations on communications transmitted to Governments and replies received
A/HRC/31/55/Add.1/ Corr.1	Corrigendum
A/HRC/31/55/Add.2	3 Mission to Burundi
A/HRC/31/55/Add.3	3 Mission to Burundi: comments by the State
A/HRC/31/56	3 Report of the Special Rapporteur on minority issues
A/HRC/31/56/Add.1	3 Mission to Brazil
A/HRC/31/56/Add.2	3 Mission to Brazil: comments by the State
A/HRC/31/57	3 Report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment
A/HRC/31/57/Add.1	3 Observations on communications transmitted to Governments and replies received

<sup>1</sup> Any reference to Kosovo, whether to the territory, institutions or population, is to be understood in full compliance with Security Council resolution 1244 (1999) and without prejudice to the status of Kosovo.



*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/31/57/Add.2	3 Follow up report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment on his follow-up visit to the Republic of Ghana
A/HRC/31/57/Add.3	3 Mission to Georgia
A/HRC/31/57/Add.4	3 Mission to Brazil
A/HRC/31/57/Add.4/ Corr.1	3 Corrigendum
A/HRC/31/57/Add.5	3 Mission to Georgia: comments by the State
A/HRC/31/57/Add.6	3 Mission to Brazil: comments by the State
A/HRC/31/58	3 Report of the Special Rapporteur on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography
A/HRC/31/58/Add.1	3 Mission to Japan
A/HRC/31/58/Add.2	3 Mission to Armenia
A/HRC/31/58/Add.3	3 Mission to Japan: comments by the State
A/HRC/31/58/Add.4	3 Mission to Armenia: comments by the State
A/HRC/31/59	3 Report of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights
A/HRC/31/59/Corr.1	3 Corrigendum
A/HRC/31/59/Add.1	3 Mission to Botswana
A/HRC/31/59/Add.2	3 Mission to Botswana: comments by the State
A/HRC/31/60	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 all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights
A/HRC/31/60/Add.1	3 Mission to China
A/HRC/31/60/Add.2	3 Mission to Greece
A/HRC/31/60/Add.3	3 Mission to China: comments by the State
A/HRC/31/60/Add.4	3 Mission to Greece: comments by the State
A/HRC/31/61	3 Final study on illicit financial flows, human rights and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development 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
A/HRC/31/62	3 Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities
A/HRC/31/62/Add.1	3 Mission to the Republic of Moldova: comments by the State
A/HRC/31/62/Add.2	3 Mission to the Republic of Moldova

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/31/63	3 Report of the Independent Expert on the enjoyment of human rights by persons with albinism
A/HRC/31/64	3 Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to privacy
A/HRC/31/65	3 Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism
A/HRC/31/66	3 Joint report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association and the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions on the proper management of assemblies
A/HRC/31/67	3, 5 Progress report of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee on its research-based report on the activities of vulture funds and the impact on human rights
A/HRC/31/68	4 Report of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/31/69	4 Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran
A/HRC/31/70	4 Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea
A/HRC/31/70/Corr.1	4 Corrigendum
A/HRC/31/71	4 Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar
A/HRC/31/71/Add.1	4 Observations by Myanmar on the report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar
A/HRC/31/72	5 Recommendations of the Forum on Minority Issues at its eighth session: Minorities and the criminal justice system (24 and 25 November 2015)
A/HRC/31/73	7 Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967
A/HRC/31/74	9 Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Elaboration of Complementary Standards on its seventh session
A/HRC/31/75	9 Report of the Intergovernmental Working Group on the Effective Implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action on its thirteenth session
A/HRC/31/76	10 Report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Mali
A/HRC/31/77	10 Report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Haiti

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/31/78	10	Report of the Independent Expert on capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights
A/HRC/31/79	3, 4, 7, 9, 10	Communications report of special procedures
A/HRC/31/80	2, 10	Technical cooperation and capacity-building to promote and protect the rights of all migrants, including women, children, older persons and persons with disabilities: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/81	2, 3	Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/82	2, 3	Outcome of the Human Rights Council panel discussion on unilateral coercive measures and human rights: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

*Documents issued in the conference room papers series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/31/CRP.1	4	Out of sight, out of mind: deaths in detention in the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/31/CRP.2	3	Regional workshop on the situation of Roma in the Americas
A/HRC/31/CRP.3	2, 10	Investigation by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on Libya: detailed findings
A/HRC/31/CRP.4	2,3	Relationship between climate change and the human right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health: informal summary of inputs received
A/HRC/20/CRP.5	4	Supplementary information on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran
A/HRC/20/CRP.6	2	Assessment mission by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to improve human rights, accountability, reconciliation and capacity in South Sudan: detailed findings
A/HRC/20/CRP.7	10	Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the situation of human rights in Ukraine: (16 November 2015 to 15 February 2016)

