



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
15 January 2020

Original: English

---

**Human Rights Council**  
Thirty-second session  
Agenda item 1  
**Organizational and procedural matters**


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

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

GE.20-00546(E)



\* 2 0 0 0 5 4 6 \*

Please recycle 



## Contents

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
Part One: Resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-second session ....	4
I. Resolutions .....	4
II. Decisions .....	5
Part Two: Summary of proceedings .....	6
I. Organizational and procedural matters .....	6
A. Opening and duration of the session .....	6
B. Attendance .....	6
C. Agenda and programme of work .....	6
D. Organization of work .....	6
E. Meetings and documentation .....	7
F. Visits .....	7
G. Selection and appointment of mandate holders .....	8
H. Adoption of the report on the session .....	8
II. Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General .....	10
A. Update by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights .....	10
B. Reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General .....	11
III. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development .....	13
A. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders .....	13
B. Panel discussions .....	21
C. General debate on agenda item 3 .....	27
D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	28
IV. Human rights situations that require the Council's attention .....	60
A. Interactive dialogue with the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic .....	60
B. Interactive dialogue with the commission of inquiry on human rights in Eritrea .....	60
C. Interactive dialogue with a special procedure mandate holder .....	61
D. Enhanced interactive dialogue on the human rights situation in South Sudan .....	61
E. General debate on agenda item 4 .....	62
F. Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	63
V. Human rights bodies and mechanisms .....	66
A. Panel discussion on the contribution of parliaments to the work of the Human Rights Council and its universal periodic review .....	66
B. Forum on Business and Human Rights .....	67
C. Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples .....	67
D. General debate on agenda item 5 .....	67
E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	68
VI. Universal periodic review .....	69

A.	Consideration of the universal periodic review outcomes .....	69
B.	General debate on agenda item 6 .....	137
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	138
VII.	Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories .....	140
A.	General debate on agenda item 7 .....	140
VIII.	Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action .....	141
A.	General debate on agenda item 8 .....	141
IX.	Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action .....	143
A.	Interactive dialogue with a special procedure mandate holder .....	143
B.	General debate on agenda item 9 .....	143
X.	Technical assistance and capacity-building .....	145
A.	Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders .....	145
B.	Interactive dialogue on cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights .....	146
C.	Interactive dialogue on technical cooperation and capacity-building for Burundi in the field of human rights .....	146
D.	General debate on agenda item 10 .....	147
E.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	148
Annexes		
I.	Attendance .....	150
II.	Agenda .....	156
III.	Documents issued for the thirty-second session .....	157
IV.	Special procedure mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-second session .....	185

## Part One

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

#### I. Resolutions

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
32/1	Youth and human rights	30 June 2016
32/2	Protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity	30 June 2016
32/3	Trafficking in persons, especially women and children: protecting victims of trafficking and persons at risk of trafficking, especially women and children in conflict and post-conflict situations	30 June 2016
32/4	Elimination of discrimination against women	30 June 2016
32/5	Human rights and arbitrary deprivation of nationality	30 June 2016
32/6	Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights	30 June 2016
32/7	The right to a nationality: women's equal nationality rights in law and in practice	30 June 2016
32/8	Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the right to food	30 June 2016
32/9	Human rights and international solidarity	30 June 2016
32/10	Business and human rights: improving accountability and access to remedy	30 June 2016
32/11	Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons	1 July 2016
32/12	Impact of arms transfers on human rights	1 July 2016
32/13	The promotion, protection and enjoyment of human rights on the Internet	1 July 2016
32/14	Protection of the human rights of migrants: strengthening the promotion and protection of the human rights of migrants, including in large movements	1 July 2016
32/15	Access to medicines in the context of the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health	1 July 2016
32/16	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	1 July 2016
32/17	Addressing the impact of multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination and violence in the context of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance on the full enjoyment of all human rights by women and girls	1 July 2016
32/18	Mental health and human rights	1 July 2016
32/19	Accelerating efforts to eliminate violence against women: preventing and responding to violence against women and girls, including indigenous women and girls	1 July 2016
32/20	Realizing the equal enjoyment of the right to education by every girl	1 July 2016

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
32/21	Elimination of female genital mutilation	1 July 2016
32/22	The right of education	1 July 2016
32/23	Protection of the family: role of the family in supporting the protection and promotion of human rights of persons with disabilities	1 July 2016
32/24	Situation of human rights in Eritrea	1 July 2016
32/25	The human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic	1 July 2016
32/26	Situation of human rights in Belarus	1 July 2016
32/27	The Social Forum	1 July 2016
32/28	Declaration on the right to peace	1 July 2016
32/29	Cooperation with and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights	1 July 2016
32/30	Capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights	1 July 2016
32/31	Civil society space	1 July 2016
32/32	The rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association	1 July 2016
32/33	Human rights and climate change	1 July 2016

## II. Decisions

<i>Decision</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
32/101	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Namibia	23 June 2016
32/102	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Niger	23 June 2016
32/103	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Mozambique	23 June 2016
32/104	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Estonia	23 June 2016
32/105	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Paraguay	23 June 2016
32/106	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Belgium	23 June 2016
32/107	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Denmark	24 June 2016
32/108	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Palau	24 June 2016
32/109	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Somalia	24 June 2016
32/110	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Seychelles	24 June 2016
32/111	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Solomon Islands	24 June 2016
32/112	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Latvia	24 June 2016
32/113	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Sierra Leone	24 June 2016
32/114	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Singapore	24 June 2016
32/115	Regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights	30 June 2016

## **Part Two**

### **Summary of proceedings**

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

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

1. The Human Rights Council held its thirty-second session at the United Nations Office at Geneva from 13 June to 1 July 2016 and on 8 July 2016. The President of the Council opened the session.
2. At the 1st meeting, on 13 June 2016, the President made a statement on the terrorist attacks that had occurred in the cities of Baghdad; Damascus; Orlando, United States of America; Halgen, Somalia; Istanbul, Turkey; Tel Aviv, Israel; and elsewhere.
3. At the same meeting, the Federal Councillor and Head of the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Didier Burkhalter, addressed the plenary.
4. At the 38th meeting, on 29 June 2016, the President made a statement on the terrorist attacks that had occurred in Afghanistan, the Central African Republic, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey.
5. In accordance with rule 8 (b) of the rules of procedure of the Human Rights Council, as contained in part VII of the annex to Council resolution 5/1, the organizational meeting of the thirty-second session was held on 30 May 2016.
6. The thirty-second session consisted of 47 meetings over 16 days (see para. 16 below).

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

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

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

8. At its 1st meeting, on 13 June 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted the agenda and programme of work of the thirty-second session.

