



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
30 September 2019

Original: English

---

**Human Rights Council**  
Thirtieth session  
Agenda item 1  
**Organizational and procedural matters**

## **Report of the Human Rights Council on its thirtieth session**

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



## Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Part One	
Resolutions, decisions and President's statements adopted by the Human Rights Council at its thirtieth session .....	4
I. Resolutions .....	4
II. Decisions .....	5
III. President's statements .....	6
Part Two	
Summary of proceedings .....	7
I. Organizational and procedural matters .....	7
A. Opening and duration of the session .....	7
B. Attendance .....	7
C. Agenda and programme of work .....	7
D. Organization of work .....	7
E. Meetings and documentation .....	8
F. Visits .....	8
G. Election of members of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee .....	9
H. Selection and appointment of mandate holders .....	9
I. Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	9
J. Adoption of the report of the session .....	10
II. Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General .....	11
A. Update by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights .....	11
B. Reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General .....	12
C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	13
III. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development .....	15
A. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders .....	15
B. Panel discussions .....	22
C. General debate on agenda item 3 .....	24
D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	26
IV. Human rights situations that require the Council's attention .....	38
A. Interactive dialogue with the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic .....	38
B. Panel discussion on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, including the issue of international abductions, enforced disappearances and related matters .....	38
C. General debate on agenda item 4 .....	39
D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	41
V. Human rights bodies and mechanisms .....	43
A. Complaint procedure .....	43
B. Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples .....	43

C.	Interactive dialogue with the Advisory Committee .....	43
D.	Open-ended intergovernmental working group on a draft United Nations declaration on the rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas.....	44
E.	General debate on agenda item 5 .....	44
F.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	45
VI.	Universal periodic review .....	48
A.	Consideration of universal periodic review outcomes .....	48
B.	General debate on agenda item 6 .....	121
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	122
VII.	Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories .....	124
A.	General debate on agenda item 7 .....	124
VIII.	Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action .....	125
A.	Panel discussions .....	125
B.	General debate on agenda item 8 .....	126
IX.	Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action .....	128
A.	Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders .....	128
B.	General debate on agenda item 9 .....	128
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	129
X.	Technical assistance and capacity-building.....	131
A.	Interactive dialogue on cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights .....	131
B.	Interactive dialogue on technical assistance and capacity-building for human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.....	131
C.	Interactive dialogue on technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in Libya .....	132
D.	Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders .....	133
E.	General debate on agenda item 10 .....	135
F.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	136
<b>Annexes</b>		
I.	Attendance.....	141
II.	Agenda .....	147
III.	Documents issued for the thirtieth session .....	148
IV.	Advisory Committee members elected by the Human Rights Council at its thirtieth session and the date of expiry of their term of membership .....	174
V.	Special procedure mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its thirtieth session.....	175

## Part One

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

#### I. Resolutions

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
30/1	Promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka	1 October 2015
30/2	Human rights and unilateral coercive measures	1 October 2015
30/3	Regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights	1 October 2015
30/4	Human rights and indigenous peoples	1 October 2015
30/5	The question of the death penalty	1 October 2015
30/6	The use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination	1 October 2015
30/7	Human rights in the administration of justice, including juvenile justice	1 October 2015
30/8	Contribution of the Human Rights Council to the high-level meeting on HIV/AIDS in 2016	1 October 2015
30/9	Equal participation in political and public affairs	1 October 2015
30/10	The grave and deteriorating human rights and humanitarian situation in the Syrian Arab Republic	1 October 2015
30/11	Review of the mandate of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples	1 October 2015
30/12	Promotion of the right to peace	1 October 2015
30/13	Promotion and protection of the human rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas	1 October 2015
30/14	Contribution of parliaments to the work of the Human Rights Council and its universal periodic review	1 October 2015
30/15	Human rights and preventing and countering violent extremism	2 October 2015
30/16	From rhetoric to reality: a global call for concrete action against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance	2 October 2015
30/17	Forum on people of African descent in the diaspora	2 October 2015
30/18	Technical assistance and capacity-building for Yemen in the field of human rights	2 October 2015
30/19	Technical assistance and capacity-building in the field of human rights in the Central African Republic	2 October 2015
30/20	Assistance to Somalia in the field of human rights	2 October 2015
30/21	Enhancement of technical cooperation and capacity-building in the field of human rights	2 October 2015

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
30/22	Technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in the Sudan	2 October 2015
30/23	Advisory services and technical assistance for Cambodia	2 October 2015
30/24	National policies and human rights	2 October 2015
30/25	Promoting international cooperation to support national human rights follow-up systems and processes	2 October 2015
30/26	Technical assistance and capacity-building for human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo	2 October 2015
30/27	Technical cooperation and capacity-building for Burundi in the field of human rights	2 October 2015
30/28	The right to development	2 October 2015
30/29	Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order	2 October 2015

## II. Decisions

<i>Decision</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
30/101	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Belarus	24 September 2015
30/102	Outcome of the universal periodic review: United States of America	24 September 2015
30/103	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Malawi	24 September 2015
30/104	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Mongolia	24 September 2015
30/105	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Panama	24 September 2015
30/106	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Maldives	24 September 2015
30/107	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Andorra	25 September 2015
30/108	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Bulgaria	25 September 2015
30/109	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Honduras	25 September 2015
30/110	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Liberia	25 September 2015
30/111	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Marshall Islands	25 September 2015
30/112	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Croatia	25 September 2015
30/113	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Jamaica	25 September 2015
30/114	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Libya	25 September 2015
30/115	Follow-up to President's statement PRST 29/1	1 October 2015

### III. President's statements

---

<i>President's statement</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
PRST/30/1	Reports of the Advisory Committee	1 October 2015
PRST/30/2	Promoting the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health by enhancing capacity-building in public health against pandemics	2 October 2015

---

## **Part Two**

### **Summary of proceedings**

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

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

1. The Human Rights Council held its thirtieth session at the United Nations Office at Geneva from 14 September to 2 October 2015. The President of the Council opened the session.
2. In accordance with rule 8 (b) of the rules of procedure of the Human Rights Council, as contained in part VII of the annex to Council resolution 5/1, the organizational meeting of the thirtieth session was held on 24 August 2015.
3. On 14 September 2015, prior to the opening of the session, the Human Rights Council observed a minute of silence in memory of the late Ambassador and Permanent Representative of South Sudan to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, Alison Monani Magaya.
4. The thirtieth session consisted of 43 meetings over 14 days (see paragraph 14 below).

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

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

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

6. At the 1st meeting, on 14 September 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted the agenda and programme of work of the thirtieth session.

##### **D. Organization of work**

7. At the 1st and 2nd meetings, on 14 September 2015, the President, further to the decision taken at the organizational meeting of the thirtieth session of the Human Rights Council, held on 24 August 2015, outlined the modalities for the clustered interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders under agenda item 3. The total duration of each clustered interactive dialogue would not exceed four hours. As soon as the list of speakers would be available following electronic registration, the secretariat would calculate the estimated time needed to complete the clustered interactive dialogue with the mandate holders. Should the total duration of a given interactive dialogue be estimated to last less than four hours, the speaking time limits would be five minutes for Member States and groups, 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 Member States and groups, and two minutes for observers. Should this measure be deemed insufficient to ensure that the total duration not exceed four hours, the speaking time limits would be further reduced to two minutes for all.
8. Also at the 1st meeting, on the same day, the President referred to the decision taken at the organizational meeting of the thirtieth session of the Human Rights Council, upon the recommendation of the Bureau, concerning the modalities and schedule of the advance inscription on the list of speakers for clustered interactive dialogues with special procedure

mandate holders under agenda item 3. The advance inscription for all clustered interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders would take place at the beginning of the 2nd meeting.

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

10. Also at the same meeting, the President referred to the recommendation of the Bureau concerning the tabling of draft proposals after the tabling deadline. At the organizational meeting of the thirtieth session, the Council had agreed that the agreement by the Council would need to be sought by the sponsor(s) before the proposals could be registered by the secretariat.

11. At the 6th meeting, on 15 September 2015, the President outlined the modalities for panel discussions, including the speaking time limits, which would be two minutes for States Members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.

12. At the 15th meeting, on 21 September 2015, the President outlined the modalities for individual interactive dialogues, including the speaking time limits, which would be three minutes for States Members of the Human Rights Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

13. At the 22nd meeting, on 24 September 2015, the President outlined the modalities for the consideration of the outcomes of the universal periodic review under agenda item 6, including the speaking time limits, which would be 20 minutes for the State concerned to present its views; where appropriate, 2 minutes for the national human rights institution with “A” status of the State concerned; up to 20 minutes for States Members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and United Nations agencies to express their views on the outcome of the review, with varying speaking times according to the number of speakers in accordance with the modalities set out in the appendix to the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 16/21; and up to 20 minutes for stakeholders to make general comments on the outcome of the review.

## **E. Meetings and documentation**

14. The Human Rights Council held 43 fully serviced meetings during its thirtieth session.

15. The list of the resolutions, decisions and President’s statements adopted by the Human Rights Council is contained in part one of the present report.

## **F. Visits**

16. At the 1st meeting, on 14 September 2015, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sri Lanka, Mangala Samaraweera, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

17. At the same meeting, the Undersecretary for Human Rights at the Ministry of the Interior of Mexico, Roberto Campa, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

18. At the 3rd meeting, on the same day, the Minister of State in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Hugo Swire, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

19. At the 9th meeting, on 16 September 2015, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Montenegro, Igor Lukšić, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

20. At the 10th meeting, on 17 September 2015, the Commissioner for Human Rights and Humanitarian Action of Mauritania, Aichetou Mint M’Haiham, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.



## G. Election of members of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee

21. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the Human Rights Council elected, pursuant to its resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, four experts to the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee. The Council had before it a note by the Secretary-General (A/HRC/30/17) containing the nomination of candidates for election, in accordance with Council decision 6/102, and the biographical data of the candidates.

22. The candidates were as follows:

<i>Nominating State</i>	<i>Expert nominated</i>
<b>African States</b>	
Ethiopia	Imeru Tamrat Yigezu
<b>Asia-Pacific States</b>	
Saudi Arabia	Ibrahim Abdul Aziz al Sheddi
<b>Latin American and Caribbean States</b>	
Argentina	Mario Luis Coriolano
<b>Western European and other States</b>	
Austria	Katharina Pabel

23. The number of candidates for each of the regional groups corresponded to the number of seats available in each of these groups. The practice of holding a secret ballot, pursuant to paragraph 70 of Human Rights Council resolution 5/1, was dispensed with and Imeru Tamrat Yigezu, Ibrahim Abdul Aziz al Sheddi, Mario Luis Coriolano and Katharina Pabel were elected as members of the Advisory Committee by consensus (see annex IV).

## H. Selection and appointment of mandate holders

24. At its 43rd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the Human Rights Council appointed three special procedure mandate holders in accordance with Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21 and its decision 6/102 (see annex V).

## I. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

### Follow-up to President's statement PRST/29/1

25. At the 40th meeting, on 1 October 2015, the President of the Human Rights Council introduced draft decision A/HRC/30/L.28, sponsored by the President and the Bureau of the Council. Subsequently, Haiti, Honduras and the Republic of Korea joined the sponsors.

26. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft decision without a vote (decision 30/115).

### Reports of the Advisory Committee

27. At the 40th meeting, on 1 October 2015, the President of the Human Rights Council introduced draft President's statement A/HRC/30/L.32.

28. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft President's statement without a vote (PRST/30/1).

**Promoting the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health by enhancing capacity-building in public health against pandemics**

29. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the President of the Human Rights Council introduced draft President's statement A/HRC/30/L.43.

30. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft President's statement without a vote (PRST/30/2).

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

31. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representatives of the Czech Republic, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of) and Switzerland made statements as observer States on the adopted resolutions.

32. 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 thirtieth session.

33. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted ad referendum the draft report on the session (A/HRC/30/2) and entrusted the Rapporteur with its finalization.

34. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Ghana, Ireland, Nigeria and Sierra Leone made statements.

35. Also at the same meeting, the observers for the Arab Commission for Human Rights and Human Rights Watch (also on behalf of Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, the East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, the Human Rights Law Centre, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, the International Service for Human Rights and the World Organization against Torture) made statements on the session.

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

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

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

37. At the 1st meeting, on 14 September 2015, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement providing an update on the activities of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR).

38. During the ensuing general debate, at the 1st, 2nd and 3rd meetings, on the same day, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, China, Congo, Cuba, Egypt<sup>1</sup> (also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mauritania, Myanmar, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sudan, Tajikistan, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe), El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)<sup>1</sup> (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg<sup>1</sup> (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Georgia, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Maldives, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Sierra Leone, South Africa, Switzerland<sup>1</sup> (also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay), the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Burundi, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, Niger, Norway, Philippines, Republic of Moldova, Senegal, Serbia, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Uruguay;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence internationale pour le développement, Al-Khoei Foundation, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Association burkinabé pour la survie de l'enfance, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (also on behalf of Centro Regional de Derechos Humanos y Justicia de Género), China Society for Human Rights Studies, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, European Union of Public Relations, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Global Network for Rights and Development, Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights Watch, Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'homme, International

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

Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Service for Human Rights, International-Lawyers.Org, Iraqi Development Organization, Kham Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Maarif Foundation for Peace and Development, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Environment and Resources Council, World Muslim Congress.

39. At the 3rd meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Azerbaijan, Bahrain, China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Japan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

40. At the same meeting, on the same day, the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Japan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Turkey made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

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

41. At the 12th meeting, on 17 September 2015, the Officer-in-Charge of the Human Rights Council Mechanisms Division of OHCHR presented the thematic reports prepared by OHCHR and the Secretary-General under agenda items 2, 3, 5 and 8.

42. At the same meeting, on the same day, and at the 13th and 14th meetings, on 18 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on the thematic reports under agenda items 2 and 3, presented by the Officer-in-Charge of the Human Rights Council Mechanisms Division of OHCHR (see chapter III, section C).

43. At the 21st meeting, on 22 September 2015, and at the 25th meeting, on 24 September, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 5, and at the 30th and 32nd meetings, on 28 September, the Council held a general debate on agenda item 8, including on the thematic reports under agenda items 2, 5 and 8, presented by the Officer-in-Charge of the Human Rights Council Mechanisms Division of OHCHR (see chapter V, section E, and chapter VIII, section B).

44. At the 34th meeting, on 29 September 2015, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 27/27, the report of the High Commissioner on the situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (A/HRC/30/32), in which the High Commissioner reported on the efforts of OHCHR to increase and strengthen its technical assistance programmes and activities aimed at improving the human rights situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and the study of the High Commissioner on the impact of technical assistance and capacity-building on the situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (A/HRC/30/33).

45. At the same meeting, on the same day, the Human Rights Council held an interactive dialogue on the study presented by Deputy High Commissioner (see chapter X, section B).

46. At the 37th meeting, on 30 September 2015, the High Commissioner made a statement by video message to present the report prepared by OHCHR on promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka (A/HRC/30/61), pursuant to the Human Rights Council decision made at its organizational meeting, held on 16 February 2015, to defer the consideration of the report until its thirtieth session. In accordance with Council resolution 25/1, the presentation was followed by a discussion on the implementation of that resolution.

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

48. During the ensuing discussion, at the 37th and 38th 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: Albania, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Montenegro, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Fiji, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, Thailand;

(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: Alliance Creative Community Project, Amnesty International, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Association burkinabé pour la survie de l'enfance, Association des jeunes pour l'agriculture du Mali, Association mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit, Centre indépendant de recherches et d'initiatives pour le dialogue, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Human Rights Watch, International Commission of Jurists, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada, Liberation, Minority Rights Group, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, United Nations Watch, World Evangelical Alliance.

49. Also at the same meeting, the Deputy High Commissioner answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

50. At the 38th meeting, on 30 September 2015, the Deputy High Commissioner provided an oral update and presented reports of OHCHR and the Secretary-General submitted under agenda items 2 and 10.

51. At the same meeting, on the same day, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights provided an oral report and presented a report of the High Commissioner submitted under agenda items 2 and 10. The Assistant Secretary-General also presented a report of OHCHR submitted under agenda item 2.

52. Also at the same meeting, on the same day, and at the 39th meeting, on 1 October 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 10, including on oral updates and reports under agenda items 2 and 10 presented by the Deputy High Commissioner and the Assistant Secretary-General (see chapter X, section E).

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

### **Situation of human rights in Yemen**

53. As notified to the secretariat, draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.4/Rev.1, sponsored by the Netherlands and co-sponsored by Belgium, the Czech Republic, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Montenegro and Poland, was withdrawn by the sponsors on 30 September 2015, prior to its consideration by the Human Rights Council.

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

54. At the 40th meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of the United States of America introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.29, sponsored by Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, and co-sponsored by Albania, Australia, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Poland, Romania and Sri Lanka. Subsequently, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

55. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made general comments on the draft resolution.

56. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Sri Lanka made a statement as the State concerned.

57. 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.

58. At the same meeting, the representatives of Ghana and South Africa made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

59. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 30/1).

60. At the same meeting, the representative of India made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

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

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

##### **Working Group on Arbitrary Detention**

61. At the 3rd meeting, on 14 September 2015, the Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, Seong-Phil Hong, presented the reports of the Working Group (A/HRC/30/36 and Add.1–3, and A/HRC/30/37).

62. At the same meeting, the representatives of Germany, Italy and New Zealand made statements as the States concerned.

63. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 3rd meeting, on 14 September 2015, and the 4th meeting, on 15 September, the following made statements and asked the Chair-Rapporteur questions:

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

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kyrgyzstan, Mauritania, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Senegal, Sudan, Switzerland, Tunisia, Ukraine, State of Palestine;

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

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

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

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence internationale pour le développement, Al-Khoei Foundation, Allied Rainbow Communities International (also on behalf of Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland and the International Lesbian and Gay Association), Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos (also on behalf of the Association for the Prevention of Torture), Defence for Children International, France libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Franciscans International, International Commission of Jurists, International Service for Human Rights, United Schools International, World Environment and Resources Council, World Muslim Congress.

64. At the 4th meeting, on 15 September 2015, the Chair-Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

65. At the 5th meeting, on 15 September 2015, the representative of Nicaragua made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

##### **Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery, including its causes and its consequences**

66. At the 3rd meeting, on 14 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery, including its causes and its consequences, Urmila Bhoola, presented her report (A/HRC/30/35 and Add.1–2).

67. At the same meeting, the representatives of Belgium and the Niger made statements as the States concerned.

68. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 3rd meeting, on 14 September 2015, and the 4th meeting, on 15 September, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, El Salvador, Gabon, India, Ireland, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Chile, Denmark, Fiji, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mauritania, Philippines, Senegal, Tunisia, Holy See;

(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 Sovereign Military Order of Malta;

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Khoei Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, International Commission of Jurists.

69. At the 4th meeting, on 15 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

#### **Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence**

70. At the 5th meeting, on 15 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence, Pablo De Greiff, presented his report (A/HRC/30/42 and Add.1).

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

72. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 5th meeting, on 15 September 2015, and the 7th meeting, on 16 September, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, Brazil, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Estonia, France, Germany, Japan, Latvia, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Nepal, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uruguay;

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

(d) Observers for the International Committee of the Red Cross and the Sovereign Military Order of Malta;

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

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



(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development (also on behalf of Franciscans International and the International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism), Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, Pax Romana.

73. At the 7th meeting, on 16 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

#### **Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances**

74. At the 5th meeting, on 15 September 2015, the Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, Ariel Dulitzky, presented the report of the Working Group (A/HRC/30/38 and Add.1–5).

75. At the same meeting, the representatives of Croatia, Montenegro and Serbia made statements as the States concerned.

76. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo made a statement.

77. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 5th meeting, on 15 September 2015, and the 7th meeting, on 16 September, the following made statements and asked the Chair-Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), France, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Nepal, Poland, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukraine, Uruguay;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence internationale pour le développement, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development (also on behalf of Franciscans International and the International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism), Beijing Children's Legal Aid and Research Center, Canners International Permanent Committee, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Franciscans International, Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, International Service for Human Rights, Iraqi Development Organization (also on behalf of Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain and the Bahrain Center for Human Rights), Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, World Muslim Congress.

78. At the 5th meeting, on 15 September 2015, the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Japan and Serbia made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

80. At the 7th meeting, on 16 September 2015, the Chair-Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

81. At the 9th meeting, on 16 September 2015, the representatives of Albania and Serbia made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

82. At the same meeting, the representatives of Albania and Serbia made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

### **Independent Expert on the enjoyment of all human rights by older persons**

83. At the 7th meeting, on 16 September 2015, the Independent Expert on the enjoyment of all human rights by older persons, Rosa Kornfeld-Matte, presented her report (A/HRC/30/43 and Add.1–3).

84. At the 8th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Austria, Mauritius and Slovenia made statements as the States concerned.

85. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 8th and 9th meetings, on 16 September 2015, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, China, Cuba, Ecuador<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, Estonia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay (also on behalf of the Southern Common Market), Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Benin, Chile, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Georgia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mali, Philippines, Singapore, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, Holy See;

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

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

(e) Observers for national human rights institutions: European Network of National Human Rights Institutions, National Human Rights Commission of the Republic of Korea (by video message);

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa culture internationale, Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace, Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland (also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association and the Swedish Federation for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights), Global Network for Rights and Development, HelpAge International, International Longevity Centre Global Alliance, Iranian Elite Research Center, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association.

86. At the 9th meeting, on 16 September 2015, the Independent Expert answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

### **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**

87. At the 7th meeting, on 16 September 2015, 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, Elzbieta Karska, presented the report of the Working Group (A/HRC/30/34 and Add.1–2).

88. At the 8th meeting, on the same day, the representative of Côte d'Ivoire made a statement as the State concerned.

89. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 8th and 9th meetings, on 16 September 2015, the following made statements and asked the Chair-Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), China, Cuba, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Chile, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Philippines, Ukraine;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa culture internationale, Alsalam Foundation, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, International Commission of Jurists, Liberation, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, World Barua Organization.

90. At the 9th meeting, on 16 September 2015, the Chair-Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

**Special Rapporteur on the implications for human rights of the environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes**

91. At the 9th meeting, on 16 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the implications for human rights of the environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes, Baskut Tuncak, presented his report (A/HRC/30/40 and Add.1).

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

93. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 9th meeting, on 16 September 2015, and the 10th meeting, on 17 September, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, France, India, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, South Africa;

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

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: China Society for Human Rights Studies, Human Rights Now, International Committee for the Indigenous Peoples of the Americas (Switzerland), Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

94. At the 10th meeting, on 17 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

**Special Rapporteur on the human rights to safe drinking water and sanitation**

95. At the 9th meeting, on 16 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the human rights to safe drinking water and sanitation, Léo Heller, presented his report (A/HRC/30/39 and Add.1–2).

96. At the same meeting, the representative of Kenya made a statement as the State concerned.

97. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights made a statement by video message.

98. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 9th meeting, on 16 September 2015, and the 10th meeting, on 17 September, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Ecuador<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, India, Indonesia, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Spain<sup>2</sup> (also on behalf of Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Maldives, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, the Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine and Uruguay);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Benin, Chile, Egypt, Eritrea, Fiji, Georgia, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kyrgyzstan, Mali, Panama, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, State of Palestine;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: American Association of Jurists, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Human Rights Now, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Arab Commission for Human Rights (also on behalf of Centre indépendant de recherches et d'initiatives pour le dialogue, International-Lawyers.Org, the Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Villages unis.

99. At the 10th meeting, on 17 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

#### **Independent Expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order**

100. At the 10th meeting, on 17 September 2015, the Independent Expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order, Alfred-Maurice de Zayas, presented his report (A/HRC/30/44).

101. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 10th and 12th meetings, on 17 September 2015, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), China, Cuba, El Salvador, Namibia, Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence pour les droits de l'homme, Centre Europe-tiers monde (also on behalf of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers), Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Indian Council of South America, Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'homme, International Committee for the Indigenous Peoples of the Americas (Switzerland), International Human Rights Association of American Minorities, Iranian Elite Research Center, Liberation, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

102. At the 12th meeting, on 17 September 2015, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

### **Special Rapporteur on the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on the enjoyment of human rights**

103. At the 10th meeting, on 17 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on the enjoyment of human rights, Idriss Jazairy, presented his report (A/HRC/30/45).

104. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 10th and 12th meetings, on 17 September 2015, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), China, Cuba, Namibia, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Belarus, Egypt, Eritrea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Syrian Arab Republic, State of Palestine;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa Speaks, Global Network for Rights and Development, Maarj Foundation for Peace and Development.

105. At the 12th meeting, on 17 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

### **Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples**

106. At the 18th meeting, on 22 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples, Victoria Lucia Tauli-Corpuz, presented her report (A/HRC/30/41 and Add.1).

107. At the same meeting, the Chair-Rapporteur of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Alexey Tsykarev, presented the reports of the Expert Mechanism (A/HRC/30/52, A/HRC/30/53 and A/HRC/30/54) (see chapter V, section B).

108. Also at the same meeting, the Representative of the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Indigenous Peoples, Myrna Cunningham, made a statement.

109. At the 20th meeting, on the same day, the representative of Paraguay made a statement as the State concerned.

110. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur and the Chair-Rapporteur of the Expert Mechanism questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Ecuador<sup>3</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, Estonia, France, Ireland, Namibia, Russian Federation, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, Guatemala, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Nepal, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Ukraine;

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

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

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

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

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence pour les droits de l'homme, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, China NGO Network for International Exchanges, Franciscans International, Indian Council of South America, Indian Law Resource Centre (also on behalf of the National Congress of American Indians and the Native American Rights Fund), Indigenous World Association, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, Iranian Elite Research Center, Liberation, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Minority Rights Group, Shimin Gaikou Centre, Syriac Universal Alliance, World Barua Organization.

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

112. Also at the same meeting, the Chair-Rapporteur of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

113. At the same meeting, the representative of Japan made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

## **B. Panel discussions**

### **Biennial panel discussion on the issue of unilateral coercive measures and human rights**

114. At the 11th meeting, on 17 September 2015, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 27/21 and Corr.1, and pursuant to the Council decision made at its organizational meeting, held on 26 May 2015, to postpone the panel discussion until its thirtieth session, the Council held its biennial panel discussion on the issue of unilateral coercive measures and human rights.

115. The Chief of the Rule of Law, Equality and Non-Discrimination Branch of OHCHR made an opening statement for the panel. Former Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Seyed Mohammad Kazem Sajjadpour, moderated the discussion.

116. At the same meeting, the panellists Aslan Abashidze, Mohamed Ezzeldine Abdel Moneim and Idriss Jazairy made statements.

117. The ensuing panel discussion was divided into two parts, which were held at the same meeting, on the same day. During the first part, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), China, Ecuador<sup>3</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Iran (Islamic Republic of)<sup>3</sup> (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Egypt, Nicaragua;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Global Network for Rights and Development, Iranian Elite Research Center, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence.

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

119. The following made statements during the second part of the panel discussion:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Cuba, Pakistan, Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belarus, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Sudan, Zimbabwe;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa Speaks, Agence pour les droits de l'homme, Indian Council of South America, International-Lawyers.Org, Society Studies Centre, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

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

#### **Annual half-day discussion on the human rights of indigenous peoples**

121. At its 19th meeting, on 22 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolutions 18/8 and 27/13, a half-day panel discussion on the follow-up to and implementation of the outcome of the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples, and its implications for the achievement of the ends of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

122. The Chief of the Rule of Law, Equality and Non-Discrimination Branch of OHCHR made an opening statement for the panel. The Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples, Victoria Lucia Tauli-Corpuz, moderated the discussion.

123. At the same meeting, the panellists Albert Kwokwo Barume, Myrna Cunningham Kain, Alejandro González Cravioto and Jannie Lasimbang made statements.

124. The ensuing panel discussion was divided into two parts, which were held at the same meeting, on the same day. During the first part, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Brazil, El Salvador, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Finland (also on behalf of Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), Peru, Philippines, Poland, Spain, Ukraine;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Defence for Children International, Indigenous World Association, Native American Rights Fund (also on behalf of the Indian Law Resource Center and the National Congress of American Indians).

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

126. The following made statements during the second part of the panel discussion:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Congo, Estonia, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Canada, Chile, Guatemala, Malaysia, New Zealand, Holy See;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Federation of University Women, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, United Schools International.

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

#### **Panel discussion on a human rights-based approach to good governance in the public service**

128. At its 23rd meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 25/8, a panel discussion on a human rights-based approach to good governance in the public service.

129. The Director of the Human Rights Treaties Division of OHCHR made an opening statement for the panel. The Director of the Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law, Anne Peters, moderated the discussion.

130. At the same meeting, the panellists Adetokunbo Mumuni, Taekyoon Kim, Safak Pavey, Mariana González Guyer and Jan Pastwa made statements.

131. The ensuing panel discussion was divided into two parts, which were held at the same meeting, on the same day. During the first part, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Bangladesh, France, Morocco (on behalf of member and observer States of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Poland<sup>3</sup> (also on behalf of Australia, Chile, the Republic of Korea and South Africa), Qatar, Russian Federation;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Egypt, Tunisia;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant (also on behalf of the Geneva Infant Feeding Association, Plan International and Save the Children International).

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

133. During the second part of the panel discussion, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, China, Estonia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Ireland, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belgium, Colombia, Ecuador, Georgia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Senegal, Singapore, Turkey;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa Speaks, Agence pour les droits de l'homme, Global Network for Rights and Development, Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'homme.

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

### C. General debate on agenda item 3

135. At the 12th meeting, on 17 September 2015, the Chair-Rapporteur of the open-ended intergovernmental working group to consider the possibility of elaborating an international regulatory framework on the regulation, monitoring and oversight of the activities of private military and security companies, Abdul Samad Minty, presented the report of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on its fourth session (A/HRC/30/47).

136. At the same meeting, the Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group on the Right to Development, Zamir Akram, provided an oral update on its sixteenth session (see the note by the Secretariat, A/HRC/30/46).

137. At the same meeting, on the same day, and at the 13th and 14th meetings, on 18 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on thematic reports and oral updates under agenda items 2 and 3, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Cuba, Estonia, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)<sup>3</sup> (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Ireland, Latvia, Latvia (also on behalf of Albania, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland,



Portugal, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Serbia, 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), Luxembourg<sup>3</sup> (on behalf of the European Union, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Montenegro, Morocco (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, the Comoros, the Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, the Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen and the State of Palestine), Namibia, Netherlands, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore<sup>3</sup> (also on behalf of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Brunei Darussalam, China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam and Yemen), South Africa, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia (also on behalf of Austria and Slovenia), Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Myanmar, Philippines, Republic of Moldova, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Zimbabwe;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf, Council of Europe;

(d) Observers for national human rights institutions: Canadian Human Rights Commission, International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights;

(e) 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, Africa Speaks, Agence internationale pour le développement, Agence pour les droits de l'homme, Alliance Defending Freedom, All-Russian Public Organization "Russian Public Institute of Electoral Law", Alsalam Foundation, American Civil Liberties Union, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Association Dunenyo, Association of World Citizens, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of the American Association of Jurists, the Arab Commission for Human Rights, Caritas Internationalis, the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers, the International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, New Humanity and Pax Romana), British Humanist Association, 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, China Society for Human Rights Studies, Colombian Commission of Jurists, 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 to Study the Organization of Peace, European Union of Public Relations, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Franciscans International (also on behalf of Edmund Rice International), Friends World Committee for Consultation, Global Network for Rights and Development, Human Rights Now, Human Rights Watch, Indian Law Resource Centre, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Catholic Child Bureau (also on behalf of the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, Defence for Children International and the World Organization against Torture), International Commission of Jurists, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (also on behalf of the Brahma Kumaris World Spiritual University, the Foundation for Gaia, the Institute for Planetary Synthesis, the International Federation of University Women, the International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Make Mothers Matter, New Humanity, the Planetary Association for Clean Energy, Servas International, Soka Gakkai International, Soroptimist International, the Sovereign Military Order of the Temple of Jerusalem and the Teresian Association), International Service for Human Rights, International-Lawyers.Org, Iranian Elite Research Center, Iraqi Development Organization, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberal International (World Liberal Union), Liberation, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Pan African Union for Science and Technology, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Pax Romana (also on behalf of the World Evangelical Alliance), Prahar, Reporters sans frontières international, Russian Peace Foundation, Save the Children International, Sikh Human Rights Group, Society for Threatened Peoples, 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.

138. At the 14th meeting, on 18 September 2015, the representatives of Chile, India, Malaysia, Myanmar and Pakistan made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

### **Human rights and unilateral coercive measures**

139. At the 40th meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.2, sponsored by the Islamic Republic of Iran, on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. Subsequently, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Brazil and the Russian Federation joined the sponsors.

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

141. Also 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.

142. 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, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco,

Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

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

143. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.2 by 33 votes to 14, with no abstentions (resolution 30/2).

144. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Argentina made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

**Regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights**

145. At the 40th meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of Belgium introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.3, sponsored by Armenia, Belgium, Mexico, Senegal and Thailand, and co-sponsored by Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland and Turkey. Subsequently, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Czech Republic, Georgia, Honduras, Indonesia, Norway, Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, Sweden and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

146. 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.

147. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 30/3).

148. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Japan made general comments.

**Human rights and indigenous peoples**

149. At the 40th meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of Guatemala, also on behalf of Mexico, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.8, sponsored by Guatemala and Mexico, and co-sponsored by Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines and Poland. Subsequently, Armenia, Cabo Verde, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

150. At the same meeting, the representatives of France and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution.

151. 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.

152. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 30/4).

153. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Japan made general comments.

### The question of the death penalty

154. At the 40th meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representatives of Belgium and the Republic of Moldova introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.11/Rev.1, sponsored by Belgium, Benin, Costa Rica, France, Mexico, Mongolia, the Republic of Moldova and Switzerland, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua and San Marino joined the sponsors.

155. At the same meeting, the representative of Saudi Arabia, also on behalf of Bangladesh, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, China, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Malaysia, Pakistan, Oman, Qatar, Singapore, the Sudan and the United Arab Emirates, introduced amendment A/HRC/30/L.34 to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.11/Rev.1. Amendment A/HRC/30/L.34 was sponsored by Saudi Arabia and co-sponsored by Bangladesh, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, China, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Malaysia, Pakistan, Oman, Qatar, Singapore, the Sudan and the United Arab Emirates.

156. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Egypt, also on behalf of Bangladesh, China, Malaysia, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and Singapore, introduced amendment A/HRC/30/L.35 to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.11/Rev.1. Amendment A/HRC/30/L.35 was sponsored by Egypt and co-sponsored by Bangladesh, China, Malaysia, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and Singapore.

157. At the same meeting, the representative of China, also on behalf of Egypt, Malaysia, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and Singapore, introduced amendment A/HRC/30/L.36 to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.11/Rev.1. Amendment A/HRC/30/L.36 was sponsored by China and co-sponsored by Bangladesh, Egypt, Malaysia, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and Singapore.

158. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Argentina, Botswana, France, Mexico, Namibia 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 and the amendments.

159. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Ireland and Sierra Leone made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/30/L.34.

160. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Sierra Leone, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/30/L.34. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Botswana, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Japan, Maldives, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ghana, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Morocco, Republic of Korea, United States of America

161. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/30/L.34 by 17 votes to 20, with 8 abstentions.<sup>4</sup>

162. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico and Montenegro made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/30/L.35.

163. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representatives of Mexico and Montenegro, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/30/L.35. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Botswana, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Maldives, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ghana, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Morocco

164. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/30/L.35 by 16 votes to 22, with 7 abstentions.<sup>4</sup>

165. At the same meeting, the representatives of Germany and Paraguay made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/30/L.36.

166. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/30/L.36. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Botswana, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Japan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Congo, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ireland, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ghana, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Maldives, Morocco, Republic of Korea, United States of America

167. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/30/L.36 by 14 votes to 22, with 9 abstentions.<sup>5</sup>

168. At the same meeting, the representatives of Botswana, Indonesia, Japan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, South Africa and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.11/Rev.1.

<sup>4</sup> Two delegations did not cast a vote.

<sup>5</sup> Two delegations did not cast a vote, and the representative of Saudi Arabia subsequently stated that there had been an error in the delegation's vote and that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft text.

169. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representatives of Botswana and Nigeria, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

*Against:*

Bangladesh, Botswana, China, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Japan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Cuba, Ghana, Kenya, Maldives, Morocco, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Viet Nam

170. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.11/Rev.1 by 26 votes to 13, with 8 abstentions (resolution 30/5).

**The use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination**

171. At the 41st meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of Cuba, also on behalf of Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, South Africa, Sudan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.15, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, South Africa, the Sudan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Chile, Namibia, Nicaragua, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

172. 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.

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Mexico

174. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.15 by 32 votes to 14, with 1 abstention (resolution 30/6).

175. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Argentina made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

176. At the same meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made general comments.

#### **Human rights in the administration of justice, including juvenile justice**

177. At the 41st meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of Austria introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.16, sponsored by Austria and co-sponsored by Andorra, Armenia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey and Uruguay. Subsequently, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Georgia, Haiti, Maldives, Malta, Morocco, Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Serbia, Tajikistan, Thailand and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

178. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 30/7).

179. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representatives of Japan, Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Kuwait, Pakistan, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates) and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote after the vote. In its statement, the representative of Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Kuwait, Pakistan, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates) disassociated the respective Member States from the consensus on the seventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. In its statement, the representative of Japan disassociated the Member State from the consensus on paragraph 24 of the draft resolution.

#### **Contribution of the Human Rights Council to the high-level meeting on HIV/AIDS in 2016**

180. At the 41st meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of Brazil, also on behalf of Colombia, Portugal and Thailand, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.17, sponsored by Brazil, Colombia, Portugal and Thailand, and co-sponsored by Angola, Australia, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, the Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Djibouti, El Salvador, Estonia, Georgia, Haiti, Honduras, Japan, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

181. 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.

182. At the same meeting, the representatives of Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation except Albania) and Albania made statements in explanation of vote before the vote. In its statement, the representative of Pakistan disassociated the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation except Albania from the consensus on the third preambular paragraph and paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

183. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 30/8).