*Documents issued in the Government series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/31/G/1	4	Note verbale dated 17 December 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Georgia 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/31/G/2	2	Nota verbal de fecha 24 de diciembre de 2015 dirigida a la Oficina del Alto Comisionado de las Naciones Unidas para los Derechos Humanos por la Misión Permanente de Guatemala ante la Oficina de las Naciones Unidas en Ginebra y otros Organismos Internacionales con sede en Ginebra
A/HRC/31/G/3	4	Letter dated 20 January 2016 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/31/G/4	2, 10	Note verbale dated 16 February 2016 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/31/G/5	4	Letter dated 26 February 2016 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/31/G/6	4	Letter dated 18 February 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Georgia to the United Nations Office addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/31/G/7	6	Letter dated 17 March 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/31/G/8	2	Note verbale dated 22 March 2016 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/31/G/9	3	Note verbale dated 22 March 2016 from the Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Secretariat of the Human Rights Council

*Documents issued in the national institution series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/31/NI/1	3 Written submission by the Azerbaijan Human Rights Commissioner (Ombudsman)
A/HRC/31/NI/2	5 Written submission by the Azerbaijan: Human Rights Commissioner (Ombudsman)
A/HRC/31/NI/3	6 Written submission by the Rwanda: National Commission for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/NI/4	3 Información presentada por la Red de Instituciones Nacionales para la Promoción y Protección de los Derechos Humanos del Continente Americano
A/HRC/31/NI/5	3 Información presentada por la Red de Instituciones Nacionales para la Promoción y Protección de los Derechos Humanos del Continente Americano
A/HRC/31/NI/6	3 Información presentada por la Red de Instituciones Nacionales para la Promoción y Protección de los Derechos Humanos del Continente Americano
A/HRC/31/NI/7	3 Información presentada por la Red de Instituciones Nacionales para la Promoción y Protección de los Derechos Humanos del Continente Americano
A/HRC/31/NI/8	3 Información presentada por la Red de Instituciones Nacionales para la Promoción y Protección de los Derechos Humanos del Continente Americano
A/HRC/31/NI/9	3 Written submission by the Greek National Commission for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/NI/10	3 Informations communiquées par le Conseil National des Droits de l'Homme du Maroc
A/HRC/31/NI/11	3 Informations communiquées par le Conseil National des Droits de l'Homme du Maroc
A/HRC/31/NI/12	3 Informations communiquées par le Conseil National des Droits de l'Homme du Maroc
A/HRC/31/NI/13	1 Comité International de Coordination des Institutions Nationales pour la Promotion et la Protection des Droits de l'Homme (CIC)
A/HRC/31/NI/14	1 Written submission by the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights (ICC)

*Documents issued in the national institution series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/31/NI/15	1 Comité Internacional de Coordinación de la Instituciones Nacionales para la Promoción y la Protección de los Derechos Humanos (CIC)
A/HRC/31/NI/16	1 Written submission by the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights (ICC)
A/HRC/31/NI/17	6 Written submission by the Nepal National Commission for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/NI/18	3 Written submission by the Azerbaijan Human Rights Commissioner (Ombudsman)

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/31/NGO/1	3 Written statement submitted by the World Muslim Congress, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/2	7 Written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/3	9 Written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/4	3 Written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/5	3 Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/6	3 Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/7	3 Exposé écrit présenté par le Chant du Guépard dans le Désert, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultative spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/8	3 Written statement submitted by the Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of Environment, 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/31/NGO/9	3 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/10	3 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/11	3 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/12	3 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/13	5 Written statement submitted by Reporters Sans Frontiers International: Reporters Without Borders International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/14	3 Written statement submitted by the Child Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/15	7 Written statement submitted by the Child Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/16	5 Written statement submitted by the Friends World Committee for Consultation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/17	3 Exposición escrita presentada por la Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/31/NGO/18	7 Written statement submitted by the Arab Association for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/19	7 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/20	3 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/21	3 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/31/NGO/22	3 Written statement submitted by the Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/23	4 Exposé écrit présenté par l'Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'Homme: IIPJFH, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultative spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/24	3 Exposé écrit présenté par l'Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'Homme: IIPJFH, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultative spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/25	3 Joint written statement submitted by the Association for Progressive Communications (APC), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, the American Civil Liberties Union, Amnesty International, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Human Rights Watch, International Commission of Jurists, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International PEN, International Press Institute, International Service for Human Rights, Privacy International, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Article 19: International Centre Against Censorship, the World Association of Newspapers, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/26	7 Written statement submitted by the Arab Association for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/27	3 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/28	4 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/29	7 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/30	7 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/31	7 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status