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

9. At the 1st meeting, on 13 June 2016, the President referred to the introduction of an online system for inscription on the lists of speakers for all general debates at the thirty-second session of the Human Rights Council. He also referred to the modalities and schedule of the online inscription, which was launched on 9 June 2016.
10. At the 1st and 2nd meetings, the President outlined, pursuant to the practice introduced at the twenty-seventh session of the Human Rights Council, the modalities for the clustered interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders under agenda item 3. The total duration of each clustered interactive dialogue would not exceed four hours. Each special procedure mandate holder in a cluster would introduce his or her report within 15 minutes and respond to questions and make concluding remarks within 15 minutes. As soon as the list of speakers would be available following electronic registration, the secretariat would calculate the estimated time needed to complete the 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 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 two minutes for observer States and other observers. Should this measure be deemed insufficient to ensure that the total duration not exceed four hours, the speaking time limit would be further reduced, to no less than 1.5 minutes per speaker.

11. Also at the 1st meeting, the President referred to the decision taken at the organizational meeting of the thirty-second session of the Human Rights Council, upon the recommendation of the Bureau, concerning the modalities and schedule of the advance inscription on the lists of speakers for clustered interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders under agenda item 3. The advance inscription for those clustered interactive dialogues would take place at the end of the 2nd meeting.

12. At the same meeting, the President outlined the speaking time limits for the general debates, 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 3rd meeting, the President outlined the speaking time limits for the panel discussions, which would be two minutes for States members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.

14. At the 20th meeting, on 21 June 2016, the President outlined the speaking time limits for the individual interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders, which would be three minutes for States members of the Human Rights Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

15. At the 26th meeting, on 23 June 2016, the President outlined the speaking time limits for the consideration of the outcomes of the universal periodic review under agenda item 6, which would be 20 minutes for the State concerned to present its views; where appropriate, 2 minutes for the national human rights institution with A status of the State concerned; up to 20 minutes for States members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and United Nations agencies to express their views on the outcome of the review, with varying speaking times according to the number of speakers in accordance with the modalities set out in the appendix to the annex to 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**

16. The Human Rights Council held 47 fully serviced meetings during its thirty-second session.<sup>1</sup>

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

## **F. Visits**

18. At the 1st meeting, on 13 June 2016, the Vice-President of Viet Nam, Dang Thi Ngoc Thinh, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

19. At the same meeting, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Azerbaijan, Mahmud Mammad-Guliyev, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

20. At the 6th meeting, on 14 June 2016, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Eritrea, Osman Saleh, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

21. At the same meeting, the representatives of Eritrea and Ethiopia made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

---

<sup>1</sup> The proceedings of the thirty-second session of the Human Rights Council can be followed through the archived webcasts of the Council sessions at <http://webtv.un.org>.

22. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Ethiopia made a statement in exercise of a second right of reply.
23. At the 11th meeting, on 16 June 2016, the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Baroness Anelay, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.
24. At the same meeting, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine, Sergiy Kyslytsya, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.
25. At the 13th meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.
26. At the 36th meeting, on 28 June 2016, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ecuador, Guillaume Long, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.
27. At the 37th meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

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

28. At the 46th meeting, on 1 July 2016, the President presented a list of candidates to be appointed for five vacancies of special procedure mandate holders.
29. At the same meeting, the representatives of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Germany, India, Latvia, the Netherlands, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements on procedural matters associated with the appointment of the special procedure mandate holders.
30. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council approved, in accordance with Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21 and its decision 6/102, the appointment of five special procedure mandate holders (see annex IV). It was decided that the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ahmed Shaheed, would remain in his current function until the appointment and entry into functions of his successor. It was also decided that the term of office of the current Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, Heiner Bielefeldt, would be extended until Ahmed Shaheed would take up his functions.
31. At the same meeting, following the appointment of the special procedure mandate holders, the representatives of Ecuador, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements.
32. At the 47th meeting, on 8 July 2016, at the outset of the resumed thirty-second session of the Human Rights Council, the President made a statement on procedural matters associated with the appointment of the five special procedure mandate holders.
33. At the same meeting, the representatives of Namibia and Paraguay made statements.
34. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation, also on behalf of Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the Sudan, Tajikistan, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), made a statement explaining the position of the delegations on the appointment, while dissociating them from the consensus on the appointment of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions.

### **H. Adoption of the report on the session**

35. At the 47th meeting, on 8 July 2016, the representatives of Australia, Azerbaijan, Canada, Czechia, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Malta, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Sierra Leone, the United States of America and Uruguay (also on behalf of Argentina, Chile, Colombia and Costa Rica) made statements as observer States on the adopted resolutions.



36. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation (also on behalf of Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, Tajikistan, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)) made a statement.

37. Also at the same meeting, the Vice-President and Rapporteur of the Human Rights Council made a statement on the draft report of the Council on its thirty-second session.

38. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted ad referendum the draft report (A/HRC/32/2) and entrusted the Rapporteur with its finalization.

39. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Ireland (also on behalf of Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Finland, France, Ghana, Hungary, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay) and Japan made statements.

40. At the same meeting, the observer for the International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Human Rights Watch, the International Commission of Jurists and the International Lesbian and Gay Association) made a statement on the session.

41. 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

42. At the 1st meeting, on 13 June 2016, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement providing an update of the activities of his Office.

43. During the ensuing general debate, at the 1st and 2nd meetings, on the same day, and at the 4th meeting, on 14 June 2016, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt<sup>2</sup> (also on behalf of Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe), El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)<sup>2</sup> (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Maldives, Morocco (also on behalf of members and observers of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Namibia, Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Netherlands (also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Mongolia, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America), Nigeria, Pakistan<sup>2</sup> (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Afghanistan, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Benin, Brazil, Cambodia, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Greece, Guinea Bissau, Honduras, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Montenegro, Myanmar, Nepal, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United States of America;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists (also on behalf of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Education Development, the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, the Union of Arab Jurists and the World Federation of Democratic Youth), Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, China NGO Network for International Exchanges, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations, International-Lawyers.Org, International Muslim Women's Union, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Service for Human Rights,

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

International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Iraqi Development Organization, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Reporters sans frontières international, Réseau international des droits humains, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization.

44. At the 2nd meeting, on 13 June 2016, the representative of Armenia made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

45. At the 4th meeting, on 14 June 2016, the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Japan, Kenya and the Republic of Korea made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

46. 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.

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

47. At the 18th meeting, on 20 June 2016, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights presented thematic reports prepared by the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General under agenda items 2, 3, 5 and 6.

48. At the 18th and 19th meetings, on the same day, and at the 20th meeting, on 21 June 2016, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on thematic reports under agenda items 2 and 3 presented by the Deputy High Commissioner (see chap. III, sect. C).

49. At the 27th meeting, on 23 June 2016, and at the 31st meeting, on 24 June, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 5, and at the 32nd meeting, on 27 June, the Council held a general debate on agenda item 6, including on thematic reports under agenda items 2, 5 and 6 presented by the Deputy High Commissioner (see chap. V, sect. D, and chap. VI, sect. B).

50. At the 38th meeting, on 29 June 2016, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights provided, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 29/23, an oral update on the situation of human rights in Ukraine.

51. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council held an interactive dialogue on the oral update provided by the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights (see chap. X, sect. B).

52. Also at the same meeting, the High Commissioner presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 30/27 on technical cooperation and capacity-building for Burundi in the field of human rights, his report thereon (A/HRC/32/30).