### **Equal participation in political and public affairs**

184. At the 41st meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of the Czech Republic, also on behalf of Botswana, Indonesia, the Netherlands and Peru, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.27/Rev.1, sponsored by Botswana, the Czech Republic, Indonesia, the Netherlands and Peru, and co-sponsored by Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey and the United States of America. Subsequently, Armenia, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Georgia, Ghana, Haiti, Honduras, Japan, Lithuania, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Serbia, Switzerland, Ukraine and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

185. At the same meeting, the representatives of Namibia and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution. In its statement, the representative of Namibia disassociated the Member State from the consensus on paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

186. 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.

187. At the same meeting, the representatives of Pakistan (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates), the Russian Federation and South Africa made statements in explanation of vote before the vote. In their statements, the representatives of Pakistan (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates) and the Russian Federation disassociated the respective Member States from the consensus on paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

188. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 30/9).

### **Human rights and preventing and countering violent extremism**

189. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representatives of Colombia and Morocco (also on behalf of Albania, Bangladesh, Cameroon, France, Iraq, Mali, Peru, Tunisia, Turkey and the United States of America) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.25/Rev.1,<sup>6</sup> sponsored by Albania, Bangladesh, Cameroon, Colombia, France, Iraq, Mali, Morocco, Peru, Tunisia, Turkey and the United States of America, and co-sponsored by Algeria, Australia, Benin, Burundi, Canada, the Central African Republic, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Fiji, Hungary, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Italy, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine. Subsequently, Bahrain, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Egypt, Finland, Georgia, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Japan, Kuwait, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, New Zealand, Nigeria, Portugal, Qatar, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Somalia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors.

190. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced amendments A/HRC/30/L.37, A/HRC/30/L.38, A/HRC/30/L.39 and A/HRC/30/L.40 to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.25/Rev.1. Amendments A/HRC/30/L.37, A/HRC/30/L.39 and A/HRC/30/L.40 were sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Belarus, China, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Pakistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Amendment A/HRC/30/L.38 was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Belarus, China, Pakistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

<sup>6</sup> Paragraph 7 of the text originally submitted by the sponsors, prior to editing, read “in line with national strategies”.



191. Also at the same meeting, the representative of China introduced amendments A/HRC/30/L.41 and A/HRC/30/L.42 to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.25/Rev.1. Amendments A/HRC/30/L.41 and A/HRC/30/L.42 were sponsored by China and co-sponsored by Belarus, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Pakistan, the Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

192. At the same meeting, the President of the Human Rights Council announced that draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.25/Rev.1 had been orally revised, and that amendments A/HRC/30/L.41 and A/HRC/30/L.42 to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.25/Rev.1 had been withdrawn by the sponsors.

193. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Albania, Algeria and Namibia made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised and on amendments A/HRC/30/L.37, A/HRC/30/L.38, A/HRC/30/L.39 and A/HRC/30/L.40.

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

195. At the same meeting, the representatives of France and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/30/L.37.

196. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/30/L.37. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Bangladesh, Botswana, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Brazil, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, Namibia

197. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/30/L.37 by 14 votes to 26, with 7 abstentions.

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

199. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Morocco, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/30/L.38. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Bangladesh, Botswana, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Argentina, Brazil, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Namibia

200. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/30/L.38 by 10 votes to 27, with 10 abstentions.

201. At the same meeting, the representatives of Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/30/L.39.

202. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/30/L.39. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

Albania, Bangladesh, Brazil, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Argentina, Botswana, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, Indonesia, Namibia, Nigeria

203. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/30/L.39 by 11 votes to 26, with 10 abstentions.

204. 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 amendment A/HRC/30/L.40.

205. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/30/L.40. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Albania, Bangladesh, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Botswana, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, Namibia, Nigeria

206. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/30/L.40 by 14 votes to 25, with 8 abstentions.

207. At the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil, Cuba, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam made

statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.25/Rev.1 as orally revised.

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

*In favour:*

Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam

*Against:*

Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

*Abstaining:*

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, El Salvador, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Pakistan

209. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.25/Rev.1 as orally revised by 37 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions (resolution 30/15).

210. At the 43rd meeting, on the same day, the representatives of China and Ireland (also on behalf of Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Iceland, Mexico, Poland, Sweden and Switzerland) made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

### **The right to development**

211. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran,<sup>7</sup> on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.12, sponsored by the Islamic Republic of Iran, on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, and co-sponsored by China. Subsequently, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Armenia, Brazil, El Salvador and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

212. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Cuba, India, Sierra Leone, South Africa and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments on the draft resolution.

213. 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.

214. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Japan, the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

*In favour:*

Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi

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

Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Japan, Portugal, Republic of Korea

216. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 33 votes to 10, with 4 abstentions (resolution 30/28).

217. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Pakistan made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

218. At the same meeting, the representatives of Japan and the Republic of Korea made general comments.

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

219. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Cuba (also on behalf of Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.14, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Cabo Verde, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Haiti, Indonesia, Namibia, Nicaragua, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and South Africa joined the sponsors.

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

221. Also 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 States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

222. 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 as orally revised. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Mexico, Paraguay

223. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised by 31 votes to 14, with 2 abstentions (resolution 30/29).

224. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Argentina made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

225. At the same meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made a general comment.

226. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria and South Africa made general comments and statements in explanation of vote after the vote on all the resolutions adopted under agenda item 3.

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

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

227. At the 15th meeting, on 21 September 2015, 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/30/48).

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

229. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 15th meeting, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Chair questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria, Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, Estonia, France, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Latvia, Maldives, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

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

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Allied Rainbow Communities International, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, International Commission of Jurists, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Syriac Universal Alliance, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch.

230. At the 15th meeting, on the same day, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic made final remarks as the State concerned.

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

232. At the 17th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Lebanon, the Syrian Arab Republic and Turkey made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

### **B. Panel discussion on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, including the issue of international abductions, enforced disappearances and related matters**

234. At its 16th meeting, on 21 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 28/22, a panel discussion on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, including the issue of international abductions, enforced disappearances and related matters.

235. The former Chair of the commission of inquiry on human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Michael Kirby, made an opening statement and moderated the discussion.

236. At the same meeting, the panellists Marzuki Darusman, David Hawk, Koichiro Iizuka and Kwon Eun-kyoung made statements.

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

238. The ensuing panel discussion was divided into two parts, which were held at the same meeting, on the same day. During the first part, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, China, Cuba, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Czech Republic, Liechtenstein, Norway;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Human Rights Watch, United Nations Watch.

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

240. During the second part of the panel discussion, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Estonia, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lithuania, Myanmar, New Zealand, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Conscience and Peace Tax International (also on behalf of the Center for Global Nonkilling), World Evangelical Alliance.

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

### C. General debate on agenda item 4

242. At the 17th meeting, on 21 September 2015, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights provided, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 28/22, an oral update on the role and achievements of OHCHR, including on the field-based structure in the Republic of Korea to strengthen the monitoring and documentation of the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

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

244. At the 17th meeting, on 21 September 2015, and at the 18th meeting, on 22 September, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 4, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, Cuba, France, Germany, Ghana, Iran (Islamic Republic of)<sup>8</sup> (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg<sup>8</sup> (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Liechtenstein and Montenegro), Montenegro, Netherlands, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

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

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Georgia, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Norway, Slovenia, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Ukraine;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Africa culture internationale, African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, African Development Association, Africa Speaks, Agence internationale pour le développement, Agence pour les droits de l'homme, Al-Hakim Foundation, Alliance Defending Freedom, All-Russian Public Organization "Russian Public Institute of Electoral Law", 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, Asian Legal Resource Centre (also on behalf of the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues), Association Dunenyo, Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, Baha'i International Community, British Humanist Association, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace, Canners International Permanent Committee, Center for Inquiry, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Comité international pour le respect et l'application de la charte africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, European Humanist Federation, European Union of Public Relations, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, France libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Franciscans International, Global Network for Rights and Development, Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights Watch, Indian Council of South America, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Career Support Association, International Educational Development, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Iranian Elite Research Center, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Lawyers for Lawyers (also on behalf of the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues and Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada), Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada (also on behalf of the Asian Legal Resource Centre, Lawyers for Lawyers and the World Organization against Torture), Liberation, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, 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, Prahar, Presse emblème campagne, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Shimin Gaikou Centre, Society for Threatened Peoples, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Women's Human Rights International Association, World Barua Organization, World Environment and Resources Council, World Evangelical Alliance, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress.

245. At the 17th meeting, on 21 September 2015, the representatives of Bahrain, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Myanmar, Pakistan, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

247. At the 18th meeting, on 22 June 2015, the representatives of Iraq, Lithuania, the Philippines and Thailand made statements in exercise of the right of reply.



## D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

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

248. At the 41st meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (also on behalf of France, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and the United States of America) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.5/Rev.1, 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, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Subsequently, Andorra, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Georgia, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Spain, Switzerland and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

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

250. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Lebanon introduced amendment A/HRC/30/L.33 to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.5/Rev.1 as orally revised. Amendment A/HRC/30/L.33 was sponsored by Lebanon.

251. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised and on the amendment.

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

253. At the same meeting, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/30/L.33.

254. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/30/L.33. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Cuba, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Maldives, Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

*Against:*

Albania, Argentina, Botswana, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Bangladesh, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, India, Kenya, Mexico, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, South Africa, Viet Nam

255. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/30/L.33 by 10 votes to 21, with 16 abstentions.<sup>9</sup>

256. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Brazil, Cuba, Pakistan and the Russian Federation made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.5/Rev.1 as orally revised.

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

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

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

258. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.5/Rev.1 as orally revised by 29 votes to 6, with 12 abstentions (resolution 30/10).

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

---

<sup>9</sup> The representative of Maldives subsequently stated that there had been an error in the delegation's vote and that it had intended to vote against the draft text.

## V. Human rights bodies and mechanisms

### A. Complaint procedure

260. At its 14th meeting, on 18 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held a closed meeting of the complaint procedure.

261. At the 15th meeting, on 21 September 2015, the President made a statement on the outcome of the meeting, stating that the Human Rights Council had examined, in its closed meeting, the report of the Working Group on Situations on its fifteenth and sixteenth sessions under the complaint procedure established pursuant to Council resolution 5/1. The President added that no case had been referred by the Working Group on Situations to the Human Rights Council for action at the thirtieth session.

### B. Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

262. At the 18th meeting, on 22 September 2015, the Chair-Rapporteur of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Alexey Tsykarev, presented the reports of the Expert Mechanism (A/HRC/30/52, A/HRC/30/53 and A/HRC/30/54).

263. At the 20th meeting, on the same day, the Human Rights Council held an interactive dialogue on the human rights of indigenous peoples under agenda items 3 and 5 (see chapter III, section A).

### C. Interactive dialogue with the Advisory Committee

264. At the 21st meeting, on 22 September 2015, the Chair of the Advisory Committee, Obiora Chinedu Okafor, presented the reports of the Committee (A/HRC/30/49, A/HRC/30/50 and A/HRC/30/51).

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Greece<sup>10</sup> (also on behalf of Brazil, the Congo, Cyprus, Japan, Lebanon, Morocco, the Republic of Korea and the Russian Federation), Ireland, Morocco, Republic of Korea (also on behalf of Chile, Egypt and Romania), Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representative of an observer State: Egypt;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, International NGO Forum on Indonesian Development, United Cities and Local Governments, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

266. At the same meeting, the Chair of the Advisory Committee answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

#### **D. Open-ended intergovernmental working group on a draft United Nations declaration on the rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas**

267. At the 21st meeting, on 22 September 2015, the Vice-Chair of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on a draft United Nations declaration on the rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas, Luis Espinosa, presented the report of the working group on its second session, held from 2 to 6 February 2015 (A/HRC/30/55).

#### **E. General debate on agenda item 5**

268. At the 21st meeting, on 22 September 2015, and the 25th meeting, on 24 September, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 5, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ecuador<sup>10</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ethiopia, Ghana (also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Ukraine, the United States of America and Uruguay), Ireland, Latvia (also on behalf of Albania, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, 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), Luxembourg<sup>10</sup> (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Montenegro, Namibia, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Cyprus, Egypt, Hungary, Kyrgyzstan, Nicaragua, Norway, Slovenia (also on behalf of Austria, Liechtenstein and Switzerland), Togo;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa culture internationale, Agence internationale pour le développement, Alliance Defending Freedom, Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Association of World Citizens, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of the Center for Global Nonkilling, the Institute for Planetary Synthesis, the Institute of Global Education, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, the International Network for the Prevention of Elder Abuse, the International Peace Bureau, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, Pax Romana and the United Network of Young Peacebuilders), Canners International Permanent Committee, Center for Environmental and

Management Studies, Centre Europe-tiers monde, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Comité Permanente por la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Conscience and Peace Tax International (also on behalf of the Center for Global Nonkilling), European Union of Public Relations, Foodfirst Information and Action Network, Franciscans International, Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'homme, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Association of Schools of Social Work, International Federation of Rural Adult Catholic Movements, International-Lawyers.Org, International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of Amnesty International, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, the International Commission of Jurists, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues and the World Organization against Torture), Iraqi Development Organization, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale, Pan African Union for Science and Technology, Prahar, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, United Schools International, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Villages unis, World Barua Organization, World Environment and Resources Council, World Muslim Congress.

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

### **Review of the mandate of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples**

269. At the 41st meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of Mexico, also on behalf of Guatemala, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.9, sponsored by Mexico and Guatemala, and co-sponsored by Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines and the United States of America. Subsequently, Cabo Verde, Canada, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Poland, Slovenia, Spain and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

270. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a general comment on the draft resolution.

271. 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.

272. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 30/11).

273. At the same meeting, the representative of Japan made a general comment.

### **Promotion of the right to peace**

274. At the 41st meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.13, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, the Philippines, South Africa, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Cabo Verde, China, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Malaysia, Namibia, Nicaragua, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

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

276. Also 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), the

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

277. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Portugal

278. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 33 votes to 12, with 2 abstentions (resolution 30/12).

**Promotion and protection of the human rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas**

279. At the 41st meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of the Plurinational State of Bolivia (also on behalf of Cuba, Ecuador and South Africa) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.19, sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador and South Africa, and co-sponsored by Angola, Argentina, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Nicaragua, Paraguay, the Sudan, Switzerland, Togo, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Egypt, Honduras, Sierra Leone and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

280. At the same meeting, the representatives of Cuba, South Africa and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments on the draft resolution.

281. 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.

282. Also 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 States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

United States of America

*Abstaining:*

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

284. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 31 votes to 1, with 15 abstentions (resolution 30/13).

285. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Republic of Korea made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

**Contribution of parliaments to the work of the Human Rights Council and its universal periodic review**

286. At the 41st meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of Ecuador introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.23, sponsored by Ecuador, Italy, Maldives, Morocco, the Philippines, Romania and Spain, and co-sponsored by Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Chile, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Ireland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Montenegro, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Slovenia, Thailand, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Albania, Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Costa Rica, Finland, Georgia, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Serbia, Sri Lanka, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

287. 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.

288. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 30/14).

289. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Japan made a general comment.

## VI. Universal periodic review

290. 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-second session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, held from 4 to 15 May 2015.

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

### A. Consideration of universal periodic review outcomes

292. 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.

#### Belarus

293. The review of Belarus was held on 4 May 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 Belarus 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.6/22/BLR/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.6/22/BLR/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.6/22/BLR/3).

294. At its 22nd meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Belarus (see section C below).

295. The outcome of the review of Belarus comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/3), 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/30/3/Add.1).

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

296. The delegation of Belarus stated that Belarus attached great importance to the universal periodic review because it was an important international mechanism for the objective assessment of the situation of human rights in all States around the world.

297. Belarus had made serious efforts in the preparation of its national report. It had adopted an inter-agency plan to implement the recommendations from its first review. Progress had been regularly reviewed by a wide group of stakeholders, including government bodies, academia, civil society and the United Nations Country Team. Furthermore, in 2012, Belarus had submitted a midterm report on the implementation of the recommendations. Four rounds of consultations had been held with civil society in the past



year to consider the implementation process. Those consultations had strengthened the partnership between State institutions and civil society, and the second national report had been prepared in collaboration with civil society within that framework. High-ranking representatives from the full range of key ministries and departments had presented the second national report, which demonstrated the importance that the national level attached to the issue. In its report, the State had included a wide range of information on the protection of human rights.

298. Belarus thanked all the delegations that had participated in its review. It particularly appreciated those delegations that had provided an objective assessment and had commended the State for its efforts.

299. Some of the recommendations received had referred to so-called “political prisoners”. Belarus had repeatedly emphasized that there had never been political prisoners in the country. Those who had been called political prisoners had in fact committed criminal offences for which they were serving appropriate sentences. Nevertheless, some changes had recently taken place, notably in August, when the President had pardoned six persons who had been referred to by some as political prisoners and thus Belarus considered the respective recommendations to be irrelevant.

300. Some other recommendations referred to the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus. The State emphasized that its position was well-known: it did not consider the Special Rapporteur to be a mechanism for cooperation in respect of human rights because of the evident political motives behind the creation of the mandate. Belarus thus did not consider the corresponding recommendations to be relevant or binding. At the same time, Belarus was open to cooperation with the special procedures of the Human Rights Council. It had invited to the country a number of thematic special procedure mandate holders and intended to extend that list. The State would continue to cooperate with human rights protection mechanisms.

301. With regard to the recommendations on the abolition of the death penalty, Belarus stated that, under the Constitution, the death penalty was an exceptional, temporary measure. For example, it was not applied to women or to anyone under 18 or over 65 years of age. Those sentenced could appeal to the President for commutation. The parliamentary group on the death penalty, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and other national institutions were working to raise public awareness of the issue and to contribute to gradual change in public opinion. Nevertheless, the latest opinion polls indicated that a significant part of the public in Belarus supported its retention. Belarus had never voted against resolutions on a moratorium on the death penalty in the United Nations General Assembly and it was committed to the global trend towards its gradual abolition.

302. In relation to the majority of the recommendations that it had noted, Belarus had proceeded on the basis that it did not reject them, but could not support them because it would not be able to implement them fully within the next five years. Nevertheless, Belarus was prepared to move forward and to cooperate actively with international and national partners, including civil society, concerning important issues such as the abolition of the death penalty.

303. Belarus was continually working to improve its legislation and legal practice. It therefore supported the part of the recommendation on adopting comprehensive legislation aimed at combating direct and indirect discrimination, contained in paragraph 129.24 of the outcome of the review. It had also supported the part of the recommendation on simplifying the registration of non-governmental organizations, contained in paragraph 129.72, the part of the recommendation on ensuring the protection of human rights defenders, contained in paragraph 129.81, and the part of the recommendation on ensuring that peaceful demonstrators were not imprisoned, harassed or ill-treated by police for exercising their rights to freedom of expression and peaceful assembly, contained in paragraph 129.90. Belarus had also accepted the part of the recommendation on conducting an investigation into the disappearance of public figures in 1999 and 2000, with the aim of bringing those responsible to justice, contained in paragraph 129.5. That investigation was being carried out. Belarus had noted the other parts of the recommendations.

304. Belarus drew attention to a series of positive developments in the country, starting with the recent work towards acceding to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and the signing of the Convention could take place very soon. Belarus had therefore supported the part of the recommendation on acceding to the Convention, contained in paragraph 129.7 of the outcome of the review. The State had already acceded to six international instruments in the past five years.

305. Belarus had been working actively to consider the possibility of creating a national human rights institution. In 2014, in collaboration with international partners, it had hosted a seminar on that subject, and many countries had participated. The outcome was the setting up of a study to assess the effectiveness of the functioning of such an institution and the feasibility of introducing an ombudsman in Belarus.

306. The concept of “torture” had been introduced into the Penal Code in accordance with the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, which would permit more effective consideration of related complaints. Places of detention were being reconstructed in order to improve the conditions of detainees. However, the large financial resources needed meant that all of the work could not be performed immediately.

307. In June 2015, Belarus had adopted a law on alternative service, thereby enabling young people who did not wish to perform military service based on their religious convictions to work instead in social services, hospitals or other civilian institutions.

308. Belarus emphasized that wide social consultations were being carried out on draft laws on combating corruption, on the culture code and against the use of tobacco. In 2015, the State had elaborated many fundamental State plans and programmes, including its national strategy on sustainable socioeconomic development to 2030.

309. A presidential election would take place in October 2015 and everything possible was being done to ensure an open, fair and transparent election atmosphere. Various international observers would be present.

310. Belarus had incorporated generally recognized principles of international law into its Constitution, and its national legislation had been finalized in accordance with such principles.

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

311. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Belarus, 18 delegations made statements.<sup>11</sup>

312. Myanmar thanked Belarus for its presentation. It appreciated the State’s constructive engagement and active participation in the universal periodic review process. It was pleased that Belarus had accepted recommendations, including its own.

313. Pakistan thanked Belarus for the updated information. It was pleased that the State had accepted the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Pakistan. It valued the constructive engagement of Belarus with the human rights mechanisms, including the universal periodic review.

314. The Russian Federation noted with satisfaction the acceptance by Belarus of the majority of the recommendations, including those it had made. It referred to the State’s constructive approach to the universal periodic review and its progress in strengthening human rights protection, notably in the fields of social and economic rights, and the rights of members of vulnerable groups. It was pleased with the reforms to the justice system, and the simplification of registration for non-governmental organizations and civil society

<sup>11</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/30thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

participation in State life. Belarus had acceded to six international human rights instruments during its first universal periodic review.

315. Rwanda commended Belarus for the progress it had made in protecting and promoting human rights since its first review. It welcomed the State's acceptance of most of the recommendations and the steps it had taken to improve its efforts to protect human rights through its policies and action plans.

316. Sierra Leone referred to the large number of recommendations that Belarus had supported and acknowledged the progress made since the State's first review. It encouraged Belarus to consider instituting a moratorium on the death penalty, noting the debate in the country regarding its replacement. Sierra Leone commended Belarus for having extended invitations to the special procedures. It understood that there were constraints that often hampered the complete implementation of the recommendations but hoped that those recommendations would be duly implemented once the constraints had been reviewed.

317. The Sudan thanked Belarus for its comprehensive presentation. It welcomed the State's positive engagement with the universal periodic review and appreciated its acceptance of most of the recommendations, including the two made by the Sudan.

318. The Syrian Arab Republic appreciated the constructive engagement of Belarus in the universal periodic review and the State's acceptance of a large number of recommendations. It was confident that that would contribute to national efforts to improve the situation of human rights in the country, especially through the judicial reform process. In particular, it wished Belarus success in implementing the national strategy on sustainable socioeconomic development to 2030.

319. Tajikistan thanked Belarus for the information provided, pointing out that it was strong evidence of the State's systematic work in the field of human rights and the strengthening of its cooperation with international mechanisms and civil society. It was also pleased with the significant achievements of Belarus in the fields of education, social protection, gender equality and child protection and with the improvements to its legislation.

320. Turkmenistan thanked Belarus for having provided updated information and commended the State for its engagement with the human rights mechanisms. It appreciated the State's acceptance of the vast majority of the recommendations, including those made by Turkmenistan, and valued its progress in protecting and promoting human rights, particularly in combating human trafficking and protecting the rights of children and women.

321. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland thanked Belarus for its commitment to the universal periodic review. It would welcome further engagement by Belarus with all of the United Nations human rights instruments, including the special procedures. It welcomed the recent release of political prisoners and hoped that there would be further positive measures. It encouraged Belarus to implement its recommendation on establishing a national human rights institution and was disappointed that Belarus had not accepted its recommendation on introducing a moratorium on the death penalty.

322. Uzbekistan thanked Belarus for having provided extensive information on its universal periodic review and noted with satisfaction the State's serious approach to the process. It was pleased with the State's acceptance of the majority of the recommendations, including its own. The effective realization of the recommendations would further strengthen the protection of human rights in Belarus.

323. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the full and open cooperation of Belarus with the universal periodic review, which demonstrated its strong commitment to the protection and promotion of human rights, and the detailed answers that Belarus had provided. It recognized the great achievements of Belarus during the review, especially in the fields of economic, social and cultural rights, despite the blockade and illegal sanctions that certain powers had imposed upon the State.

324. Zimbabwe commended Belarus for having accepted most of the recommendations from its second universal periodic review. The evident open and constructive engagement of the State with all stakeholders during and after the review was proof of its commitment

to the protection and promotion of human rights and to the fulfilment of its international obligations.

325. Azerbaijan commended Belarus for its constructive approach to the universal periodic review process and its continuing efforts to promote and protect human rights. It was pleased that its recommendation on continuing active cooperation with the human rights mechanisms had enjoyed the full support of Belarus and was convinced that the State's second review would bring further positive changes.

326. Bahrain thanked Belarus for its report detailing the progress it had made and hailed its positive interaction with the Human Rights Council. It referred to the advancement of Belarus by 15 places in the human development index. Bahrain appreciated the serious approach taken by Belarus to human rights, which was reflected in the State's acceptance of the majority of the recommendations, including the three made by Bahrain.

327. Belgium emphasized the need for the abolition of the death penalty and was pleased that Belarus had accepted the recommendation on undertaking the steps necessary to hold a discussion on the topic within the relevant parliamentary working group and to apply certain minimum standards while awaiting a moratorium. It regretted that Belarus had not accepted its recommendation on cooperating better with the United Nations mechanisms, especially the special procedures and the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus.

328. China commended Belarus for its active cooperation with the human rights mechanisms and constructive participation in the universal periodic review. It appreciated the State's acceptance of numerous recommendations, especially its own on continuing to eradicate poverty, raising the standard of living in rural areas, and improving social security for women, older persons, children and persons with disabilities. The State's progress in promoting the right to development as a basic human right needed to be acknowledged.

329. Cuba thanked Belarus for the information it had provided and highlighted the large number of recommendations that it had accepted. That demonstrated the commitment of Belarus to the universal periodic review, which was a process that analysed the situation of human rights in all countries without politicization or confrontation. It thanked Belarus for having accepted its three recommendations.

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

330. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Belarus, seven other stakeholders made statements.

331. United Nations Watch was deeply concerned about the situation of human rights in Belarus. It welcomed the release of six political prisoners in August, including a presidential candidate, but referred to the timing of the pardons, coming one day after the deadline for presidential candidacies. It regretted the rejection by Belarus of the recommendations on immediately releasing all political prisoners. Referring to the prosecution of journalists, it highlighted the rejected recommendation calling for the removal of all obstacles to the freedom of the press and an end to the harassment of journalists. It deplored the continued use of torture in Belarus and referred to the continued calls for the State to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. It urged the State to allow the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus to visit the country.

332. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues called upon Belarus to invite the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus to visit the country and to institute a moratorium on the death penalty. It deplored the fact that the State had not accepted the recommendations based on its international obligations, including those on protecting human rights defenders and journalists and those on upholding the freedoms of peaceful assembly and association. While relieved by the recent release of certain prisoners, it referred to the years of sanctions they had been subject to and to the fact that they continued to be deprived of numerous civil and political rights, and called for the restoration of the rights of all former political prisoners. It urged the international

community to measure the State's progress in implementing reforms according to precise criteria.

333. The Human Rights House Foundation was deeply disappointed that the universal periodic review was the only mechanism recognized by Belarus, that there was a lack of cooperation with the other mechanisms and that it was the only European country that was not a member of the Council of Europe. It regretted the fact that Belarus had not cooperated with non-registered non-governmental organizations in the country in relation to the universal periodic review. It referred to some of the recommendations that the State had not supported and stated that Belarus had affirmed that it had implemented six recommendations, including one on ensuring that the judiciary was independent of the other branches of government. It asked how that recommendation had been implemented, given the lack of independence of the judiciary. It welcomed the release of political prisoners in August but pointed out that none of them had been rehabilitated in relation to their civil and political rights. It referred to the increased cooperation with international election monitoring mechanisms ahead of the presidential elections but stated that human rights violations continued.

334. While aware that there were many other pressing human rights concerns in Belarus, the International Fellowship of Reconciliation was disappointed that Belarus had not received any recommendations relating to conscience objection to military service. It pointed out that a new law on the issue was to come into force in July 2016, but that it did not meet international standards, as only those whose objections were based on religious convictions would be eligible for alternative service and the process for assessing those convictions was ambiguous and might limit the provision to members of certain religious communities. It called upon Belarus to reconsider that legislation.

335. Action Canada for Population and Development referred to the acceptance by Belarus of the recommendations on prosecuting acts of violence against women and on ensuring women's access to reproductive health services. It called upon Belarus to eliminate restrictions on access to oral contraception and voluntary sterilization, to expand access to free abortion and contraception, including for adolescents, and to work to remove restrictions that limited adolescents' ability to make free and informed decisions on their sexual and reproductive health. It was deeply concerned that Belarus had not accepted the recommendations on ensuring that non-discrimination principles with respect to gender included lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons and on adopting specific anti-discrimination legislation for that group. It was also concerned that Belarus refused to abolish article 193-1 of the Criminal Code, which criminalized the activities of non-registered non-governmental organizations.

336. Amnesty International regretted that Belarus had rejected the recommendations on establishing a moratorium on the use of the death penalty and on ending the secrecy surrounding executions. It also regretted that Belarus had resumed executions in 2014. Death sentences were often imposed after unfair trials. It welcomed the release of two prisoners of conscience in August 2015 but was concerned that people were routinely deprived of their rights to freedom of expression, association and assembly and that civil society organizations were forced to close due to bureaucratic hurdles. It regretted that Belarus had rejected recommendations on amending its legislation to guarantee the right to freedom of assembly. It was deeply disappointed that Belarus had rejected recommendations on allowing the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus to visit the country.

337. CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation welcomed the cooperation of Belarus with the universal periodic review process. Its partners on the ground had observed that the human rights situation in Belarus had further deteriorated in comparison with 2011 as a result of such repressive practices as arbitrary detention, enforced disappearances, abductions and the continued harassment of human rights defenders. It welcomed the release of six political prisoners in August 2015, but pointed out that that had taken place one day after the deadline for candidates to register for the October presidential election. It asked whether Belarus would implement all of the recommendations that it had partially accepted concerning the freedom of expression, assembly and association, the registration

of non-governmental organizations and amendments to electoral laws. It asked Belarus to allow independent civil society monitors to observe the election in October.

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

338. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 259 recommendations received, Belarus had supported 152 recommendations, provided additional clarification on another 6 recommendations, indicating which part had been supported and which part had been noted, and noted 101.

339. The delegation of Belarus thanked all the delegations and representatives of civil society that had participated in the dialogue, especially those that had given a positive assessment of the progress that Belarus had made since its first universal periodic review. It had also carefully listened to and taken note of all of the points of criticism. Belarus was committed to the universal periodic review mechanism and to cooperating with civil society, as had been demonstrated in the preparation of the national report. It would cooperate actively with all interested States in the implementation of all of the recommendations from its review.

#### **United States of America**

340. The review of the United States of America was held on 11 May 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 United States 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.6/22/USA/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.6/22/USA/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.6/22/USA/3).

341. At its 22nd meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the United States (see section C below).

342. The outcome of the review of the United States comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/12), 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/30/12/Add.1 and Corr.1).

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

343. Ambassador Harper, the Permanent Representative of the United States of America, reiterated the importance of the universal periodic review mechanism, particularly its universality.

344. He pointed out that the universal periodic review had been a process of self-reflection and improvement for the United States and underscored the importance of the State's vibrant civil society and federal structure.

345. The United States appreciated the efforts of civil society to ensure that the Government lived up to its values, pointing out that its contributions to the universal periodic review process were invaluable. A robust and open civil society space was one of the key ingredients for a successful democracy.

346. The federal system of government enhanced protections for human rights, and State, local, and tribal officials were often best positioned to solve problems.

347. The different levels of government in that federal system had been described as laboratories of democracy because they could develop and test different and creative solutions. Where their solutions worked well, those best practices could be shared and emulated elsewhere.

348. As one example, in Brooklyn, New York, the district attorney had revamped the Conviction Review Unit and tasked it to review wrongful conviction claims and questionable convictions.

349. As another example, through the Race to the Top programme, State, local, and tribal school districts were asked to submit their best and most innovative education reform ideas for federal funding, many of which were aimed at better supporting low-income and minority students, students with disabilities and English learners. Race to the Top grantees now served 22 million students and 1.5 million teachers in more than 40,000 schools.

350. The Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Scott Busby, pointed out that the United States had carefully reviewed its 343 recommendations and had supported in whole or in part 260 of them. Responses to each and brief explanations for many were included in the State's written submission.

351. The United States had supported many of the recommendations on civil rights, including those on continuing to work towards the elimination of racial discrimination and the excessive use of force by law enforcement.

352. For example, in May 2015, the Department of Justice had announced a landmark agreement to address findings that the Cleveland Division of Police had engaged in a pattern or practice of using excessive force.

353. That agreement required the City of Cleveland to implement within its police department widespread reforms focused on building community trust, creating a culture of community and problem-oriented policing, officer safety and training, and officer accountability.

354. The United States had supported the recommendations on improving conditions in prisons and places of detention.

355. For example, in May 2015, the Department of Justice had announced a settlement to protect prisoners from harm caused by sexual victimization by correctional officers in a women's prison in Alabama.

356. The Department anticipated working cooperatively with additional States, as it had with Alabama, to ensure that prisoners were not sexually abused.

357. The United States had not supported the majority of the recommendations on capital punishment, pointing out that continuing differences in that area were a matter of policy, and not what the rules of international human rights law currently required.

358. The State had supported a number of recommendations on continuing to promote and protect the rights of indigenous persons and peoples.

359. For example, in August 2015, the Government of the United States had announced that it had restored the Athabascan name of Denali to the highest mountain in North America. That designation recognized its sacred status to generations of Alaska Natives.

360. The United States had supported or supported in part a number of recommendations on surveillance.

361. The Freedom Act of 2015, which prohibited bulk collection by the Government under Titles IV and V of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, had been enacted in June. Instead, it permitted the Government to obtain telephone metadata records without allowing it to hold the metadata in bulk.

362. With respect to transparency, the Act required the Government to release to the public unclassified versions of opinions by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act Court or Court of Review that involved significant or novel interpretations of law. When that was not possible, the Act required the Government to release unclassified summaries.

363. The United States had supported or supported in part several recommendations on closing the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay.

364. President Obama had made clear his desire to close the Guantanamo Bay detention facility and to continue to work with Congress, the courts, and the international community to do so in a responsible manner that was consistent with the State's international obligations.

365. Until it was closed, the United States would continue to ensure that operations there were conducted in that manner.

366. The State supported the recommendations on combating discrimination in the workplace and it continued to make progress in that area.

367. For example, in September 2015, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission had secured a \$17 million jury verdict on behalf of women who had been subjected to sexual harassment while working at an agricultural packing house. That reflected the commitment of the United States to ensure that members of all immigrant and vulnerable populations were protected by federal employment anti-discrimination laws.

368. Additionally, in June, the Departments of Justice, Homeland Security and Labour announced the second phase of their Anti-Trafficking Coordination Team Initiative.

369. In districts where the first phase of that Initiative had been implemented, there had been an increase of 119 per cent in federal cases filed on forced labour, international sex trafficking and adult sex trafficking, an increase of 114 per cent in defendants charged, and an increase of 86 per cent in defendants convicted.

370. Lastly, the United States had supported the recommendations on ratifying the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the ILO Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111).

371. It had also supported the recommendations on ratifying the Convention on the Rights of the Child, as the United States agreed with its goals and intended to review how it could move towards ratification.

372. Under the Constitution of the United States, treaty ratification required not only approval by the executive branch, but also a two-thirds supermajority of the Senate. Despite that challenge, the Administration had pushed for positive Senate action on those treaties and would continue to do so.

373. The United States was strengthening its inter-agency working group mechanism to work towards the implementation of the recommendations it had supported.

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

374. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the United States, 17 delegations made statements.<sup>11</sup>

375. Greece pointed out that the national report for the second review of the United States had touched upon all of the recommendations from the first review and contained references to concrete examples of their implementation. It was pleased that the State had accepted a large part of the recommendations made during the second review, and ultimately hoped that the repealing of capital punishment by three States since the first review would lead to a moratorium throughout the country.

376. Honduras welcomed the measures taken by the United States to implement the recommendations, especially those on racial discrimination and violence. It asked the United States to strengthen measures to protect unaccompanied migrant children, especially girls, in compliance with the principle of the best interests of the child.

377. During the review, India had highlighted the disproportionate use of force by the United States, and was reassured by the State's response that great care was taken to ensure that the use of force, including targeted strikes, conformed to all applicable domestic and



international laws. India appreciated the State's acceptance of the recommendations it had made on ratifying the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. India recommended that the report of the Working Group be adopted.

378. The Islamic Republic of Iran noted that the United States had completely or partially accepted four of its five recommendations. It urged the State to increase efforts to address discrimination against minorities and migrants, racial discrimination, including racial profiling, the use of excessive force, and ill-treatment and torture in detention centres.

379. Iraq commended the United States for the protection of civil rights and the fight against racial discrimination. It applauded the State for its cooperation with human rights mechanisms and for its human rights awareness trainings for law enforcement officials and the relations between those officials and civil society.

380. Ireland welcomed the commitment of the United States to eliminate racial discrimination and to address the use of excessive force in policing. It regretted that the State had not accepted its recommendation on imposing a moratorium on executions in advance of abolishing the death penalty. While noting the decline in its use, Ireland was concerned about the manner in which the death penalty was implemented. It also regretted that the Supreme Court had recently upheld the use of lethal injection.

381. Israel stated that the United States had contributed to the promotion of human rights across the globe. It supported the adoption of the report of the Working Group.

382. Latvia pointed out that the United States had supported the majority of the recommendations on ratifying the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and on cooperating with the special procedures. Issuing a standing invitation to the special procedures should remain the ultimate goal. Latvia supported the adoption of the report of the Working Group on the United States.

383. Libya welcomed the acceptance by the United States of the majority of the recommendations and its tireless efforts to fight against the use of excessive force by law enforcement officials. Libya recommended that the report of the Working Group be adopted.