*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/31/NGO/32	7 Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/33	7 Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/34	8 Written statement submitted by the Modern Advocacy, Humanitarian, Social and Rehabilitation Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/35	3 Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/36	7 Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/37	3 Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/38	3 Exposé écrit présenté par Drepavie, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/39	6 Exposé écrit présenté par Drepavie, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/40	2 Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/41	4 Written statement submitted by the Korean Assembly for Reunion of Ten-million Separated Families, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/42	5 Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/43	9 Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/44	3 Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/45	3 Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/31/NGO/46	3 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/47	3 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/48	3 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/49	3 Written statement submitted by Privacy International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/50	4 Written statement submitted by International Educational Development, Inc., a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/51	3 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/52	3 Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/53	3 Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/54	3 Joint written statement submitted by OIDEL, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status, Arigatou International, Brahma Kumaris World Spiritual University, International Association for Religious Freedom, New Humanity and ONG HOPE International, non-governmental organizations in general consultative status, Al-Hakim Foundation, Asia-Pacific Human Rights Information Center, Association Points-Cœur, Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers, Equitas International Centre for Human Rights Education, Foundation for GAIA, International Catholic Child Bureau, International Council of Jewish Women, International Federation of University Women, International Network for the Prevention of Elder Abuse, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development: VIDES, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco: IIMA, Latter-Day Saint Charities, Mothers Legacy Project, Planetary Association for Clean Energy, Sovereign Military Order of the Temple of Jerusalem: OSMTH, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status and Lucis Trust Association and

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
	Soka Gakkai International, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/55	3 Written statement submitted by the Association Miraisme International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/56	4 Written statement submitted by the Korean Bar Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/57	3 Written statement submitted by the Association Miraisme International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/58	3 Written statement submitted by the Association Miraisme International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/59	3 Written statement submitted by the Association Miraisme International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/60	3 Written statement submitted by the International Commission of Jurists, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/61	3 Written statement submitted by the Hazrat Javad-al-Aemeh Cultural Charity Institute, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/62	3 Written statement submitted by Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europe, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/63	7 Written statement submitted by The Palestinian Return Centre Ltd, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/64	6 Written statement submitted by International Commission of Jurists, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/65	3 Exposé écrit présenté par France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/66	2 Written statement submitted by the International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR), non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/67	4 Written statement submitted by Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/68	4 Written statement submitted by Alsalam Foundation, 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/31/NGO/69	4 Written statement submitted by Iraqi Development Organization, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/70	4 Written statement submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/71	3 Written statement submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/72	4 Written statement submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/73	2 Written statement submitted by the International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR), non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/74	3 Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/75	6 Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/76	4 Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/77	3 Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/78	4 Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/79	4 Written statement submitted by International Educational Development, Inc., a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/80	3 Exposición escrita presentada por la Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas (Cuban United Nations Association), organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/31/NGO/81	7 Exposición escrita presentada por la Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas (Cuban United Nations Association), organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/31/NGO/82	3 Exposición escrita presentada por la Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas (Cuban United Nations Association), organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/31/NGO/83	3 Written statement submitted by the Society Studies Centre (MADA ssc), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/84	7 Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/85	4 Written statement submitted by the International Federation of Liberal Youth, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/86	4 Written statement submitted by Reporters Sans Frontiers International: Reporters Without Borders International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/87	3 Written statement submitted by the Iranian Elite Research Center, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/88	3 Written statement submitted by the International Alliance of Women, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/89	4 Written statement submitted by the Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/90	3 Written statement submitted by the Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/91	3 Written statement submitted by the Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/92	4 Written statement submitted by the Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/93	3 Written statement submitted by the Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/94	4 Written statement submitted by Nazra for Feminist Studies, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/95	10 Written statement submitted by the American Association of Jurists, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/96	4 Written statement submitted by the American Association of Jurists, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/97	4 Joint written statement submitted by the Shimin Gaikou Centre (Citizens' Diplomatic Centre for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples), International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR), non-governmental organizations in special consultative status