53. At the 38th and 39th meetings, on the same day, the Human Rights Council held an interactive dialogue on the report presented by the High Commissioner (see chap. X, sect. C).

54. At the 39th meeting, the High Commissioner presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 29/21, his report on the situation of human rights of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar (A/HRC/32/18).

55. At the same meeting, the High Commissioner presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 30/1 on promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka, an oral update of OHCHR on the implementation of that resolution.

56. During the ensuing general debate, at the 39th meeting, on 29 June 2016, and at the 40th meeting, on 30 June, the following made statements:

(a) The representatives of Myanmar and Sri Lanka, as the States concerned;

(b) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Germany, Ghana, Latvia (also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Estonia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania,

Luxembourg, Malta, the Marshall Islands, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Ukraine and the United States of America), Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Liechtenstein, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), Pakistan<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Viet Nam;

(c) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Azerbaijan, Canada, Denmark, Estonia, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Marshall Islands (also on behalf of Palau), New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Thailand, Turkey, United States of America;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Centre indépendant de recherches et d'initiatives pour le dialogue, Human Rights Watch, Integrated Youth Empowerment – Common Initiative Group, International Commission of Jurists (also on behalf of Franciscans International, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues and the International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism), International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Minority Rights Group, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Prahar, Society for Development and Community Empowerment, United Nations Watch, World Barua Organization.

57. At the 40th meeting, on 30 June 2016, the representative of Bahrain made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

58. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 10, including on the report and oral updates under agenda items 2 and 10 presented by the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights and the Deputy High Commissioner (see chap. X, sect. D).

### **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**

##### **Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants**

59. At the 4th meeting, on 14 June 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants, François Crépeau, presented his report (A/HRC/32/40).

60. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 5th and 6th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Bangladesh, China, Costa Rica<sup>2</sup> (also on behalf of Brazil, Italy, Morocco, the Philippines, Senegal, Slovenia, Switzerland and Thailand), Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Dominican Republic<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ecuador, El Salvador, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan<sup>2</sup> (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, South Africa (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Afghanistan, Angola, Armenia, Australia, Benin, Canada, Costa Rica, Egypt, Greece, Honduras, Italy, Libya, Nepal, Niger, Peru, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Turkey, United States of America, Holy See;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Caritas Internationalis, China Society for Human Rights Studies, Defence for Children International, Franciscans International, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Save the Children International, Terre des hommes fédération internationale.

61. At the 6th meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

##### **Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights**

62. At the 5th meeting, on 14 June 2016, the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights, Philip Alston, presented his reports (A/HRC/32/31 and Add.1–2).

63. At the same meeting, the representatives of Chile and Romania made statements as the States concerned.

64. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 5th and 6th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, China, Costa Rica<sup>2</sup> (also on behalf of Italy, Morocco, the Philippines, Senegal, Slovenia and Switzerland), Cuba, Dominican Republic<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan<sup>2</sup> (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, South Africa (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Togo, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belarus, Benin, Egypt, Eritrea, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Nepal, Niger, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Tunisia, United States of America;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Allied Rainbow Communities International, Center for Economic and Social Rights, China Foundation for Poverty Alleviation, Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture.

65. At the 6th meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

66. At the 6th meeting, on 14 June 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, Dainius Pūras, presented his reports (A/HRC/32/32 and Add. 1–2 and A/HRC/32/33).

67. At the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, Maud de Boer-Buquicchio, and the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery, Urmila Bhoola, joined the Special Rapporteur and made statements to present the joint report on their visit to Nigeria (A/HRC/32/32/Add.2).

68. At the 8th meeting, on 15 June 2016, the representatives of Nigeria and Paraguay made statements as the States concerned.

69. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 8th and 9th meetings, on 15 June 2016, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Belgium, Botswana, China, Cuba, Dominican Republic<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Panama, Philippines, Portugal (also on behalf of Brazil), Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, South Africa (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland, Togo, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Argentina, Belarus, Benin, Egypt, Greece, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Lithuania, Malaysia, Monaco, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Turkey, Uruguay;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Africa culture internationale, Center for Reproductive Rights, Comité international pour le respect et l'application de la charte africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Defence for Children International (also on behalf of Make Mothers Matter and the Consortium for Street Children), Freedom Now, Friends World Committee for Consultation, International Lesbian and Gay Association (also on behalf of Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland and the Swedish Federation of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights), Iraqi Development Organization, Sisters of Mercy of the Americas.

70. At the 9th meeting, on 15 June 2016, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

### **Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children**

71. At the 6th meeting, on 14 June 2016, the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children, Maria Grazia Giammarinaro, presented her reports (A/HRC/32/41 and Corr.1 and Add.1).

72. At the 8th meeting, on 15 June 2016, the representative of Jordan made a statement as the State concerned.

73. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 8th and 9th meetings, on 15 June 2016, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Belarus<sup>2</sup> (also on behalf of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libya, Nicaragua, Nigeria, the Philippines, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Singapore, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, the United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Belgium, Botswana, China, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Georgia, Germany, India, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Morocco, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Switzerland, Togo, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Estonia, Greece, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Kuwait, Malaysia, Nepal, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, United States of America, Uruguay;

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

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

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

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa culture internationale, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, China Foundation for Poverty Alleviation, Friends World Committee for Consultation, Sisters of Mercy of the Americas, World Barua Organization.

74. At the 9th meeting, on 15 June 2016, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

75. At the same meeting, the representatives of Indonesia and Thailand made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

### **Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers**

76. At the 9th meeting, on 15 June 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers, Mónica Pinto, presented her reports (A/HRC/32/34 and Add.1).

77. At the same meeting, the representative of Guinea Bissau made a statement as the State concerned.

78. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 9th meeting, on 15 June 2016, and at the 11th meeting, on 16 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, China, Cuba, Dominican Republic<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ecuador, France, India, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Maldives, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Togo, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Argentina, Egypt, Estonia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Pakistan, Tunisia, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Association burkinabé pour la survie de l'enfance, Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, China NGO Network for International Exchanges, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Human Rights House Foundation (also on behalf of the International Bar Association), Indian Council of South America, International Bar Association, International Commission of Jurists (also on behalf of the International Service for Human Rights), World Muslim Congress.

79. At the 9th meeting, on 15 June 2016, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela raised a point of order in relation to the statement made by the United States of America, opposing the reference to a State that was not mentioned in the report of the Special Rapporteur.

80. Four delegations supported the point of order<sup>3</sup> while three delegations spoke against it.<sup>4</sup>

81. Under rules 113 and 127 of the General Assembly rules of procedure, the Human Rights Council conducted a roll-call vote on the question of whether a reference in the statement to a State not mentioned in the report of the Special Rapporteur was in order. The result of the vote was affirmative with 13 in favour and 12 against with 11 abstentions.

82. At the 11th meeting, on 16 June 2016, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

83. At the 9th meeting, on 15 June 2016, the representatives of China and Egypt made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

84. At the 13th meeting, on 16 June 2016, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

#### **Independent Expert on human rights and international solidarity**

85. At the 9th meeting, on 15 June 2016, the Independent Expert on human rights and international solidarity, Virginia Dandan, presented her reports (A/HRC/32/43 and Add.1).