384. The Philippines encouraged the United States to continue to introduce measures aimed at aligning its domestic legislation with international standards and to further improve existing guidelines to offer better protection to women, children and migrants. The Philippines commended the United States for having given priority to the fight against the sex trafficking of minors through, inter alia, the reinforcement of international cooperation, and it appreciated the State's initiatives to combat intolerance, violence and discrimination against members of all minority groups. The Philippines supported the adoption of the report of the Working Group on the United States.

385. Romania expressed appreciation for the consideration given by the United States to the recommendations it had made.

386. The Russian Federation hoped that the United States would take seriously the recommendations from the review and that the State would work to implement them. It was particularly disappointed by violations of international humanitarian law, extrajudicial executions and the intimidation of journalists and the media, which clearly amounted to a violation of the right to freedom of expression. It ultimately hoped that the State would accept fair criticism and work to improve the human rights situation in the country.

387. Rwanda welcomed the presentation by the United States on developments in human rights since its review in May 2015. It also welcomed the progress and achievements made by the State, and recommended that the report of the Working Group be adopted.

388. Senegal welcomed the engagement of the United States in the implementation of the recommendations, particularly those on police violence against the black community, torture and discrimination. It invited the State to present a midterm report on the status of the implementation of the recommendations and recommended that the report of the Working Group be adopted.

389. Sierra Leone was disappointed that many of the recommendations made to the United States had been met with a lukewarm response. Its recommendation on establishing a centralized human rights institution had not enjoyed the support of the State. It recommended that the report of the Working Group be adopted.

390. The Sudan encouraged the United States to promote and protect human rights, particularly those of persons with disabilities, to combat racial discrimination and to ratify core international human rights instruments.

391. Togo noted with satisfaction the measures taken by the United States to implement the recommendations of its first review and welcomed the State's acceptance of the majority of the recommendations it had received in its second review. Togo supported the adoption of the report of the Working Group.

### 3. General comments made by other stakeholders

392. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the United States, 10 other stakeholders made statements.<sup>12</sup>

393. The International Lesbian and Gay Association welcomed the positive response of the United States to the recommendations on fighting discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons still lacked legal protection, and the International Lesbian and Gay Association urged the Government to enact federal laws that would guarantee non-discrimination in many areas of civil and social life. Violence against transgender women constituted a national crisis: in the first nine months of 2015, at least 90 transgender persons had been killed.

394. The American Civil Liberties Union stated that the report of the Working Group provided concrete recommendations on how the United States might rectify its human rights situation. However, the State's past record on implementing universal periodic review recommendations had been disappointing and the Government's engagement had not translated into any meaningful changes in domestic policies, especially those that were out of step with international human rights standards.

395. Human Rights Watch regretted that the United States appeared to use the universal periodic review process more as a way to highlight its current policies than to commit to improving its human rights record. It urged the State to specify how it planned to implement the recommendations it had supported on looking into racial disparities in the application of the death penalty and on investigating allegations of torture by an independent body.

396. The Indian Council of South America was disappointed that the United States had noted the recommendation on responding to the suggestion by the special procedures regarding the cases of Alaska, Hawaii and Dakota, contained in paragraph 176.325 of the outcome of the review. Those cases should be addressed through the United Nations decolonization process, as the right to self-determination of indigenous people continued to be denied.

397. Action Canada for Population and Development regretted that the United States had not supported the recommendations on ratifying the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. It was deeply concerned about the State's refusal to allow its foreign assistance to be used to provide safe abortion services in situations of conflict. It welcomed the State's support for recommendations on ending gender-based violence, discrimination based on sexual orientation, trafficking and the sexual exploitation of children.

398. The US Human Rights Network was deeply disappointed by the response of the United States to the 343 recommendations it had received during its second review. It was also disappointed that the State had noted the recommendations calling for the abolition of

<sup>12</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/30thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

the death penalty. Moreover, the State seemed to fall back on the premise that economic, social and cultural rights would be realized progressively, while poverty was steadily advancing throughout the country.

399. Amnesty International stated that the response of the United States to the scrutiny of its human rights record under the universal periodic review would appear positive through its support, or partial support, of approximately three quarters of the 343 recommendations it had received. However, the State had a poor record in implementing international recommendations even when it appeared to support them, whether through the universal periodic review or from the treaty bodies or special procedures. It urged the United States to embark upon a programme of ratification and withdrawal of reservations.

400. The International Human Rights Association of American Minorities stated that the recommendation contained in paragraph 176.325 of the outcome of the review, which the United States had noted, suggested that the United Nations decolonization process ought to be available to Alaska, Hawaii and Dakota. It called upon the Human Rights Council to reinstate the topic of self-determination in its agenda.

401. The World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace stated that the United States should meaningfully engage with civil society in a pattern of participation aimed at the implementation of the recommendations received in its second review. The United States should create a national human rights institution based on the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles). One of the first tasks of such an institution should be to shape a plan of action on racial justice and to organize a conference on human rights education.

402. The Indigenous World Association was concerned about the lack of effective protection for indigenous peoples' sacred places. The United States continued to insist that the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples was a non-binding instrument and failed to implement existing laws on the protection of sacred places. Mining activities were given preference over cultural practices despite numerous recommendations made by United Nations mechanisms on that matter.

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

403. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 343 recommendations received, the United States had supported 150 and noted 83. The remaining 110 recommendations had elements that had been supported and others noted, for which the State had provided explanations and on which it would provide further clarifications.

404. The United States pointed out that it could not respond to all the issues raised by Member States and civil society during the session, but stated that it must rededicate itself to ensuring that its civil rights laws lived up to their promise, especially in the realm of police practices.

405. The Deputy Assistant Secretary of State pointed out that the vast majority of police officers and police departments worked tirelessly to protect the civil and constitutional rights of those they served. However, when federal, State, local or tribal officials wilfully used excessive force that violated the Constitution or federal law, the United States had the authority to prosecute them.

406. In the past six years, the Departments of Justice, Homeland Security and Labour had brought criminal charges against more than 400 law enforcement officials.

#### **Malawi**

407. The review of Malawi was held on 5 May 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 Malawi 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.6/22/MWI/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.6/22/MWI/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.6/22/MWI/3).

408. At its 22nd meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Malawi (see section C below).

409. The outcome of the review of Malawi comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/5), 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/30/5/Add.1).

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

410. The delegation stated that Malawi had received 199 recommendations during its universal periodic review in May 2015. At that stage, the State had supported 145 recommendations, of which it considered 13 to already have been implemented. Responses to a further 13 recommendations had been pending.

411. Of the 13 recommendations that had been pending, Malawi had since accepted 9 and rejected 4. The State had thus accepted 154 of the 199 recommendations it had received.

412. When deciding on which of the recommendations to support, the Government and the people of Malawi had been guided by the State's constitutional values and ideals, national priorities as reflected in the second growth and development strategy, and various sectoral policies. The recommendations it had supported therefore spoke to the aspirations of the people of Malawi. The State was mindful that the review and the interactive dialogue would continue with the submission of its midterm report in 2017 and its report for the third review, to take place in 2019.

413. Malawi was keen to ensure that the recommendations it had supported would be implemented. Since the review in May, it had taken the following steps to implement the recommendations: first, in July, the State had established a national task force on the universal periodic review to start the process of disseminating the recommendations; second, it was using the recommendations as key benchmarks to develop a national human rights action plan for 2016 to 2020, a process led by the Ministry for Justice and Constitutional Affairs and the Malawi Human Rights Commission; and third, it was planning to convene a national stakeholders meeting for October 2015 to discuss the way forward and to determine how to prioritize the implementation process. The plan was to link the implementation of the recommendations to the national human rights action plan.

414. The delegation thanked the members of the troika and all the Member and observer States that had participated in the interactive dialogue during the review. It appreciated the role played by all the key stakeholders in Malawi, including the government ministries and departments, constitutional bodies and civil society.

415. On behalf of the Government of Malawi, the delegation affirmed its strongest commitment to the cause of human rights at home and abroad.

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

416. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Malawi, 17 delegations made statements.<sup>13</sup>

417. Ethiopia commended Malawi for its constructive advances in the implementation of the recommendations from the first review. It thanked the State for having accepted the recommendations it had made in the second review on promoting human rights education for law enforcement organs and on enhancing efforts to achieve the remaining Millennium Development Goals. It noted with satisfaction the efforts made in developing a medium-term plan aimed at reducing poverty and child mortality.

418. Gabon referred to the commitment of Malawi to follow up on the recommendations received at the review in May 2015. It was pleased with the significant efforts the State had made to promote and protect human rights and was particularly pleased with those efforts made in relation to vulnerable people, such as women, children, persons with disabilities and detainees. It encouraged Malawi to continue its efforts to implement the recommendations.

419. Ghana pointed out that Malawi had supported the recommendations on submitting overdue reports to the treaty bodies and on issuing standing invitations to all special procedures. It hoped that the State would respond favourably to the recommendations it had made on ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and on decriminalizing defamation.

420. Ireland referred to the progress Malawi had made in the tripartite elections in 2014 and the current work of the national task force on electoral reforms to improve the coherence, integrity and adequacy of the electoral and legal framework. It trusted that the current review of legislation dealing with violence against women would address many of the concerns raised during the interactive dialogue. It was pleased that both of the recommendations made by Ireland had enjoyed the support of Malawi. It looked forward to the prisons bill of 2003 being submitted to Parliament at the earliest opportunity. It welcomed the increased decentralization of the hearing of homicide cases and called for a time-bound action plan to deal with prison overcrowding. It appreciated the State's commitment to establish a legal framework on the right to food, building on the draft food and nutrition bill, and the proposal to integrate the food security bill and the nutrition security bill.

421. Lesotho noted with appreciation the steps that Malawi had taken to clear its backlog of State party reports. It congratulated the State on having taken measures to address the HIV and AIDS pandemic. The adoption of the national HIV and AIDS strategic plan of 2011 was a step in the right direction, and it encouraged Malawi to scale up the relevant programmes. It applauded the State for having taken steps to curb infant mortality. It congratulated Malawi for having enacted the Gender Equality Act of 2013 and encouraged the State to implement it effectively.

422. Libya applauded the Government of Malawi for the openness it had shown in preparing its report. Malawi had accepted a large number of recommendations, which reflected the Government's positive interaction with the universal periodic review mechanism.

423. Norway commended Malawi for having increased the involvement of the director of prosecutions in cases of human rights violations, for having established an interministerial task force and for having increased the use of the Penal Code to prosecute cases of trafficking. It also commended Malawi for having initiated work on a national human rights action plan. Norway hoped for continued progress in relation to the issue of medical abortions in cases of sexual violence and looked forward to the State's continued progress

---

<sup>13</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/30thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

in the follow-up to the recommendations and in relation to the universal periodic review process.

424. Rwanda welcomed the acceptance by Malawi of the recommendations on revising the State's Constitution and on harmonizing its laws so they were in line with international obligations in relation to the definition of the child. Rwanda was pleased that Malawi had accepted its recommendation on promoting human rights education and making primary education free and compulsory. It looked forward to hearing about the State's progress in implementing the recommendations it had accepted.

425. Sierra Leone pointed out that Malawi was striving to fulfil its human rights obligations at both international and regional levels. It acknowledged that many recommendations, including those made by Sierra Leone, had enjoyed the support of Malawi. It applauded the State for having instituted a moratorium on the death penalty and encouraged it in its efforts to abolish the death penalty. It also encouraged Malawi to implement its recommendations on providing equal and free access to primary education and on criminalizing all forms of trafficking.

426. South Africa welcomed the positive developments in Malawi since the first review. It congratulated the State on a successful second review and on its acceptance of a large number of recommendations. It welcomed the progress made in the area of economic, social and cultural rights and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. It commended Malawi for its leadership in combating HIV and AIDS and encouraged the State to continue its efforts to tackle challenges, particularly in relation to extreme poverty, inequality and hunger.

427. The Sudan appreciated the efforts made by Malawi to promote and protect human rights, and particularly its legislative and policy developments. It thanked the State for having accepted the three recommendations it had made.

428. Togo welcomed the measures Malawi had taken to improve the living conditions of detainees and to improve the capacity of security forces in the fight against torture. It thanked the State for having accepted the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Togo. It requested the international community to assist Malawi with the implementation of the recommendations.

429. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela expressed its full appreciation to Malawi for its commitment to the universal periodic review mechanism. It was pleased with the responses the State had provided. It referred to the progress made in the field of human rights and the efforts of the Government of Malawi in that regard. The State had made progress in ratifying international human rights instruments. It hoped that Malawi would continue to strengthen its commitment to its people with a particular emphasis on the most vulnerable groups.

430. Angola congratulated Malawi on having accepted a large number of recommendations, including those it had made. It commended the State for its commitment to strengthen cooperation with international and regional mechanisms to promote and protect human rights. It encouraged Malawi to continue its efforts in the areas of education, health and agriculture. It welcomed the adoption of the law on persons with disabilities, which provided equal opportunities and special educational facilities.

431. Benin congratulated Malawi on its commitment to the Human Rights Council. It was pleased with the State's efforts to promote and protect human rights, which included submitting reports on the implementation of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. It welcomed the measures that Malawi had taken to protect the rights of detainees. Benin encouraged the State to continue its efforts to promote and protect human rights.

432. Botswana appreciated the fact that Malawi had supported the majority of the recommendations. It commended the State for having adopted and implemented legislation on trafficking in persons and on gender, among others. The judicial reforms and the training of the police on human rights violations were also commendable. Botswana encouraged Malawi to finalize the review of the Prisons Act and to ensure its implementation.

433. China welcomed the constructive participation of Malawi in the universal periodic review process and its acceptance of a large number of recommendations. It appreciated the State's commitment to implement the recommendations it had accepted. China particularly welcomed the acceptance of the recommendations it had made. At the beginning of the year, Malawi had suffered serious floods, which had greatly affected cereal production, and the country must therefore be facing greater challenges on economic, social and cultural fronts. China called upon the international community to increase its aid to Malawi.

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

434. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Malawi, seven other stakeholders made statements.

435. The Malawi Human Rights Commission referred to the considerable progress made by the Government of Malawi in the promotion and protection of human rights, especially in the areas of gender and women's rights, children's rights, economic, social and cultural rights, and civil and political rights. It commended the Government for the inclusive approach that it had taken, which had enabled the participation of stakeholders in the universal periodic review process. The State had supported the majority of the recommendations it had received. The recommendations had addressed key challenges in the realization of human rights. The Malawi Human Rights Commission would continue to engage with the Government on the recommendations on ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and on decriminalizing defamation, which Malawi had not supported. It was concerned about the delays in the implementation of pieces of legislation, such as the legislation on trafficking in persons and the provision in the Education Act on compulsory education. It would continue to play a crucial role in the follow-up to the implementation of the recommendations.

436. The International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission, also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association, commended Malawi for its achievements in the areas of gender and women's and children's rights. They welcomed the State's acceptance of two recommendations on sexual orientation and gender identity. However, 17 recommendations on sexual orientation had not enjoyed the support of Malawi. The sodomy laws, which the Government had referred to the Law Commission for review on 7 December 2011, were yet to be reviewed. They called for the repealing of sections 137 (a), 153 and 156 of the Penal Code and an amendment to the discriminatory sections of the marriage law. Between 2014 and 2015, serious cases of human rights abuses of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex community had been documented.

437. UPR Info stated that Malawi had received 199 recommendations that had been made with the intention of improving the human rights situation on the ground. However, the review would remain an empty shell unless all stakeholders effectively and genuinely followed up with concrete actions at the national level. In June 2015, 50 non-governmental organizations had begun drafting an implementation plan to see how they could support the Government in the challenging implementation process. The implementation of the recommendations from the universal periodic review was dependent on political will and in Malawi that political will did exist. A dialogue between the Government and civil society organizations was scheduled to take place in October. That would have to be followed up with many other meetings to take the universal periodic review to its full potential.

438. Action Canada for Population and Development welcomed the fact that Malawi had accepted recommendations on gender-based violence, early and forced marriages, gender equality, the protection of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons from violence, maternal mortality, reproductive health services for adolescents and HIV. It called upon the Government to consult with organizations working on those issues when implementing the recommendations. It recommended that Malawi put in place an effective mechanism to ensure the delivery of public health services in a confidential, respectful and non-judgmental manner, revisiting the delivery mode of the prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV programme to remove any access barriers, and ensure the availability of referral health facilities close to police stations. It encouraged the State to swiftly implement the three recommendations on reviewing the legislation on abortion. It was

disappointed that Malawi had not accepted the recommendations on criminalizing spousal rape and female genital mutilation, on decriminalizing adult consensual sexual activity, and on eliminating legal and social discrimination based on sexual and gender identity, and urged the State to reconsider its decisions.

439. Amnesty International welcomed the acceptance by Malawi of the recommendation on taking measures to protect lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons from violence and to prosecute perpetrators. Malawi had also agreed to guarantee effective access to health services for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. It referred to the State's rejection of the recommendations on repealing provisions in the Penal Code criminalizing consensual same-sex sexual activities between adults, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons engaging in such conduct continued to face prosecution. It pointed out that Malawi had rejected the recommendations on abolishing the death penalty and strongly encouraged the Government to keep those recommendations under consideration. Malawi must act immediately to reduce pretrial detention, to guarantee fair trials and to ensure prisoners' access to adequate food. It was concerned about the practice of imprisoning failed asylum seekers and suspected illegal immigrants.

440. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme commended Malawi for its success in its democratic transition through free and transparent elections. It appreciated the efforts the State had made in economic and social spheres, and the adoption of the second growth and development strategy. However, in spite of the adoption of the Marriage, Divorce and Family Relations Law of 2015, gender inequality continued in society. The courts continued to sentence persons to death. It encouraged Malawi to draw up a code of conduct aimed at security and police forces to ensure the appropriate use of firearms. It urged Malawi to take appropriate measures to apply the law on trafficking in persons effectively and to better protect persons with albinism in society.

441. Centre pour les droits civils et politiques commended Malawi for having demonstrated its commitment to human rights by appearing before the Human Rights Council and for having accepted 154 recommendations. It also commended Malawi for having been progressive and having enacted good laws. The national human rights plan, which was being drafted, would go a long way in guiding Malawi in the implementation of the recommendations. It was unfortunate that the State had rejected recommendations on the death penalty and sexual minorities. Malawi should also address other outstanding issues, such as poor conditions in prisons, corruption and access to information.

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

442. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 199 recommendations received, Malawi had supported 154 recommendations and noted 45.

443. The delegation thanked Member and observer States and other stakeholders for their active engagement. It was grateful to those States that had commended Malawi for its efforts and that had recognized the significant steps that Malawi had taken in the promotion and protection of human rights. Malawi had also taken note of the criticisms, where it had been perceived that the State had not done well. The challenge that Malawi faced was that, where it had been alleged that violations had taken place, the information had not been brought to the relevant authorities, such as the Malawi Human Rights Commission. In that context, the delegation urged those who had relevant documentation or reports to bring them to the attention of the authorities.

444. The delegation emphasized the commitment and willingness of Malawi to continue its engagement and collaboration with the Human Rights Council and other United Nations bodies to ensure that Malawi fulfilled its obligations.

#### **Mongolia**

445. The review of Mongolia was held on 5 May 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 Mongolia 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.6/22/MNG/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.6/22/MNG/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.6/22/MNG/3).

446. At its 24th meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Mongolia (see section C below).

447. The outcome of the review of Mongolia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/6), 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/30/6/Add.1).

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

448. The delegation of Mongolia stated that, as follow-up to the second review, the Government had carefully considered all 164 recommendations jointly with national non-governmental organizations and other relevant stakeholders. As a result, Mongolia had supported 150 recommendations and noted 14 recommendations.

449. In July 2015, Mongolia had ratified the ILO Safety and Health in Mines Convention, 1995 (No. 176) and the Marrakesh Treaty to Facilitate Access to Published Works for Persons Who Are Blind, Visually Impaired or Otherwise Print Disabled.

450. In the upcoming fall session, Parliament would hold a debate on the decriminalization of defamation acts when it conducted its secondary review of the draft of the revised Criminal Code. Once the revised Criminal Code was enacted, the death penalty would be abolished legally.

451. The National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia had successfully hosted the 20th Annual General Meeting of the Asia Pacific Forum of National Human Rights Institutions, as well as the 3rd Biennial Conference, which had focused on the prevention of torture and the protection of the rights and dignity of people held in places of detention.

452. With respect to the recommendation on lifting the declaration of recognizing article 14 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Mongolia fully supported the work of the human rights treaty bodies. The Government would consider recognizing the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination under article 14 of the Convention, as well as the competence of the Committee against Torture under articles 21 and 22 of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

453. With regard to the recommendations on recognizing the competence of the Committee against Torture and on making declarations under articles 21 and 22 of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, Mongolia had ratified the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture in 2014, and would assign the National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia the function of the national preventive mechanism by revising the law on the national human rights commission. The State would prioritize the successful implementation of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture. It would also begin cooperating with the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture and continue to take effective measures to address the issues relating to torture raised in other recommendations made during the second review.

454. Regarding the recommendations on ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, Mongolia was a State party to all the core international human rights treaties except the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. Research and surveys to study the possibility of acceding to the Convention were being undertaken by the relevant authorities and agencies. Before considering the possibility of becoming a State party, the Government wished to see more States, especially those that were recipients of foreign workers, including Mongolian citizens, accede to the Convention.

455. Although domestic work was a non-traditional form of employment in Mongolia, the Government would study the possibility of ratifying the ILO Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189).

456. With respect to the recommendation on considering accession to the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its Protocol and on enacting legislation to protect asylum seekers and refugees regardless of country of origin, Mongolia clarified that the Convention and its Protocol had always been given careful consideration by the relevant authorities and agencies. Due to their strong relevance to the national security policy of the State, a decision to accede to those instruments would ultimately be a matter for the Parliament of Mongolia.

457. At the same time, the Government would further study the possibility of introducing a specific regulation to provide working guidelines for the relevant authorities on the issue of promoting and protecting the rights of asylum seekers, and would continue to work together with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to ensure the rights of asylum seekers, particularly in compliance with the principle of non-refoulement.

458. With respect to the recommendations on considering the ratification of the Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons and the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness, Mongolia pointed out that a stateless person enjoyed the same rights as foreign nationals. The citizenship and nationality of a child born of a stateless person were regulated by the law on citizenship and nationality. The national security policy also required that an appropriate balance of foreign nationals, stateless persons and migrants be maintained in the country. Those laws and policy documents ensured the rights of stateless persons in line with the main principles enshrined in the Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons and in the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.

459. Regarding the recommendation on establishing judicial and other mechanisms to investigate allegations of torture, police brutality and arbitrary detention, Mongolia was committed to strengthening its efforts to investigate all allegations of torture and police brutality. National legislation prohibited the arbitrary detention of persons by law enforcement officials, as any act of detention had to be approved by a judge.

460. Moreover, in accordance with previous practice, the Government would develop and adopt a plan on the implementation of the accepted recommendations after holding extensive consultations with the relevant human rights non-governmental organizations, civil society organizations and other relevant stakeholders. In that regard, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs would hold, in cooperation with UPR Info and national human rights non-governmental organizations, a two-day consultative meeting in mid-October 2015 in Ulaanbaatar for all the relevant stakeholders.

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

461. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Mongolia, 14 delegations made statements.

462. India pointed out that 150 recommendations had enjoyed the support of Mongolia. It believed that the State had gained much from participating in the universal periodic review and it was hopeful that Mongolia would continue its efforts to implement the supported recommendations in the coming years.

463. Kyrgyzstan appreciated the positive efforts made by Mongolia and its commitment to promote and protect human rights. It referred to the State's substantive efforts to promote the right to education, to implement judicial reform and to strengthen institutional and legislative mechanisms. Kyrgyzstan also referred to the progress made in the areas of accession to international instruments, strengthening human rights institutions and environmental protection.

464. The Lao People's Democratic Republic was pleased that Mongolia had supported a large number of recommendations, including the two recommendations it had made on strengthening the education system, including by ensuring the equal access of children with disabilities to education, and on promoting gender equality and the involvement of women in public services. It welcomed the State's achievements in promoting gender equality, improving the education system, and addressing the unemployment rate and domestic violence.

465. The Philippines was pleased that Mongolia had supported the recommendations on stepping up efforts to curb domestic violence and on providing adequate human and financial resources for programmes to combat human trafficking. However, it regretted that Mongolia had noted the recommendations on considering the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, and reiterated its recommendation to Mongolia and to all other States to consider ratifying the Convention.

466. Rwanda stated that the acceptance by Mongolia of the recommendation on making efforts to increase women's representation in decision-making positions was a clear indication of the State's commitment to further consolidate the enjoyment of human rights in the country.

467. Sierra Leone noted with appreciation that Mongolia had supported a large number of recommendations, including most of those made by Sierra Leone. Also notable were the ratification of several key international human rights instruments and the Government's commitment to implement into national law the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. It was commendable that, even prior to the moratorium of 2010, the President of Mongolia had granted pardon to all those sentenced to death. It encouraged Mongolia to make further efforts aimed at the full abolition of the death penalty in the country.

468. Tajikistan referred to the efforts of Mongolia to take targeted steps to improve State mechanisms and to build capacity to promote and protect human rights, including by expanding its treaty obligations through accession to a number of treaties. It welcomed the measures taken to improve the legislative basis in the fields of health care and gender equality, and the increased efforts to combat human trafficking and the steps taken to address its consequences. Tajikistan also welcomed the State's cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and civil society.

469. Turkmenistan welcomed the efforts made by the Government of Mongolia to strengthen its legislative, institutional and policy mechanisms for the promotion and protection of human rights. It commended the State for having established the National Committee on Gender Equality, led by the Prime Minister, whose functions included the implementation of the law on gender equality in ministries, agencies and local government organizations.

470. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela pointed out that Mongolia had made notable progress in acceding to international human rights instruments and had submitted outstanding reports to the treaty bodies. It was pleased that the State had reduced the level of poverty in the country and the number of people lacking food. It encouraged Mongolia to continue to bolster its well-targeted social programmes, particularly for the most in need in society.

471. Algeria encouraged Mongolia to continue to make efforts to improve the rights of migrant workers, including by ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

472. China welcomed the commitment of Mongolia to implement the recommendations it had supported. China appreciated the State's support for the recommendation made by China and its commitment to continue to invest more in education and the development of children and to combat discrimination, violence and hatred.

473. Djibouti encouraged Mongolia to continue its efforts to promote and protect human rights, including by promoting gender equality and the participation of women in public services. It welcomed the adoption of the Criminal Code, which had abolished the death penalty.

474. Estonia pointed out that Mongolia had maintained a moratorium on the death penalty since 2010, and the revised draft Criminal Code excluded capital punishment. It also pointed out that the death penalty had not yet been abolished de jure and it encouraged the State to move swiftly from a moratorium to abolition. It welcomed the decision by Mongolia to join the Freedom Online Coalition, while pointing out that there were still measures that needed to be taken to ensure that journalists, media workers and civil society activists were able to practice their activities freely in accordance with international standards without any fear of punishment.

475. While pointing out that Mongolia had supported the recommendation made by Ghana on rectifying the shortcomings relating to the definition of torture under the Criminal Code in order to ensure that evidence obtained from torture was not admissible in legal proceedings, Ghana asked for an update on the steps Mongolia had taken, if any, to enact the legislative amendment necessary to bring the definition of torture into line with the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. It was pleased that Mongolia had joined the Group of Friends of the Convention against Torture Initiative.

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

476. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Mongolia, six other stakeholders made statements.

477. The National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia stated that the Government had taken certain initiatives and made efforts to implement the recommendations from the first review; however, those actions had not been done to the expected degree and had not achieved substantive outcomes. It appreciated the recommendations made during the second review on important human rights issues, including torture, human trafficking, domestic violence, the right to a healthy and safe environment, the promotion of gender equality and the prevention of discrimination against vulnerable groups. It would cooperate with the Government, civil society and other stakeholders to implement the recommendations received during the second review and to improve the situation of human rights in the country.

478. UPR Info stated that, in the wake of the universal periodic review in May 2015, over 40 stakeholder organizations had begun drafting an implementation action plan in order to support the Government in the challenging implementation process. It highlighted the fact that, without the involvement of civil society, there would be no sustainable implementation. It welcomed the good example set by the Government, which had consulted with civil society before the adoption of its review outcome. The Government had shown its political will to consult with civil society. It referred to a consultation meeting between the Government, civil society and the United Nations Country Team, which would benefit the drafting process for the United Nations Development Assistance Framework of the United Nations Country Team.

479. Federatie van Nederlandse Vereniginge tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland stated that, as follow-up to the recommendations from the first review, the Government had drafted amendments to the Criminal Code in order to criminalize hate crimes and hate speech. Mongolia still did not have a legal framework that protected everyone from any type of discrimination, especially on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity. The above-mentioned draft bill had not been passed by Parliament, which meant that lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons continued to suffer from various types of discrimination. It urged the Government to scale up its efforts to uphold

the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Constitution and to ensure equality before the law and non-discrimination for everyone. It was necessary for the Government to train public servants on the human rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons, to reassess its human rights programmes and projects, and to include the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex community in the processes of assessment, planning, implementation and evaluation.

480. The Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development appreciated the Government's efforts to consult with civil society organizations on the translation of the recommendations and on its decision to accept and implement the recommendations. It urged the Government to develop a concrete plan of action for the implementation of the recommendation and to provide adequate resources in the national budget for that purpose. While recognizing the efforts made by the Government towards the promotion and protection of human rights, it was concerned about recent backtracking in protecting freedoms of expression, association and assembly and the weak adherence to non-discrimination. It was also concerned about the absence of effective legislative protection for human rights defenders who faced attacks, abuse, libel and slander, which was evidenced by the increasing cancellation of media operating permits when high-ranking public officials were criticized, the severe sentencing of individuals struggling for environmental preservation, and the restriction of the right to freedom of peaceful assembly of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. It was concerned about environmental degradation and stressed the need to pay attention to irresponsible mining and the consequent displacement of herder communities who were forced to forego their nomadic culture, tradition and livelihood and join the urban poor.

481. Amnesty International reported that no executions had been carried out since 2009, and that, in January 2010, the President had announced a moratorium on executions and commuted the death sentences of those who had appealed for clemency. It was concerned that the death penalty remained in the Criminal Code even after the State's accession in 2012 to the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aimed at the abolition of the death penalty. In that regard, it urged the Government to pass without delay the draft Criminal Code, currently pending before Parliament, which included provisos for the abolition of the death penalty.

482. The International Service for Human Rights urged Mongolia to implement fully the recommendations it had accepted on preventing and responding to discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity and on establishing effective protection for, and accountability for attacks against, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex individuals, including human rights defenders. It encouraged the State to continue to improve the independence and effectiveness of the National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia, including by providing sufficient funds. It called upon the Government to implement the recommendations relating to corporate accountability. Initiating a national action plan on business and human rights that would include significant input from civil society and human rights defenders, and actively participating in the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights were important steps towards respecting human rights in the extractive sector and beyond. It urged the Government to ensure that no regulatory measures were used to silence human rights defenders or independent civil society.

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

483. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 164 recommendations received, Mongolia had supported 150 recommendations and noted 14.

484. The delegation of Mongolia thanked Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council for their participation and constructive dialogue during its second review. The recommendations, comments and questions would be a valuable contribution to the State's endeavours in promoting and protecting human rights in the country.

485. The delegation underscored the uniqueness and advantage of the universal periodic review, which provided all Member States with an equal opportunity to present their human rights situation at the Human Rights Council, to share good practices and to discuss challenges in the implementation of human rights obligations.

486. Mongolia had been making continuous efforts to ensure the effective protection and promotion of human rights at the national level. There was still room for improvement, which included making domestic legislation compatible with international treaties, ensuring the effective enforcement of laws, and building capacity and strengthening human resources. In that regard, Mongolia was strongly interested in continuing to cooperate with OHCHR and other relevant United Nations bodies and to receive necessary technical assistance.

487. Mongolia was running, for the first time, for membership in the Human Rights Council, which would be for the term 2016–2020. It was genuinely hopeful that it would enjoy the full support of Member States for its candidacy.

### **Panama**

488. The review of Panama was held on 6 May 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 Panama 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.6/22/PAN/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.6/22/PAN/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.6/22/PAN/3).

489. At its 24th meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Panama (see section C below).

490. The outcome of the review of Panama comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/7), 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.

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

491. The delegation reiterated the commitment of Panama to the protection of human rights. The Government would continue to take actions to strengthen their enjoyment at the national level and to promote them universally.

492. Panama had welcomed the comments and recommendations of the delegations that had participated in the interactive dialogue during its second universal periodic review and recognized the contributions of civil society organizations to the preparation of the national report. It acknowledged the work of the troika, composed of Germany, Ghana and the Russian Federation.

493. Since its first review in 2010, Panama had made significant progress in the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted, including those on the administration of justice, on strengthening the legal and institutional framework, on improving cooperation with United Nations agencies and on ratifying international instruments.

494. Out of the 125 recommendations it had received during its second review, Panama had accepted 90 per cent of them. Those recommendations had already been incorporated into national policies and were in the process of being implemented.

495. In that context, Panama had amended the Family Code to set the minimum age for marriage at 18 years, in compliance with the Convention of the Rights of the Child. It had ratified the ILO Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189) and established a high-

level inter-institutional commission to draft a comprehensive law on the protection of children, with advice from United Nations agencies. It had developed legislation to create a national preventive mechanism against torture, which had been reviewed by the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture, and had established a working group to follow up on the State's compliance with the human rights conventions.

496. Further, Panama had accepted the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and, in 2014, had signed the Inter-American Convention against Racism, Racial Discrimination and Related Forms of Intolerance. As a result, the Government was drafting a law that consolidated the existing legal and administrative regulations in order to establish mechanisms to prevent racism and to eliminate all discriminatory practices.

497. Regarding the rights of persons with disabilities, the Government and civil society were working together to review Act 42 of 1999 and to adapt it to international standards. Furthermore, it had established a national service for statistics on persons with disabilities in order to generate plans, programmes and projects that responded coherently to the needs of that segment of society, including persons with disabilities without birth registration.

498. The process of certification of disability had begun in May 2015. In August, the Government had signed an agreement with the Government of Ecuador on inter-institutional cooperation in the area of persons with disabilities. In addition, through Cabinet resolution 89 of 2015, the Government had decided to submit to the National Assembly a bill adopting the Marrakech Treaty to Facilitate Access to Published Works for Persons Who Are Blind, Visually Impaired or Otherwise Print Disabled.

499. The Government was committed to addressing overcrowding in the prison system, and promoted repatriations, commutations of sentences and probation. It was also focused on the social and legal needs of women prisoners. A bill to establish a penitentiary force was being drafted and a new building to house the academy for the penitentiary force would be inaugurated in 2016.

500. The elimination of child labour, trafficking, violence against women and femicide were considered priorities for Panama. In that context, the Government provided care for victims of such crimes, promoted the integration of the actions of the judiciary and those of the National Institute for Women. It was considering the establishment of a specialized body of the police dedicated to the protection of women and had strengthened the department providing free legal assistance within the judiciary.

501. Regarding the situation of young people, the Government conducted information programmes and awareness-raising activities for young persons in especially difficult circumstances in order to mitigate their exposure to the problems they faced. To that end, more than 4,000 young people in conflict with the law were participating in a programme called Safe Neighbourhoods. Through that programme, young people belonging to gangs were given the opportunity to better manage their lives and to receive training for jobs created through public investment.

502. The Ministries of Education and of Social Development, as well as the Defensoría del Pueblo de la República de Panamá (Office of the Ombudsman), were involved in school programmes that targeted children and adolescents and were aimed at preventing all forms of violence, including bullying. Those programmes were complemented by professional assistance for children and included guidance for pregnant teenagers in order to prevent discrimination or rejection of those girls and to ensure they remained in the education system.

503. The Government was strengthening intercultural bilingual education in indigenous regions and was taking the administrative steps necessary to pay the compensation established by the ruling of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of October 2014.

504. Despite serious budget constraints that would continue in 2016, the Government had pursued an ambitious programme to increase access to drinking water in 12 regions, benefiting mostly the indigenous populations in the districts of Guna Yala, Ngobe Bugle and Embera.

505. The Government, with the participation of OHCHR and civil society organizations, was studying amendments to the procedure for determining refugee status.

506. The delegation reiterated the commitment of Panama to protect human rights at the national level and to promote those rights universally. In that spirit, Panama had presented its candidacy for membership in the Human Rights Council for the period 2016–2018. It had shared with Member States its credentials and commitments in document A/70/71.

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

507. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Panama, 11 delegations made statements.

508. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela recognized the importance that Panama had placed on the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted. The State had ratified such important instruments as the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela referred to the significant decrease in women's unemployment in Panama, by more than 10 per cent in less than a decade, and commended the State for having met the Millennium Development Goal on poverty reduction ahead of time. It encouraged Panama to continue to strengthen its social policies in favour of the neediest sectors of the population.

509. Algeria welcomed the cooperation of Panama with the universal periodic review and the acceptance by Panama of most of the recommendations made by States, including the two Algeria had made on adopting legislative and policy measures to fight racial discrimination against persons of African descent and on ensuring universal access to education, particularly for people living in remote areas. Algeria encouraged Panama to continue its efforts to promote and protect human rights.

510. Benin welcomed the efforts and achievements of Panama in implementing the recommendations from its second review. It praised in particular the procedure the State used to determine refugee status, the enactment of accountability measures, the establishment of mechanisms to promote and protect human rights, and the adoption of the act that set the minimum age for marriage at 18 years.

511. China welcomed the constructive and active participation of Panama during the universal periodic review. It thanked the delegation for having presented the Government's feedback on the recommendations it had received during the review. Panama had accepted the recommendations China had made on protecting the rights of detainees and on protecting the right to education for all, including vulnerable groups. It congratulated the State for having implemented the Millennium Development Goals, in particular the one on poverty alleviation. China supported the State's efforts to promote sustainable economic and social development.