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/31/NGO/98	2 Written statement submitted by the Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/99	4 Written statement submitted by the World Muslim Congress, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/100	7 Written statement submitted by Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/101	3 Written statement submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/102	10 Exposé écrit présenté par Franciscans International, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif général
A/HRC/31/NGO/103	3 Written statement submitted by the Norwegian Refugee Council, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/104	6 Written statement submitted by the International Bar Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/105	9 Exposé écrit présenté par le Centre européen pour le droit, la justice et les droits de l'homme (European Centre for Law and Justice), organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/106	3 Written statement submitted by the Federal Union of European Nationalities, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/107	4 Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/108	5 Written statement submitted by The European Centre for Law and Justice (Centre européen pour le droit, la justice et les droits de l'homme), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/109	4 Written statement submitted by the Iranian Elite Research Center, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/110	3 Joint written statement submitted by Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities), New Humanity, non-governmental organizations in general consultative status, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, Alliance Defending Freedom, Association Points-Coeur, Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, International Association of Charities, International Catholic Child Bureau, International Volunteer Organization for Women Education Development, Istituto

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
	Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, Mouvement International d'Apostolate des Milieux Sociaux Independants, Teresian Association, World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/111	3 Written statement submitted by the Iranian Elite Research Center, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/112	4 Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/113	7 Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/114	3 Written statement submitted by the Arab NGO Network for Development, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/115	3 Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/116	3 Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/117	2 Written statement submitted by the Arab NGO Network for Development, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/118	3 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/119	3 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/120	3 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/121	3 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/122	3 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/123	3 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/124	3 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/31/NGO/125	4 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/126	3 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/127	4 Written statement submitted by the Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/128	3 Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/129	7 Written statement submitted by the Norwegian Refugee Council, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/130	6 Written statement submitted by the Arab NGO Network for Development, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/131	2 Written statement submitted by the Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/132	2 Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/133	3 Written statement submitted by Liberal International (World Liberal Union), non-governmental organizations in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/133 /Corr.1	3 Corrigendum
A/HRC/31/NGO/134	3 Written statement submitted by the International Catholic Child Bureau, non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/135	3 Written statement submitted by the International Catholic Child Bureau, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/136	3 Written statement submitted by the International Catholic Child Bureau, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/137	4 Written statement submitted by the Marangopoulos Foundation for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/138	5 Written statement submitted by the Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/139	4 Written statement submitted by the Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, 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/31/NGO/140	3 Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Watch, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/141	3 Written statement submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/142	5 Written statement submitted by the European Centre for Law and Justice (Centre européen pour le droit, les Justice et les droits de l'homme), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/143	6 Written statement submitted by the Foundation for Aboriginal and Islander Research Action Aboriginal Corporation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/144	3 Written statement submitted by Auspice Stella, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/144/Corr.1	3 Corrigendum
A/HRC/31/NGO/145	1 Joint written statement submitted by New Humanity, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers, International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (OIDEI), Mouvement International d'Apostolate des Milieux Sociaux Independants, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/146	3 Written statement submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/147	3 Joint written statement submitted by Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, International Catholic Child Bureau, World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/148	8 Written statement submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/149	4 Exposición escrita presentada por la Comité Permanente por la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/31/NGO/150	3 Exposición escrita presentada por la Comité Permanente por la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/31/NGO/151	7 Written statement submitted by Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/152	7 Written statement submitted by Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/153	7 Written statement submitted by Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/154	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/31/NGO/155	3 Written statement submitted by Global Helping to Advance Women and Children, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/156	3 Joint written statement submitted by International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, non-governmental organizations in general consultative status, International-Lawyers.Org., Arab Organization for Human Rights, General Arab Women Federation, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Organisation Mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale, Organisation pour la Communication en Afrique et de Promotion de la Cooperation Economique Internationale: OCAPROCE Internationale, Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, Inc., World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/157	3 Written statement submitted by Jossour Forum des Femmes Marocaines, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/158	4 Joint written statement submitted by the Nonviolent Radical Party, the Transnational and Transparty, non-governmental organization in general consultative status, the Women's Human Rights International Association, non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/159	10 Exposé écrit présenté par International Catholic Child Bureau, une organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/31/NGO/160	3	Written statement submitted by the Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of Environment, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/161	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/162	3	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/163	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/164	2, 8	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/165	3	Joint written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/166	4	Joint written statement submitted by the Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational and Transparty, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, the Women's Human Rights International Association, France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, the International Educational Development, Inc., Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/167	7	Written statement submitted by Adalah: The Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/168	4	Written statement submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/169	4	Written statement submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/170	4	Written statement submitted by the Society for Development and Community Empowerment (SDCE), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/171	7	Written statement submitted by the BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/172	3	Written statement submitted by Liberation, a non-governmental organization on the roster