86. At the same meeting, the representative of Morocco made a statement as the State concerned.

87. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Conseil national des droits de l'homme du Maroc made a statement.

88. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 9th meeting, on 15 June 2016, and at the 11th meeting, on 16 June, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Dominican Republic<sup>5</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ecuador, El Salvador, India, Pakistan<sup>5</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Panama, Philippines, Qatar, South Africa;

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

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of Association Points-Cœur, the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Edmund Rice International, Fondazione Marista per la Solidarietà Internazionale, the Foundation for Gaia, the International Movement of Apostolate in the Independent Social Milieus, the International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education, the International Volunteerism Organization for

<sup>3</sup> Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador and the Russian Federation.

<sup>4</sup> Germany, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

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



Women, Education and Development, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, the Lucis Trust Association, New Humanity, Pax Christi International and the Planetary Association for Clean Energy), International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations (also on behalf of the American Association of Jurists, France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, the International Fellowship of Reconciliation and the World Federation of Democratic Youth).

89. At the same meeting, on 16 June 2016, the Independent Expert answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

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

90. At the 11th meeting, on 16 June 2016, the Chair of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises, Dante Pesce, presented the reports of the Working Group (A/HRC/32/45 and Add.1–4).

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

92. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 11th and 13th meetings, on 16 June 2016, and at the 14th meeting, on 17 June, the following made statements and asked the Chair questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ecuador, Germany, Ghana, Indonesia, Mexico, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, South Africa, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Brazil, Chile, Czechia, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mozambique, Niger, Norway, Spain, Tunisia, United States of America, State of Palestine;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Khoei Foundation, Centro Regional de Derechos Humanos y Justicia de Género, Indian Council of South America, International Commission of Jurists, International Service for Human Rights.

93. At the 14th meeting, on 17 June 2016, the Chair answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

94. At the 11th meeting, on 16 June 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, David Kaye, presented his report (A/HRC/32/38).

95. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 11th and 13th meetings, on 16 June 2016, and at the 14th meeting, on 17 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Belgium, Botswana, China, Cuba, Dominican Republic<sup>5</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), France, Germany, Ghana, India, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Libya, Maldives, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan<sup>5</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovenia, South Africa, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Austria, Burkina Faso, Costa Rica, Czechia, Egypt, Estonia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Libya, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Spain, Sweden (also on behalf of Finland), Turkey, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement, Al-Khoei Foundation, Alsalam Foundation, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, International Bar Association, International Educational Development, People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy, Presse emblème campagne.

96. At the 13th meeting, on 16 June 2016, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

97. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Egypt and Thailand made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

98. At the 14th meeting, on 17 June 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the right to education, Kishore Singh, presented his reports (A/HRC/32/37 and Add.1).

99. At the same meeting, the representative of Fiji made a statement as the State concerned.

100. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 14th and 15th meetings, on 17 June 2016, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, China, Dominican Republic<sup>5</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia (also on behalf of Egypt, Portugal and Senegal), France, Georgia, Ghana, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan<sup>5</sup> (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Russian Federation, Slovenia (also on behalf of Brazil, Costa Rica, Italy, Morocco, the Philippines, Senegal, Switzerland and Thailand), South Africa, Togo;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Benin, Burkina Faso, Costa Rica, Egypt, Estonia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Malaysia, Mali, Niger, Poland, Sierra Leone, Tunisia;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Association for Progressive Communications, Federation of Cuban Women, Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Liberation.

101. At the 15th meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

102. At the 14th meeting, on 17 June 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, Maina Kiai, presented his reports (A/HRC/32/36 and Add.1–3).

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

104. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 14th and 15th meetings, on 17 June 2016, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, China, Cuba, Dominican Republic<sup>5</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), France, Georgia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Maldives, Nigeria, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Costa Rica, Czechia, Egypt, Estonia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Myanmar, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Ukraine, United States of America, State of Palestine;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement, American Association of Jurists, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Foodfirst Information and Action Network, Freedom Now, Human Rights House Foundation, International Service for Human Rights, Iraqi Development Organization, People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy.

105. At the 15th meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

106. At the 16th meeting, on the same day, the representative of the Russian Federation made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

### **Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences**

107. At the 16th meeting, on 17 June 2016, the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences, Dubravka Šimonović, presented her reports (A/HRC/32/42 and Corr.1 and Add.1–3).

108. At the same meeting, the representatives of Georgia, South Africa and the Sudan made statements as the States concerned.

109. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Public Defender (Ombudsman) of Georgia made a statement.

110. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 16th meeting, on 17 June 2016, and at the 17th meeting, on 20 June 2016, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, China, Cuba, Dominican Republic<sup>5</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ecuador, France, Germany, Ghana, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan<sup>5</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Slovenia, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland, Togo, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Japan, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malaysia, Mali, Montenegro, Myanmar, Nepal, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Republic of Moldova, Sao Tome and Principe, Spain, Sudan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United States of America, Uruguay;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Ecumenical Alliance for Human Rights and Development, International Catholic Child Bureau, Korea Center for United Nations Human Rights Policy, Korean Council for the Women Drafted for Military Sexual Slavery by Japan, Liberation, Victorious Youths Movement, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (also on behalf of CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation).

111. At the 17th meeting, on 20 June 2016, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

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

112. At the 16th meeting, on 17 June 2016, the Chair of the Working Group on the issue of discrimination against women in law and in practice, Frances Raday, presented the reports of the Working Group (A/HRC/32/44 and Add.1–2).

113. At the same meeting, the representatives of Senegal and the United States of America made statements as the States concerned.

114. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 16th meeting, on 17 June 2016, and at the 17th meeting, on 20 June, the following made statements and asked the Chair questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Dominican Republic<sup>5</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ecuador, France, Ghana, Greece, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Russian Federation, Slovenia, Sudan, Switzerland, Togo, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Afghanistan, Angola, Armenia, Australia, Benin, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Republic of Moldova, Sao Tome and Principe, Sweden, Tunisia, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Alliance Defending Freedom (also on behalf of Global Helping to Advance Women and Children), British Humanist Association, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland, Make Mothers Matter.

115. At the 16th meeting, on 17 June 2016, the Chair answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

### **Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons**

116. At the 17th meeting, on 20 June 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons, Chaloka Beyani, presented his reports (A/HRC/32/35 and Add.1–4).

117. At the same meeting, the representatives of Honduras, Iraq, the Philippines and the Syrian Arab Republic made statements as the States concerned.

118. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 17th and 18th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Austria, China, Cuba, Georgia, Ghana, Latvia, Nigeria, Qatar (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Central African Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Libya, Norway, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Turkey, Ukraine, United States of America, State of Palestine;

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

(d) Observers for the International Committee of the Red Cross and the Sovereign Military Hospitaller Order of St. John of Jerusalem of Rhodes and of Malta;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Khwei Foundation, Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, Centre Europe-tiers monde,

Franciscans International, International-Lawyers.Org, Minority Rights Group, World Barua Organization, World Jewish Congress.