512. Cuba stressed the fact that Panama had accepted almost 90 per cent of the recommendations it had received during its second universal periodic review. The State had accepted the two recommendations that Cuba had made on continuing prison reform and on implementing measures and strategies to alleviate the immediate needs of households living in extreme poverty.

513. Ecuador welcomed the efforts of Panama to comply with the second universal periodic review, a human rights mechanism guided by the principles of equality, impartiality, universality, objectivity, non-selectivity, dialogue and cooperation between States. Ecuador was pleased that Panama had presented its achievements and challenges in continuing to promote the participation of women and in continuing its efforts to combat illiteracy, particularly among indigenous women. Ecuador referred to the will of Panama to ratify the ILO Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169) and to the State's efforts to promote the rights of persons with disabilities.

514. El Salvador welcomed the cooperation of Panama with the universal periodic review, which was a valuable mechanism that ensured the promotion and protection of human



rights in a spirit of cooperation among States. It congratulated Panama on having accepted most of the recommendations from its second review.

515. Ghana stated that the number of recommendations accepted by Panama attested to the State's commitment to human rights. It was honoured to be part of the troika of the second review of Panama. It looked forward to the implementation of the recommendations it had made to Panama on presenting overdue reports to the treaty bodies and on enacting legislation prohibiting discrimination, particularly on the grounds of race and ethnicity. Ghana renewed its appeal to Panama to consider ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. It encouraged the Government to take into account the issues raised by the Defensoría del Pueblo de la República de Panamá (Office of the Ombudsman) in addressing the remaining challenges facing Panama in fulfilling its human rights obligations, including increasing the resources allocated to human rights institutions.

516. Honduras welcomed the positive steps taken by the Government to implement the universal periodic review recommendations, in particular those aimed at providing education in rural areas without discrimination, especially to indigenous peoples and persons of African descent. Honduras encouraged Panama to continue to incorporate the rights of persons with disabilities into all public policy and to ratify the Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

517. Rwanda welcomed the commitment of Panama to ratify various human rights instruments and to promote equal opportunities for women and their organizations. It commended Panama for having accepted the recommendation on establishing a national policy that comprehensively protected and promoted the rights of children, especially with regard to the minimum age at marriage.

518. Sierra Leone referred to the cooperative spirit that Panama had demonstrated by issuing a standing invitation to the special procedures and through its renewed commitment to institution-building and the implementation of public policies aimed at incorporating international norms into national legislation. Sierra Leone was pleased that Panama had accepted the three recommendations it had made. It looked forward to learning more about the efforts the Government would make to incorporate them into national laws and policies. It encouraged Panama to consider ratifying in the near future the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

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

519. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Panama, four other stakeholders made statements.

520. Defensoría del Pueblo de la República de Panamá (Office of the Ombudsman) regretted the budget cuts it had suffered in 2015 and 2016, which endangered the continuity of the projects and programmes it was implementing. In that regard, it recalled that a recommendation from the State's first universal periodic review had called for the strengthening of the Office of the Ombudsman through, among other things, a budget increase. The reduction in the budget was a direct attack on the institution and a violation of law. The activities that were threatened included the "Educating and re-educating on human rights" and "Women know your rights" projects and the expansion of the free legal aid office of the Faculty of Law at the University of Panama. Regarding the situation of prisons, the Office of the Ombudsman referred to the problems of overcrowding, the lack of medical care, the classification of inmates and the poor quality of food. Thus, to address those issues, the rehabilitation and resocialization of inmates should be a priority. Lastly, the Office of the Ombudsman had reiterated to the authorities that the ratification of the ILO Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169) and the implementation of the preventive mechanism against torture were still pending.

521. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland stated that the sex- and gender-diverse population continued to be at risk in Panama owing to the absence of a legal framework that recognized the principle of equality and non-discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity. COC Nederland had received reports of the illegal and arbitrary detention of trans, gays and

lesbians. Discrimination also extended to the provision of health care, which had led to a growing population of men who had sex with men infected with HIV/AIDS. It regretted that the National Assembly had twice dismissed a bill on discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity and considered, in that context, that the support of the United Nations was essential for the implementation of the recommendations requesting Panama to harmonize its policies in accordance with the Yogyakarta Principles on the Application of International Human Rights Law in relation to Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity, to defend the fundamental rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons and to respect already agreed upon international standards relating to that subject.

522. Franciscans International recalled that Panama had accepted recommendations on water, health, poverty and childhood, and pointed out that State practice to permit and promote mining without protecting the environment and human rights constituted a serious obstacle to improvements in those areas. For example, a foreign company had ceased its operations in 2014 without closing the mine and without fulfilling its obligations to workers. In addition, the operations of a Panamanian mining company affected a large area in the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor, declared a natural reserve, with serious consequences for the forest and the persons living in that area. Franciscans International urged the Government to supervise the activities of mining companies, safeguard the environment and take the measures necessary to defend the rights to life and health. It referred to the four recommendations on trafficking and stated that the labour exploitation, prostitution and mistreatment of undocumented persons had increased with the influx of migrants. Thus, it requested the Government to implement programmes to prevent trafficking. Lastly, it urged the Government to ensure the rights of migrants and refugees and to monitor the implementation of the two accepted recommendations relating to migrant children.

523. Action Canada for Population and Development recalled that Panama had accepted five recommendations specifically calling for the adoption of anti-discrimination legislation based on sexual orientation and gender identity and the promotion of measures in favour of the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. However, it regretted that the State had not supported a recommendation calling for the abolition of provisions of the executive order establishing as serious offenses the conduct of police officers who practiced lesbianism and homosexuality, as expressed literally in the norm. It also regretted that certain issues raised during the interactive dialogue, such as the implementation of programmes to eliminate discrimination in the media, the adoption of a plan against discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity, the repeal of section 40 of Act 7/2014 banning same-sex marriage, the enactment of legislation guaranteeing the legal equality of same-sex couples, and the legal recognition of the gender identity of transgender people, had not been incorporated into the recommendations of the second review. Action Canada requested Panama to take into account those issues and reiterated that the Government had an obligation to ensure the right of non-discrimination of all persons, including discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity.

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

524. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 125 recommendations received, Panama had supported 111 recommendations and noted 14.

525. Panama acknowledged the delegations that had contributed during the adoption of its report. It had taken note of all the comments and concerns raised in order to officially send them to the Government, in Panama City. The delegation recognized that, in that regard, some mining activities could remain a challenge vis-à-vis the protection of the environment and human rights. The delegation indicated that the Government was committed to addressing that issue.

#### **Maldives**

526. The review of Maldives was held on 6 May 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 Maldives 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.6/22/MDV/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.6/22/MDV/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.6/22/MDV/3).

527. At its 24th meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Maldives (see section C below).

528. The outcome of the review of Maldives comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/8), 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/30/8/Add.1).

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

529. The delegation stated that the consideration by the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review of Maldives in May 2015 had gained nationwide interest, renewing and strengthening the commitment of the Government to the process.

530. After careful consideration, Maldives had accepted 198 recommendations and rejected 60 recommendations out of a total of 258 recommendations received.

531. Referring to recent developments, the delegation stated that bills on health services, sports, the National Integrity Commission and disaster management had been ratified. The new Penal Code had come into effect on 16 July 2015, after a comprehensive roll-out and a sensitization programme had been conducted to familiarize the relevant stakeholders with the changes. Many amendments to legislation had also been ratified to comply with the Constitution of 2008 and the new Penal Code.

532. The delegation highlighted other developments, which included the Government's commitment to provide all inhabited islands with 24-hour electricity before 2018, the introduction of the concept of a "smart city", efforts to develop a "youth city" to cater to the nearly 50 per cent of the population that were below the age of 25 years, and the introduction of an Islamic financing loan programme to benefit small- and medium-sized enterprises.

533. With the approval of Parliament, the President had appointed three new members to the Human Rights Commission to replace members whose terms had been completed. Members had also been appointed to the Public Service Media Governing Board.

534. Of the 60 recommendations that the Government had rejected, and had thus taken note of, most had contradicted the Islamic faith and the Constitution of Maldives. The State had rejected recommendations relating to freedom of religion, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons, and non-traditional forms of the family. Non-Muslims were allowed to practice their own faith in private. Explanations relating to the recommendations were contained in the addendum to the report.

535. The Government had developed a comprehensive strategy for the implementation of the 198 recommendations accepted. Under the guidance of the President of Maldives, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs would continue to be the principal agency coordinating the implementation of the recommendations, and it had already started consultations. Following informal meetings, the reconstituted standing committee on the Universal Periodic Review had held its first formal meeting on 20 August 2015. The new standing committee had eight members from the Government and four members from civil society. The State had taken a results-based approach in implementing the recommendations by

identifying measurable and verifiable benchmarks. To promote human rights values, the Government would continue its efforts to provide human rights education.

536. New legislation, such as the bill on gender equality, would be presented at the next session of Parliament. The adverse impacts of climate change were also viewed as posing new challenges, and the country had not been immune to the waves of drug abuse and radical extremism spreading across the globe.

537. Maldives had been very forthcoming about its limitations and had exercised maximum transparency in highlighting the challenges it faced. Despite those challenges, it had achieved immeasurable progress in the past decade. It was unfortunate that several forces both outside and inside were trying to reap the benefits of its political vulnerability. Change was sustainable only if it were locally owned, driven and shaped. Institutions needed to have the space and time to grow organically according to the specific needs of the people of the country.

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

538. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Maldives, 17 delegations made statements.<sup>14</sup>

539. Algeria congratulated Maldives on the progress it had made in human rights and on having accepted more than 80 recommendations. It was pleased that Maldives had accepted one of the two recommendations made by Algeria, which was on ratifying the Convention against Discrimination in Education.

540. Azerbaijan valued the constructive approach of Maldives to the universal periodic review process. It welcomed the State's acceptance of the majority of the recommendations, including the one made by Azerbaijan.

541. Bahrain thanked Maldives for its views and comments on the recommendations received, which demonstrated the State's strong commitment to work with human rights mechanisms. In that regard, Bahrain made specific reference to the acceptance of the recommendations it had made to Maldives on guaranteeing education, including for children with disabilities. Bahrain referred to the State's willingness to pursue international cooperation and a positive dialogue on human rights and to its commitments to implement legislative and institutional reforms.

542. Belgium welcomed the acceptance by Maldives of two of the recommendations it had made on protecting the rights of the child and on gender equality. It regretted the State's rejection of the recommendation on continuing the moratorium on the death penalty with a view to abolishing it and on prohibiting the application of the death penalty to persons under the age of 18 years at the time of the offence, in compliance with the State's international obligations and the commitments it had made during the first universal periodic review.

543. Benin commended Maldives for its efforts and achievements, including its ratification of the main ILO conventions, the visits of United Nations special procedures, initiatives for migrant workers, progress in the areas of education, health and housing, and the promotion and protection of the rights of women. It encouraged Maldives to continue to work towards Parliament's adoption of the draft law on gender equality.

544. Botswana welcomed the ratification by Maldives of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, Supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the State's finalization of the national action plan to combat trafficking in persons. It appreciated the continued cooperation of Maldives with the special procedures and other human rights mechanisms.

<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/30thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

545. China welcomed the commitment of Maldives to implement the recommendations accepted and it thanked the State for having accepted those made by China on according attention to the human rights impact of climate change and drug crime. It understood the difficulties the State faced in such fields as human and financial resources and wished Maldives sustained political stability, social harmony and economic prosperity. It hoped the international community would provide the technical assistance and capacity-building support urgently needed by Maldives.

546. Côte d'Ivoire welcomed the attention paid by Maldives to the recommendations made during the review. It called upon the State to continue to take measures aimed at respecting and protecting civil and political rights, guaranteeing freedom of expression and promoting gender equality. It also encouraged Maldives to build upon measures to combat religious discrimination and violence against vulnerable groups. It asked Maldives to continue to cooperate with the international community.

547. Cuba appreciated the presentation by Maldives of its position on the postponed recommendations and for having accepted the two recommendations made by Cuba on women's empowerment and on the rights of persons with disabilities. It reiterated its call for the international community, including the United Nations mechanisms, to cooperate with the Government of Maldives so that it would attain the set objectives.

548. Djibouti welcomed the remarkable progress made by Maldives in promoting and protecting human rights, particularly in the modernization of national legislation. It commended Maldives for its efforts to promote the well-being of its citizens, and especially their rights to health, education and housing.

549. Egypt was supportive of the efforts of the Government of Maldives to overcome challenges and to consolidate sustainable home-grown democracy. It acknowledged the progress made by Maldives as it underwent significant political transition and experienced chronic suffering owing to the adverse effects of climate change. It encouraged the Government to maintain its resolve and to continue its constructive engagement with international human rights mechanisms. It welcomed the State's acceptance of more than 75 per cent of the recommendations it had received, and especially the four made by Egypt.

550. Ethiopia was pleased that Maldives had implemented a significant number of recommendations and it understood the challenges the country had faced since the first universal periodic review. It thanked Maldives for having accepted its recommendation. It appreciated the successful results in such areas as education, housing and sustainable development. Ethiopia recommended that Maldives continue to facilitate favourable conditions for minority religious groups.

551. Ghana supported the call by Maldives for the international community to support the implementation of the recommendations the State had accepted and to strengthen peace and political stability. It welcomed the State's acceptance of the recommendations on strengthening the independence of the judiciary, and it requested updates on the steps taken by Maldives to promote religious dialogue and to implement effectively the laws aimed at addressing violence against women. Ghana would be grateful to know of the progress made by Maldives to enact a juvenile justice law in compliance with the Convention on the Rights of the Child and to pass legislation to enhance freedom of religion for citizens and foreigners.

552. Honduras welcomed the measures adopted by Maldives to implement the universal periodic review recommendations on protecting migrant workers from trafficking and exploitation, with a focus on guaranteeing non-discrimination with regard to access to the labour market. It commended the State for having considered the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. Honduras particularly valued the establishment of institutional infrastructure to promote mutual understanding, tolerance and interreligious dialogue in order to address religious extremism and strengthen cultural diversity.

553. India appreciated the constructive participation of the Government of Maldives in the universal periodic review process, which had witnessed the participation of 102 delegations and resulted in 258 recommendations. Maldives had accepted 198

recommendations, including the recommendation made by India on better protecting foreign workers and effectively implementing the Anti-Human Trafficking Act.

554. Iraq commended Maldives for having accepted the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Iraq. It welcomed the measures taken by Maldives in relation to the freedom of the media, the freedom of expression, the right to education, especially for children with special needs, health, housing, and combating domestic violence and trafficking in persons. It commended the State for its efforts to enhance the rights of women and to consolidate democracy.

555. Kuwait commended Maldives for the efforts being made to strengthen human rights. It appreciated the State's acceptance of the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Kuwait on strengthening comprehensive health services and improving the quality of education. It was an indication of the attention paid by Maldives to the promotion and protection of human rights.

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

556. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Maldives, eight other stakeholders made statements.

557. United Nations Watch condemned the unlawful incarceration of former President Mohamed Nasheed, who, it stated, had been arrested in 2012 on unsubstantiated terrorism charges following the arrest of a corrupt judge. Former President Nasheed had been denied the opportunity to submit evidence in his case, and the presiding judge had served simultaneously as the key witness. The international community had condemned the sentencing of former President Nasheed to 13 years' imprisonment. Many members of the opposition were currently awaiting trial or were in prison following the Government's crackdown on political dissent. United Nations Watch was also concerned that survivors of sexual violence, the majority of whom were women, were prosecuted for fornication and subjected to flogging as legal punishment. It called upon Maldives to release former President Nasheed from prison immediately and to hold free and fair elections.

558. The Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development was concerned that violent attacks against journalists, the media and political activists had increased significantly over the past three years, and that the police attempted to thwart demands for accountability, including through a violent crackdown on a rally that had marked one year since the disappearance of journalist Ahmed Rilwan. It urged the Government to review the terrorism prevention bill and the freedom of expression bill in line with the commitments it had made during the universal periodic review. While the Government had accepted all of the recommendations on ensuring the independence of the judiciary and on strengthening the rule of law, the lack of judicial independence was a major challenge to realizing human rights. It urged the Government to reinstate the six-decade-long moratorium on the death penalty and called upon Maldives to publicly set out a comprehensive, measurable and time-bound action plan for the implementation of the recommendations from the universal periodic review in cooperation and consultation with civil society.

559. Action Canada for Population and Development welcomed the acceptance by Maldives of the recommendations on adopting a gender equality bill, legislating against domestic violence, providing more shelters, and addressing the practices of female genital mutilation and early and forced marriage. Regarding the implementation of those recommendations, it urged the Government to consult and collaborate with local non-governmental organizations, particularly those that worked with women and those that worked on gender issues. It was deeply concerned that Maldives had rejected the recommendations on adopting a law against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and on decriminalizing consensual extramarital sexual relations. Issues addressed by stakeholders during the review such as formulating a policy to address unsafe abortion and providing sexual and reproductive health education were absent among the recommendations.

560. Amnesty International stated that, in September 2014, the Supreme Court had brought contempt of court charges against the Human Rights Commission of Maldives for having highlighted flaws in the judicial system in its universal periodic review submission.

Amnesty International was concerned that hundreds of people, including former President Nasheed, former Defence Minister Nazim and former Deputy Speaker of Parliament Nazim, had been charged and tried in grossly unfair trials, especially in violation of their right to freedom of assembly. According to Amnesty International, prisoners who filed an appeal were unlikely to receive a fair and impartial appeal hearing until the Government enforced judicial compliance with fair trial guarantees. It urged the Government to strengthen the independence and impartiality of the judiciary and to guarantee the rule of law, as recommended during the review. It deeply regretted the State's rejection of 28 recommendations on the death penalty and flogging and it urged the Government to immediately announce a moratorium on those practices with a view to abolishing them.

561. The International Commission of Jurists stated that the Maldivian judiciary continued to disregard international and domestic principles of judicial independence, impartiality and accountability. For instance, the "treason" case of the Supreme Court against the National Human Rights Commission of Maldives for its universal periodic review submission to the Human Rights Council violated numerous international standards, including those on reprisals and the independence of national human rights institutions. According to the International Commission of Jurists, politically motivated criminal trials against former President Nasheed and former Defence Minister Nazim, among others, had involved arbitrary detentions and gross violations of the rights to fair trial and appeal, and the human rights crisis had created an environment conducive to attacks against journalists and civil society. It urged Maldives to accept and implement the universal periodic review recommendations on strengthening judicial independence, the Human Rights Commission of Maldives and other constitutional bodies, and on protecting human rights and the rule of law. It referred to its recent submission to the Human Rights Council and to its joint fact-finding mission report for a more detailed analysis.

562. The International Service for Human Rights reported that the Supreme Court had initiated a case against the Human Rights Commission of Maldives following its contribution to the second universal periodic review, which had touched upon the politicization and lack of independence of the judiciary. In 2015, the Supreme Court had handed down a verdict in that case, declaring the submission by the Commission to be unlawful and that the Commission must abide by a set of 11 very broad and ill-defined guidelines on carrying out its activities, including that any communication with international bodies must take place through the relevant government institutions. The decision of the Supreme Court was a clear breach of international law and incompatible with the State's membership in the Human Rights Council. Preventing the relevant stakeholders from participation undermined the universal periodic review process as a whole and constituted an act of reprisal.

563. The Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative shared the concerns of OHCHR regarding reservations about the trial of former President Nasheed and it supported the call for his immediate release. It was deeply concerned about the future of democracy in Maldives given the developments over the past year, such as the lack of positive action in the case of the disappearance of a journalist, the actions against the Human Rights Commission of Maldives for having engaged with the universal periodic review, the continued restrictions on the right to counsel and on the right to remain silent under certain circumstances, and the arbitrary removal of Supreme Court justices. It welcomed the Government's indicated willingness to work with certain intergovernmental organizations, including the Commonwealth Secretariat, and looked forward to necessary reforms being implemented promptly. It called upon the Government to fulfil swiftly its reporting obligations to various United Nations mechanisms and to engage constructively in partnership with civil society at home and internationally regarding the universal periodic review recommendations it had accepted and those it had rejected.

564. Freedom Now stated that former President Mohamed Nasheed had been imprisoned by the Government on fabricated charges of terrorism and that there had been shocking violations of due process throughout his case in a corrupt court system. The Government continued to support that gross infringement of justice, along with the cases of about two dozen other political prisoners and some 1,700 people facing legal charges for their peaceful political activism. Several world leaders, including the United Nations High

Commissioner for Human Rights and the European Parliament, had called for the release of former President Nasheed. Freedom Now expected that that the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention would soon present an independent and impartial judgment on the case of former President Nasheed, and that the Government would completely abide by the recommendations of the Working Group as it had fully engaged in that process.

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

565. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 258 recommendations received, Maldives had supported 198 recommendations and noted 60.

566. The delegation reiterated the support of Maldives for the universal periodic review process and its principles and expressed appreciation to all who had participated in the discussion. However, it was disappointed that some delegations had used that opportunity in a manner that was inconsistent with those principles.

567. The delegation referred to the attention that the international community and media had given to the democracy consolidation process of Maldives and reminded the participants of how far the State had progressed in only a decade, especially in the protection of the rights of the vulnerable in society, women, children and older persons, and in economic and social development.

568. The delegation responded to some of the comments made on the independence of the judiciary, the Human Rights Commission of Maldives and the trial of former President Nasheed.

569. The Government believed that the judiciary should be free from interference and undue influence by the executive, and that it, along with other institutions, must be given the time and space to grow organically into a robust, democratic institution. Maldives continued to engage with the international human rights mechanisms aimed at strengthening the judiciary and it was working with international partners towards strengthening the judiciary and restoring public confidence.

570. The decision of the Supreme Court and the 11-point guidelines contained therein did not stipulate, in any specific terms, any restriction or limitation on the ability of the Human Rights Commission of Maldives to submit reports to the United Nations. The substance of the *suo moto* case was not concerned with the substance of the report prepared for the universal periodic review, but issues concerning the compilation of that report.

571. On the issue of the sentencing of former President Nasheed, the delegation reiterated that former President Nasheed had been sentenced on 13 March 2015 to 13 years in prison by the Criminal Court for having ordered the illegal abduction of a judge in January 2012. Former President Nasheed's lawyers had had some questions about the process but had refused to appeal. Under the provisions of article 223 of the Constitution, the Prosecutor General had filed an appeal at the High Court and then at the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court was expected to hold a preliminary hearing on the appeal application in the near future.

572. The Government's efforts in the democracy consolidation process and in strengthening the rule of law would not falter. Commitment to the economic and social advancement of the people of Maldives and the protection of the environment were the top priorities of the Government of President Abdulla Yameen Abdul Gayoom.

573. The delegation reaffirmed the Government's commitment to provide in 2017 a midterm report on its progress in implementing the recommendations. Maldives hoped that the third cycle of the universal periodic review would adopt the lessons learned from its past two cycles and achieve more fruitful results.

#### Andorra

574. The review of Andorra was held on 7 May 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 Andorra 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.6/22/AND/1 and Corr.1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/22/AND/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.6/22/AND/3).

575. At its 26th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Andorra (see section C below).

576. The outcome of the review of Andorra comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/9), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/30/9/Add.1).

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

577. The delegation of Andorra thanked the troika for its excellent work and expressed its appreciation to the Member States who had taken the floor and made recommendations during the presentation of the national report in May 2015.

578. Andorra was fully committed to the universal periodic review process, which was a unique space that provided States with an opportunity to exchange experiences and good practices and to improve the situation of human rights in their respective countries.

579. After the presentation of the national report to the Working Group, Andorra had taken note of the findings and the comments and recommendations made. Member States had made a total of 85 recommendations. The Ministry for Foreign Affairs had been responsible for compiling the recommendations and initiating a broad consultation process with the government departments involved in their implementation. That exercise had led to a thorough analysis of the human rights situation in the country, which had been done in order to define the position of Andorra on each of the recommendations received.

580. Each recommendation had been carefully analysed in order to assess its applicability and potential to improve the situation of human rights in the country over the next four and a half years. Many of the recommendations had already been implemented and their acceptance should therefore be seen as a commitment by Andorra to maintain already implemented policies. Conversely, many of the recommendations that had had a priori the support of the Government of Andorra had in the end been noted, as those recommendations had contained an element that had prevented their acceptance in full.

581. Once the consultations between the departments concerned had been concluded, the Government, at the meeting of the Council of Ministers on 26 August 2015, had taken a position on the recommendations received. Of the 85 recommendations received during the second review, Andorra had accepted 41 and noted the remaining 44.

582. The delegation explained the State's position on the main recommendations, many of which were related to the ratification of and accession to the main international human rights conventions. During the presentation of the national report by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Andorra had committed to examining its legislation with regard to each of the major international human rights instruments in order to assess if the legislation was in line with the provisions thereof.

583. The delegation reiterated the commitment of Andorra and, to that end, the State had accepted the recommendations that encouraged it to consider accession to the main international human rights conventions, without prejudice to finally proceeding to do so.

However, the State had not accepted the recommendations that required its accession before the next universal periodic review.

584. The delegation clarified that that was an exercise in responsibility, as Andorra understood that becoming a party to international conventions required a thorough analysis of national legislation in relation to the provisions of the international conventions and of the State's ability to fulfil its commitments.

585. Andorra could not accept the recommendations on ratifying various ILO conventions, as becoming a party to those instruments required membership in the organization. Andorra was now a member of 23 international organizations and had limited resources, which did not allow it to become a member of additional organizations such as ILO. However, it considered that its national labour legislation complied with the main ILO conventions.

586. Andorra had noted the recommendations on providing a legal framework to guarantee the right of asylum and refugee status. The Government of Andorra was in contact with the European Union and UNHCR to coordinate its participation in the current humanitarian crisis affecting Syrian refugees.

587. Regarding the creation of a national human rights institution, Andorra had, during the presentation of its national report, pledged to study the issue without prejudice in order to take the steps necessary for its creation. The courts of justice and the Raonador del Ciutadà (Ombudsman) were the main bodies guaranteeing human rights in the country. The creation of a new institution responsible for ensuring respect for human rights could lead to a duplication of powers. For that reason, Andorra would study the issue without committing itself to creating such an institution in the coming years.

588. Andorra had accepted all the recommendations on strengthening the rights of persons with disabilities. It was firmly committed to the principle of inclusive education in schools and to continuing such action in the coming years.

589. In March 2016, Andorra would present its initial report to the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. That action was also aimed at complying with several recommendations on cooperating fully with the treaty bodies and on presenting the corresponding periodic reports within the established deadlines.

590. During the first universal periodic review, Andorra had not accepted the recommendations on ensuring the right to strike. However, in the second review, it had accepted such recommendations and would make the necessary legislative amendments to guarantee the right to strike and collective bargaining. An important step taken relating to that right was the initiation in Parliament of a procedure on a legislative initiative on the right to strike, in compliance with the commitment made by Andorra to the Secretary-General of the United Nations during his visit to the State. The text, which could not be approved before the parliamentary elections held earlier that year, would be proposed to the new Parliament.

591. Lastly, with regard to the recommendations on the rights of women, Andorra had agreed to adopt a comprehensive law on gender equality, in accordance with the provisions of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, and to continue to implement policies to promote gender equality. However, Andorra had noted the recommendation on providing quotas for women's representation on the boards of companies, as business in Andorra was mainly characterized by the presence of small- and medium-sized enterprises.

592. The delegation thanked the Human Rights Council for its attention.

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

593. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Andorra, seven delegations made statements.

594. China welcomed the participation of Andorra in the universal periodic review and its decision to accept most of the recommendations, especially those made by China on

strengthening legislation against racism and intolerance, taking measures to prohibit public incitement to racial hatred, violence and discrimination, and improving health policies in order to provide migrant women and female children with affordable health services.

595. The Council of Europe congratulated the delegation of Andorra on the successful presentation of its national report. It highlighted the challenges faced by Andorra, namely the lack of comprehensive legislation against racism and racial discrimination, including the non-implemented recommendations of the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, conditions of detention, the need to separate juvenile detainees from others and to improve the access of prisoners to medical assistance, and the absence of a specific law addressing gender-based violence. It invited the Government to ensure the effective implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention), which had come into force in 2014, and to ratify the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime and its Additional Protocol.

596. Ghana commended Andorra for its commitment to the universal periodic review mechanism. It highlighted the large number of recommendations the State had accepted, in particular those on the strengthening of laws and policies to check all forms of discrimination and those on strengthening the criminal justice system. It praised Andorra for having accepted the recommendations on ratifying the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. Ghana appealed to the Government to take concrete steps to implement the recommendations it had accepted, including those on aligning its legislation with the Rome Statute and on submitting overdue periodic reports to the various human rights treaty bodies.

597. Sierra Leone pointed out that, since its first universal periodic review, Andorra had submitted two reports to the treaty bodies as recommended. It referred to the commitment of Andorra to human rights, especially the advancement of children's rights through the prohibition of corporal punishment. However, it was concerned about discrimination against women and incidents of racial intolerance. It encouraged Andorra to ratify the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, Supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, to establish a national human rights institution, and to enact laws on the status of refugees and asylum seekers.

598. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela praised the open cooperation of Andorra with the universal periodic review. It highlighted the State's political will to implement the recommendations accepted during the first and second reviews. It referred to the progress made in the protection of women rights, and significantly the adoption of legal provisions to eradicate gender-based and domestic violence. It praised Andorra for having strengthened its plans and social programmes in the areas of employment, health and food.

599. Angola welcomed the delegation of Andorra and the presentation of its national report for the second review. It appreciated the various initiatives taken by Andorra relating to its legislation, the protection of the child, the elimination of gender-based and domestic violence, and the adoption of the Foreign Investment Act. Angola encouraged Andorra to continue its cooperation with the human rights mechanisms.

600. Rwanda praised Angola for the strong commitment it had made to the protection and promotion of human rights and the constructive and participatory role it had played since the first universal periodic review. It commended the State for having extended a standing invitation to all of the special procedures of the Human Rights Council.

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

601. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Andorra, no other stakeholders made statements.

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

602. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 85 recommendations received, Andorra had supported 41 recommendations and noted 44.

603. The delegation of Andorra concluded by thanking the Member States that had taken the floor, the representatives of civil society, the troika and the secretariat. It reiterated the commitment of Andorra to the universal periodic review process, stressing that the second review had given the State a new and useful opportunity to look at the situation of human rights in the country in order to improve it.

#### Bulgaria

604. The review of Bulgaria was held on 7 May 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 Bulgaria 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.6/22/BGR/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.6/22/BGR/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.6/22/BGR/3).

605. At its 26th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Bulgaria (see section C below).

606. The outcome of the review of Bulgaria comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/10), 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/30/10/Add.1 and Corr.1).

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

607. The delegation of Bulgaria stated that the Government attributed great importance to the universal periodic review process as a valuable tool to assess objectively the human rights situation in every Member State and to set the path for its further improvement. The second review had proven to be a beneficial exercise for Bulgaria, as it had assisted the Government in evaluating progress since the first review and in setting its goals in the area of human rights.

608. Bulgaria would carry out its efforts within the national coordination mechanism for human rights, which had been tasked with improving coordination among public authorities and other stakeholders involved in the implementation of the State's international human rights obligations. In that regard, a seminar had been held to consider and discuss thoroughly all of the 182 recommendations received during the review, as well as the follow-up on those recommendations. Based on wide consultations, the Government had then taken a position on all of the recommendations and submitted its report to the Human Rights Council. The State had accepted or accepted in principle 174 recommendations of the 182 recommendations it had received.

609. The delegation provided additional information on some areas that had been covered in the national report and on the recommendations received. It highlighted several achievements in the area of deinstitutionalization with the aim of protecting and promoting the rights of the child, which was a top priority of the Government. Among those achievements was the placement of a large number of children living in institutions into a family or a family-type environment, the introduction of new approaches to combating

abandonment, and strengthening the partnership between the health-care, social assistance, and education sectors.

610. Regarding gender equality, the delegation reiterated the commitment of Bulgaria to continue to promote the active participation of women in all spheres of social and political life. An act on gender equality was being drafted with the aim of ensuring an integrated policy on gender equality through the involvement of all institutions at every level. The act would reinforce the efforts of the Government to reduce and to eliminate the gender pay gap. The Government had recently made a commitment to develop and adopt a national strategy on gender equality, covering the period 2015–2020.

611. In pursuance of the State's commitments to implement the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, an action plan on the implementation of the Convention for the period 2015–2020 had been adopted in May 2015. The plan outlined the specific steps and the roles and responsibilities of the respective governmental bodies and stakeholders, with the input of organizations for persons with disabilities.

612. Regarding tolerance and non-discrimination, the delegation, while recalling the long-standing historic tradition of ethnic and religious tolerance in Bulgaria, stated that the Government had been pursuing a consistent policy aimed at preventing and eliminating any form of discrimination and increasing understanding and tolerance among persons belonging to different ethnic, religious or linguistic groups.

613. The full integration of Roma in society was an important goal of the Government. Thus, particular efforts were directed at providing the conditions necessary for the integration of Roma into society. Bulgaria had prepared and would present by the end of 2015 its periodic report on article 9 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

614. Regarding asylum seekers and refugees, the delegation confirmed the State's commitment to ensure respect for the human rights of all persons seeking protection in its territory, in cooperation with its various partners, including non-governmental organizations. Domestic legislation provided for the full protection of the rights of persons seeking international protection. A national strategy on migration, asylum and integration for the period 2015–2020 had been adopted in 2015. Bulgaria was mainly a transit country for mixed migration flows and was committed to supporting those who expressed their wish to stay, while taking the necessary precautions regarding its national security.

615. Several recommendations were on reforming the judicial system. Following the approval of an updated strategy to continue the reform of the judicial system and in line with six strategic goals, a draft act to amend and supplement the act on the judicial system had been presented for a wide discussion. The draft envisaged a change in the structure and organization of the Supreme Judicial Council and was aimed at reinforcing the independence of the courts and at elaborating the appraisal of the performance of judges, prosecutors and investigating magistrates as a basis for their professional development. In September 2015, the National Assembly had adopted, during its first reading, the amendments to the Constitution that provided for the separation of the colleges of judges and prosecutors. The amendments would also reinforce the principle of democratic accountability in the work of prosecutors and investigative magistrates.

616. The delegation provided explanations relating to some of the recommendations that the Government had not been able to support. Regarding the recommendation contained in paragraph 123.80 of the outcome of the review, Bulgaria believed that States should cease funding for organizations and political parties that advocated racism. However, it found factually incorrect the allegation made in the recommendation that such practices might exist in Bulgaria. Consequently, the Government had not been able to support the recommendation.

617. Regarding the recommendation contained in paragraph 123.163 of the outcome of the review, there had been, for about 20 years, a legal procedure in place providing for the recovery and the change of the names of Bulgarian citizens who had been forced to change their original names. Regarding the recommendation contained in paragraph 123.164, the Religious Denominations Act provided for the restitution of nationalized, expropriated,

confiscated or otherwise illegally taken properties of religious communities, subject to the condition that the relevant legal requirements were met. The restitution of confiscated properties was provided for based on court decisions on a non-discriminatory basis.

618. Concerning the recommendation contained in paragraph 123.165, the Constitution guaranteed the right of those citizens whose mother tongue was not the Bulgarian language to study and use their own language, alongside the compulsory study of the Bulgarian language. The Constitution also guaranteed the free use of the mother tongue in many spheres of life. However, Bulgarian, as a State language, must be used in election campaigns. That legal requirement could not affect in any way the free exercise of any political rights of any citizen of Bulgaria.

619. The delegation reiterated the commitment of Bulgaria to follow through with the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted with a view to strengthening the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The Government would prepare a voluntary midterm report on the implementation of the recommendations, as it had done during the first review.

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

620. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Bulgaria, 17 delegations made statements.

621. Albania noted with satisfaction that Bulgaria had supported most of the recommendations made during the review. It referred to the State's commitment to implement those recommendations. It commended Bulgaria for its efforts to promote gender equality.

622. Algeria noted with satisfaction that Bulgaria had supported most of the recommendations made during the review, including the two recommendations made by Algeria on gender equality and on improving the rights of migrant workers. It encouraged the State to continue its efforts to ensure more guarantees for migrant workers and women.

623. Benin noted with satisfaction the efforts of Bulgaria to promote and protect human rights, including by strengthening legislation on gender equality, fighting domestic violence and protecting the rights of persons with disabilities. It recommended that Bulgaria continue its efforts in the area of juvenile justice and the protection of children placed in specialized institutions.

624. China welcomed the acceptance by Bulgaria of the majority of the recommendations, including those made by China. It noted with satisfaction the measures taken by Bulgaria to ensure gender equality, to protect the rights of women belonging to ethnic minorities, and to address racial discrimination and hatred.

625. Côte d'Ivoire welcomed the interest shown by Bulgaria in the recommendations made during its review. It encouraged Bulgaria to continue its reforms, with a view to bringing its legislation into line with international norms. It further encouraged the State to enhance its efforts to protect vulnerable groups of the population and to combat all forms of discrimination.

626. The Council of Europe referred to some of the challenges that Bulgaria faced, including the discrimination of Roma, the malfunctioning of the judicial system, the lack of coherent policies on preventing corruption, and discrimination against minorities. It welcomed the measures taken by Bulgaria to address those issues.

627. Ghana encouraged the national coordination mechanism for human rights to continue to give priority to the promotion and protection of the rights of the child, of persons with disabilities, and of migrants and refugees, and to the promotion of ethnic and religious tolerance, and the protection of minorities. It commended Bulgaria for having ratified the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and its Optional Protocol.

628. Greece noted with appreciation the progress made by Bulgaria in enhancing the existing solid institutional framework for the protection of human rights, and in promoting

equal opportunities for men and women. It welcomed the State's efforts to strengthen the national council on gender equality and to raise awareness about domestic violence. It was confident that Bulgaria would establish working groups for the follow-up on the recommendations, as was done during the first review.

629. Iraq welcomed the acceptance by Bulgaria of most of the recommendations made during the review, including those made by Iraq. It commended the State for its efforts to achieve gender equality, reduce poverty, protect the rights of children, achieve religious tolerance, and combat hate speech and violence.