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/31/NGO/173	3 Written statement submitted by the World Barua Organization (WBO), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/174	4 Written statement submitted by the Integrated Youth Empowerment: Common Initiative Group (I.Y.E. – C.I.G.), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/175	3 Written statement submitted by the Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/176	3 Written statement submitted by The Article 19: International Centre Against Censorship, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/177	4 Written statement submitted by People for Successful Corean Reunification, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/178	4 Written statement submitted by the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/179	3 Written statement submitted by the Association for Progressive Communications (APC), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/180	4 Exposé écrit présenté par Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of Environment, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/181	9 Written statement submitted by Servas International, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/182	4 Written statement submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/183	3 Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/184	3 Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/185	3 Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/186	3 Written statement submitted Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/187	3 Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/31/NGO/188	5 Written statement submitted the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/189	4 Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/190	3 Written statement submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/191	9 Written statement submitted by the Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/192	3 Written statement submitted by the Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/193	3 Written statement submitted by the Society for the Protection of Unborn Children (SPUC), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/194	3 Exposición escrita presentada por la Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas (Cuban United Nations Association), organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/31/NGO/195	6 Joint written statement submitted by Franciscans International, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, Edmund Rice International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/196	3 Written statement submitted by the Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/197	6 Written statement submitted by the Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/198	3 Written statement submitted by the Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/199	3 Exposé écrit présenté par le Global Network For Rights And Development, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/200	6 Exposé écrit présenté par l'Observatoire Mauritanien pour les Droits de l'Homme et la Démocratie, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/31/NGO/201	6 Exposé écrit présenté par l'Observatoire Mauritanien pour les Droits de l'Homme et la Démocratie, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/202	6 Exposé écrit présenté par l'Observatoire Mauritanien pour les Droits de l'Homme et la Démocratie, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/203	6 Exposé écrit présenté par l'Observatoire Mauritanien pour les Droits de l'Homme et la Démocratie, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/204	6 Exposé écrit présenté par l'Observatoire Mauritanien pour les Droits de l'Homme et la Démocratie, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/205	6 Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association Mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/206	6 Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association Mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/207	6 Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association Mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/208	6 Written statement submitted by the Association Mauritanienne pour la Promotion du Droit, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/209	4 Written statement submitted by the Association Mauritanienne pour la Promotion du Droit, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/210	6 Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association "Paix" pour la lutte contre la Contrainte et l'injustice, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/211	6 Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association "Paix" pour la lutte contre la Contrainte et l'injustice, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/212	6 Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association "Paix" pour la lutte contre la Contrainte et l'injustice, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/31/NGO/213	6 Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association "Paix" pour la lutte contre la Contrainte et l'injustice, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/214	6 Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association "Paix" pour la lutte contre la Contrainte et l'injustice, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/215	6 Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association "Paix" pour la lutte contre la Contrainte et l'injustice, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/216	3 Exposé écrit présenté par Rencontre Africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/217	6 Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association "Paix" pour la lutte contre la Contrainte et l'injustice, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/218	7 Written statement submitted by the Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions (ICAHD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/219	3 Written statement submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/220	3 Written statement submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/221	4 Written statement submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/222	6 Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association Mauritanienne pour la santé de la mère et de l'enfant, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/223	9 Joint written statement submitted by International-Lawyers.Org, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, the General Arab Women Federation, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Organisation Mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale, the Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, the International Educational Development, Inc., World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/31/NGO/224	3, 7	Joint written statement submitted by International-Lawyers.Org, 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 Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, Inc., the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/225	3	Joint written statement submitted by International-Lawyers.Org., International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, Inc., World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/226	7	Joint written statement submitted by International-Lawyers.Org., 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 Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, Inc., the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/227	3	Written statement submitted by International-Lawyers.Org., 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 Organisation Mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale, the Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, Inc., the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/228	3, 4	Written statement submitted by International-Lawyers.Org., 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 Organisation Mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale, the Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, Inc., the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster, 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/31/NGO/229	3 Written statement submitted by Shia Rights Watch Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/230	4 Written statement submitted by the Iranian Elite Research Center, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/231	3 Written statement submitted by the International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/232	4 Exposición escrita presentada por la Asociación HazteOir.org., organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/31/NGO/233	5 Exposición escrita presentada por la Asociación HazteOir.org., organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/31/NGO/234	9 Written statement submitted by Auspice Stella, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

---

## **Annex IV**

### **Special procedure mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-first session**

**Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (member from Eastern European States)**

Alexey Tsykarev (Russian Federation)

**Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (member from Latin American and Caribbean States)**

Erika Yamada (Brazil)

**Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises (member from Asia-Pacific States)**

Surya Deva (India)

**Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967**

Stanley Michael Lynk (Canada)

---