119. At the 18th meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

120. At the 19th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Armenia and Azerbaijan made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

### **Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions**

121. At the 17th meeting, on 20 June 2016, the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, Christof Heyns, presented his reports (A/HRC/32/39 and Add.1–5).

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

123. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 17th and 18th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Belgium, China, Cuba, Ghana, Namibia, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, South Africa, Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Sudan, United States of America, State of Palestine;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Il Cenacolo, International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations, International-Lawyers.Org, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization, World Muslim Congress.

124. At the 18th meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

## **B. Panel discussions**

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

125. At the 3rd meeting, on 13 June 2016, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council decision 31/115, a high-level panel discussion on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Council, focused on its achievements and challenges.

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

127. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: former President of the Human Rights Council on its 9th cycle, Joachim Rucker; former President of the Human Rights Council on its 8th cycle, Baudelaire Ndong Ella; former President of the Human Rights Council on its 7th cycle, Remigiusz Achilles Henczel; former President of the Human Rights Council on its 6th cycle, Laura Dupuy Lasserre; former President of the Human Rights Council on its 5th cycle, Sihasak Phuangketkeow; former President of the Human Rights Council on its 4th cycle, Alex Van Meeuwen; former President of the Human Rights Council on its 3rd cycle, Martin I. Uhomoibhi; former President of the Human Rights Council on its 2nd cycle, Doru Costea; former President of the Human Rights Council on its 1st cycle, Luis Alfonso de Alba Góngora (by video message); former Special Rapporteur on the human rights to safe drinking water and sanitation, Catarina de Albuquerque; United Nations Advocate at Human Rights Watch, Laila Matar.

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: China (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Russian Federation and South Sudan), Cuba (also on behalf of Algeria, Angola, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mauritania, Nicaragua, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam), Egypt<sup>6</sup> (also on behalf of Belarus, Cuba, Ecuador, Indonesia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Uganda and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Morocco (on behalf of member and observers of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Qatar (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Rwanda<sup>6</sup> (also on behalf of the European Union, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Sudan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America and Uruguay), Switzerland (also on behalf of Austria, Liechtenstein and Slovenia), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (also on behalf of Ethiopia, Italy, Japan, Mexico and Morocco), Viet Nam (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations);

(b) Representative of an observer State: Honduras;

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

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

(e) Observer for a national human rights institution: Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions;

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, the Asian Legal Resource Centre, the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales, the Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Commission of Jurists and the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues).

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Bangladesh, Brazil<sup>6</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries), Costa Rica<sup>6</sup> (also on behalf of Brazil, Italy, Morocco, the Philippines, Senegal, Slovenia, Switzerland and Thailand), Dominican Republic<sup>6</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ecuador, Ireland<sup>6</sup> (also on behalf of Botswana, Costa Rica, Georgia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay), Pakistan<sup>6</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Portugal, Saudi Arabia, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), United Arab Emirates;

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

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation (also on behalf of Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, the Asian Legal Resource Centre, the Baha'i International Community, the Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Commission of Jurists and the International

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

Federation for Human Rights Leagues), Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme.

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

**Panel discussion on the promotion and protection of the right to development, as part of the commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Right to Development**

131. At the 7th meeting, on 15 June 2016, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 31/4, a panel discussion on the promotion and protection of the right to development, as part of the celebrations of the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Right to Development.

132. A video produced by OHCHR was screened to mark the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Right to Development and to open the panel discussion.

133. The High Commissioner made an opening statement for the panel. The Permanent Representative of Egypt to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Amr Ramadan, moderated the discussion for the panel.

134. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Secretary of Human Rights at the Ministry for Justice of Brazil, Flavia Piovesan; Permanent Representative of Jamaica to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Wayne McCook; Head of the Department of International Law and Human Rights and Director of the Human Rights Centre at the United Nations-mandated University for Peace in Costa Rica, Mihir Kanade; Executive Director of the South Centre in Geneva, Martin Khor.

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Brazil<sup>6</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries), China (also on behalf of Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, Cambodia, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe), Dominican Republic<sup>6</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, Ethiopia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)<sup>6</sup> (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Namibia, Nigeria, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), United Arab Emirates;

(b) Representative of an observer State: Tunisia;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, Indian Council of South America, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations.

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

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Egypt, Jordan, Malaysia, Pakistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development (also on behalf of the Sexual Rights Initiative), Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of Association Points-Cœur, the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers, Edmund Rice International, the International Movement of Apostolate in the Independent Social Milieus, 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, Pax Christi International and the Teresian Association), China Society for Human Rights Studies, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, ONG Hope International.

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

### **Annual full-day discussion on the human rights of women**

139. Pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 6/30 and 29/14, an annual full-day discussion on the human rights of women was held on 16 June 2016. The full-day discussion was divided into two panel discussions.

140. At the 10th meeting, on the same day, the Human Rights Council held the first panel discussion on violence against indigenous women and girls and its root causes.

141. The Deputy High Commissioner made an opening statement for the panel. A member of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Wilton Littlechild, moderated the discussion for the panel.

142. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences, Dubravka Šimonović; Founder and Director of Centro de Culturas Indígenas del Perú, journalist and indigenous peoples' rights activist, Tarcila Rivera Zea; indigenous lawyer, Founder and Managing Director of Riverview Global Partners, Josephine Cashman; Executive Director of Yiaku Laikipiak Trust, Jennifer Koinante.

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Denmark<sup>6</sup> (also on behalf of Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway and Sweden), Dominican Republic<sup>6</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Namibia, Pakistan<sup>6</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Panama, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Canada (also on behalf of Australia and New Zealand), Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Indian Law Resource Centre (also on behalf of the Native American Rights Fund), Penal Reform International (also on behalf of Friends World Committee for Consultation), Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

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

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, El Salvador, Indonesia, Paraguay, Russian Federation, South Africa;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Chile, Italy, Peru, Spain, Suriname;



(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: International Development Law Organization;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, Women's International Democratic Federation.

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

147. At the 12th meeting, on the same day, the Human Rights Council held the second panel discussion on women's rights and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: delivering on the promise to leave no one behind.

148. The Deputy High Commissioner made an opening statement for the panel. The Executive Director of the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development moderated the discussion for the panel.

149. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Australian Ambassador for Women and Girls, Natasha Stott Despoja; Executive Director of the International Trade Centre, Arancha González; Professor of Economics in the Centre for Economic Studies and Planning of Jawaharlal Nehru University, Jayati Ghosh; Young Women's Coordinator at the World Young Women's Christian Association, Vanessa Anyoti.

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Dominican Republic<sup>6</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), India (also on behalf of Brazil, China, the Russian Federation and South Africa), Netherlands, Pakistan<sup>6</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Philippines (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations), Qatar (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Russian Federation, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States);

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

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

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain (by video message);

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, United Nations Watch.

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

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Paraguay, Slovenia, United Arab Emirates;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Chile, Egypt, Estonia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Nepal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Plan International, Swedish Federation of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights.

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

154. At the 13th meeting, on the same day, the representative of Honduras made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

**Panel discussion on the possibility of using sport and the Olympic ideal to promote human rights for all, including persons with disabilities**

155. At the 37th meeting, on 28 June 2016, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 31/23, a panel discussion on the possibility of using sport and the Olympic ideal to promote human rights for all, including persons with disabilities.