630. Kyrgyzstan appreciated the efforts made by Bulgaria to implement its human rights obligations, including through the institutional and legislative framework for the promotion and protection of human rights. It referred to the continued commitment of Bulgaria to promote fundamental freedoms and rights by having created the national coordination mechanism for human rights.

631. Romania referred to the commitment of Bulgaria to uphold human rights standards, as shown through its adoption of legislation and its updating of the institutional framework. It noted with appreciation the holistic approach taken by Bulgaria to fulfil its human rights obligations.

632. Rwanda commended Bulgaria for its efforts to protect and promote human rights, improve democratic elections and respect the freedom of assembly. It welcomed the State's accession of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the establishment of the national coordination mechanism for human rights.

633. Sierra Leone commended Bulgaria for its consistent engagement with the universal periodic review process. In 2013, the State had submitted a voluntary midterm report, which had highlighted its progress in strengthening the institutional and legislative framework for human rights. It commended Bulgaria for its reform of the judiciary and its anti-trafficking measures. Sierra Leone encouraged the State to implement effectively policies on violence against minorities, to intensify efforts to combat gender stereotypes and to promote gender equality.

634. The Sudan commended Bulgaria for its positive engagement in the universal periodic review. It noted with appreciation that Bulgaria had supported the recommendations made by the Sudan.

635. Tajikistan noted with satisfaction the efforts of Bulgaria to improve the judicial system and to introduce new human rights mechanisms and to strengthen existing ones. It referred to the commitment of Bulgaria to expand its human rights obligations by acceding to a number of international treaties.

636. Turkmenistan noted with satisfaction that Bulgaria had supported its recommendations. It appreciated the State's active cooperation with various human rights bodies of the United Nations, including the Human Rights Council.

637. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela referred to the progress made by Bulgaria in improving its legislative framework on domestic and gender-based violence in order to protect victims of violence. It appreciated the State's efforts to protect and promote human rights despite the challenges of the economic crisis.

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

638. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Bulgaria, three other stakeholders made statements.

639. Action Canada for Population and Development commended Bulgaria for its acceptance of all the recommendations on adopting legislation on gender equality and urged the State to enact and implement the relevant legislation. It called upon Bulgaria to classify all forms of violence within the family as criminal offences and to ratify the Istanbul Convention. It regretted the absence of recommendations relating to the high pregnancy rates among adolescents and young people, the overreliance on abortions as a family planning method and the need to include comprehensive sexuality education in

school curricula. It called upon Bulgaria to address those issues and to consult and collaborate with local non-governmental organizations in that process.

640. Amnesty International was concerned about the fact that legislation and practice relating to hate crimes fell short of international human rights standards. Its research showed that the criminal justice system failed to ensure a thorough investigation and prosecution of hate crimes. The Criminal Code did not protect against hate crimes based on disability, sexual orientation or gender identity, and the process of revising the Criminal Code had stalled since July 2014. Despite some progress, serious gaps remained in the asylum system, including inadequate conditions in reception centres. Several measures had been taken to control the flow of refugees and migrants, and numerous instances of illegal pushbacks had been documented. It urged Bulgaria to halt the unlawful pushback of migrants and refugees and to investigate all such allegations. It called upon Bulgaria to implement the national integration strategy for refugees and to ensure that people in need of international protection were guaranteed an adequate standard of living and access to health care, education and other public services.

641. Allied Rainbow Communities International commended Bulgaria for the important steps it had taken to implement the recommendations from the first review on the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. It highlighted a few issues that needed to be taken into consideration to improve laws and policies. For example, there had been no significant development of measures to overcome the continuing discriminatory patterns against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. The efforts to overcome the stereotypical attitudes towards the roles of men and women and gender inequality remained unsatisfactory. It was problematic that there was no gender recognition legislation. Hate crimes based on sexual orientation and gender identity must be included in the Penal Code, and sexual orientation and gender identity or expression needed to be included as a qualifying circumstance.

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

642. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 182 recommendations received, Bulgaria had supported 174 recommendations and noted 8.

643. In conclusion, the delegation of Bulgaria thanked all the participants in the review and stated that the Government would give due consideration to all the issues raised by the participants. The Government would work to enhance its administrative capacity in order to implement effectively the recommendations it had accepted. The delegation conveyed the assurances of the Government that it would increase the participation of stakeholders, including non-governmental organizations, in the follow-up process. Bulgaria would maintain its commitment to fulfil its international human rights obligations. The universal periodic review process was an essential part of that endeavour.

#### Honduras

644. The review of Honduras was held on 8 May 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 Honduras 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.6/22/HND/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.6/22/HND/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.6/22/HND/3).

645. At its 26th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Honduras (see section C below).



646. The outcome of the review of Honduras comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/11), 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.

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

647. The head of the delegation of Honduras stated that Honduras was participating in the session of the Human Rights Council on the occasion of the adoption of the outcome of its universal periodic review. The State was committed to reporting on its progress and the challenges it faced in the field of human rights.

648. During the second review, Honduras had received 152 recommendations, none of which had been rejected. It had accepted 92 per cent of those recommendations. The remaining 8 per cent were still being considered and had thus been noted.

649. Most of the recommendations noted, namely the recommendations contained in paragraphs 126.1–126.12 of the outcome of the review, were on ratifying international instruments and reforming the Constitution or domestic legislation, which required broader consultations and national debate.

650. The delegation reiterated the State's commitment to incorporate all of the accepted recommendations into the public policy and national human rights action plan and to promote their implementation through the appropriate mechanisms. The delegation provided an update on the progress made so far.

651. Honduras continued to show its openness to cooperating with the special procedures. The delegation referred to the visit of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples in November and to the visit of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of internally displaced persons, which would take place before the end of the year.

652. In line with the recommendation contained in paragraph 124.15 of the outcome of the review, Honduras had submitted in 2015 four reports to the treaty bodies, thereby fulfilling all of the reporting obligations that had been pending.

653. In relation to the recommendations on harmonizing domestic legislation with, and adhering to, international human rights instruments, contained in paragraphs 124.1 and 125.1 of the outcome of the review, Honduras had incorporated crimes against humanity, genocide and war crimes into the new draft Criminal Code, in line with the Rome Statute.

654. With regard to the recommendation on establishing an OHCHR country office, contained in paragraph 124.14 of the outcome of the review, an exploratory mission had recently taken place, with the expectation that operations would begin in late 2015 or early 2016. Honduras thanked the States that had made contributions to enable the establishment of the Office, hoping that it would assist the country in enhancing the capacities of existing institutions.

655. Regarding the recommendation contained in paragraph 125.45 of the outcome of the review, the police investigations directive within the Secretariat (Ministry) for Security had been functioning since 4 September and the necessary human, financial and logistic resources had been allocated thereto.

656. Regarding the recommendation contained in paragraph 125.44 of the outcome of the review, since the second review, 6,037 persons, among them members of the armed forces, public servants and persons deprived of their liberty, had been provided with human rights training.

657. With regard to the issue of trafficking and sexual exploitation, and consistent with the recommendations contained in paragraphs 125.22 and 125.23 of the outcome of the review, 23 victims had been rescued and more than 10 traffickers had been punished in accordance with the law that year. A cooperation agreement between the Ministry for Development and Social Inclusion and the commission against trafficking had also been signed with a view to having victims included in the social protection system.

658. With regard to the recommendations contained in paragraphs 125.47, 125.48, 125.50, 125.51–125.54 and 125.56–125.60 of the outcome of the review, the law on the protection of human rights defenders, journalists, the media and justice officials had come into force in May 2015. Through that law, the State recognized the right of everyone, individually or collectively, to defend, promote, protect and fulfil human rights, as well as the obligation of the State to respect human rights defenders and to reasonably prevent threats, harassment and attacks that could be generated against them, regardless of whether those threats came from State or private institutions.

659. As part of that law, the national protection system had been established. Two cases of human rights defenders had already been dealt with through that mechanism.

660. The process of elaborating the regulations of that law had also been initiated and, following requests from various national and international human rights organizations, had been extended to promote and encourage the greater participation of organizations and sectors protected by that law.

661. Human rights organizations had recently elected their representatives to the national protection council. A total of 10 million lempiras had been allocated from the national budget in order to guarantee its sustainability.

662. In addition, on 22 September, during the current session of the Human Rights Council, Honduras had joined a group of countries supporting a declaration to condemn acts of intimidation or reprisals against human rights defenders.

663. Regarding the human rights of persons deprived of their liberty and relating to the recommendations contained in paragraphs 124.22 and 124.23 of the outcome of the review, Honduras had increased the budget for 2016 for the national penitentiary institute, and the concept for a national penitentiary academy had been defined.

664. With regard to the recommendations contained in paragraphs 125.8 and 125.9 of the outcome of the review, Honduras had established the “Consular y Migratorio de Honduras” to monitor human rights. A comprehensive system to monitor and evaluate the public policy and national human rights action plan with indicators would also be established and assistance from OHCHR had already been requested.

665. The President of the national institute for women highlighted the progress made with regard to the recommendations on gender-based violence, contained in paragraphs 124.9, 124.27, 124.29–124.31, 124.33, 124.35, 124.46 and 125.12–125.14 of the outcome of the review.

666. Reference had been made to a project supported by the Inter-American Development Bank called “City Woman”. To be implemented in 2016, the project was aimed at improving women’s lives through their access to the justice system and their inclusion in the social protection system.

667. Honduras was also working on the drafting of a comprehensive law to combat violence against women, with the participation of women’s organizations and feminist organizations.

668. Honduras had reactivated the committee on the implementation of the national plan on violence against women. It was also implementing the second plan on equality and gender equity for 2010–2022 and incorporating a gender perspective in the design, implementation and evaluation of public policies and programmes and the public budget. As of October 2015, a national campaign to combat violence against women, prioritizing the prevention of domestic violence, trafficking and femicide, would also be initiated. Furthermore, efforts were underway to create, within the office of the public prosecutor, a unit on crimes against women.

669. Honduras had continued its efforts to guarantee economic, social and cultural rights and to combat poverty in accordance with the recommendations received during the second review. The Under Secretariat for Development and Social Inclusion would provide information about actions aimed at social inclusion and development to reduce the levels of inequality and poverty.

670. With regard to the recommendations contained in paragraphs 125.70–125.72 of the outcome of the review, a multidimensional poverty index had been designed for three key areas, namely health, education and quality of life, with human rights as guiding principles.

671. Regarding the recommendations contained in paragraphs 125.61 and 125.65 of the outcome of the review, Honduras was implementing the national plan for literacy for 2016–2017, with the goal of reaching 600,000 young people and adults who could not read or write.

672. In line with the recommendations contained in paragraphs 124.20, 124.57, 124.59 and 125.76 of the outcome of the review, and following a broad consultation process and with the support of the United Nations Development Programme, Honduras had adopted a public policy against racism and racial discrimination, and for comprehensive development for indigenous and Afro-Honduran communities.

673. Referring to the recommendations contained in paragraphs 125.19 and 125.77–125.81 of the outcome of the review, Honduras had established the “Consular y Migratorio de Honduras” and the “Alho Voice” help centre to monitor Honduran consular activity in the United States.

674. Honduras continued to implement outreach campaigns to address fully the immigration status of children, young people and adults and to create work opportunities. A centre for returning migrants had recently been opened in Omoa.

675. Regarding employment, and particularly the recommendation contained in paragraph 125.68 of the outcome of the review, Honduras was implementing programmes to include people in the labour market.

676. With regard to the recommendation contained in paragraph 125.26 of the outcome of the review, the Economic and Social Council had drafted a law on labour inspection.

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

677. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Honduras, nine delegations made statements.

678. China welcomed the constructive participation of Honduras in the universal periodic review and the State’s decision to support most of the recommendations it had received. It was pleased that Honduras had supported the recommendations made by China on economic development, increasing labour opportunities, poverty alleviation and raising the standard of living. China encouraged Honduras to gradually implement the recommendations it had supported and called upon the international community to provide the necessary support to Honduras on the basis of consultations with the country.

679. Cuba commended Honduras for the information it had provided. It was pleased that the State had already, during the review, supported the majority of the recommendations, including two recommendations made by Cuba. It invited Honduras to take concrete action, particularly to implement the fundamental law on education and to continue to take measures to address the situation of migrant children.

680. Sierra Leone pointed out that Honduras had implemented 106 recommendations out of a total of 129 recommendations received since 2010, showing the State’s willingness to improve the national human rights framework. It referred to the favourable response of Honduras to recommendations previously made by Sierra Leone, and specifically the recommendation on strengthening normative standards aimed at eliminating domestic violence against women. It recognized the constraints faced by the State in implementing all of the recommendations and the State’s sheer determination to note all of them.

681. UNICEF congratulated Honduras on the adoption of laws and policies aimed at guaranteeing the human rights of children, including the national policy for the prevention of violence against children and young people. It encouraged the State to pursue long-term national financing strategies to retain and expand the coverage of social protection programmes. UNICEF called upon Honduras to reduce the causes of child migration and to ensure the conditions for their dignified reception and reintegration, and it offered the

support of UNICEF. It reaffirmed its commitment to continue to support Honduras in the State's efforts to realize the rights of children, including through the implementation of the recommendations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child and of the universal periodic review.

682. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela highlighted the constructive dialogue that had taken place during the review of Honduras. The State had provided concrete responses to questions raised in a spirit of open cooperation. It underscored the commitment of Honduras, which the State had demonstrated through its acceptance of 92 per cent of the recommendations received. It encouraged Honduras to continue to strengthen its social programmes benefiting the most vulnerable sectors of the population.

683. Algeria thanked Honduras for the additional information the State had provided on the progress it had made in implementing the recommendations. It had taken note of the acceptance by Honduras of almost all of the recommendations, and in particular the acceptance of the two recommendations made by Algeria on continuing the policy to combat violence against children and young people and on implementing the national human rights action plan. Algeria wished Honduras every success in implementing the recommendations.

684. Belgium was concerned about the independence of the judiciary, combating impunity, the protection of women from violence, the freedom of expression, and the protection of journalists and human rights defenders. It commended Honduras for having accepted all of the recommendations made by Belgium. It hoped that the implementation of the recommendations would assist Honduras in improving human rights in the country.

685. Benin welcomed the progress made by Honduras during the past five years, particularly regarding the establishment of a political and institutional framework and the State's cooperation with human rights mechanisms. It recommended that the State continue its efforts to protect vulnerable groups, notably women, children and young adults.

686. Rwanda congratulated Honduras on the adoption of the public policy and national human rights action plan for the period 2013–2022. It welcomed the strengthening of the gender unit of the judiciary and the incorporation of the offence of femicide into the Criminal Code. It acknowledged the State's efforts to bring national legislation into line with international human rights instruments. The progress made in combating impunity for serious crimes and in reducing the homicide rate was a good step by Honduras in protecting human rights.

### 3. General comments made by other stakeholders

687. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Honduras, 10 other stakeholders made statements.<sup>15</sup>

688. Article 19: International Centre against Censorship reported that journalists and media workers had been killed that year in Honduras. In 2015, an association for free speech had issued 170 alerts for different attacks on the freedom of expression. The protection mechanism of the law on the protection of human rights defenders, journalists, the media and justice officials had not entered into force and regulations had not been issued. The law on free expression of 1958 criminalized and censored the work of journalists.

689. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland, also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association, commended Honduras for having accepted recommendations on sexual orientation and gender identity, in particular those on implementing policies and programmes to promote tolerance and non-discrimination and on adopting measures to investigate, prosecute and punish hate crimes against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons. Notwithstanding the will of

<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/30thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

the Government, the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender community continued to be one of the most vulnerable and discriminated groups in Honduras.

690. Franciscans International referred to the situation of communities in Honduras that were affected by exploitative industries. The situation was a matter of life or death. With the general law on mining, the State had declared the usefulness of the exploitation of lands. The impact on indigenous communities had been devastating, and a number of persons defending their land had lost their lives. The situation was also marked by impunity. Indigenous communities had called for the creation of an international commission against impunity in Honduras. Indigenous communities and families, including children, suffered from intimidation and threats. They were left in a situation marked by abandonment by the State. Franciscans International recalled the obligations of Honduras under the Inter-American Court of Human Rights.

691. Amnesty International stated that, in recent years, human rights defenders in Honduras, including peasant and Garifuna leaders, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex activists, justice officials and journalists, had been victims of physical violence, kidnapping and threats in reprisal for their work. It was pleased that Honduras had accepted the recommendations on protecting individuals at risk, including by implementing the new law on the protection of human rights defenders, journalists, the media and justice officials. It was concerned about reports that proposed changes to the Criminal Code could eliminate language that prohibited discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. It urged Honduras to ensure that there was no backslide on the progress made since the State's universal periodic review in 2010.

692. The World Organization against Torture was concerned about the recent adoption by Congress of a law on work for persons deprived of their liberty, which set forth a special regimen for high risk and aggressive prisoners, that had restrictions contrary to the dignified treatment of persons deprived of their liberty and the principle of non-discrimination. It referred to reports of sexual violence and to the fact that abortion continued to be criminalized, without exception. It called upon Honduras to adopt the measures necessary to end impunity in cases of torture and ill-treatment, including by accepting and ratifying mechanisms and instruments that allowed for the review of individual communications.

693. Peace Brigades International Switzerland recognized the importance of the acceptance by Honduras of the universal periodic review recommendations. However, in their daily lives, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons suffered from violence, discrimination, sexual, physical and psychological mistreatment, and exclusion. It referred to hate crimes against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons due to their sexual orientation or gender identity. It also referred to the draft law on the Criminal Code that would eliminate article 321, in which the punishment for discrimination based on sexual or gender identity was codified.

694. The International Service for Human Rights stated that Honduras did not recognize the work carried out by human rights defenders in different areas. There was a clear legal persecution by companies that, with the participation or the omission of the State, undermined the work of human rights defenders. It also referred to various cases that showed human rights violations by the judicial system itself, including cases in which communities had been accused of usurping land. In the current year, the network of human rights defenders had recorded 70 attacks against human rights defenders. The International Service for Human Rights called for the protection of the human rights defenders that were before the United Nations today. It called for respect for the right to defend human rights free from fear and free from reprisals. That call was made on behalf of numerous networks of human rights groups.

695. The Center for Reproductive Rights regretted that Honduras had not supported the recommendations on reproductive health and rights. It was deeply concerned about the lack of access to health services, including with regard to sexual and reproductive rights, without discrimination. It urged the State to amend the current law in order to legalize abortion in cases of rape and to amend its extreme prohibitions on accessing, using and selling emergency contraception. Honduras should pass and implement legislation guaranteeing

women's access to essential reproductive health services, provide information that would enable women to exercise reproductive autonomy and in particular protect their rights to health, life and dignity.

696. The Foodfirst Information and Action Network regretted the lack of recommendations made to Honduras on economic, social and cultural rights, and in particular the right to food, as well as the right to access water, land, seeds and other natural resources. The development model of Honduras was based on the extraction of natural resources, including through the mining industry, the expansion of monocrop agriculture for the production of biofuels and the creation of "model cities", which was contrary to the world view of indigenous peoples, campesinos, the Garifuna and other rural communities.

697. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom was concerned about the increase in violence against women. It referred to cases of domestic violence and impunity. Despite the fact that femicide had been criminalized, there was no institution to implement the legislation. Although there were investigative bodies, there were no specialized units to address femicide. Institutions were weak and resources were limited. Organizations called upon Honduras to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, to meet its promise to the feminist movement and fulfil its obligations under the ILO Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189).

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

698. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 152 recommendations received, Honduras had supported 140 recommendations and noted 12.

699. In conclusion, the delegation thanked the delegations and civil society organizations for their participation in the universal periodic review of Honduras. The State would, in due time, submit a midterm report on the progress it had made in implementing the recommendations.

700. The delegation stated that the country needed Hondurans to become united in an unconditional, open and transparent dialogue to build the Honduras that everyone aspired it to be.

#### **Liberia**

701. The review of Liberia was held on 4 May 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 Liberia 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.6/22/LBR/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.6/22/LBR/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.6/22/LBR/3).

702. At its 27th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Liberia (see section C below).

703. The outcome of the review of Liberia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/4), 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/30/4/Add.1).

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

704. The delegation of Liberia stated that its Constitution of 1847 guaranteed equality before the law, the right to work and freedom of expression and assembly, among other rights. Liberia had been in the vanguard of the promotion and protection of human rights for over 168 years.

705. The universal periodic review process provided an opportunity to demonstrate to the Human Rights Council and the international community that, notwithstanding the difficulties it faced, Liberia was unwavering in its commitment to the international human rights treaties.

706. Liberia had accepted a number of the recommendations it had received during the first review. Over the past five years, it had fully implemented many of those recommendations, while it had made significant progress on others.

707. Liberia had just come through its greatest crisis since the end of its 14-year civil conflict in 2003. In fact, in early 2014, it was engulfed in a fight against the Ebola virus, to which over 4,000 Liberians and foreign residents had succumbed. The crisis had consumed a great deal of the State's resources and devastated the economy, thereby posing a challenge to the speedy implementation of the State's human rights agenda.

708. Through the strong leadership of the President, the resilience of the people of Liberia, and the support of the United Nations and the State's international partners, Liberia had been declared free of the Ebola virus. However, owing to the porosity of its borders and the free movement of people, Liberia was at risk as long as the virus remained in neighbouring countries.

709. Despite challenges, Liberia was steadfast in its determination to participate in the universal periodic review process. In July 2015, a two-day consultative workshop had been held in Liberia, bringing together more than 50 representatives from government ministries and agencies, the Independent National Commission on Human Rights, and civil society organizations. Based on the views expressed during the workshop and taking into consideration the feasibility of implementation given the political, economic, social and cultural climate in Liberia, out of the 186 recommendations received during the second review, 147 had enjoyed the support of Liberia. The remaining 39 recommendations had been noted. However, even where Liberia had noted a recommendation, it did not mean that the recommendation had not enjoyed any support. It meant, rather, that the Government of Liberia was not able at that time to commit to the practical implementation of such a recommendation. Nonetheless, all of the recommendations received during the review had been incorporated into the State's National Human Rights Action Plan, with the noted recommendations included as aspirational provisions of the action plan.

710. Liberia had accepted the recommendations on its international treaty obligations, including those on domestication, harmonization and reporting to the treaty bodies. Liberia had favourably considered the ratification of additional human rights instruments. However, because ratification not only represented a significant financial undertaking, but also had political, social and cultural implications, Liberia would move cautiously in that regard, while giving priority to the ratification of only those outstanding human rights treaties that would facilitate the consolidation of peace and stability in the country and not frustrate or unravel it.

711. Liberia would continue its efforts towards harmonizing its laws at both the constitutional and statutory levels with the treaties it had ratified. Where legal reform was time-consuming, it would proceed to do so by way of executive orders, regulations and policies as appropriate, in order to facilitate the speedy implementation of its human rights obligations.

712. Subsequent to the submission of the national report, and while the recommendations were under consideration, the Constitution Review Committee, established by the President to review the Constitution of 1986 with a view to recommending amendments that could help to improve the governance of the country and to protect human rights, submitted to the

President 25 proposals for amendments to the Constitution, including on the right to a nationality.

713. Regarding equality, the Constitution Review Committee proposed that respect for and recognition of persons with disabilities be enshrined in the Constitution and that education and job opportunities be accorded to them.

714. Regarding women's rights, the Committee advanced three proposals: first, that the Constitution ensure women's participation in governance and national affairs; second, that women have access to equal economic and social opportunities, and third, that the Constitution guarantee inheritance rights for women. Those recommendations would be submitted to a referendum.

715. Liberia had finalized a national strategy on its treaty obligations and a draft common core document, which would allow Liberia to make significant progress in addressing its treaty reporting obligations consistent with the recommendation made.

716. The State recognized the critical role that the special procedures could play in strengthening the engagement between Member States and the Human Rights Council in furthering human rights. Accordingly, and to implement the recommendations it had received during the first and second universal periodic reviews, Liberia had extended a standing invitation to the special procedure mandate holders. It looked forward to constructive engagement with all of the special procedures in order to strengthen the promotion and protection of human rights.

717. Liberia had accepted most of the recommendations on the rights of women and children, including those on eliminating sexual and gender-based violence. The State was committed to eradicating discrimination and to realizing the right to equal protection of the laws as enshrined in the Constitution. In addition to the proposals relating to constitutional amendments, Liberia would strengthen prosecutorial services relating to sexual and gender-based violence in the three regional hubs and give favourable consideration to establishing sexual and gender-based violence courts in all 15 judicial circuits, as provided for under the statute creating Criminal Court E for sexual and gender-based violence.

718. Regarding the recommendations on adopting a law explicitly prohibiting female genital mutilation and harmful traditional practices, Liberia reiterated its position that it was opposed to those practices, and to early marriage and trial by ordeal. It had therefore accepted all of the recommendations on that subject and was taking steps to address the challenges it faced. Thus, in August 2015, while the universal periodic review recommendations were under consideration, a draft domestic violence act, which partially criminalized female genital mutilation and other harmful practices, had been submitted to the legislature. If adopted, the act would prohibit female genital mutilation from being performed on children under 18 years of age, and on women 18 years or older who did not consent to the practice. Liberia would continue to strengthen efforts to combat sexual and gender-based violence through further comprehensive legislation to prohibit and criminalize female genital mutilation and all harmful traditional practices and through the strengthening of institutional capacities. It would also strengthen alternative measures to reduce female genital mutilation and traditional harmful practices, for example, by raising awareness about the harmful effects of such practices, especially on the future of girls, and by providing alternative livelihoods for traditional practitioners.

719. Liberia had also accepted the recommendations on the administration of justice and the rule of law, considering that no foundation for peace and stability could be laid without respect for the rule of law. In December 2014, the Security Council had resolved that the Government of Liberia should, by 30 June 2016, fully assume responsibility for the security architecture of Liberia from the United Nations Mission in Liberia, which had been in the State since 2003. In that regard, Liberia had developed a plan for the transition with a human rights-based approach, which was being implemented in close collaboration with the United Nations and international partners. Through the transition plan, Liberia would strengthen capacity in the justice and security sectors, expand the scope and breadth of existing services, especially in the area of pretrial detentions and gender-based violence, and address outstanding challenges that were a threat to the effective administration of justice.



720. Liberia had, however, chosen to note some recommendations that had presented significant political, economic, social and cultural challenges and had thus been considered unfeasible to implement in the short term. For instance, Liberia was not opposed to the abolition of the death penalty in principle, as evidenced by the fact that it had not carried out a single execution since the reintroduction of the death penalty in 2005. However, the State was inclined to maintain its position of “abolitionist by practice” so it would serve as a deterrent for conduct that posed a threat to the consolidation of peace and security in Liberia. It had therefore accepted the recommendations on maintaining the de facto moratorium with a view to a consideration of de jure abolition.

721. The Government had also noted the recommendations on the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons. While the Constitution of Liberia prohibited discrimination and protected the fundamental rights and freedoms of all persons within its borders without distinction on the basis of sexual orientation, the State would like to tread cautiously in that area until there had been adequate public discourse, sensitization and awareness on the need to protect those rights.

722. Liberia had accepted the recommendations on revising the immigration and nationality law. However, article 28 of the Constitution of 1986 already provided for the right of Liberian women to transmit their nationality to their children on an equal basis with Liberian men. The Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization had begun to draft a new alien and nationality law consistent with the Constitution and obligations undertaken to reform the nationality laws in order to prevent statelessness in Liberia.

723. In closing, the delegation thanked the Human Rights Council, OHCHR, the Member States that had made recommendations and the non-governmental organizations that had made comments. Liberia remained committed to integrating a human rights-based approach as a foundational measure for sustaining peace, democracy and the rule of law.

724. Liberia also acknowledged the support and technical advice offered by the Human Rights and Protection Section of the United Nations Mission in Liberia, and by United Nations agencies and other international partners.

725. The recommendations made during the second universal periodic review had had a significant influence, as they informed the State’s strategies and priorities. Liberia looked forward to implementing the recommendations it had accepted and to working closely with the Human Rights Council, the special procedure mandate holders and other partners to strengthen compliance with its international human rights obligations.

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

726. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Liberia, 15 delegations made statements.

727. Libya congratulated Liberia on its active participation in the universal periodic review and its commitment to human rights. It welcomed the positive developments, including the launching of a holistic long-term strategy starting in 2012, which was aimed at promoting a range of sectors and improving national development. Libya was pleased that Liberia had accepted most of the recommendations it had received, which demonstrated its engagement with the universal periodic review and its willingness to pursue its human rights agenda.

728. Sierra Leone commended Liberia for its efforts to comprehensively integrate human rights standards into the national legal framework and policies. In particular, it noted with appreciation the work carried out by the Constitution Review Committee. It referred to the challenges still faced by Liberia relating to the Ebola epidemic. It encouraged the international community to support the ongoing efforts to rebuild the State’s health-care system and to provide further assistance for the rehabilitation and reintegration of survivors and orphans. Regarding gender violence, Sierra Leone hoped that more could be done to implement comprehensive strategies aimed at preventing and eliminating child rape.

729. Togo welcomed the cooperation of Liberia with the universal periodic review and the progress it had made since its first review. It was pleased that Liberia had accepted most

of the recommendations from its second review and invited the international community to offer it support in implementing the recommendations.

730. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela pointed out that Liberia had frankly referred to the challenges it faced in implementing human rights in the country. The conflict and the Ebola epidemic had had negative effects on the State's capacity to progress in terms of development. However, Liberia had made efforts to fulfil its human rights commitments through its ratification of several international instruments and its submission of reports to the treaty bodies. Based on genuine dialogue and cooperation, the universal periodic review should contribute to enabling Liberia to surmount the crisis. It urged the international community to provide the State with all of the assistance it required.

731. Angola congratulated Liberia on having accepted most of the recommendations received. It supported the State's commitment to human rights, in particular its ratification of regional and international instruments and its submission of human rights reports. It acknowledged the challenges faced by Liberia in guaranteeing access to justice and it encouraged the State's efforts to create regional centres of justice and security. It also encouraged Liberia to pursue its peace and reconciliation strategy and continue to make progress in terms of justice, health and education for vulnerable groups.

732. Rwanda acknowledged the intensive efforts made by Liberia to fight against the Ebola virus and it was pleased that the State had supported many of the recommendations. It encouraged Liberia to continue its efforts aimed at the abolishment of the death penalty and at the total eradication of female genital mutilation.

733. Benin welcomed the efforts made by Liberia in the area of human rights and in eradicating the Ebola virus. It invited the international community to provide Liberia with the assistance necessary to realize human rights, fight poverty, and achieve economic and social development. It urged the State to pursue the implementation of the universal periodic review recommendations.

734. Botswana commended Liberia for the implementation of a number of policies, including the strategic road map for national healing, peacebuilding and reconciliation, and the economic stabilization and recovery plan, which was aimed at improving health-care infrastructure, education and social welfare. It noted with appreciation the measures taken to address gender-based violence and harmful practices against women. It encouraged Liberia to ensure the full implementation of those laws.

735. China congratulated Liberia for having put an end to the Ebola outbreak. It appreciated the State's participation in the universal periodic review and its support for the recommendations made by China on taking effective measures to protect vulnerable groups, especially to combat violence against women and children, and on strengthening judicial and law enforcement institutions and eliminating corruption. The Ebola outbreak had had a negative impact on economic and social development and had created further challenges in the promotion and protection of human rights. China called upon the international community to provide Liberia with technical assistance and capacity-building.

736. The Congo commended Liberia for its excellent cooperation with the universal periodic review mechanism and for its efforts to address a number of challenges that had arisen from a long period of conflict and the Ebola epidemic. It encouraged Liberia to implement the recommendations from the universal periodic review.

737. Cuba stated that the Ebola epidemic had had a negative impact on the development of Liberia during recent times despite the international assistance the State had received, including from Cuba in the health sector. It reiterated that it was necessary for the international community, in particular developed countries, to increase cooperation with and financial assistance to Liberia and especially to strengthen health infrastructure. Cuba thanked Liberia for having supported its recommendations on health and economic and social rights.

738. Djibouti welcomed the efforts made by Liberia to promote and protect human rights, including through the improvement of living conditions, which had been negatively affected during the Ebola crisis. It encouraged Liberia to continue its effort to consolidate

the rule of law through peacebuilding and reconciliation, on the basis of the establishment of a national truth, reconciliation and justice commission.

739. Ethiopia acknowledged the continuing engagement of Liberia with the Human Rights Council mechanisms. It appreciated the State's acceptance of many of the recommendations. It commended Liberia for having launched a long-term comprehensive strategy for development and for its actions relating to peacebuilding and reconciliation. Ethiopia also noted with satisfaction the State's commitment to promote and protect human rights by providing a wide coverage of social services, especially health care and education.

740. Gabon congratulated Liberia on its commitment to implement the recommendations from the second universal periodic review. It referred to the many difficulties caused by the Ebola epidemic, and the notable actions taken by Liberia to improve the human rights situation, including with regard to the legal and institutional framework. It encouraged Liberia to implement the recommendations from the universal periodic review.

741. Ghana stated that it would support the efforts of Liberia to implement the recommendations from the universal periodic review. The presence of the delegation of Liberia was a reminder of the dark days of the civil war but it was also a reassurance of how far the resilient people of Liberia had come. Ghana urged Liberia to join the Group of Friends of the Responsibility to Protect in order to promote a better understanding of the "never again" moment captured in the Charter of the United Nations, and to say enough to war in the region and in the world.

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

742. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Liberia, three other stakeholders made statements.

743. The International Lesbian and Gay Association regretted the lack of support by Liberia for recommendations on issues relating to sexual orientation and gender identity. According to the Association, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons in Liberia continued to be subject to human rights abuses such as harassment, physical attacks, verbal abuse, hate crimes, religious intolerance, negative media expression and family rejection. The Penal Code criminalized "voluntary sodomy" by same-sex couples, and the State lacked legal provisions to combat hate crimes and incidents against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons, who also faced obstacles in accessing basic services, particularly health services, and remained stigmatized and discriminated against.

744. Amnesty International appreciated the efforts of Liberia to uphold human rights in spite of the challenges arising from the Ebola outbreak. However, despite policy reform and other positive initiatives, it was concerned about shortcomings in the justice sector. It urged Liberia to improve detention conditions, so they were in line with international standards, and to use pretrial detention as a measure of last resort. It was also concerned about deficiencies in the judicial system that had led to impunity for sexual and gender-based violence. Amnesty International reiterated its call on the State to increase resources for, and improve coordination and cooperation with, the justice system for cases of gender-based violence. It also called upon Liberia to accelerate the ratification of the Optional Protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child and to abolish the death penalty immediately.

745. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme congratulated Liberia on having achieved positive results in the fight against the Ebola virus, and for the progress it had made in the area of human rights since its first universal periodic review. It referred to the establishment of a national human rights commission and supported the actions taken to implement the "palava hut" programme for peacebuilding and reconciliation in the country. It was concerned about the increase in unemployment rates among young people and about violence against women and children. It hoped that the current constitutional reforms would contribute to the abolishment of the death penalty and the elimination of discrimination against women and the recruitment of children in the military. It invited Liberia to pay further attention to inequalities in health services and to protecting survivors of the Ebola epidemic. It requested the international community to support Liberia in its plan for stabilization and economic recovery, to re-establish its health infrastructure and to rebuild the economy affected by the Ebola virus.

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

746. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 186 recommendations received, Liberia had supported 147 recommendations and noted 39.

747. The delegation of Liberia expressed its appreciation for and thanked Member States, the Human Rights Council, non-governmental organizations and all those who had contributed to the universal periodic review process for their comments and support. It had taken note of comments received and would continue to increase efforts to implement the recommendations despite challenges and difficulties. The recommendations that had been noted would also inspire the national human rights plan.

##### Marshall Islands

748. The review of the Marshall Islands was held on 11 May 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 Marshall Islands 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.6/22/MHL/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.6/22/MHL/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.6/22/MHL/3).

749. At its 27th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the Marshall Islands (see section C below).

750. The outcome of the review of the Marshall Islands comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/13), 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/30/13/Add.1 and Corr.1).

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

751. The Marshall Islands was grateful to OHCHR, the Human Rights Council, the Working Group, the Regional Rights Resource Team of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat and its bilateral partners for having allowed and having prepared the State to take part in the universal periodic review process.

752. The Marshall Islands was pleased to submit its responses to the recommendations made in the universal periodic review. Given its limited resources to ensure the proper implementation of the recommendations, the Government of the Marshall Islands once again called upon the international community to provide assistance in that regard.

753. Regarding the ratification of human rights treaties, the Marshall Islands had accepted the recommendations on ratifying or acceding to the core human rights instruments and the respective optional protocols and on analysing and developing strategies to do so as endorsed by its Cabinet in May 2015.

754. The Marshall Islands had accepted the recommendations on strengthening the promotion of human rights activities and would continue to work with various non-governmental organizations in that regard. It had also accepted the recommendations on developing socioeconomic strategies and plans.

755. In addition, the Marshall Islands had accepted the recommendations on further reviewing its laws so as to be in conformity with international human rights standards and

its Constitution. While some gaps might exist, they would naturally be addressed over an extended period of time as part of the implementation process.

756. The Marshall Islands had accepted the recommendations on addressing women's rights, domestic violence and other issues affecting women. It recognized that adequate progress towards basic national development, as well as the achievement of wider regional and global goals, would not happen without addressing the social and economic contribution of women.

757. The Marshall Islands had accepted the recommendations on implementing children's rights in order to improve the situation of children in the country and the recommendations on continuing to take steps to address the needs of persons with disabilities.

758. The Marshall Islands had accepted the recommendations on, and recognized the need for, strengthening progress in education and health. Although it had made progress towards gender parity in education, that had not resulted in economic outcomes for women and girls. Furthermore, while the State had been able to strengthen prenatal and postnatal programmes, and to increase its emphasis on preventative care in order to ensure that women could continue to have safe pregnancies and births, the Marshall Islands had the highest teenage pregnancy rate and second-youngest population in the Pacific.