156. The High Commissioner made an opening statement for the panel.

157. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Project Manager at the Nippon Foundation Paralympic Support Center and three-time Paralympic gold medallist in ice sledge speed racing, Miki Matheson; Head of Sustainability, Accessibility and Legacy at the Rio 2016 Organizing Committee for the Olympic and Paralympic Games, Tania Braga; Secretary-General of the Russian Paralympic Committee and five-time Paralympic gold medallist in swimming, Andrey Strokin; member of the Marketing Commission of the International Olympic Committee and Olympic silver medallist in water polo, Stavroula Kozompoli; Executive Director of the Institute for Human Rights and Business, John Morrison.

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Brazil<sup>6</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries), Dominican Republic<sup>6</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Greece<sup>6</sup> (also on behalf of Brazil, the Congo, Cyprus, China, Japan, Lebanon, Morocco, the Republic of Korea and the Russian Federation), Maldives, Qatar (also on behalf of Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Brazil, Cyprus, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Japan, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Turkey and the United Arab Emirates), Russian Federation, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahamas, Egypt, Malaysia, United States of America;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Human Rights Watch, Terre des hommes fédération internationale (also on behalf of Defence for Children International, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik and the Vienna Institute for Development and Cooperation).

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

160. During the second slot, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: China, Nigeria, Pakistan<sup>6</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), South Africa, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Austria, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Spain, Sudan, Holy See;

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

(d) Observer for the International Olympic Committee;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, International Service for Human Rights, Iraqi Development Organization.

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

### C. General debate on agenda item 3

162. At the 18th and 19th meetings, on 20 June 2016, and at the 20th meeting, on 21 June, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on thematic reports under agenda items 2 and 3, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil<sup>6</sup> (also on behalf of Austria, Germany, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Norway and Switzerland), China, Costa Rica<sup>6</sup> (also on behalf of Algeria, Andorra, Belgium, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Guatemala, Ireland, Italy, Kiribati, Luxembourg, Maldives, the Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Morocco, the Netherlands, Palau, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Romania, Samoa, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Uganda, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay), Cuba, Ecuador, Ghana, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of)<sup>6</sup> (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), Norway<sup>6</sup> (also on behalf of Argentina, Ghana and the Russian Federation), Pakistan<sup>6</sup> (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Philippines, Russian Federation, Slovenia (also on behalf of Austria and Croatia), Slovenia (also on behalf of Argentina, Austria, Brazil, El Salvador, Namibia, Portugal, Singapore, Tunisia and Uruguay), South Africa, Switzerland (also on behalf of Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, the Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay and the State of Palestine);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahamas, Chile, Costa Rica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Greece, Guyana, Iraq, Ireland, Peru, Poland, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Tunisia, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for national human rights institutions: Asia Pacific Forum, Commission on Human Rights of the Philippines (also on behalf of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions);

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, Agence internationale pour le développement, Agence pour les droits de l'homme, Alliance Defending Freedom, Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association burkinabé pour la survie de l'enfance, Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association Dunenyo, Association Points-Cœur (also on behalf of Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII), Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Auspice Stella, British Humanist Association, Center for Inquiry, Centre Europe-tiers monde (also on behalf of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers), Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Chant du guépard dans le désert, Child Rights Connect (also on behalf of the Consortium for Street Children, Defence for Children International, EuroChild, Fondazione Marista per la Solidarietà Internazionale, Foundation ECPAT International, Franciscans International, International Movement ATD Fourth World, Make Mothers Matter, Plan International, Save the Children International and the Women's World Summit Foundation), CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation (also on behalf of Article 19: International Centre against Censorship), Colombian Commission of Jurists, Comité Permanente por la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos, Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Ecumenical Federation of Constantinopolitans, European Centre for Law and Justice, European Union of Jewish

Students, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Federation of Cuban Women, Foodfirst Information and Action Network, Friends World Committee for Consultation, Fundación Latinoamericana por los Derechos Humanos y el Desarrollo Social, Il Cenacolo, Indian Council of South America, Institute for Policy Studies, International Career Support Association, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations, International-Lawyers.Org, International Muslim Women's Union, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (also on behalf of the International Federation of University Women, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco and the Teresian Association), International Service for Human Rights, Iraqi Development Organization, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Korea Center for United Nations Human Rights Policy, Liberation, Minnesota Citizens Concerned for Life Education Fund, Mothers Legacy Project, Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Prahar, Réseau international des droits humains (also on behalf of the Foodfirst Information and Action Network), Save the Children International (also on behalf of Centre Europe-tiers monde, Child Rights Connect, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, the Consortium for Street Children, Defence for Children International, EuroChild, the International Catholic Child Bureau, the International Council of Women, Plan International and Terre des hommes fédération internationale), Society for Threatened Peoples, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Victorious Youths Movement, Women's International Democratic Federation, World Barua Organization, World Evangelical Alliance, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress.

163. At the 19th meeting, on 20 June 2016, the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Pakistan and the Republic of Korea made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

165. At the 20th meeting, on 21 June 2016, the representatives of Iraq and the Philippines made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

### **Youth and human rights**

166. At the 41st meeting, on 30 June 2016, the representatives of El Salvador (also on behalf of Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, France, Greece, Italy, Morocco, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova and Tunisia), Portugal and the Republic of Moldova introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.1, sponsored by Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Greece, Italy, Morocco, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova and Tunisia, and co-sponsored by Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Ecuador, Georgia, Germany, Haiti, Honduras, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Nicaragua, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Qatar (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Romania, Serbia, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Spain, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Ukraine, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Argentina, the Bahamas, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Fiji, Guatemala, Hungary, Ireland, Japan, Mongolia, Myanmar, Panama, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Sri Lanka and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

167. 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.

168. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 32/1).

## Protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity

169. At the 41st meeting, on 30 June 2016, the representatives of Chile (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico and Uruguay), Brazil and Uruguay introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1, sponsored by Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico and Uruguay, and co-sponsored by Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine and the United States of America. Angola, the Netherlands and Paraguay withdrew their original co-sponsorship. Subsequently, the Dominican Republic, Estonia, Guatemala, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Serbia and Slovakia joined the sponsors.

170. At the same meeting, in accordance with rule 116 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the representative of Saudi Arabia moved the adjournment of the consideration of the draft resolution.

171. Subsequently, the representatives of Bangladesh and Nigeria (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, with the exception of Albania) made statements in favour of the motion. The representatives of Mexico and Panama made statements against the motion.

172. Under the same rule, a recorded vote was taken on the motion to adjourn the consideration of the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

*Abstaining:*

Botswana, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Kenya, Namibia, South Africa, Togo, Viet Nam

173. The Human Rights Council rejected the motion to adjourn the consideration of the draft resolution by 22 votes to 15, with 9 abstentions.<sup>7</sup>

174. At the same meeting, the representative of Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, with the exception of Albania) introduced amendments A/HRC/32/L.71, A/HRC/32/L.72, A/HRC/32/L.73, A/HRC/32/L.74, A/HRC/32/L.75, A/HRC/32/L.76, A/HRC/32/L.77, A/HRC/32/L.78, A/HRC/32/L.79, A/HRC/32/L.80 and A/HRC/32/L.81 to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1.

175. Amendments A/HRC/32/L.71, A/HRC/32/L.72, A/HRC/32/L.73, A/HRC/32/L.74, A/HRC/32/L.75, A/HRC/32/L.76, A/HRC/32/L.77, A/HRC/32/L.78, A/HRC/32/L.79, A/HRC/32/L.80 and A/HRC/32/L.81 were sponsored by Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, with the exception of Albania). Subsequently, Belarus joined the sponsors.

176. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Maldives, the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made general comments on draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1 and on the proposed amendments.

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

177. 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.

178. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Uruguay) and Slovenia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.71.

179. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.71. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Togo, United Arab Emirates

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Botswana, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Namibia, South Africa, Viet Nam

180. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.71 by 18 votes to 17, with 9 abstentions.<sup>8</sup>

181. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Uruguay) and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.72.

182. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.72. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Togo, United Arab Emirates

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Botswana, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Namibia, South Africa, Viet Nam

183. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.72 by 18 votes to 17, with 9 abstentions.<sup>8</sup>

184. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Uruguay) and Germany made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.73.

185. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.73. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria,

<sup>8</sup> The delegations of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) did not cast a vote.

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Namibia

186. The Human Rights Council adopted amendment A/HRC/32/L.73 by 24 votes to 17, with 4 abstentions.<sup>9</sup>

187. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Uruguay) and Panama made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.74.

188. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.74. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Botswana, Ethiopia, Ghana, Mongolia, Namibia

189. The Human Rights Council adopted amendment A/HRC/32/L.74 by 23 votes to 17, with 5 abstentions.<sup>9</sup>

190. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Uruguay) and the Netherlands made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.75.

191. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.75. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Mongolia, Namibia, South Africa

192. The Human Rights Council adopted amendment A/HRC/32/L.75 by 20 votes to 18, with 6 abstentions.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> The delegations of Bolivia (Plurinational State of) and Cuba did not cast a vote.

<sup>10</sup> The delegations of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) did not cast a vote.

193. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Uruguay) and Slovenia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.76.

194. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.76. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Mongolia, Namibia, Philippines, South Africa

195. The Human Rights Council adopted amendment A/HRC/32/L.76 by 21 votes to 17, with 7 abstentions.<sup>11</sup>

196. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Uruguay), Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.77.

197. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.77. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Ethiopia, Ghana, Mongolia, Namibia

198. The Human Rights Council adopted amendment A/HRC/32/L.77 by 23 votes to 18, with 4 abstentions.<sup>11</sup>

199. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Uruguay), the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.78.

200. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.78. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Togo, United Arab Emirates

*Against:*

<sup>11</sup> The delegations of Bolivia (Plurinational State of) and Cuba did not cast a vote.



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

*Abstaining:*

Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Mongolia, Namibia, Philippines, South Africa, Viet Nam

201. The Human Rights Council adopted amendment A/HRC/32/L.78 by 18 votes to 17, with 9 abstentions.<sup>12</sup>

202. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Uruguay), the Netherlands, Panama and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.79.

203. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.79. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mongolia, Morocco, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Ecuador, Ethiopia, Namibia, Philippines, South Africa

204. The Human Rights Council adopted amendment A/HRC/32/L.79 by 22 votes to 17, with 5 abstentions.<sup>12</sup>

205. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Uruguay), Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.80.

206. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.80. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Togo, United Arab Emirates

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation,<sup>13</sup> Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Botswana, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Namibia, South Africa, Viet Nam

<sup>12</sup> The delegations of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) did not cast a vote.

<sup>13</sup> The representative of the Russian Federation subsequently stated that there had been an error in the delegation's vote and that it had intended to vote in favour of the amendment.

207. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.80 by 20 votes to 16, with 8 abstentions.<sup>14</sup>

208. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Uruguay), the Netherlands, the Russian Federation, Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.81.

209. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.81. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Togo, United Arab Emirates

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Botswana, Ecuador, Ghana, India, Namibia, Philippines, South Africa, Viet Nam

210. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.81 by 19 votes to 17, with 8 abstentions.<sup>15</sup>

211. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Uruguay), Nigeria, Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on retaining the title of draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1.

212. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Qatar, a recorded vote was taken on retaining the title of draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Albania, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Viet Nam

*Against:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Burundi, Côte d'Ivoire, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Togo, United Arab Emirates

*Abstaining:*

Botswana, China, Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, India, Namibia, South Africa

213. The Human Rights Council retained the title of draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1 by 22 votes to 15, with 8 abstentions.<sup>16</sup>

214. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Uruguay), Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on retaining the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1.

<sup>14</sup> The delegations of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) did not cast a vote.

<sup>15</sup> The delegations of Cuba, Ethiopia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) did not cast a vote.

<sup>16</sup> The delegations of Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) did not cast a vote.

215. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Qatar, a recorded vote was taken on retaining the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Albania, Belgium, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, South Africa, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Viet Nam

*Against:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Côte d'Ivoire, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Togo, United Arab Emirates

*Abstaining:*

Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Namibia

216. The Human Rights Council retained the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1 by 21 votes to 14, with 9 abstentions.<sup>17</sup>

217. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Uruguay), Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on retaining paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1.

218. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Qatar, a recorded vote was taken on retaining paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Albania, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, South Africa, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Viet Nam

*Against:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Côte d'Ivoire, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Togo, United Arab Emirates

*Abstaining:*

Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, India, Namibia

219. The Human Rights Council retained paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1 by 23 votes to 14, with 8 abstentions.<sup>18</sup>

220. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Uruguay), the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on retaining paragraphs 3 to 7 of draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1.

221. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Maldives, a recorded vote was taken on retaining paragraphs 3 to 7 of draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Albania, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former

<sup>17</sup> The delegations of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) did not cast a vote.

<sup>18</sup> The delegations of Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) did not cast a vote.

Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Togo, United Arab Emirates

*Abstaining:*

Botswana, Ecuador, Ghana, India, Namibia, Philippines, South Africa

222. The Human Rights Council retained paragraphs 3 to 7 of draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1 by 21 votes to 17, with 7 abstentions.<sup>19</sup>

223. At the same meeting, the representatives of Albania, Algeria, Botswana, France, Ghana, Indonesia, Mexico (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Uruguay), Morocco, Namibia, the Netherlands, Nigeria, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Viet Nam made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution as amended.

224. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Nigeria, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1 as amended. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Albania, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Togo, United Arab Emirates

*Abstaining:*

Botswana, Ghana, India, Namibia, Philippines, South Africa

225. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1 as amended by 23 votes to 18, with 6 abstentions (resolution 32/2).