759. As a nation affected by climate change, the Marshall Islands had accepted the recommendations on addressing climate change and would continue to advocate for human rights issues relating to the impacts of climate change. It recognized the need to implement measures to build resilience, reduce disaster risk, and support renewable energy and energy efficiency, and other adaptation measures. On 24 September 2015, the President had signed a proclamation on a state of disaster, as the communities in the atolls of the Marshall Islands affected by Typhoon Nangka had been overwhelmed with the challenges resulting from persisting strong winds, storm surges and inundation and were facing damage to coastal infrastructure, both private and public, and economic hardship. As the saying in the Pacific goes, "We are not drowning, we are fighting."

760. The Marshall Islands had accepted the recommendations and emphasized the report of the Special Rapporteur on the implications for human rights of the environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes on his visit to the country in March 2012 and to the United States in April 2012 "to assess the impact on human rights of the nuclear testing programme conducted in the Marshall Islands by the United States from 1946 to 1958".

761. Last but not the least, the Marshall Islands referred to the importance of establishing a national human rights institution. However, at the present time it was not considering such an establishment owing to limited resources. Overall, as with the promotion of human rights, the Government continued to work with various non-governmental organizations, particularly Women United Together Marshall Islands.

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

762. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Marshall Islands, seven delegations made statements.

763. China thanked the Marshall Islands for its constructive participation in the universal periodic review and welcomed the State's positive response to the recommendations made during the review. It thanked the Marshall Islands for having accepted its recommendation on improving public infrastructure and water sanitation so as to ensure adequate living standards for its people despite the effects of climate change, and for having responded rapidly with the assistance of the international community.

764. Cuba was grateful to the small island developing State, which had suffered the negative effects of nuclear testing and of climate change, for having accepted the two recommendations made by Cuba. The progress the State had made in human rights should be emphasized, and of particular note was the State's interest in implementing the recommendations accepted during the first universal periodic review. Cuba reiterated its call for the international community to support the Marshall Islands in the areas mentioned

by the State in its national report. It wished the Marshall Islands every success in the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted in the second universal periodic review.

765. Fiji thanked and commended the Marshall Islands for its constructive engagement with the universal periodic review process. Fiji was located in the same region and understood the challenges of a small island developing State with resource constraints and many extraneous challenges to development. Accordingly, the efforts of the Marshall Islands to ensure that human rights were addressed through an institutional structure most appropriate for the size and situation of the country were appreciated. It thanked the Marshall Islands for having positively considered the recommendations Fiji had made. The national gender policy and gender-responsive budgeting and planning were useful tools to ensure the mainstreaming of a gender perspective on human rights. Fiji would continue to work in partnership with the Marshall Islands on climate change advocacy and in learning from best practices for training on the impacts of climate change on human rights.

766. The Philippines welcomed the presentation of updates and the responses to the recommendations the Marshall Islands had received during its second universal periodic review. With the resource constraints of the Marshall Islands, its acceptance of a large number of recommendations left no doubt about its strong commitment to the promotion, protection and fulfilment of the human rights of its people. As a fellow climate-vulnerable country, the Philippines appreciated the continuing adherence of the Marshall Islands to a human rights-based approach in addressing the adverse impact of climate change on the full and effective enjoyment of human rights. The Philippines looked forward to its continuing partnership with the Marshall Islands in that regard. It also looked forward to the reinforced cooperation and active engagement of the Marshall Islands with its bilateral, regional and international partners in the implementation of the recommendations from the second universal periodic review.

767. Sierra Leone commended the Marshall Islands for its efforts to incorporate human rights into national legislation and for its willingness to seek international assistance and technical support to meet its commitments. In spite of its limited resources, the Marshall Islands had in recent years sought to adopt a series of normative standards, which demonstrated its commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Sierra Leone referred to, with particular interest, the national strategic plan for 2015–2017, the national policy on disability-inclusive development, the human rights commission bill and the child protection bill. It hoped the two bills would be adopted into national law and policies in the foreseeable future. It believed that serious consideration should again be given to the impact climate change had on the region and therefore the capacity of the Marshall Islands to implement human rights norms, especially as it was a small island developing State subject to specific geographical sensitivities. Nonetheless, it hoped the recommendations it had made to the Marshall Islands, including those on abolishing child marriage, had enjoyed the support of the State, with the possibility that they would be incorporated into future national human rights strategies.

768. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela stated that, despite major challenges such as the economic crisis and climate change, the Marshall Islands had made noteworthy efforts to implement the recommendations it had accepted in the universal periodic review. The State had undertaken major legislative reforms to bring its laws into line with international standards and it had made significant progress in terms of policy for protecting women's rights. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela recognized the political will of the Marshall Islands to honour its human rights commitments. It encouraged the State to continue to strengthen social policy in terms of the most vulnerable groups with the support of the international community.

769. Rwanda welcomed the delegation of the Marshall Islands and thanked the State for its participation in the universal periodic review. It acknowledged the continued commitment of the Marshall Islands to human rights and to strengthening the laws protecting human rights. It congratulated the Marshall Islands on having ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. It welcomed the measures the State had taken to combat gender-based violence and to protect the rights of children. It wished the Marshall Islands every success in implementing the recommendations it had accepted.

### 3. General comments made by other stakeholders

770. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Marshall Islands, two other stakeholders made statements.

771. United Nations Watch stressed that, according to the annual human rights survey conducted by Freedom House, the Marshall Islands had received the highest possible rankings in terms of the measures on freedom, civil liberties and political rights. That was worthy of sincere congratulations. At the same time, United Nations Watch encouraged the Marshall Islands to take further actions to strengthen the protection of human rights, particularly in the fields of the rights of women and children, and non-discrimination relating to sexual orientation and gender identity and persons with disabilities. In addition, it encouraged the Marshall Islands to take measures to increase the participation and representation of women in political life. Respect for human rights and the founding principles of the Charter of the United Nations were demonstrated not only by a State's domestic policies and practices, but also by the degree to which it supported the promotion and protection of human rights in the international arena. In that regard, the Marshall Islands had an exemplary record in its voting at the General Assembly. Where others might go along to get along, the Marshall Islands had taken firm and principled positions in support of peace, human rights, and the equality principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and in noble opposition to selectivity, polarization, demonization, politicization and double standards. Due to its small size and budget, the Marshall Islands had a delegation only in New York but none in Geneva. United Nations Watch was concerned that a State Member of the United Nations was effectively being 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.

772. The World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace was aware of the unique challenges relating to the history of the resilient nation of the Marshall Islands regarding human rights. The right of self-determination was the most significant pursuit of the people of the Marshall Islands. The process of demilitarization and decolonization was significant and its legacy continued to impact the ability of the Marshall Islands to guarantee civil liberties, human rights and fundamental freedoms. There had been 67 atmospheric detonations of nuclear bombs on the nation of atolls for over a decade after the conclusion of the Second World War. While the bombs had stopped, the symptoms of sickness continued to haunt economic, social and cultural rights, specifically the right to health. The Marshall Islands was a State Member of the United Nations but had also entered into the Compact of Free Association with the United States. The World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace believed that the human rights mechanisms of the Human Rights Council, and specifically the special procedures, could contribute to the promotion and protection of human rights. It applauded the visit in 2012 of the Special Rapporteur on the implications for human rights of the environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes to investigate the nuclear testing programme. The Marshall Islands should issue a standing invitation to all special procedures. Climate change and human rights should be prioritized. The Marshall Islands should ratify the core human rights treaties, and a national human rights institution should be created to coordinate national plans of action to address the intersectionality of human rights in the islands. Human rights education was absolutely essential, with a focus on climate justice. The scale and intensity of climate change was a crisis in Oceania. Climate change already violated the right to self-determination and impacted even more the right to water, food and health. All States that had posed questions and made recommendations had to protect human rights in the Marshall Islands by committing to 1.5 degrees in Paris. States also had to assist in addressing the impact of climate change harnessing the political will and resources of the international community. The World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace would volunteer to assist in human rights education. It also pledged assistance in creating a national human rights institution. It echoed the voice of Ambassador DeBroom and advocate Kathy Jetnil-Kijiner during the opening of the United Nations Climate Summit in 2014. It stood in solidarity even as the water rose.

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

773. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 111 recommendations received, the Marshall Islands had supported 102 recommendations and noted 9.

774. The delegation of the Marshall Islands thanked all the delegations and non-governmental organizations that had made comments for the universal periodic review. The Marshall Islands would continue to find opportunities and avenues to improve the human rights situation in the country but wished to state that strengthened capacity required the implementation of plans and commitments to promote and protect human rights. Moreover, support from the international community was necessary. The Marshall Islands again thanked OHCHR, the Human Rights Council, the Working Group, the Regional Rights Resource Team of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat and its bilateral partners for their support, which had ensured the meaningful participation of the Marshall Islands in its second universal periodic review.

#### Croatia

775. The review of Croatia was held on 12 May 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 Croatia 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.6/22/HRV/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.6/22/HRV/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.6/22/HRV/3).

776. At its 27th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Croatia (see section C below).

777. The outcome of the review of Croatia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/14), 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/30/14/Add.1).

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

778. The delegation of Croatia, led by Vesna Batistić Kos, the Permanent Representative of Croatia to the United Nations Office at Geneva, was pleased to present the State's position on the recommendations received during the second review. It was an opportunity for Croatia to show the continuity of its policies in the field of the protection and promotion of human rights. If elected to the Human Rights Council for the period 2017–2019, Croatia would work with all Member States in the genuine spirit of cooperation and solidarity. It appreciated all of the constructive remarks and recommendations made by States during the interactive dialogue.

779. The Government of Croatia had reviewed carefully and in good will 167 recommendations in close cooperation and through intensive and fruitful consultations with all the relevant actors in Croatia. The State had been able to accept 162 recommendations, of which 6 had been partially accepted but were now fully accepted. Only five recommendations had been noted.

780. The delegation addressed the Human Rights Council on the recommendations received by thematic cluster.



781. The delegation drew attention to the fact that Croatia was a party to almost all of the international human rights treaties, without reservations to any of their provisions. With regard to the recommendation on ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, Croatia, as a State member of the European Union, adhered to the common policy on migration and would continue to participate actively in the consideration of the European Union asylum framework. It underlined the particular sensitivity that Croatia attached to the current plight of migrants arriving in Europe. From the beginning of the crisis, about 55,000 people had entered Croatia on their way to final destinations in Europe, and that number was still growing. All arrivals had been taken care of in a humane and dignified manner. Croatia had emphasized that the current situation required a swift but comprehensive response, and it would continue to advocate the importance of addressing the root causes of those overwhelming migrations. Regarding the ratification of the ILO Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189), Croatia considered that its existing legal framework was sufficient and the State was therefore not currently planning to ratify the Convention. In addition, its legislation did not recognize the term “domestic worker”.

782. A review of the alignment of national legislation and practices was ongoing, with a view to making a decision on ratifying the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Preparatory activities relating to the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict were also envisaged, and the ratification of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance was under consideration.

783. Regarding the recommendation on establishing an interministerial committee responsible for international human rights obligations, Croatia used a system where the ministries were the competent State bodies that, in accordance with their jurisdiction, dealt with the implementation of the provisions of human rights conventions.

784. Regarding the legislative and institutional framework, Croatia was proud that, in accordance with the analyses of different human rights mechanisms, it had a solid legal framework. Thus, all related recommendations had been accepted.

785. Croatia had accepted all of the recommendations relating to the issue of discrimination and hate crime and speech. The Criminal Code adopted in 2013 was fully harmonized with modern European criminal laws that distinguished defamation and insult. Furthermore, the amendments passed in 2015 had amended the criminal offence of severe defamation and stipulated more clearly the preconditions for the exclusion of unlawfulness.

786. There had been several recommendations relating to prisons and torture, and Croatia had accepted all of them.

787. Croatia was surprised by the number of recommendations (20) on domestic violence; however, it had accepted all of them. Through a permanent adjustment of the legislative framework (the Gender Equality Act and the national policy on gender equality), specific and targeted measures had already been put in place to combat gender discrimination and gender-based violence effectively. Croatia would continue to implement measures to further increase the proportion of women in decision-making processes. Further action on gender equality and women’s empowerment would include measures to combat widespread gender stereotypes and raise the level of public knowledge on the subject.

788. All of the recommendations on the rights of the child and the rights of persons with disabilities had already been implemented or were in the process of implementation. Croatia traditionally supported all resolutions that focused on the protection of the child, including in armed conflict. Croatia had adopted a new national strategy on the rights of the child for 2014–2020, which included several measures to improve the situation further.

789. Croatia fully recognized the need to strengthen the promotion, protection and monitoring of the rights of persons with disabilities. It had established a modern institutional framework that could respond to their needs and through which their rights could be exercised. Croatia was among a small number of countries that had a special office of the ombudsperson for persons with disabilities.

790. Croatia attached great importance to the protection of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons from discrimination, and to enabling them to enjoy their rights. The Life Partnership Act, adopted in 2014, had introduced civil partnership for same-sex couples, which provided all the rights that married heterosexual couples enjoyed with the exception of the right to adopt children. However, the recommendation on strengthening the accountability and prosecution of law enforcement officers who committed abuses against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons and ethnic minorities had been noted. Since 2007, Croatia had been implementing a system that tracked all hate crimes and, during that period, no law enforcement officers had been recorded as perpetrators of hate-motivated criminal offences or misdemeanours. In addition, since 2006, the Croatian police department had introduced education on hate crimes for police officers at the police academy.

791. Croatia was pleased that it had received only four recommendations on trafficking in persons. That was a significant decrease from the first universal periodic review and, importantly, it was a sign that the State's efforts to combat the phenomenon were effective.

792. Croatia had accepted all of the recommendations on minorities, and those recommendations were currently being implemented. Members of national minorities in Croatia enjoyed the rights prescribed in the Croatian Constitution, in the international instruments that Croatia had adopted and in the laws established for the purpose of their protection. Minorities were guaranteed the right to representation in Parliament and in local self-government units. Regarding the Roma minority, it was important to stress that the national policy on Roma had been in place since 2003 and that Croatia was also one of the founding members of the Decade of Roma Inclusion. Although challenges in numerous areas still existed, the progress made in Roma inclusion could not be disputed. Such progress had been documented particularly in the areas of education and employment.

793. Regarding refugees and returnees, the head of the delegation stated that it was one of those important issues that still existed in society as a consequence of the war. She reiterated that Croatia was fully dedicated to solving all problems relating to the right to adequate housing and other rights of those persons, and that it was cooperating actively within the framework of the regional housing programme. In addition, Croatia had accepted all four recommendations relating to that issue.

794. Croatia had accepted all of the recommendations on war crimes and missing persons. As was clearly shown in the interactive dialogue with the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances the previous week, regional cooperation was the inevitable requirement to resolve the remaining issues relating to missing persons. It was progressing and it should be sped up. An initiative for the preparation of a regional list of missing persons had been started.

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

795. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Croatia, 14 delegations made statements.

796. Benin noted with interest the important measures that Croatia had taken to strengthen the legal framework to protect minorities and vulnerable groups. It commended Croatia for the reforms to its judiciary and to its public prosecutor's office, and the simplification of the procedures concerning youth justice. It encouraged Croatia to ratify the international instruments relating to human rights, to promote equal opportunities and to foster the implementation of the relevant national policies.

797. China welcomed the constructive engagement of Croatia with the universal periodic review mechanism and its decision to accept most of the recommendations. It appreciated the fact that Croatia had accepted the recommendations made by China. The State was continuing its efforts to implement effectively the action plan on the employment of all minority groups in order to achieve its goals. Croatia had also accepted the recommendation on implementing a national immigration policy, had taken measures according to the relevant situation and had made the adjustments necessary to protect the rights of migrants.

798. Côte d'Ivoire thanked Croatia for its replies and the additional information it had provided during the meeting. It commended Croatia for its interest in the recommendations from the review and wished it success in implementing the recommendations it had accepted, as that would contribute effectively to the full enjoyment of human rights. It invited Croatia to further its efforts relating to migration management and the promotion of gender equality, and to work to overcome racial and other prejudices. To conclude, Côte d'Ivoire invited Croatia to pursue fruitful cooperation with the human rights mechanisms.

799. The Council of Europe referred to the recommendations made to Croatia by various monitoring bodies of the Council of Europe, and to three main challenges facing the State. First, there was the need to resolve the human rights issues from the conflict of 1991–1995 and to provide victims with access to justice and effective domestic remedies, including reparations. Second, it urged Croatia to facilitate the naturalization of all stateless Roma and to provide them with access to free legal aid, and to end the segregation and discrimination of Roma children in schools. Third, it called upon Croatia to improve material conditions in prisons, reduce overcrowding and end the physical ill-treatment of prisoners. It invited Croatia to ratify the Istanbul Convention and the Third Additional Protocol to the European Convention on Extradition.

800. Cuba thanked Croatia for the explanation it had provided on its position on the recommendations received within the Working Group. In addition, it thanked Croatia for having accepted the two recommendations made by Cuba on the rights of women and of persons with disabilities. It urged Croatia to implement the recommendations it had accepted as a sign of the State's commitment to the universal periodic review mechanism.

801. Estonia welcomed the measures taken by Croatia to address several crucial challenges raised in the review concerning the institutional set-up, the legislation and the implementation of measures at various levels. It appreciated the State's continued commitment to improve the human rights situation in Croatia further. It referred to the recommendation on ensuring an investigation into all unresolved cases of missing persons and bringing perpetrators to justice.

802. Romania pointed out that the large majority of the recommendations received by Croatia during the session of the Working Group and those made by Romania had been accepted. It was pleased that its recommendations were already being implemented. It noted with satisfaction the voluntary commitment by Croatia to provide an update for the second universal review through its midterm report.

803. Rwanda commended Croatia for its commitment to promote human rights and it welcomed the positive steps the State had taken to promote inclusive education. It encouraged Croatia to consider ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

804. Serbia was pleased that Croatia had accepted its recommendations. However, it was concerned about the deterioration in Croatia of the human rights situation of the Serbian minority; for example, the Vukovar City Council had decided to ban the use of the Cyrillic script in an area where Serbs comprised 40 per cent of the population. It called upon Croatia to comply with its international commitments and respect the religious freedom of minorities. It also called upon Croatia to ensure full accountability for all manifestations of ethnic-based hate speech, racism and extremist rhetoric. It reiterated its recommendation on prosecution for past human rights violations, war crimes and crimes against humanity.

805. Sierra Leone appreciated the commitment of Croatia to establish normative standards for the promotion and protection of fundamental freedoms. Recognizing the challenges in addressing the issue of human trafficking, Sierra Leone encouraged Croatia to increase its efforts aimed at human rights training for all its law enforcement officials. It recommended that the State ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and encouraged Croatia to do more with regard to protecting and granting asylum to unaccompanied migrant children. It urged Croatia to do more to effectively address incidents of hate crimes with a view to standardizing the criminalization of such practices.

806. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela referred to the full and open cooperation of Croatia with the Working Group, which testified to its commitment to promote and protect human rights. It was pleased that, during the period under review, Croatia had shown considerable progress in raising awareness among the population about minorities and vulnerable groups, and its efforts to promote the political participation of women and to guarantee gender equality. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the progress made in the human rights arena and encouraged Croatia to continue to strengthen its social programmes, particularly in the areas of employment, health and food, in order to guarantee the best possible levels of well-being of the population.

807. Albania was pleased that Croatia had accepted the majority of the recommendations, including both of the recommendations made by Albania, and commended the State for its commitment to implement them fully. It was also pleased with the progress made by Croatia regarding the rights of the Roma community and its participation in the regional process on the issue of refugees. It encouraged Croatia to make further progress in all areas of protecting and promoting human rights.

808. Bulgaria thanked Croatia for its engagement with the universal periodic review process and for its bilateral cooperation and dialogue relating to it. It commended Croatia for having implemented the national programme for the protection and promotion of human rights 2013–2016 and for having created institutions and mechanisms. It encouraged Croatia to strengthen its efforts to combat discrimination, the social exclusion of minorities and cases of hate speech, while taking note of the creation of a working group to monitor hate crimes. It also encouraged judicial reform, the process of deinstitutionalization and the fight against domestic violence.

809. Egypt was encouraged by the continued efforts and commitment of Croatia to promote and protect human rights. It commended the State for its positive institutional, legislative and policy developments, particularly in relation to strengthening international human rights institutions, eliminating sexual violence, combating hate speech, preventing torture and ensuring the better representation of women in public and political life. It invited Croatia to continue its efforts and to seize the opportunity provided through the universal periodic review, including through an effective national follow-up process to address institutional and policy challenges. Egypt welcomed the State's acceptance of its recommendations on realizing the right to work, ensuring a balance in the geographical coverage of health care and attaining the right to safe drinking water and sanitation for all, and wished the State success in the implementation of those recommendations.

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

810. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Croatia, three other stakeholders made statements.

811. Allied Rainbow Communities International recognized the progress made by Croatia in the protection of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender rights, but pointed out that gender identity issues were neglected. It was concerned about the lack of adequate legislation providing access to legal gender recognition. The regulations for obtaining medical documentation and on determining requirements and preconditions for gender-affirming surgery were ineffective and violated the human rights of trans persons. It called upon Croatia to ensure respect for the right to gender identity and the right to bodily autonomy as a matter of urgency, and to accept and implement the recommendation on strengthening the human rights protection of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons in line with its international obligations and commitments and domestic legislation. It stressed the importance of having close cooperation with lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer organizations and human rights organizations when working on the advancement of their rights.

812. The Human Rights House Foundation urged Croatia to take the financial measures necessary to guarantee everyone's access to the legal aid system. There were serious threats to the freedom of the media as a result of the new provisions of the Penal Code, which had reintroduced defamation and the prosecution of journalists. Discrimination towards women and minority and vulnerable groups was widespread. The Human Rights House Foundation

called upon Croatia to amend the Anti-Discrimination Act by redefining the grounds of discrimination and to draft a national anti-discrimination plan. It urged Croatia to implement the Constitutional Act on the Rights of National Minorities and reiterated its call for the State to engage in a more systematic manner with human rights groups.

813. Action Canada for Population and Development referred to the positive developments made by Croatia in having accepted the recommendations on sexual violence and in having ratified the Istanbul Convention. It referred to the importance of article 9, as it called for effective cooperation with organizations combating violence against women. It highlighted the lack of specialist rape crisis centres and the need for legislative and other measures to provide victims with specialist support services in an adequate geographical distribution. It regretted that no recommendations had addressed the challenges of accessibility and affordability of abortion and the need to monitor the implementation of the health education curricula in schools.

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

814. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 167 recommendations received, Croatia had supported 162 recommendations and noted 5.

815. The head of the delegation expressed her gratitude to all the speakers, including those from civil society. With a view to ratifying the Istanbul Convention, Croatia would conduct the activities required to ensure there were administrative and financial resources, as the ratification must go hand in hand with creating the preconditions for its effective implementation.

816. Regarding investigating and prosecuting war crimes, the Government was committed to the prosecution and punishment of individuals responsible for crimes during the war. The head of the delegation emphasized that there was no ethnic bias in prosecuting war crimes, as Croatia investigated and prosecuted war crimes in a non-discriminatory manner. The State was especially proud of the new bill on compensating the victims of sexual violence committed during the war.

817. The head of the delegation stressed that Croatia continued to protect and promote the participation of all of its 22 national minorities in all aspects of society with the objective of implementing the Constitutional Act on the Rights of National Minorities. The right to the equal official use of minority languages and scripts other than Croatian was respected throughout the country, with the use of the Serbian Cyrillic script in the town of Vukovar remaining a sensitive issue. Regardless of the sensitiveness of that issue, the Government was determined to ensure the full implementation of the provisions of the Constitutional Act on the Rights of National Minorities, while being bound by constitutional court orders prohibiting the use of coercive measures to enforce that law in the area of Vukovar.

818. The Government was committed to change Roma social and economic dynamics by providing the Roma community with specific programmes and resources. The Croatian national Roma inclusion strategy for 2013–2020 and the accompanying action plan went beyond the four areas recommended in the most progressive international documents.

819. Croatia was handling the migratory influx with great sensitivity but its capacity was not unlimited. It recognized its duty to ensure the security and safety of people passing through Croatian territory and the assistance they required. Shelters in Croatia were fully functional but refugees and migrants were refusing to stay and were choosing to continue their journey.

820. The head of the delegation concluded by stating that Croatia was confident that the final outcome of the review would further contribute to the State's efforts to strengthen the human rights of its citizens, and it fully supported the universal periodic review mechanism.

#### **Jamaica**

821. The review of Jamaica was held on 13 May 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 Jamaica 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.6/22/JAM/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.6/22/JAM/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.6/22/JAM/3).

822. At its 28th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Jamaica (see section C below).

823. The outcome of the review of Jamaica comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/15), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/30/15/Add.1).

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

824. The delegation of Jamaica stated that, during the interactive dialogue, 168 recommendations had been made. Jamaica had accepted the majority of those recommendations, including some that the Government regarded as already implemented or as being in the process of implementation.

825. Jamaica had submitted its final response to the recommendations received in May 2015, including those that the Government had declared would require further consideration. In all, Jamaica had accepted 92 recommendations completely and 2 recommendations in part, including 68 that the Government considered as already implemented or in the process of implementation.

826. Jamaica had a longstanding policy that reflected its serious commitment to its obligations to implement international treaties to which it was a party, in good faith. As such, Jamaica did not bind itself and its citizens to any treaty unless or until it was satisfied that the domestic framework to give effect to that international treaty would stand up to national scrutiny and to the standards set by that treaty. That fundamental approach had informed the State's responses to those recommendations relating to the accession to various treaties.

827. The delegation then addressed the responses to the recommendations by thematic cluster.

828. On institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures, Jamaica confirmed its acceptance of those recommendations on, inter alia, establishing a national human rights institution and human rights training and sensitization for the Jamaica Constabulary Force and the judiciary.

829. With respect to the recommendations on human rights defenders, the delegation reiterated that there was no basis for stating that human rights defenders were at risk in Jamaica. Full protection was afforded to those persons as citizens under the law. Jamaican human rights advocates were extremely active, and openly and boldly engaged in fearless advocacy, and had contributed and continued to contribute positively to the development of the Jamaican human rights architecture.

830. Jamaica confirmed its acceptance of the recommendation on creating an online system to track international recommendations, including those accepted by the State under the universal periodic review mechanism. As a small island developing State, with resources that were often stretched quite thinly, such a system would, if effectively implemented, go a long way in assisting Jamaica with both domestic implementation and reporting responsibilities.

831. Jamaica was not opposed to accepting visits of special rapporteurs but they were and would continue to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Jamaica was therefore not in a position to issue standing invitations to special rapporteurs, irrespective of how much it valued their work and the issues for which they advocated. In the case of agreed visits, it was critically important that the Government be given adequate notice, through established diplomatic channels, to ensure that the necessary arrangements were in place for successful visits, in accordance with mutually-agreed timelines.

832. The delegation also placed on record its recommendation that a mechanism be put in place by the Human Rights Council that allowed for the sharing of information among the various human rights bodies and procedures, as often there were overlapping requests that were inefficient and unduly stretched the limited resources of many Member States.

833. Jamaica had accepted the majority of the recommendations on non-discrimination and actions to protect vulnerable persons, including women, children and persons with disabilities, as well as the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex community. It had an agglomeration of legislation, policies, strategies and measures in place at various levels, forming an effective machinery that provided all Jamaicans with redress from discrimination of any kind. Jamaica was therefore not in agreement with those recommendations that suggested that the only way to fight discrimination effectively was through a single anti-discrimination law.

834. Jamaicans could, and did, seek redress in various sectors, primarily the employment, education and health sectors. The delegation referred to several mechanisms that were in place for that purpose, including the Industrial Disputes Tribunal and the mechanisms within the Ministries for Education and Health.

835. The Government of Jamaica condemned all forms of discrimination and negative stereotypes affecting women and children. It was pursuing appropriate policies to eliminate those acts, and a gender equality framework was currently in place for that purpose. Legal and constitutional reforms were being undertaken to protect against sexual discrimination and sexual harassment.

836. Jamaica was a party to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2007), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (1984), the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1991) and other conventions and platforms. It also supported the agreed outcome documents of international and regional meetings on gender equality.

837. Some of the relevant domestic legislation that promoted gender equality and the protection of women, girls, boys, men and persons with disabilities included the Charter of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms of 2011, the Sexual Offences Act of 2011, the Child Care and Protection Act of 2004 and the Domestic Violence Act of 1995 (amended 2004).

838. Jamaica had accepted the recommendation on ensuring that women and girls had effective access to justice, including through the provision of legal aid. That was reflected in the Legal Aid Act, through which legal aid was available to both men and women.

839. Jamaica continued to take steps to end prejudice and stigmatization affecting all Jamaicans, including lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. It emphasized mutual respect among all Jamaicans, adherence to the rule of law and continuing the strong historical tradition of freedom of expression and opinion. Jamaica had not accepted any recommendations that sought to typify the attitude of Jamaican society generally as “homophobic”.

840. The Government of Jamaica had consistently condemned all acts of violence against all persons and had been a leading voice in the Caribbean region regarding that issue.

841. Legislative and administrative reforms had significantly improved the operations of State actors with regard to the police, the judiciary and conditions in prisons. Therefore, Jamaica had no difficulty in accepting many of the recommendations in those areas.

842. Jamaica had also accepted most of the recommendations that had addressed the implementation or strengthening of social and economic rights and conditions of Jamaican citizens.

843. Regarding the recommendations relating to trafficking in persons, most of which had been accepted by Jamaica, the delegation stated that, owing to the clandestine nature of that crime, it had been difficult to secure convictions. However, there had been one successful conviction, and seven cases were before the courts.

844. Jamaica had noted the recommendation on decriminalizing abortion. In Jamaica, abortion was permissible on certain medical grounds.

845. Although Jamaica had accepted several of the recommendations relating to the Independent Commission of Investigations, which investigated cases of alleged excessive use of force, it regarded as redundant the recommendation on amending the Coroner's Act to strengthen the Commission's powers. Currently, the Coroner's Act gave the coroner the authority to deem anyone an interested party in a coroner's inquest. Should the Commission have an interest in a matter before the Coroner's Court, it simply had to indicate that interest to the coroner.

846. Regarding the recommendations on corporal punishment, that form of punishment had been abolished in early childhood institutions, children's homes and other arranged alternate living spaces, and appropriate measures were being taken to ensure that it was discontinued in schools. The Child Care and Protection Act afforded protection for all children from abuse.

847. The Government was committed to the implementation of the recommendations from the universal periodic review and would endeavour to uphold its demonstrated tradition of respect for the rule of law. It reiterated the Government's gratitude to its many bilateral and multilateral partners, which had offered sage advice and technical and other assistance to increase the State's capacity to honour its obligations to the people of Jamaica.

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

848. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Jamaica, nine delegations made statements.

849. Sierra Leone applauded Jamaica for the steps it had taken and for its constitutional provisions, which further guaranteed fundamental freedoms, as evidenced in the Charter of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms. Despite the challenging financial situation, Jamaica had managed to reform its justice sector and had entertained the idea of establishing a national human rights commission based on the Paris Principles. Sierra Leone recognized that the implementation of the recommendations was often determined by the scarcity of resources, which could undermine general political will. However, it was clear that Jamaica was dedicated to the universal periodic review process and to the Human Rights Council as a whole. It encouraged Jamaica to continue to seek assistance to address more comprehensively adaptation measures in order to tackle the effects of climate change. It also encouraged Jamaica to establish a moratorium on the death penalty and to ratify 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.

850. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela appreciated the efforts of Jamaica to comply with the universal periodic review recommendations it had accepted. It was pleased that the State had enabled a positive interaction during its review. It highlighted major advances in the country relating to gender equality and the adoption of the Law on Persons with a Disability, which had given that vulnerable group more protection. It recognized the State's efforts in the field of human rights and encouraged Jamaica to continue to strengthen its social policies in favour of the most vulnerable sector of the population.

851. The Bahamas pointed out that Jamaica had embarked on a path of national transformation through its national development plan for 2009–2030. It was pleased that, despite the constraints that the country faced as a small island developing State, Jamaica had accepted 23 of the recommendations made during its review and had already implemented or was in the process of implementing a further 62 recommendations. It referred to the State's continuing efforts to promote and protect the rights of the most



vulnerable groups in society and applauded its strides in advancing the rights of women by having incorporated a gender perspective into its laws and public policies and by having pursued measures to combat violence against women.

852. Benin welcomed the efforts and accomplishments of Jamaica through the implementation of recommendations made during its universal periodic review. Benin congratulated Jamaica on having ratified the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography and for having taken actions as part of its economic reform programme, reduced unemployment, lowered inflation, reduced the current account deficit and raised foreign domestic investment. It noted with satisfaction the progress made in terms of gender equality with the appointment of a woman as Prime Minister and with the presence of women in Parliament, at 21 per cent of total parliamentarians. Benin recommended that Jamaica continue its efforts to reduce poverty, improve access to drinking water and take strong measures to broaden access to education in rural areas.

853. Botswana commended Jamaica for having accepted the majority of the recommendations made during its review. It applauded Jamaica for having taken measures to promote and protect the rights of the most vulnerable persons, and for having approved the social protection strategy, among others, which would cater to vulnerable persons. Botswana welcomed the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, and the amendment to the Trafficking in Persons Act. It emphasized that their implementation was crucial to the protection of the rights of children.

854. China welcomed the constructive approach of Jamaica to the universal periodic review, its comprehensive and positive feedback on the recommendations and its acceptance of most of the recommendations. China appreciated the State's acceptance of its recommendations on implementing its national poverty policy and programme in order to redouble its efforts to reduce poverty and improve the lives of vulnerable groups, and on increasing investment in education, improving the coverage and quality of education and particularly ensuring the right to education for children from poor families, girls and children with disabilities. China wished the Government greater success in the comprehensive development of human rights.

855. Cuba congratulated Jamaica on its acceptance of the majority of the recommendations. During the review of Jamaica, Cuba had highlighted the important advances made by the country in the area of human rights, which included the implementation of policies to improve the rights of the child and of persons with disabilities, and in the health-care system. It thanked Jamaica for having accepted the two recommendations made by Cuba on disabilities and the fight against HIV/AIDS. It wished Jamaica success in the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted in its second universal periodic review.

856. The Philippines was pleased that Jamaica had accepted a large number of recommendations, and it was particularly pleased that Jamaica had accepted its recommendation on continuing its advocacy to keep global warming at or below 1.5 degrees Celsius above the pre-industrial level. The Philippines was also pleased that Jamaica was stepping up efforts to establish a national human rights institution that was compliant with the Paris Principles. It acknowledged the State's continuing efforts to provide its anti-trafficking in persons programmes with adequate resources. It looked forward to the State's reinforced cooperation and active engagement with its bilateral, regional and international partners to combat trafficking in persons. It regretted that Jamaica was not ready to accept its recommendation on considering the ratification of the ILO Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189). However, it was hopeful that, with the State's strong advocacy for the protection and promotion of the rights of vulnerable groups, Jamaica would find ample reason to consider ratifying that Convention.

857. Rwanda was pleased that Jamaica had accepted its recommendation on intensifying efforts to establish a national human rights institution. It recognized the measures taken by Jamaica to combat human trafficking, such as the implementation of the national plan of

action to combat trafficking in persons, and commended the State for having adopted legislative measures aimed at eliminating discrimination against women.

### 3. General comments made by other stakeholders

858. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Jamaica, three other stakeholders made statements.

859. The International Lesbian and Gay Association commended the Government for its efforts and its acceptance of recommendations on promoting and protecting human rights, including those of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons. It was deeply concerned that several recommendations had not enjoyed the full, or even partial, support of Jamaica. It understood that some recommendations, such as those on amending the buggery law or on legalizing abortion, were particularly sensitive. It urged the Government to conduct a legal audit on the impact several pieces of legislation had on vulnerable groups such as persons living with HIV, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons, women and girls, and persons with disabilities. It was encouraged by the prioritization of the needs of vulnerable groups and urged the Government to review its social protection strategy with human rights organizations to ensure lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons, persons living with HIV, street children and other vulnerable groups could have better access to available services. It commended the State for having included human rights education in school curricula. The State's response to homelessness among lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons was generally woefully insufficient. It welcomed the efforts to establish a national human rights institution and urged that it be structured to address the multilayered way in which vulnerable groups, including lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons, experienced discrimination and violence and that it be empowered to make complaints to both the Government and international human rights bodies.

860. Amnesty International welcomed the acceptance by Jamaica of the recommendations on establishing and operationalizing a national human rights institution in accordance with the Paris Principles. It welcomed the establishment and work of the Independent Commission of Investigations and referred to the decline in killings by State agents in 2014 compared with the number in 2013. However, local organizations were concerned about the obstacles faced by the Independent Commission of Investigations in carrying out its functions, including the lack of cooperation from members of the police force and under-resourcing. Amnesty International called upon Jamaica to provide the Commission with the resources necessary to carry out its mandate effectively, including for timely ballistics and forensic analysis. It was concerned about the serious delays at the Coroner's Court and at the Supreme Court, and called upon Jamaica to ensure the Special Coroner in charge of fatal police shootings had the resources necessary to carry out its functions. It welcomed the Government's appointment of a commission of inquiry to investigate alleged human rights violations during the state of emergency in 2010 and reminded Jamaica that that commission should complement, not substitute, an independent, impartial and properly resourced criminal justice process. Amnesty International was concerned about detention conditions in police lock-ups and correctional facilities and called upon Jamaica to improve those conditions. It echoed concerns expressed during the review that Jamaica lacked a general legal framework against discrimination, including with regard to discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity or expression. It was concerned that impunity continued for violent and hateful attacks on people based on their real or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity or expression, and it regretted the State's reluctance to accept the recommendations on abolishing the death penalty, on establishing a formal moratorium on executions and on decriminalizing consensual same-sex sexual activities.

861. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme underscored the efforts made by Jamaica and particularly the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, the updating of reports to the treaty bodies and cooperation with the special procedures. It congratulated Jamaica on its contribution to the adoption of the Decade for People of African Descent and hoped that the national development plan entitled "Vision 2030 Jamaica" would enable the country to achieve its socioeconomic development

objectives. It deplored the persistence of the excessive use of force by law enforcement officers, the poor conditions of detention, and discrimination against women, minorities, persons with disabilities, and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons. It was also concerned about the extent of physical and sexual violence against women and girls and about the fact that no formal moratorium on the death penalty had been adopted to date. It urged Jamaica to take additional measures against those harmful practices that undermined the enjoyment of human rights. It encouraged the State to accede to the international instruments to which it was not yet a party, to ensure that the human rights and fundamental freedoms enshrined in the Constitution were protected, and to improve the implementation of laws protecting the most vulnerable groups.

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

862. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 168 recommendations received, Jamaica had supported 92 recommendations and noted 74. Additional clarification was provided on two recommendations.

863. In its concluding remarks, the delegation of Jamaica thanked all States and representatives of civil society for their contributions, ideas, questions and recommendations. All of the recommendations had been given the most careful consideration and had been the subject of intense inter-agency consultation.

864. The delegation was pleased that the State had been able to accept most of the recommendations made. It understood the overall spirit behind all of the recommendations, including those that had not been accepted.

865. The universal periodic review was a valuable contributor to the strengthening and improvement of the human rights architecture and policies and practice at all levels, especially the national level.

866. The delegation had taken note of a number of observations made and was confident that the submissions by Jamaica in the universal periodic review process had provided adequate responses or explanations with regard to the issues raised. However, it had to respond to the assertion that there was impunity for attacks against vulnerable persons and groups by emphasizing that that was not so.

867. Jamaica would follow through on its promise to reflect on some of the recommendations that had been made and stressed that it would not be complacent in the areas where progress had been made.

868. The Government was committed to intensifying its efforts to communicate to the Jamaican public the variety of options available to them to seek redress for alleged violations of their rights.

869. In conclusion, the delegation expressed its appreciation to all the ministries, agencies and departments of government and members of civil society for their tremendous support and constructive engagement in the process.

#### **Libya**

870. The review of Libya was held on 13 May 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 Libya 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.6/22/LBY/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.6/22/LBY/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.6/22/LBY/3).

871. At its 28th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Libya (see section C below).

872. The outcome of the review of Libya comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/16), 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/30/16/Add.1).

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

873. The delegation of Libya expressed its appreciation to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council and the Working Group, as well as the troika (El Salvador, Maldives and South Africa) for their cooperation, professionalism and constructive contribution to the universal periodic review process and to the preparation of the second universal periodic review report on Libya.

874. The delegation also thanked all of the States that had participated in the second universal review of Libya, in May 2015. They had made 202 recommendations, most of which Libya had accepted. There was no doubt that Libya had accepted those recommendations with its firm commitment to the universal periodic review mechanism and its determination to improve the human rights situation within the scope of the interim constitutional declaration, Islamic law and Libyan identity, taking into account the fact that it was going through a very difficult transitional period and facing daunting challenges at political, security, social and economic levels. Libya was working to fulfil people's aspirations in building State institutions. There was no doubt that promoting human rights, ending abuses, ensuring accountability and preventing impunity in Libya required continued international and regional political support.

875. The delegation paid tribute to the pivotal political role of the United Nations, which was aimed at the success of the political process, ending the conflict, and consolidating security and stability in Libya. That would contribute to supporting State institutions, represented in the army and the police, in maintaining security and enforcing the law in order to counter the problem of the random proliferation of arms through a programme of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration.

876. The delegation underscored the importance of strengthening national capacities to deal effectively with various security challenges relating to cross-border crimes, such as the increasing acts of terrorism committed by Da'esh and other terrorist groups, as well as smuggling in all its forms, including the smuggling of drugs, and trafficking in persons, which was associated with the phenomenon of illegal migration. Those challenges exceeded the capacity of any single country and required a spirit of shared responsibility on the part of the international community, neighbouring countries and the European Union.

877. Libya hoped that the international community and the United Nations Support Mission in Libya would continue to provide the technical assistance that would assist the State in fulfilling its obligations in the fields of human rights and the rule of law, including by continuing measures to achieve transitional justice and bolstering support for national reconciliation and social justice efforts, and continue to work on legislative and practical levels to strengthen the rights of all groups in society, including Amazigh, Tabu, Tuarek and other social groups, and offer protection to women and persons with disabilities.

878. The delegation once again expressed its appreciation to the Human Rights Council and all the States that had made observations. The delegation emphasized the commitment of Libya to work on the implementation of all the recommendations it had accepted. It called for the establishment of a genuine partnership with all of the international organizations and civil society organizations that were interested in promoting and achieving human rights and the rule of law in Libya.

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

879. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Libya, 17 delegations made statements.<sup>16</sup>

880. Estonia was concerned about the continuing violence between several armed groups. The protracted conflict, the lack of border controls and the fragile rule of law had enabled the continued trafficking of human beings, drugs and weapons. It called upon all of the parties involved in the conflict to respond to the demands of the Libyan people and agree to a political solution mediated by the United Nations, cease armed hostilities and take immediate steps to protect civilians, especially vulnerable groups, namely women, children and internally displaced persons. Estonia encouraged Libya to take concrete steps in order to implement the recommendations accepted and show its real commitment to improve the human rights situation in its territory.

881. Ethiopia thanked Libya for having accepted the recommendations it had made on intensifying efforts to fight terrorism and seeking assistance from the international community and on continuing to implement the remaining accepted recommendations from its first review. It referred to the challenges that Libya faced in ensuring peace and security and in implementing the recommendations accepted in its first review. It recommended that Libya redouble its efforts to restore peace and order.

882. Iraq was pleased that Libya had accepted most of the recommendations, including those made by Iraq, and it congratulated the State on the adoption of a policy on human rights and fundamental freedoms that would lead to the rule of law and the achievement of social justice for all citizens, despite the difficulties that Libya was facing with regard to the stability of the country. It called upon the international community to support Libya in its efforts to strengthen human rights.

883. Ireland noted with satisfaction that both of its recommendations had been accepted by Libya. However, the human rights situation in Libya remained of serious concern, and it urged the State to take swift action to hold accountable those responsible for violations of international human rights law and humanitarian law. It also urged its full cooperation with the International Criminal Court. It was concerned about the protection of civilians, humanitarian workers, human rights defenders and media workers. It emphasized that continued reports of torture and ill-treatment in detention centres must also be investigated and addressed.

884. Italy welcomed the acceptance by Libya of 161 recommendations, including the one made by Italy on strengthening efforts to investigate all allegations of torture, summary executions, enforced disappearance and other abuses, and on bringing those responsible to justice. Italy was committed to supporting the efforts of the Libyan people to take forward the democratic transition and restart the reconstruction of the country.

885. Kuwait commended the achievements made in the field of human rights despite the crisis that Libya was witnessing, which had repercussions in a number of spheres. The large number of recommendations accepted by Libya reflected the genuine efforts of the State to protect all people. It hoped that Libya would emerge from the crisis through a comprehensive dialogue under the aegis of the United Nations.

886. Latvia was pleased that all of its recommendations had enjoyed the support of Libya. It was, however, alarmed by reports of continued serious human rights violations, including summary executions, arbitrary detention, torture and other ill-treatment. It shared the concerns of the High Commissioner for Human Rights about the near-absolute impunity for such violations. It urged Libya to act swiftly on its universal periodic review commitments and to investigate all allegations of torture in a prompt and impartial manner and ensure that victims obtained redress. It also encouraged Libya to make full use of the expertise of the

---

<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/30thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

special procedures by allowing those special procedures who had requested to visit Libya to do so.

887. Morocco commended Libya for having responded positively to the universal periodic review, which was exemplified by the acceptance of a large number of recommendations. Morocco praised Libya for its renewed commitment to protect human rights and to honour its obligations despite the difficulties and challenges resulting from the transitional phase. Libya was in dire need of assistance in order to address the institutional, security and development aspects of such challenges. Morocco expressed solidarity with Libya.

888. Sierra Leone applauded Libya for having extended a standing invitation to the special procedures and an invitation to the High Commissioner for Human Rights. It was concerned, however, about the challenges that Libya continued to face, and in particular the humanitarian situation, which had led to the displacement of thousands, as well as the alarming expansion of the activities of terrorist groups in the region. It appreciated the State's willingness to establish normative standards and its expressed urgent need to rebuild State institutions. It encouraged the international community to continue to assist Libya in establishing durable peace, security and stability in the country.

889. Rwanda appreciated the continued engagement of Libya with the mechanism of the Human Rights Council. It encouraged Libya to ensure adequate human rights protection for the migrant populations residing in the country or transiting through its borders. It also encouraged Libya to establish policies aimed at increasing women's representation in decision-making positions.

890. The State of Palestine stated that the acceptance by Libya of the recommendations reflected the way Libya dealt with human rights mechanisms. It valued the efforts made by Libya to protect and promote human rights through the support for and development of a national institutional structure and relevant legislation, despite the challenges and difficulties facing the country. It appreciated the cooperation of Libya with the universal periodic review mechanism. Libya had studied the recommendations through consultations with all the concerned parties.

891. The Sudan commended Libya for its commitment to the universal periodic review and for its efforts to promote the human rights of its citizens. It was pleased that Libya had accepted most of the recommendations, including those made by the Sudan on including human rights in education curricula.

892. Togo was pleased with the progress made by Libya in implementing the recommendations accepted in the first universal periodic review, despite the crisis that the State had gone through. In addition, many measures had been taken for the enjoyment of human rights. Togo welcomed the fact that Libya had accepted most of the recommendations made during the second universal periodic review and invited the international community to assist Libya in their implementation.

893. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland was concerned that Libya had a limited capacity to investigate all human rights violations, including assassinations of journalists and human rights defenders. All such violations must be investigated and perpetrators must be brought to justice. It was encouraged that a committee had been created to draft the constitution with elected members and that the rights of minorities had been enshrined in the draft. It stressed that the committee and the constitution drafting assembly must act on feedback from civil society. It emphasized that all parties and their associated forces should commit to the final text from the Libyan Political Dialogue.

894. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela recalled that, through 2011, Libya had had the highest per capita GDP and life expectancy in the region and the most developed infrastructure in Africa. It denounced the grave consequences of the military aggressions of the powers that had seized resources, which had claimed the lives of thousands of people. It urged the restoration of conditions that would pave the way to peace in Libya. It was certain that solutions in line with international law could prevent the escalation of violence.

895. Algeria pointed out that Libya had accepted most of the recommendations, including those made by Algeria on reaching a peaceful solution to the crisis and on including human rights in education curricula. Libya had spared no effort to implement all of the recommendations it had accepted. Algeria expressed its full solidarity with Libya and wished it further progress.

896. Angola acknowledged the difficulties facing Libya but noted with appreciation the State's efforts to promote and protect human rights and its assistance to vulnerable groups, as well as the establishment of the National Council for Civil Liberties and Human Rights.

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

897. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Libya, eight other stakeholders made statements.

898. United Nations Watch was deeply concerned about the human rights situation in Libya and called attention to three areas of particular concern. First, it was alarmed by the sexual violence taking place with complete impunity. Despite decision nos. 39 and 119, no concrete action had yet been taken to effectively address the gross human rights violations relating to sexual violence. Second, women's rights were denied to Libyan women on a daily basis. If laws had been promulgated to allegedly strengthen their rights, the situation on the ground had barely changed since the fall of the Qaddafi regime. On the contrary, religious legal opinions, issued by the Grand Mufti, had been a major blow to the full enjoyment of human rights by women in the country. Third, the use of torture was increasing, while Law No. 10 had completely failed to prevent those major human rights violations.

899. Article 19: International Centre against Censorship welcomed the acceptance by Libya of all 14 recommendations relating to freedom of expression, association or assembly. It also welcomed the acceptance of the recommendation made by Latvia, whose implementation would require substantial legal reform, including the repealing of Law No. 15 of 2012 and Law No. 5 of 2014. It also welcomed the acceptance of the recommendation made by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on ensuring that all human rights violations, including the assassination of journalists and human rights defenders, were investigated and that the perpetrators were brought to justice. Prominent women's rights activist Salwa Bugaighis and youth activists Tawfik Bensaud and Sami al-Kawafi had been assassinated by gunmen. Libya must ensure that independent, speedy and effective investigations and prosecutions take place, and that supportive mechanisms, such as safety, risk-awareness and self-protection trainings, were in place to protect the freedom of expression of stakeholders from future attacks. It also called upon Libya to put in place a national plan for the implementation of the recommendations accepted, in cooperation with civil society.

900. The Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, also on behalf of the World Organization against Torture, called upon Libya to adopt a four-year national action plan to ensure the implementation of the universal periodic review recommendations and cooperation with all stakeholders, including civil society. Militias and paramilitary groups on all sides of the conflict continued to commit grave violations that could amount to war crimes and crimes against humanity. Those violations were fuelled in large part by an almost total lack of effective accountability mechanisms in the country. The two organizations called for concrete and effective steps to be taken to remedy the obstacles, namely the widespread lack of accountability for serious crimes and the failure to form a coherent vetting process for security institutions, that would hinder the implementation of universal periodic review recommendations. The Libyan authorities had failed to establish a mechanism for transitional justice and, in doing so, had denied truth and reconciliation to Libyan citizens.

901. The Arab Commission for Human Rights was concerned about the reservations of Libya to the signing of the Rome Statute. It was also deeply concerned about the situation on the ground in Libya and the failure to reach a peace agreement. It urged all parties involved in the conflict to reach a political solution that would prevent further bloodshed and it urged Libya to adopt a national plan or national strategies to collect weapons. It was

not acceptable in democratic countries that arms were sold on the streets; the possession of weapons should be subject to the lawful authority of the State, and weapons should be used by the State only to protect its citizens. All militias and armed groups should be disarmed regardless of their affiliations. It urged Libya to implement Security Council resolution 2178 (2014) in relation to holding fighters for Da'esh responsible for their actions.

902. Amnesty International regretted that Libya had rejected a specific recommendation on taking measures to ensure that forces loyal to the Government were held accountable for their indiscriminate targeting of civilians, civilian property and infrastructure. Over the past year, it had documented a pattern of abuses by Operation Dignity forces aligned with the Government. It called upon Libya to act on the recommendations it had accepted on ensuring the safe return of internally displaced persons to their homes. It welcomed the State's acceptance of the recommendations on ensuring that the rights of migrants, asylum seekers and refugees in Libya were protected. Foreign nationals were subjected to abductions, human trafficking, extortion, sexual violence and indefinite detention in immigration detention centres. It welcomed the recommendations on ending arbitrary detention and on closing illegal detention centres. Where cases had been processed, trials had been marred by serious flaws and had resulted in the death penalty. It therefore regretted the State's rejection of the recommendation on establishing a moratorium on executions. It also regretted the refusal by Libya to take special measures in favour of gender equality.

903. The World Organization against Torture reported that human rights defenders had become prime targets for many armed groups involved in the ongoing civil war in Libya. Violence, harassment and intimidation were daily occurrences for those defenders and they occurred in a climate of impunity resulting from the breakdown of the State. It was essential to go beyond their needs for protection and to reclaim the essential role human rights defenders should play in the conflict-settlement and peacebuilding process. It called upon the Libyan authorities to promote the participation of human rights defenders in the implementation of the political agreement recently concluded. It welcomed the seven recommendations on the need for the protection of human rights defenders and on the need for measures to foster the accountability of the perpetrators of assassinations, attacks, intimidation and harassment against human rights defenders. It called upon Libya to implement those recommendations within the shortest delay.

904. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme stated that Libya was facing the following challenges: the deterioration of State infrastructure, the weakness of the judiciary and the administration, increased tensions among armed groups and extremists in the south, the development of mafias, the proliferation of small arms, the smuggling of migrants and the massive internal displacement of civilian populations. It attached great importance to the signing of the State's draft peace agreement adopted in Skhirat, Morocco. It hoped that all parties would take that opportunity to rebuild trust among them by signing the agreement before the deadline of 20 October 2015. It was alarmed by the situation of African migrant workers, who continued to suffer from mistreatment and persecution. Measures should be taken to put an end to those practices. It urged Libya to strengthen cooperation with the International Criminal Court and the special procedure mandate holders. It called for the perpetrators of violations of international humanitarian law and human rights, or of the infringements of those rights, including sexual violence, to be held accountable for their acts.

905. Centre indépendant de recherches et d'initiatives pour le dialogue stated that the political divisions in Libya had had an important impact on the review of Libya. The State had presented the report four months after the deadline, and the report was biased. When it came to highlighting the points of division, there were many falsifications, and no facts had been stated. The report did not refer to the war crimes committed in Benghazi or to the fact that the House of Representatives had turned a blind eye to the acts of the rebellion, amounting to grave violations of human rights and leading to charges of ethnic cleansing. The situation was dire. Only three clinics and hospitals were operational. There were shortages of medicines, medical equipment, medical staff, food, water and electricity. Airports and ports were not functioning. Through resolution 28/30, the Human Rights Council had called for a mission to be sent to Libya for an investigation. Centre



indépendent de recherches et d'initiatives pour le dialogue emphasized the importance of that resolution and called upon the Human Rights Council to provide that team with all the requirements necessary to conduct a clear and independent investigation on the ground in order to ensure that there was no impunity and that perpetrators were brought to justice.

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

906. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 202 recommendations received, Libya had supported 161 recommendations, provided additional clarification on another 10 recommendations, and noted 31.

907. The delegation of Libya was grateful to all the delegations that had made statements during the session; those statements reflected a full understanding of the challenges that Libya faced, especially the security challenges posed by the Islamic State and other terrorist groups. That had negatively affected the ability of Libya to control the situation, especially the human rights and humanitarian situation. Libya looked forward to the full support of the international community at technical and political levels. The delegation emphasized that the United Nations Support Mission in Libya had an important role to play and that its contribution would enable the competent authorities to carry out their duties in order to ensure the rule of law and the protection of human rights, and to help civil society organizations and activists to operate freely and without constraints. Libya was confident that the universal periodic review recommendations would lead the Government to redouble its efforts to ensure that basic rights were enshrined in legislation and protected in practice.

## B. General debate on agenda item 6

908. At its 28th meeting, on 25 September 2015, and its 29th meeting, on 28 September, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 6, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Brazil (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese Speaking Countries), China, Ghana, India, Luxembourg<sup>17</sup> (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Grenada, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Luxembourg, Solomon Islands;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa Speaks, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace, Canners International Permanent Committee, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, Colombian Commission of Jurists, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, European Union of Public Relations, Global Network for Rights and Development, Human Rights Law Centre, Indian Council of Education, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Association of Schools of Social Work, International Educational Development, International Institute for Non-Aligned Studies, Iraqi Development Organization, Kham Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Maarif Foundation for Peace and Development, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Pan African Union for Science and Technology, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Roma Centre for Social Intervention and Studies, United Schools International, UPR Info, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Environment and Resources Council.

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

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

### **Belarus**

909. At its 22nd meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/101 on the outcome of the review of Belarus.

### **United States of America**

910. At its 22nd meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/102 on the outcome of the review of the United States of America.

### **Malawi**

911. At its 22nd meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/103 on the outcome of the review of Malawi.

### **Mongolia**

912. At its 24th meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/104 on the outcome of the review of Mongolia.

### **Panama**

913. At its 24th meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/105 on the outcome of the review of Panama.

### **Maldives**

914. At its 24th meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/106 on the outcome of the review of Maldives.

### **Andorra**

915. At its 26th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/107 on the outcome of the review of Andorra.

### **Bulgaria**

916. At its 26th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/108 on the outcome of the review of Bulgaria.

### **Honduras**

917. At its 26th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/109 on the outcome of the review of Honduras.

### **Liberia**

918. At its 27th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/110 on the outcome of the review of Liberia.

### **Marshall Islands**

919. At its 27th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/111 on the outcome of the review of the Marshall Islands.

### **Croatia**

920. At its 27th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/112 on the outcome of the review of Croatia.

**Jamaica**

921. At its 28th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/113 on the outcome of the review of Jamaica.

**Libya**

922. At its 28th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/114 on the outcome of the review of Libya.

## **VII. Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories**

### **A. General debate on agenda item 7**

923. At its 29th and 30th meetings, on 28 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 7, during which the following made statements:

(a) The representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and the State of Palestine, as the States concerned;

(b) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Cuba, Ghana, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)<sup>17</sup> (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(c) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Bahrain, Chile, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Oman, Senegal, Sudan, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Uruguay, Yemen;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa Speaks, Al-Haq, American Association of Jurists, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas, Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace, Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches, Defence for Children International, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos (also on behalf of the Union of Arab Jurists), Global Network for Rights and Development, Human Rights Now, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, International-Lawyers.Org, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Peivande Gole Narges Organization, Palestinian Return Centre, Union of Arab Jurists.

## VIII. Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

### A. Panel discussions

#### Annual discussion on the integration of a gender perspective

924. At its 6th meeting, on 15 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 6/30, the annual discussion on the integration of a gender perspective. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The Queen of the Belgians gave a keynote address. Member and Rapporteur of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, Patricia Schulz, made introductory remarks and moderated the discussion.

925. At the same meeting, the panellists Michael Møller, Virginia Dandan, Tracy Robinson and Subhas Gujadhur made statements.

926. The ensuing panel discussion was divided into two parts, which were held at the same meeting, on the same day. During the first part, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Brazil, Ecuador<sup>17</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Montenegro, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Sierra Leone;

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

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Gazeteciler ve Yazarlar Vakfı, Pan African Union for Science and Technology.

927. The following made statements during the second part:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, El Salvador, India, Ireland, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Nicaragua, Poland, Spain, Switzerland;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence pour les droits de l'homme, Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace, Indian Law Resource Centre.

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

#### Panel discussion on the impact of the world drug problem on the enjoyment of human rights

929. At its 31st meeting, on 28 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 28/28, a panel discussion on the impact of the world drug problem on the enjoyment of human rights, to have a constructive and inclusive dialogue on this issue with relevant stakeholders, including specialized United Nations agencies and civil society, and with the participation of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

930. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. Former President of the Swiss Confederation and member of the Global Commission on Drug Policy, Ruth Dreifuss, moderated the discussion.

931. At the same meeting, the panellists Javier Andres Florez, Ann Fordham, Mohammad-Mahmoud Ould Mohamedou, Shekhar Saxena and Aldo Lale-Demoz made statements. Ambassador of Thailand to the United Nations Office at Vienna and Chair of the 58th session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, Arthayudh Srisamoot, participated in the panel discussion and made a statement.

932. The ensuing panel discussion was divided into two parts, which were held at the same meeting, on the same day. During the first part, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Colombia<sup>17</sup> (also on behalf of Albania, Brazil, Greece, Guatemala, Mexico, Norway, Paraguay, Switzerland and Uruguay), Ecuador<sup>17</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Mexico, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Portugal, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Sierra Leone, Switzerland<sup>17</sup> (also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Colombia, Greece, Guatemala, Israel, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, San Marino, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay), Uruguay<sup>17</sup> (on behalf of the Union of South American Nations);

(b) Representative of an observer State: Singapore;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Centro Regional de Derechos Humanos y Justicia de Género (also on behalf of Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Harm Reduction International, Intercambios, the International Service for Human Rights and the Washington Office on Latin America), International Harm Reduction Association, International Lesbian and Gay Association (also on behalf of the International Service for Human Rights).

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

934. During the second part, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, El Salvador, France, India, Paraguay;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Egypt, Greece, Kyrgyzstan, Nicaragua, Sweden, Tunisia;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, International Educational Development, Penal Reform International.

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

## **B. General debate on agenda item 8**

936. At its 30th and 32nd meetings, on 28 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 8, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina (also on behalf of Brazil, Chile, Colombia and Uruguay), China, Cuba, Ireland, Luxembourg<sup>17</sup> (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of

Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, South Africa, Ukraine<sup>17</sup> (also on behalf of Australia, Hungary, Maldives, Morocco, Poland and Uruguay), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America (also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Ukraine), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Denmark (also on behalf of Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), Iran (Islamic Republic of), Slovenia, Spain, Sudan, Uruguay;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development (also on behalf of the Federation for Women and Family Planning), Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Advocates for Human Rights, Africa culture internationale, African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, Africa Speaks, Agence internationale pour le développement, Agence pour les droits de l'homme, Alliance Defending Freedom, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Global Network for Rights and Development, Helios Life Association, Human Rights Law Centre (also on behalf of Allied Rainbow Communities International, the International Lesbian and Gay Association and the International Service for Human Rights), Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'homme, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Service for Human Rights, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development (also on behalf of Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco), Iranian Elite Research Center, Iraqi Development Organization, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Marangopoulos Foundation for Human Rights, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Prahar, Presse emblème campagne, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Solidarité Suisse-Guinée (also on behalf of the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul), Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace, World Barua Organization, World Environment and Resources Council, World Muslim Congress.

## **IX. Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action**

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

#### **Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent**

937. At the 32nd meeting, on 28 September 2015, the Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent, Mireille Fanon Mendes-France, presented the report of the Working Group (A/HRC/30/56 and Add.1–2).

938. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Netherlands and Sweden made statements as the States concerned.

939. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands Institute for Human Rights made a statement by video message.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Brazil, Cuba, Ecuador<sup>18</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ghana, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahamas, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Tunisia;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, Africa Speaks, Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace, Global Network for Rights and Development, 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, the African Canadian Legal Clinic, the African Development Association, the Arab Commission for Human Rights, Association Dunenyu, Comité international pour le respect et l'application de la charte africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples, the December Twelfth Movement International Secretariat, the Drammeh Institute, the International Association against Torture, International-Lawyers.Org and Tiye International), Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development.

941. At the same meeting, the Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

### **B. General debate on agenda item 9**

942. At its 32nd meeting, on 28 September 2015, and its 33rd meeting, on 29 September, 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: China, Cuba, Luxembourg<sup>18</sup> (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation),

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



Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Colombia, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Uruguay;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Advocates for Human Rights, Africa culture internationale, African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, Africa Speaks, Agence internationale pour le développement, Agence pour les droits de l'homme, Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas, Global Network for Rights and Development, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International-Lawyers.Org, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 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, the African Canadian Legal Clinic, the African Development Association, the Arab Commission for Human Rights, Association Dunenyó, Comité international pour le respect et l'application de la charte africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples, the December Twelfth Movement International Secretariat, the International Association against Torture, International-Lawyers.Org, Nord-Sud XXI and Tiye International), Iranian Elite Research Center, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, National Union of Jurists of Cuba, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Prahar, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Muslim Congress.

943. At the 33rd meeting, on 29 September 2015, the representative of Estonia made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

## C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

### **From rhetoric to reality: a global call for concrete action against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance**

944. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.20, sponsored by Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, the Russian Federation and Turkey. Subsequently, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Nicaragua and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

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

946. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Ghana made a general comment on the draft resolution as orally revised.

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

948. 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 States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

#### *In favour:*

Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco,

Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Japan, Portugal, Republic of Korea

950. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised by 32 votes to 12, with 3 abstentions (resolution 30/16).<sup>19</sup>

**Forum on people of African descent in the diaspora**

951. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.21, sponsored by Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Panama and Peru. Subsequently, Bangladesh, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Nicaragua and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

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

953. The Chief of the Programme Support and Management Services of OHCHR made a statement on the budgetary implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

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

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

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Japan, Maldives, Republic of Korea

956. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised by 32 votes to 12, with 3 abstentions (resolution 30/17).

957. At the same meeting, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote on all resolutions adopted under agenda item 9.

<sup>19</sup> The representative of Namibia subsequently stated that there had been an error in the delegation's vote and that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft text.

## **X. Technical assistance and capacity-building**

### **A. Interactive dialogue on cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights**

958. At the 33rd meeting, on 29 September 2015, 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.

959. At the same meeting, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine, Sergiy Kyslytsya, made a statement as the State concerned.

960. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, also at the same meeting, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Assistant Secretary-General questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, China, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Latvia, Netherlands, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Georgia, Hungary, Lithuania, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey;

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

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

(e) Observer for a national human rights institution: Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights (by video message);

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Advocates for Human Rights, Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights Watch, International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Catholic Child Bureau.

961. At the same meeting, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

962. At the 35th meeting, on the same day, the representative of the Russian Federation made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

### **B. Interactive dialogue on technical assistance and capacity-building for human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo**

963. At the 34th meeting, on 29 September 2015, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 27/27, the report of the High Commissioner on the situation of human rights and the activities of the United Nations Joint Human Rights Office in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (A/HRC/30/32) and the study of the High Commissioner on the impact of technical assistance and capacity-building on the human rights situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (A/HRC/30/33). In accordance with Council resolution 27/27, the presentation was followed by an interactive dialogue on the study of the High Commissioner.

964. At the same meeting, the Minister for Justice and Human Rights of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Alexis Thambwe Mwamba, made a statement as the State concerned.

965. During the ensuing discussion, also at the same meeting, 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 the Group of African States), Botswana, China, France, Gabon, Ireland, Morocco, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Belgium, Egypt, Mozambique, New Zealand, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Togo;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Franciscans International, International Catholic Child Bureau (also on behalf of the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul and the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd), International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, World Organization against Torture.

966. At the same meeting, the Deputy High Commissioner answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

### **C. Interactive dialogue on technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in Libya**

967. At the 34th meeting, on 29 September 2015, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights provided, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 28/30, an oral update on the mission to investigate violations and abuses of international human rights law committed in Libya since the beginning of 2014. In accordance with Council resolution 28/30, the oral update was followed by a stand-alone interactive dialogue, with the participation of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Libya.

968. The Director of the Division of Human Rights, Transitional Justice and Rule of Law of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya, on behalf of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Libya, participated in the dialogue and made a statement.

969. At the same meeting, the representative of Libya made a statement as the State concerned.

970. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 34th and 35th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Assistant Secretary-General questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), China, Estonia, France, Germany, Ghana, Netherlands, Portugal, Russian Federation, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Czech Republic, Egypt, Italy, Kuwait, Malta, Norway, Senegal, Spain, Turkey, Yemen;

(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: Amnesty International, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Human Rights Watch, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

971. At the 35th meeting, on 29 September 2015, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights and the Director of the Division of Human Rights, Transitional Justice and Rule of Law of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

## D. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders

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

972. At the 35th meeting, on 29 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Cambodia, Rhona Smith, presented her report (A/HRC/30/58).

973. At the same meeting, the representative of Cambodia made a statement as the State concerned.

974. 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: China, France, Ireland, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Switzerland, Thailand;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Human Rights Now, Human Rights Watch, International Catholic Child Bureau, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada, World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace.

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

### Independent expert on the situation of human rights in the Sudan

976. At the 35th meeting, on 29 September 2015, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Sudan, Aristide Nononsi, presented his report (A/HRC/30/60).

977. At the same meeting, the representative of the Sudan made a statement as the State concerned.

978. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 36th meeting, on 30 September 2015, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), China, Cuba, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ireland, Morocco, Netherlands, Qatar, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Kuwait, Mali, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Switzerland;

(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: Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Eastern Sudan Women Development Organization, Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Jubilee Campaign, Society Studies Centre.

979. At the 36th meeting, on 30 September 2015, the representative of the Sudan made final remarks as the State concerned.

980. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

981. At the 38th meeting, on the same day, the representative of the Sudan made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

#### **Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic**

982. At the 36th meeting, on 30 September 2015, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic, Marie-Therese Keita Bocoum, presented her report (A/HRC/30/59).

983. At the same meeting, the representative of the Central African Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

984. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 36th and 37th meetings, on 30 September 2015, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Estonia, France, Gabon, Ireland, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Belgium, Benin, Croatia, Egypt, Luxembourg, Mali, Mozambique, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sudan, Togo;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Caritas Internationalis (also on behalf of the World Evangelical Alliance), Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Jubilee Campaign, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Save the Children International.

985. At the 37th meeting, on the same day, the representative of the Central African Republic made final remarks as the State concerned.

986. Also at the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

#### **Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Somalia**

987. At the 37th meeting, on 30 September 2015, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Somalia, Bahame Nyanduga, presented his report (A/HRC/30/57).

988. At the same meeting, the representative of Somalia made a statement as the State concerned.

989. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, also 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 (on behalf of the Group of African States), China, Ethiopia, France, Ireland, Morocco, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Djibouti, Egypt, Italy, Norway, Sudan, Turkey, Yemen;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Advocates for Human Rights, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace (also on behalf of the International Federation of Journalists), CIVICUS: World Alliance

for Citizen Participation, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Human Rights Watch, International Educational Development, Minority Rights Group.

990. At the same meeting, the representative of Somalia made final remarks as the State concerned.

991. Also at the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

## **E. General debate on agenda item 10**

992. At the 38th meeting, on 30 September 2015, the Deputy High Commissioner provided, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 29/21, an oral update, and presented country reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General submitted under agenda items 2 and 10 (A/HRC/30/30 and A/HRC/30/31).

993. At the same meeting, on the same day, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights provided, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 29/13, an oral report, and presented a report of the High Commissioner submitted under agenda item 10 (A/HRC/30/66). The Assistant Secretary-General also presented a report of the High Commissioner submitted under agenda item 2 (A/HRC/30/67).

994. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Iraq, Myanmar, Nigeria, South Sudan and Yemen made statements as the States concerned.

995. At the 38th meeting, on 30 September 2015, and at the 39th meeting, on 1 October, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 10, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), China, El Salvador, France, Germany, Ghana, India (also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Myanmar, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Thailand, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam), Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg<sup>20</sup> (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Iceland, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Maldives, Morocco (on behalf of member and observer States of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Belarus, Canada, Egypt, Georgia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Philippines, Senegal, Thailand, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: African Union, Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf, Council of Europe, Organization of Islamic Cooperation;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Advocates for Human Rights, Africa culture internationale, Africa Speaks, Agence pour les droits de l'homme, Alliance Creative Community Project, Alsalam Foundation, Al Zubair Charity Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Association burkinabé pour la survie de l'enfance, Association des jeunes pour l'agriculture du Mali, Association mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit, Association of World Citizens, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Cameroon Youths and Students Forum

<sup>20</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

for Peace, Center for Reproductive Rights, Centre indépendant de recherches et d'initiatives pour le dialogue, Global Network for Rights and Development, Human Rights Information and Training Center, Human Rights Watch, Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'homme, International Career Support Association, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, Iranian Elite Research Center, Iraqi Development Organization, Kham Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada, Liberation, Maarif Foundation for Peace and Development, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés, Prahar, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Save the Children International, Sikh Human Rights Group, Solidarité Suisse-Guinée, United Nations Watch, World Barua Organization.

996. At the 39th meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representatives of Cameroon, Myanmar, Nigeria and Thailand made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

### **Technical assistance and capacity-building for Yemen in the field of human rights**

997. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Saudi Arabia, on behalf of the Group of Arab States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.1/Rev.2, sponsored by Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Yemen, and co-sponsored by Thailand. Subsequently, Bangladesh, Maldives, Pakistan and Turkey joined the sponsors.

998. At the same meeting, the representative of Saudi Arabia, on behalf of the Group of Arab States, orally revised the draft resolution.

999. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Yemen made a statement as the State concerned.

1000. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

1001. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

1002. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 30/18).

1003. At the same meeting, the representatives of Germany (also on behalf of the Czech Republic) and the Netherlands made general comments.

### **Technical assistance and capacity-building in the field of human rights in the Central African Republic**

1004. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.6, sponsored by Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by Belgium, Croatia, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Spain. Subsequently, Australia, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Georgia, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

1005. 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 States of America made general comments on the draft resolution.



1006. 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.

1007. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 30/19).

#### **Assistance to Somalia in the field of human rights**

1008. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representatives of Somalia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (also on behalf of Australia, Italy, Somalia, Turkey and the United States of America) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.7, sponsored by Australia, Italy, Somalia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, and co-sponsored by Algeria, Angola, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, the Central African Republic, the Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Morocco, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, the Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia and Uganda. Subsequently, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Canada, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, Djibouti, Georgia, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Japan, Madagascar, Maldives, Malta, New Zealand, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen joined the sponsors.

1009. At the same meeting, the representative of Sierra Leone made a general comment on the draft resolution.

1010. 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.

1011. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 30/20).

#### **Enhancement of technical cooperation and capacity-building in the field of human rights**

1012. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Thailand, also on behalf of Brazil, Honduras, Indonesia, Morocco, Norway, Singapore and Turkey, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.10/Rev.1, sponsored by Brazil, Honduras, Indonesia, Morocco, Norway, Singapore, Thailand and Turkey, and co-sponsored by Chile, Eritrea, Malaysia, Mexico, Montenegro, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Tajikistan, the United States of America, Uruguay and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Albania, Algeria, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Chad, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Luxembourg, Maldives, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland and Tunisia joined the sponsors.

1013. At the same meeting, the representative of Thailand, also on behalf of Brazil, Honduras, Indonesia, Morocco, Norway, Singapore and Turkey, orally revised the draft resolution.

1014. 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.

1015. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

1016. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 30/21).

### **Technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in the Sudan**

1017. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.18, sponsored by Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States. Subsequently, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Costa Rica, Thailand and Turkey joined the sponsors.

1018. At the same meeting, the representative of Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, orally revised the draft resolution.

1019. 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.

1020. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Sudan made a statement as the State concerned.

1021. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

1022. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 30/22).

### **Advisory services and technical assistance for Cambodia**

1023. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Japan introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.22/Rev.1, sponsored by Japan and co-sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovakia, Spain and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Finland, Italy, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovenia and Sweden joined the sponsors.

1024. At the same meeting, the representative of Japan orally revised the draft resolution.

1025. Also 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.

1026. At the same meeting, the representative of Cambodia made a statement as the State concerned.

1027. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

1028. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

1029. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 30/23).

### **National policies and human rights**

1030. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representatives of Ecuador and Peru, also on behalf of Algeria, Italy, Romania and Thailand, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.24, sponsored by Algeria, Ecuador, Italy, Peru, Romania and Thailand, and co-sponsored by Argentina, Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Djibouti, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Panama, Paraguay, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Spain and Turkey. Subsequently, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Georgia, Honduras, Indonesia, Japan, Maldives, Nicaragua, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

1031. At the same meeting, the representatives of Ecuador and Peru orally revised the draft resolution.

1032. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

1033. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 30/24).

#### **Promoting international cooperation to support national human rights follow-up systems and processes**

1034. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representatives of Brazil and Paraguay introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.26, sponsored by Brazil and Paraguay, and co-sponsored by Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Ecuador, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Mexico, the Netherlands, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sierra Leone, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay. Subsequently, Algeria, Armenia, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Italy, Kazakhstan, Luxembourg, Maldives, Montenegro, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Thailand and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

1035. At the same meeting, the representative of Sierra Leone made a general comment on the draft resolution.

1036. 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.

1037. At the same meeting, the representative of South Africa made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

1038. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 30/25).

1039. At the same meeting, the representative of Japan made a general comment.

#### **Technical assistance and capacity-building for human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo**

1040. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.30, sponsored by Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by Belgium and Denmark. Subsequently, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Thailand, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

1041. 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.

1042. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo made a statement as the State concerned.

1043. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 30/26).

#### **Technical cooperation and capacity-building for Burundi in the field of human rights**

1044. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.31, sponsored by Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by Belgium, Bulgaria,

Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Albania, Australia, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Costa Rica, Lithuania, New Zealand, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey joined the sponsors.

1045. At the same meeting, the representative of Algeria orally revised the draft resolution.

1046. Also 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 States of America made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

1047. At the same meeting, the representative of Burundi made a statement as the State concerned.

1048. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 30/27).

## Annex I

### Attendance

#### Members

Albania	Ghana	Qatar
Algeria	India	Republic of Korea
Argentina	Indonesia	Russian Federation
Bangladesh	Ireland	Saudi Arabia
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Japan	Sierra Leone
Botswana	Kazakhstan	South Africa
Brazil	Kenya	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
China	Latvia	United Arab Emirates
Congo	Maldives	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Côte d'Ivoire	Mexico	United States of America
Cuba	Montenegro	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
El Salvador	Morocco	Viet Nam
Estonia	Namibia	
Ethiopia	Netherlands	
France	Nigeria	
Gabon	Pakistan	
Germany	Paraguay	
	Portugal	

#### States Members of the United Nations represented by observers

Andorra	Denmark	Lebanon
Angola	Djibouti	Lesotho
Armenia	Dominican Republic	Liberia
Australia	Ecuador	Libya
Austria	Egypt	Liechtenstein
Azerbaijan	Equatorial Guinea	Lithuania
Bahamas	Eritrea	Luxembourg
Bahrain	Fiji	Madagascar
Belarus	Finland	Malawi
Belgium	Georgia	Malaysia
Benin	Greece	Mali
Bulgaria	Grenada	Malta
Burkina Faso	Guatemala	Marshall Islands
Burundi	Haiti	Mauritania
Cambodia	Honduras	Mongolia
Cameroon	Hungary	Mozambique
Canada	Iceland	Myanmar
Central African Republic	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Nepal
Chad	Iraq	New Zealand
Chile	Israel	Nicaragua
Colombia	Italy	Niger
Costa Rica	Jamaica	Norway
Croatia	Jordan	Oman
Cyprus	Kiribati	Panama
Czech Republic	Kuwait	Peru
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	Kyrgyzstan	Philippines
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Poland
		Republic of Moldova
		Romania

Rwanda	South Sudan	Togo
Saint Lucia	Spain	Tunisia
San Marino	Sri Lanka	Turkey
Senegal	Sudan	Turkmenistan
Serbia	Sweden	Ukraine
Singapore	Switzerland	United Republic of Tanzania
Slovakia	Syrian Arab	Uruguay
Slovenia	Republic	Uzbekistan
Solomon Islands	Tajikistan	Yemen
Somalia	Thailand	

### **Non-Member States represented by observers**

Holy See  
State of Palestine

### **United Nations**

Economic Commission for Europe  
Joint United Nations Programme on  
HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS)

United Nations Children's Fund  
(UNICEF)  
United Nations Interim Administration  
Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK)

### **Specialized agencies and related organizations**

Food and Agriculture Organization of  
the United Nations (FAO)

International Labour Organization (ILO)

### **Intergovernmental organizations**

African Union  
Cooperation Council for the Arab States of  
the Gulf  
Council of Europe  
European Union

International Organization of la  
Francophonie  
Organization of Islamic Cooperation  
Movement of Non-Aligned Countries

### **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**

Canadian Human Rights Commission  
Defensoría del Pueblo de la República de  
Panamá  
Equality and Human Rights Commission  
of Great Britain  
European Network of National Human  
Rights Institutions  
International Coordinating Committee of  
National Institutions for the Promotion  
and Protection of Human Rights  
Kenya National Commission on Human  
Rights

Malawi Human Rights Commission  
National Human Rights Commission of  
the Republic of Korea  
National Human Rights Commission of  
Mongolia  
Netherlands Institute for Human Rights  
Northern Ireland Human Rights  
Commission  
Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for  
Human Rights

## Non-governmental organizations

- Action Canada for Population and Development
- Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs
- Advocates for Human Rights
- Africa culture internationale
- African-American Society for Humanitarian Aid and Development
- African Canadian Legal Clinic
- African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters
- African Development Association
- Africa Speaks
- Agence internationale pour le développement
- Agence pour les droits de l'homme
- Al-Hakim Foundation
- Al-Haq
- Al-Khoei Foundation
- All China Women's Federation
- Alliance Creative Community Project
- Alliance Defending Freedom
- Allied Rainbow Communities International
- All-Russian Public Organization "Russian Public Institute of Electoral Law"
- Alsalam Foundation
- Al Zubair Charity Foundation
- American Anthropological Association
- American Association of Jurists
- American Civil Liberties Union
- Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain
- Amnesty International
- Arab Commission for Human Rights
- Arab NGO Network for Development
- Archbishop E. Kataliko Actions for Africa "KAF"
- 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
- Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas
- Association burkinabé pour la survie de l'enfance
- Association des jeunes pour l'agriculture du Mali
- Association Dunenyo
- Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism
- Association for Progressive Communications
- Association for the Prevention of Torture
- Association mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit
- Association of World Citizens
- Association "Paix" pour la lutte contre la contrainte et l'injustice
- Association pour les victimes du monde
- Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII
- Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights
- Baha'i International Community
- Bahrain Center for Human Rights
- Bakhtar Development Network Switzerland
- Beijing Children's Legal Aid and Research Center
- Bischöfliches Hilfswerk Misereor
- Brahma Kumaris World Spiritual University
- British Humanist Association
- Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies
- Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace
- Canners International Permanent Committee
- Caritas Internationalis
- Center for Development of Civil Society
- Center for Environmental and Management Studies
- Center for Global Nonkilling
- Center for Inquiry
- Center for Legal and Social Studies
- 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
- Centro Regional de Derechos Humanos y Justicia de Género
- Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims
- Child Development Foundation
- China Association for Preservation and Development of Tibetan Culture
- China NGO Network for International Exchanges
- China Society for Human Rights Studies

Chinese People's Association for Peace and Disarmament  
 CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation  
 Collectif des femmes africaines du Hainaut  
 Colombian Commission of Jurists  
 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 of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches  
 Commission to Study the Organization of Peace  
 Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative  
 Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul  
 Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd  
 Conscience and Peace Tax International  
 Corporación para la Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos Reiniciar  
 Cultural Survival  
 December Twelfth Movement International Secretariat  
 Defence for Children International  
 Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers  
 Drammeh Institute  
 Earthjustice  
 East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project  
 Eastern Sudan Women Development Organization  
 Ecumenical Alliance for Human Rights and Development  
 Edmund Rice International  
 Espace Afrique international  
 European Center for Constitutional and Human Rights  
 European Humanist Federation  
 European Law Students' Association  
 European Union of Public Relations  
 European Youth Forum  
 Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos  
 Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland  
 Federation for Women and Family Planning  
 Federation of Cuban Women  
 Foodfirst Information and Action Network  
 Foundation for Gaia  
 France libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand  
 Franciscans International  
 Freedom House  
 Freedom Now  
 Friedrich Ebert Foundation  
 Friends World Committee for Consultation  
 Gazeteciler ve Yazarlar Vakfı  
 General Research Institute on the Convention on the Rights of the Child  
 Geneva Infant Feeding Association  
 Genève pour les droits de l'homme: formation internationale  
 Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights  
 Global Network for Rights and Development  
 Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant  
 Grupo Intercultural Almaciga  
 Harm Reduction International  
 Hawa Society for Women  
 Helios Life Association  
 HelpAge International  
 Himalayan Research and Cultural Foundation  
 Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries  
 Human Rights Advocates  
 Human Rights House Foundation  
 Human Rights Information and Training Center  
 Human Rights Law Centre  
 Human Rights Network  
 Human Rights Now  
 Human Rights Watch  
 Indian Council of Education  
 Indian Council of South America  
 Indian Law Resource Centre  
 Indigenous Information Network  
 Indigenous World Association  
 Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'homme  
 Institute for Planetary Synthesis  
 Institute for Policy Studies  
 Institute of Global Education  
 Intercambios  
 International Association against Torture  
 International Association for Democracy in Africa  
 International Association of Democratic Lawyers  
 International Association of Schools of Social Work  
 International Career Support Association  
 International Catholic Child Bureau



International Commission of Jurists  
 International Committee for the  
 Indigenous Peoples of the Americas  
 (Switzerland)  
 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 Journalists  
 International Federation of Rural Adult  
 Catholic Movements  
 International Federation of University  
 Women  
 International Fellowship of  
 Reconciliation  
 International Gay and Lesbian Human  
 Rights Commission  
 International Harm Reduction  
 Association  
 International Humanist and Ethical  
 Union  
 International Human Rights Association  
 of American Minorities  
 International Indian Treaty Council  
 International Institute for Non-Aligned  
 Studies  
 International-Lawyers.Org  
 International Lesbian and Gay  
 Association  
 International Longevity Center Global  
 Alliance  
 International Movement against All  
 Forms of Discrimination and Racism  
 International Movement ATD Fourth  
 World  
 International Movement for Fraternal  
 Union among Races and Peoples  
 International Network for the Prevention  
 of Elder Abuse  
 International NGO Forum on Indonesian  
 Development  
 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 Service for Human Rights  
 International Studies Association  
 International Trade Union Confederation  
 International Volunteerism Organization  
 for Women, Education and  
 Development  
 International Women Bond  
 International Work Group for Indigenous  
 Affairs  
 International Youth and Student  
 Movement for the United Nations  
 Iranian Elite Research Center  
 Iraqi Development Organization  
 Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice  
 delle Salesiane di Don Bosco  
 Ius Primi Viri International Association  
 Iuventum  
 Jossour forum des femmes marocaines  
 Journalists and Writers Foundation  
 Jubilee Campaign  
 Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims  
 of Torture  
 La Brique  
 Latter-Day Saint Charities  
 Lawyers for Lawyers  
 Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada  
 Liberal International  
 Liberation  
 Lutheran World Federation  
 Maarij Foundation for Peace and  
 Development  
 Make Mothers Matter  
 Marangopoulos Foundation for Human  
 Rights  
 Mbororo Social and Cultural  
 Development Association  
 Minority Rights Group  
 Mothers Legacy Project  
 National Coalition against Racial  
 Discrimination  
 National Congress of American Indians  
 National Union of Jurists of Cuba  
 Native American Rights Fund  
 New Humanity  
 Nonviolence International  
 Nonviolent Radical Party; Transnational  
 and Transparty  
 Nord-Sud XXI  
 Norwegian Refugee Council  
 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  
 Palestinian Return Centre  
 Pan African Union for Science and  
 Technology  
 Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation  
 Pax Romana  
 Peace Brigades International Switzerland  
 Peivande Gole Narges Organization  
 Penal Reform International  
 Planetary Association for Clean Energy  
 Plan International

Prahar	Tiye International
Presse emblème campagne	The Equal Rights Trust
Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme	UNESCO Centre Basque Country
Reporters sans frontières international	Union of Arab Jurists
Réseau international des droits humains	United Cities and Local Governments
Roma Centre for Social Intervention and Studies	United Nations for Education, Universal Science and Human Rights
Russian Peace Foundation	United Nations Watch
Saami Council	United Network of Young Peacebuilders
Save the Children International	United Schools International
Schweizerische Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Jugendverbände	Universal Networking Digital Language Foundation
Servas International	UPR Info
Sikh Human Rights Group	US Human Rights Network
Shia Rights Watch	Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik
Shimin Gaikou Centre	Victorious Youths Movement
Shirkat Gah Women's Resource Centre	Villages unis
Shivi Development Society	VIVAT International
Society for Threatened Peoples	Washington Office on Latin America
Society Studies Centre	Women Organization for Development and Capacity-Building
Soka Gakkai International	Women's Human Rights International Association
Solar Cookers International	Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
Solidarité pour un monde meilleur	World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace
Solidarité Suisse-Guinée	World Barua Organization
Soroptimist International	World Environment and Resources Council
SOS Kinderdorf International	World Evangelical Alliance
Sovereign Military Order of the Temple of Jerusalem	World Federation of United Nations Associations
Stichting Justitia et Pax Nederland	World Jewish Congress
Stiftung Brot fuer Alle	World Muslim Congress
Sudanese Women Parliamentarians Caucus	World Organization against Torture
Swedish Federation for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights	World Russian People's Council
Syriac Universal Alliance	
Teresian 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 thirtieth session***Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/1	1	Annotations to the agenda for the thirtieth session of the Human Rights Council: note by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/30/2	1	Report of the Human Rights Council on its thirtieth session
A/HRC/30/3	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Belarus
A/HRC/30/3/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/30/4	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Liberia
A/HRC/30/4/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/30/5	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Malawi
A/HRC/30/5/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/30/6	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Mongolia
A/HRC/30/6/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/30/7	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Panama
A/HRC/30/8	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Maldives
A/HRC/30/8/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/30/9	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Andorra
A/HRC/30/9/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/30/10	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Bulgaria
A/HRC/30/10/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/30/10/Add.1/Corr.1	6	Corrigendum
A/HRC/30/11	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Honduras
A/HRC/30/12	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: United States of America
A/HRC/30/12/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/30/12/Add.1/Corr.1	6	Corrigendum
A/HRC/30/13	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Marshall Islands
A/HRC/30/13/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/30/13/Corr.1	6	Corrigendum
A/HRC/30/14	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Croatia
A/HRC/30/14/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/30/15	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Jamaica
A/HRC/30/15/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/30/16	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Libya
A/HRC/30/16/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/30/17	1	Election of members of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee: note by the Secretary-General

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/18	2, 3	Capital punishment and the implementation of the safeguards guaranteeing protection of the rights of those facing the death penalty: yearly supplement of the Secretary-General to his quinquennial report on capital punishment
A/HRC/30/19	2, 3	Human rights implications of overincarceration and overcrowding: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/20	2, 3	The Role of Prevention in the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/21	2, 3	High-level panel discussion on the question of the death penalty: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/22	2, 3	Consolidated report of the Secretary-General and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the right to development
A/HRC/30/23	2, 3	Human Rights Council panel discussion on the equal enjoyment of the right to education by every girl: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/24	2, 3	Evaluation of the implementation of the second phase of the World Programme for Human Rights Education: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/24/Corr.1	2, 3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/30/25	2, 3	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the rights of indigenous peoples
A/HRC/30/26	2, 3	Promotion, protection and implementation of the right to participate in public affairs in the context of the existing human rights law: best practices, experiences, challenges and ways to overcome them: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/27	3, 4, 7, 9, 10	Communications report of special procedures: communications sent, 1 March to 31 May 2015; Replies received, 1 May to 31 July 2015
A/HRC/30/28	2, 10	Panel discussion on the issue of national policies and human rights: 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/30/29	2, 5	Cooperation with the United Nations, its representatives and mechanisms in the field of human rights: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/30/30	2, 10	Role and achievements of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights in assisting the Government and people of Cambodia in the promotion and protection of human rights: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/30/31	2, 10	Situation of human rights in Yemen: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/32	2, 10	Situation of human rights and the activities of the United Nations Joint Human Rights Office in the Democratic Republic of the Congo: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/32/Corr.1	2, 10	Corrigendum
A/HRC/30/32/Corr.2	2, 10	Corrigendum
A/HRC/30/33	2, 10	Study on the impact of technical assistance and capacity-building on the human rights situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (2008–2014): report of the United Nations
A/HRC/30/34	3	Annual report 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
A/HRC/30/34/Add.1	3	Mission to Côte d'Ivoire (7–10 October 2014)
A/HRC/30/34/Add.2	3	Comments by Côte d'Ivoire
A/HRC/30/35	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery, including its causes and consequences, Urmila Bhoola
A/HRC/30/35/Add.1	3	Mission to the Niger
A/HRC/30/35/Add.2	3	Mission to Belgium
A/HRC/30/36	3	Report of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention
A/HRC/30/36/Add.1	3	Follow-up mission to Germany
A/HRC/30/36/Add.2	3	Mission to New Zealand
A/HRC/30/36/Add.3	3	Follow-up mission to Italy
A/HRC/30/36/Add.4	3	Follow-up mission to Germany: comments by the State on the report of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention
A/HRC/30/37	3	United Nations Basic Principles and Guidelines on remedies and procedures on

## Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		the right of anyone deprived of their liberty to bring proceedings before a court
A/HRC/30/38	3	Report of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances
A/HRC/30/38/Add.1	3	Mission to Serbia, including Kosovo
A/HRC/30/38/Add.2	3	Mission to Montenegro
A/HRC/30/38/Add.3	3	Mission to Croatia
A/HRC/30/38/Add.4	3	Follow-up report to the recommendations made by the Working Group: missions to Mexico and Timor Leste
A/HRC/30/38/Add.5	3	Study on enforced or involuntary disappearances and economic, social and cultural rights
A/HRC/30/39	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation
A/HRC/30/39/Add.1	3	Priorities for the period 2014–2017
A/HRC/30/39/Add.2	3	Mission to Kenya
A/HRC/30/40	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the implications for human rights of the environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes, Baskut Tuncak
A/HRC/30/40/Add.1	3	Mission to Kazakhstan
A/HRC/30/40/Add.1/Corr.1	3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/30/40/Add.2	3	Mission to Kazakhstan: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur
A/HRC/30/41	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples, Victoria Lucia Tauli-Corpuz
A/HRC/30/41/Add.1	3	The situation of indigenous peoples in Paraguay
A/HRC/30/42	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence, Pablo De Greiff
A/HRC/30/42/Add.1	3	Mission to Burundi (8–16 December 2014)
A/HRC/30/43	3	Report of the Independent Expert on the enjoyment of all human rights by older persons, Rosa Kornfeld-Matte
A/HRC/30/43/Add.1	3	Mission to Slovenia
A/HRC/30/43/Add.2	3	Mission to Austria
A/HRC/30/43/Add.3	3	Mission to Mauritius
A/HRC/30/43/Add.4	3	Mission to Mauritius: comments by the State on the report of the Independent



---

*Documents issued in the general series*


---

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		Expert
A/HRC/30/44	3	Report of the Independent Expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order, Alfred-Maurice de Zayas
A/HRC/30/44/Corr.1	3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/30/45	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on the enjoyment of human rights, Idriss Jazairy
A/HRC/30/46	3	Report of the Working Group on the Right to Development on its sixteenth session: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/30/47	3	Report of the open-ended intergovernmental working group to consider the possibility of elaborating an international regulatory framework on the regulation, monitoring and oversight of the activities of private military and security companies on its fourth session
A/HRC/30/48	4	Report of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/30/48/Corr.1	4	Corrigendum
A/HRC/30/49	3, 5	Role of local government in the promotion and protection of human rights: final report of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee
A/HRC/30/50	3, 5	Final report of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee on the possibilities of using sport and the Olympic ideal to promote human rights for all and to strengthen universal respect for them
A/HRC/30/51	5	Reports of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee on its fourteenth and fifteenth sessions: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/30/52	5	Report of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples on its eighth session, Geneva, 20–24 July 2015
A/HRC/30/53	5	Promotion and protection of the rights of indigenous peoples with respect to their cultural heritage: study of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous People
A/HRC/30/54	5	Summary of responses to the questionnaire seeking the views of States and indigenous peoples on best practices regarding possible appropriate measures and implementation strategies to attain the goals of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: report of the Expert

## Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
A/HRC/30/55	5	Report of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on the draft United Nations declaration on the rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas
A/HRC/30/56	9	Report of the Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent on its fifteenth and sixteenth sessions
A/HRC/30/56/Add.1	9	Mission to the Netherlands
A/HRC/30/56/Add.2	9	Mission to Sweden
A/HRC/30/56/Add.3	9	Mission to the Netherlands and Curaçao: comments by the State on the report of the Working Group
A/HRC/30/57	10	Report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Somalia, Bahame Tom Nyanduga
A/HRC/30/58	10	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Cambodia, Rhona Smith
A/HRC/30/59	10	Report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic, Marie-Therese Keita Bocoum
A/HRC/30/60	10	Report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Sudan, Aristide Nononsi
A/HRC/30/61	2	Comprehensive report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on Sri Lanka
A/HRC/30/62	2, 3	Full-day meeting on the theme, "Towards better investment in the rights of the child": report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/63	3	Ways and means, as well as obstacles and challenges and proposals to overcome them, for the enhancement of international cooperation in the United Nations human rights machinery, including the Human Rights Council: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/30/64	2, 3	Panel discussion on the effects of terrorism on the enjoyment by all persons of human rights and fundamental freedoms: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/65	2, 8	Study on the impact of the world drug problem on the enjoyment of human rights: 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/30/66	10	Technical assistance provided to assist in the promotion and protection of human rights in Iraq: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/67	2	Violations and abuses committed by Boko Haram and the impact on human rights in the countries affected: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/68	2, 3	Report of the Secretary-General on the safety of journalists and the issue of impunity: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/30/69	3	Methods of work of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention
A/HRC/30/70	2, 3	Annual full-day discussion on the human rights of women: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/71	3	Report of the Working Group on the Right to Development on its sixteenth session (Geneva, 27 April, 1–4 September 2015)

*Documents issued in the conference room papers series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/CRP.1	3	Update by the Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence on his visit to Burundi
A/HRC/30/CRP.2	2	Report of the OHCHR Investigation on Sri Lanka (OISL)
A/HRC/30/CRP.3	2, 10	Oral update of the High Commissioner for Human Rights on the human rights violations and abuses against Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar

*Documents issued in the limited series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/L.1 and Rev.1, Rev.2	10	Technical assistance and capacity-building for Yemen in the field of human rights
A/HRC/30/L.2	3	Human rights and unilateral coercive measures
A/HRC/30/L.3	3	Regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights
A/HRC/30/L.4 and Rev.1	2	Situation of human rights in Yemen
A/HRC/30/L.5 and Rev.1	4	The grave and deteriorating human rights and humanitarian situation in the Syrian

*Documents issued in the limited series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		Arab Republic
A/HRC/30/L.6	10	Technical assistance and capacity building in the field of human rights in the Central African Republic
A/HRC/30/L.7	10	Assistance to Somalia in the field of human rights
A/HRC/30/L.8	3	Human rights and indigenous peoples
A/HRC/30/L.9	5	Review of the mandate of the expert mechanism on the rights of indigenous peoples
A/HRC/30/L.10 and Rev.1	10	Enhancement of technical cooperation and capacity-building in the field of human rights
A/HRC/30/L.11 and Rev.1	3	The question of the death penalty
A/HRC/30/L.12	3	Right to development
A/HRC/30/L.13	5	Promotion of the right to peace
A/HRC/30/L.14	3	Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order
A/HRC/30/L.15	3	The use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination
A/HRC/30/L.16	3	Human rights in the administration of justice, including juvenile justice
A/HRC/30/L.17	3	Contribution of the Human Rights Council to the high level meeting on HIV/AIDS in 2016
A/HRC/30/L.18	10	Technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in the Sudan
A/HRC/30/L.19	5	Promotion and protection of the human rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas
A/HRC/30/L.20	9	From rhetoric to reality: a global call for concrete action against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance
A/HRC/30/L.21	9	Forum on people of African descent in the diaspora
A/HRC/30/L.22 and Rev.1	10	Advisory services and technical assistance for Cambodia
A/HRC/30/L.23	5	Contribution of parliaments to the work of the Human Rights Council and its universal periodic review
A/HRC/30/L.24	10	National policies and human rights
A/HRC/30/L.25 and Rev.1	3	Human rights and preventing and countering

---

*Documents issued in the limited series*

---

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		violent extremism
A/HRC/30/L.26	10	Promoting international cooperation to support national human rights follow-up systems and processes
A/HRC/30/L.27 and Rev.1	3	Equal participation in political and public affairs
A/HRC/30/L.28	1	Follow-up to PRST/29/1
A/HRC/30/L.29	2	Promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka
A/HRC/30/L.30	10	Assistance technique et renforcement des capacités en matière des droits de l'homme en République Démocratique du Congo
A/HRC/30/L.31	10	Technical cooperation and capacity building for Burundi in the field of human rights
A/HRC/30/L.32	1	Reports of the Advisory Committee
A/HRC/30/L.33	4	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.5/Rev.1
A/HRC/30/L.34	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.11/Rev.1
A/HRC/30/L.35	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/L.36	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/L.37	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.25
A/HRC/30/L.38	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.25
A/HRC/30/L.39	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.25
A/HRC/30/L.40	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.25
A/HRC/30/L.41	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.25
A/HRC/30/L.42	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.25
A/HRC/30/L.43	1	Promoting the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health through enhancing capacity-building in public health against pandemics

---

*Documents issued in the Government series*

---

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/G/1	10	Note verbale dated 12 August 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Cambodia to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High

## Documents issued in the Government series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/G/2	4	Letter dated 10 August 2015 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of Georgia to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/30/G/3	4	Letter dated 10 September 2015 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/30/G/4	2	Note verbale dated 16 September 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Sri Lanka to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/G/5	10	Note verbale dated 15 September 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Ukraine to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/30/G/6	7	Note verbale dated 18 September 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Saudi Arabia to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/30/G/7	3	Note verbale dated 11 September 2015 from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Albania to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/G/8	4	Letter dated 25 September 2015 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/30/G/9	10	Note verbale dated 30 September 2015 from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of the Sudan to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/30/G/10	2, 3	Note verbale dated 1 October 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Singapore to the United Nations Office and other

---

*Documents issued in the Government series*

---

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		international organizations in Geneva addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/30/G/11	3	Note verbale dated 2 October 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/G/12	7	Note verbale dated 6 October 2015 from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Albania to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

---

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

---

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/NGO/1	3	Written statement submitted by the World Muslim Congress, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/2	3	Written statement submitted by the Prahar, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/3	6	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/4	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/5	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/6	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/7	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/8	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/30/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/30/NGO/10	4, 5	Written statement submitted by the International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/11	8	Written statement submitted by the International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/12	4	Written statement submitted by the International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/13	3	Written statement submitted by the Himalayan Research and Cultural Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/14	4	Written statement submitted by the International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/15	3	Written statement submitted by the Center for Global Nonkilling, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/16	9	Written statement submitted by the Prahar, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/17	3	Written statement submitted by the Auspice Stella, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/18	4	Written statement submitted by the Europe Third World Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/19	4	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/20	7	Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/21	3	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/22	6	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization



---

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*


---

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/23	3	Written statement submitted by the Society Studies Centre (MADA ssc), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/24	3	Written statement submitted by the Modern Advocacy, Humanitarian, Social and Rehabilitation Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/25	3	Written statement submitted by the Reporters Sans Frontiers International: reporters Without Borders International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/26	4	Written statement submitted by the Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/27	4	Written statement submitted by the Alsalam Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/28	4	Written statement submitted by the Nord-Sud XXI: North-South XXI, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/29	4	Written statement submitted by the International Educational Development, Inc., a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/30/NGO/30	4	Written statement submitted by the International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/31	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/32	6	Written statement submitted by the International Commission of Jurists, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/33	4	Written statement submitted by the International Federation for the Protection of the Rights of Ethnic, Religious, Linguistic & Other Minorities, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/30/NGO/34	3	Written statement submitted by the Nord-Sud XXI: North-South XXI, 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/30/NGO/35	8	Joint written statement submitted by the Ewiiapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, National Congress of American Indians, Native American Rights Fund, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Indian Law Resource Centre, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/30/NGO/36	3	Joint written statement submitted by the Ewiiapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, National Congress of American Indians, Native American Rights Fund, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Indian Law Resource Centre, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/30/NGO/37	7	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/38	5	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/39	4	Written statement submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/40	4	Joint written statement submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, European Humanist Federation, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/41	2	Written statement submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights (JKCHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/42	3	Written statement submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights (JKCHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/43	4	Written statement submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights (JKCHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/44	10	Written statement submitted by the World Federation of Ukrainian Women's Organizations, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/45	3	Written statement submitted by the Child Foundation, 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/30/NGO/46	4	Written statement submitted by the Child Foundation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/47	4	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/48	2, 10	Written statement submitted by the International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/49	5	Written statement submitted by the International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/50	9	Written statement submitted by the Prahar, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/51	4	Written statement submitted by the Pax Romana (International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs and International Movement of Catholic Students), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/52	3	Written statement submitted by the Hawa Society for Women, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/53	3	Written statement submitted by the Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/54	3	Written statement submitted by the Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/55	4	Written statement submitted by the Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/56	10	Written statement submitted by the International Educational Development, Inc., a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/30/NGO/57	10	Written statement submitted by the Eastern Sudan Women Development Organization, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/58	3	Written statement submitted by the Eastern Sudan Women Development Organization, 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/30/NGO/59	9	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/60	4	Written statement submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/61	3	Written statement submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/62	4	Written statement submitted by the Nazra for Feminist Studies, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/63	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/64	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/65	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/66	9	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/67	4	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/68	10	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/69	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/70	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/71	5	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/72	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/73	3	Written statement submitted by the Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, 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/30/NGO/74	3	Written statement submitted by the Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/75	4	Exposición conjunta escrita presentada por Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, American Association of Jurists, organizaciones no gubernamentales reconocidas como entidades consultivas especiales
A/HRC/30/NGO/76	4	Written statement submitted by the Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/77	3	Exposición conjunta escrita presentada por Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, American Association of Jurists, organizaciones no gubernamentales reconocidas como entidades consultivas especiales
A/HRC/30/NGO/78	5	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/79	4, 5	Written statement submitted by the International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/80	5	Written statement submitted by the International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/81	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/82	3	Written statement submitted by the HelpAge International, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/83	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/84	4	Written statement submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/85	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/30/NGO/86	3	Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/87	3	Written statement submitted by the World Organisation Against Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/88	3	Joint written statement submitted by the International Catholic Child Bureau, Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, Defence for Children International, Edmund Rice International Limited, International Juvenile Justice Observatory, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development: VIDES, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, Terre Des Hommes Federation Internationale, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/89	2	Written statement submitted by the World Evangelical Alliance, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/90	3	Exposé écrit présenté conjointement par le International Catholic Child Bureau, Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, Edmund Rice International Limited, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development: VIDES, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, organisations non gouvernementales dotées du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/30/NGO/91	3	Written statement submitted by the International Federation of University Women, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/92	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), nongovernmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/93	3	Written statement submitted by the Federal Union of European Nationalities, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/94	3	Written statement submitted by the Federal Union of European Nationalities, a non-

---

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*


---

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/95	3	Written statement submitted by the Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europe, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/96	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/97	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/98	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/99	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/100	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/101	2	Written statement submitted by the International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/102	3	Written statement submitted by the Gazeteciler ve Yazarlar Vakfı, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/103	7	Written statement submitted by the Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/104	7	Written statement submitted by the Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/105	4	Written statement submitted by the Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/106	3	Written statement submitted by the Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/107	10	Joint written statement submitted by the International Catholic Child Bureau, Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, Edmund

---

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*


---

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		Rice International Limited, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development: VIDES, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/108	3	Written statement submitted by the Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, a nongovernmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/109	7	Written statement submitted by the Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, a nongovernmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/110	3	Exposé écrit présenté conjointement par le France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, organisations non gouvernementales dotées du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/30/NGO/111	3	Written statement submitted by the Family and Life, a nongovernmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/112	2	Written statement submitted by the Association Points-Coeur, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/113	10	Exposé écrit présenté par le Franciscans International, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif général
A/HRC/30/NGO/114	3	Written statement submitted by the Women's Human Rights International Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/115	3	Written statement submitted by the Liberal International (World Liberal Union), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/116	4	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/117	4	Written statement submitted by the Nord-Sud XXI: NorthSouth XXI, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/118	3	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/119	7	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Now, a non-governmental



---

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*


---

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/120	4	Written statement submitted by the Women's Human Rights International Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/121	7	Joint written statement submitted by Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, BADIL Resource Centre for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/122	10	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/123	4	Written statement submitted by the International Educational Development, Inc., a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/30/NGO/124	5	Written statement submitted by the World Youth Alliance, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/125	2	Written statement submitted by the Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/126	3	Written statement submitted by Le Collectif des Femmes Africaines du Hainaut, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/127	3	Written statement submitted by the Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/128	10	Written statement submitted by the Association for Progressive Communications (APC), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/129	4	Written statement submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/130	5	Written statement submitted by the Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/131	3	Joint written statement submitted by International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, nongovernmental organizations in general consultative status, Asociación Española para el Derecho Internacional de los Derechos Humanos AEDIDH, American Association of Jurists,

---

 Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series
 

---

Symbol

Agenda item

Amman Center for Human Rights Studies, Apne Aap Women World Wide (India) Trust, Armenian Constitutional Right-Protective Centre, Association Dunenyo, Association of War-Affected Women, Association pour l'Intégration et le Développement Durable au Burundi, Atheist Alliance International, Aube Nouvelle pour la Femme et le Développement, Autre Vie, BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, Bangladesh Nari Progati Sangha, Center for Development of Civil Society, Centre d'accompagnement des alternatives locales de développement, Centre for Democracy and Development, Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme, Foundation for Human Horizon, Foundation for the development of knowledge Suma Veritas, Humanitaire Plus, Institute of Global Education, Institute of Noahide Code, International Career Support Association, International Federation of Women in Legal Careers, International Federation of Women Lawyers, International Institute for Child Protection, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, Labour, Health and Human Rights Development Centre, Lama Gangchen World Peace Foundation (LGWPF), Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada, Marangopoulos Foundation for Human Rights, Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés (OIPMA), Public Services International, Réseau des Organisations Féminines d'Afrique Francophone, Réseau International des Droits Humains (RIDH), Save the Climat, Shirley Ann Sullivan Educational Foundation, Solidarité Agissante pour le Développement Familial (SADF), Sun Charity USA, Tandem Project, The, The Children's Project, Inc., United Nations Association of San Diego, United Religions Initiative, Women's World Summit Foundation, World Association for Psychosocial Rehabilitation, World for World Organization, Yayasan Pendidikan Indonesia, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Arab NGO Network for Development, Dzeno Association, Indian Council of South America (CISA), Institute for Planetary Synthesis, International Society for Human Rights, Share The World's Resources (STWR), non-governmental organizations on the roster

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/NGO/132	3	Written statement submitted by the Make Mothers Matter: MMM, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/133	4	Written statement submitted by the Women's Human Rights International Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/134	5	Written statement submitted by the Indian Council of South America (CISA), a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/30/NGO/135	3	Exposición escrita presentada por Indian Council of South America (CISA), organización no gubernamental reconocida en la Lista
A/HRC/30/NGO/136	9	Written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a nongovernmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/137	6	Written statement submitted by the Indian Council of South America (CISA), a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/30/NGO/138	9	Exposición escrita presentada por Indian Council of South America (CISA), organización no gubernamental reconocida en la Lista
A/HRC/30/NGO/139	2	Written statement submitted by the Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/140	3	Written statement submitted by the International-Lawyers.Org, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/141	5	Exposición escrita presentada por Indian Council of South America (CISA), organización no gubernamental reconocida en la Lista
A/HRC/30/NGO/142	3	Written statement submitted by the International-Lawyers.Org, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/143	5	Written statement submitted by the International Indian Treaty Council (IITC), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/144	3	Written statement submitted the Association for Progressive Communications (APC), 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/30/NGO/145	3	Written statement submitted the Asian-Eurasian Human Rights Forum, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/146	4	Written statement submitted by the Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/147	3	Written statement submitted by the Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/148	4	Written statement submitted by the Liberation, a nongovernmental organization on the Roster
A/HRC/30/NGO/149	8	Written statement submitted by the Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/150	2	Written statement submitted by the Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/151	4	Written statement submitted by the Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/152	2	Written statement submitted by the Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/153	3	Exposición escrita presentada por Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociación Civil, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/30/NGO/154	6	Written statement submitted by the Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociación Civil, a nongovernmental organization in consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/155	5	Written statement submitted by the Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational and Transparty, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, Women's Human Rights International Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status, Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, a nongovernmental organization on the roster

*Documents issued in the national institutions series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/NI/1	6	Written submission by the Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights: note by the Secretariat

---

*Documents issued in the national institutions series*


---

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/30/NI/2	3	Information presented by the Canadian Human Rights Commission: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/30/NI/3	3	Information provided by the European Network of National Human Rights Institutions: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/30/NI/4	3	Information presented by the Provedor for Human Rights and Justice of Timor-Leste: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/30/NI/5	2	Information provided by the Ombudsman's Office of Colombia: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/30/NI/6	3	Information provided by the Ombudsman's Office of Colombia: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/30/NI/7	2	Information provided by the Ombudsman's Office of Colombia: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/30/NI/8	2	Information provided by the Ombudsman's Office of Colombia: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/30/NI/9	2	Information provided by the Ombudsman's Office of Colombia: note by the Secretariat

---

**Annex IV****Advisory Committee members elected by the Human Rights Council at its thirtieth session and the date of expiry of their term of membership**

---

<i>Member</i>	<i>Date of expiry</i>
Ibrahim Abdul Aziz al Sheddi (Saudi Arabia)	30 September 2018
Mario Luis Coriolano (Argentina)	30 September 2018
Katharina Pabel (Austria)	30 September 2018
Imeru Tamrat Yigezu (Ethiopia)	30 September 2018

---

## **Annex V**

### **Special procedure mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its thirtieth session**

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

Karima Bennoune (United States of America)

#### **Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent (member from Latin American and Caribbean States)**

Ahmed Reid (Jamaica)

#### **Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances (member from Eastern European States)**

Henrikas Mickevicius (Lithuania)

---