226. At the 46th meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representatives of China, Mexico, the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Qatar (on behalf of States Members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, with the exception of Albania) and the United Arab Emirates made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

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

227. At the 42nd meeting, on 30 June 2016, the representative of Belgium, also on behalf of Armenia, Mexico, the Republic of Korea, Senegal and Thailand, introduced draft decision A/HRC/32/L.4, sponsored by Armenia, Belgium, Mexico, the Republic of Korea, Senegal and Thailand. Subsequently, Australia, Austria, Botswana, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Japan, Panama and Tunisia joined the sponsors.

228. At the same meeting, the President of the Council announced that draft decision A/HRC/32/L.4 had been orally revised and that amendment A/HRC/32/L.66 to draft decision A/HRC/32/L.4 had been withdrawn by the sponsor.

229. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.66 was sponsored by the Russian Federation.

230. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft decision as orally revised without a vote (decision 32/115).

<sup>19</sup> The delegations of Cuba and Ethiopia did not cast a vote.

**Trafficking in persons, especially women and children: protecting victims of trafficking and persons at risk of trafficking, especially women and children in conflict and post-conflict situations**

231. At the 42nd meeting, on 30 June 2016, the representative of the Philippines, also on behalf of Germany, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.6, sponsored by Germany and the Philippines, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine and the United States of America. Subsequently, Argentina, Belarus, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechia, Fiji, Guatemala, Honduras, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Rwanda, Thailand and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

232. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 32/3).

**Elimination of discrimination against women**

233. At the 42nd meeting, on 30 June 2016, the representative of Colombia, also on behalf of Mexico, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.7/Rev.1, sponsored by Colombia and Mexico, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Croatia, Denmark, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Haiti, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay. Subsequently, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechia, Estonia, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, Malta, Mongolia, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Rwanda, San Marino, Slovenia, Ukraine and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

234. At the same meeting, the representative of Colombia orally revised the draft resolution.

235. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced amendments A/HRC/32/L.67, A/HRC/32/L.68, A/HRC/32/L.69 and A/HRC/32/L.70 to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.7/Rev.1 as orally revised, and announced that amendment A/HRC/32/L.68 had been withdrawn.

236. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.67 was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by China. Subsequently, Cuba, Egypt and Iran (Islamic Republic of) joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.68 was sponsored by the Russian Federation. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.69 was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by China. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.70 was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by China. Subsequently, Egypt joined the sponsors.

237. At the same meeting, the representative of Mexico made a statement on the proposed amendments to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.7/Rev.1 as orally revised.

238. 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 draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.7/Rev.1 as orally revised and on the proposed amendments.

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

240. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.67.

241. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.67. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Morocco, Nigeria, Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Burundi, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Ghana, Namibia, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Togo, United Arab Emirates

242. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L67 by 20 votes to 16, with 11 abstentions.

243. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico and Panama made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.69.

244. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.69. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Burundi, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Morocco, Togo

245. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L69 by 21 votes to 16, with 9 abstentions.<sup>20</sup>

246. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico and Slovenia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.70.

247. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.70. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Burundi, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Morocco, South Africa, Togo

<sup>20</sup> The delegation of Cuba did not cast a vote.

248. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L70 by 23 votes to 14, with 9 abstentions.<sup>20</sup>

249. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Ecuador, El Salvador, Paraguay, the Russian Federation and Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.7/Rev.1 as orally revised. In its statement, the representative of Paraguay disassociated the member State from the consensus on paragraph 11 of the draft resolution. In its statement, the representative of Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf and on behalf of Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates) disassociated the member States from the consensus on the tenth and thirteenth preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 6, 11 and 18 of the draft resolution. In its statement, the representative of China disassociated the member State from the consensus on paragraph 18 of the draft resolution. In its statement, the representative of Ecuador disassociated the member State from the consensus on the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. In its statement, the representative of El Salvador disassociated the member State from the consensus on the tenth and thirteenth preambular paragraphs and paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

250. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 32/4).

#### **Human rights and arbitrary deprivation of nationality**

251. At the 42nd meeting, on 30 June 2016, the representative of the Russian Federation, also on behalf of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.8, sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by the Plurinational State of Bolivia. Subsequently, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Botswana, Cabo Verde, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Haiti, Mexico, Tunisia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

252. 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.

253. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 32/5).

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

254. At the 42nd meeting, on 30 June 2016, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.11, sponsored by the Islamic Republic of Iran, on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, and co-sponsored by China. Subsequently, Paraguay joined the sponsors.

255. 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.

256. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 32/6).

#### **The right to a nationality: women's equal nationality rights in law and in practice**

257. At the 42nd meeting, on 30 June 2016, the representative of Mexico, also on behalf of Algeria, Australia, Botswana, Colombia, Slovakia, Turkey and the United States of America, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.12, sponsored by Algeria, Australia, Botswana, Colombia, Mexico, Slovakia, Turkey and the United States of America, and co-sponsored by Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Denmark, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine and Uruguay. Subsequently, Argentina, Austria, Costa

Rica, Czechia, Greece, Guatemala, Japan, Lithuania, the Marshall Islands and Sri Lanka joined the sponsors.

258. At the same meeting, the representative of Saudi Arabia, on behalf of States members of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf, made a general comment on the draft resolution.

259. 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.

260. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 32/7).

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

261. At the 42nd meeting, on 30 June 2016, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.15, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Cyprus, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Eritrea, Haiti, Luxembourg, Mexico, Nicaragua, the Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Andorra, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Lithuania, Malaysia, Maldives, Monaco, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Qatar (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Serbia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic and Thailand joined the sponsors.

262. 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.

263. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 32/8).

#### **Human rights and international solidarity**

264. At the 42nd meeting, on 30 June 2016, the representative of Cuba, also on behalf of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Eritrea, Haiti, Nicaragua, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.16, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Eritrea, Haiti, Nicaragua, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Bangladesh, Belarus, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Pakistan, Qatar (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States) and Sri Lanka joined the sponsors.

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

266. 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.

267. 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.

268. 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 draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.16. The voting was as follows:

##### *In favour:*

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



Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Mexico

269. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 33 votes to 13, with 1 abstention (resolution 32/9).

**Business and human rights: improving accountability and access to remedy**

270. At the 42nd meeting, on 30 June 2016, the representative of Norway, also on behalf of Argentina, Ghana and the Russian Federation, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.19, sponsored by Argentina, Ghana, Norway and the Russian Federation, and co-sponsored by Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, Honduras, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Paraguay, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Spain withdrew its original co-sponsorship. Subsequently, Australia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

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

272. 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.

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

274. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 32/10).

**Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons**

275. At the 43rd meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representatives of Austria and Uganda introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.13, sponsored by Austria and Uganda, and co-sponsored by Albania, Angola, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Georgia, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Zambia. Subsequently, Afghanistan, Argentina, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechia, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Maldives, Monaco, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea, Serbia, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Sri Lanka, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

276. 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.

277. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 32/11).

### **Impact of arms transfers on human rights**

278. At the 43rd meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representatives of Ecuador and Peru introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.14, sponsored by Ecuador and Peru, and co-sponsored by Angola, El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, Palau and the Sudan. Subsequently, Cabo Verde, Chile, the Congo, Guatemala, Maldives, Nigeria, Panama, Switzerland and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

279. At the same meeting, the representative of Peru orally revised the draft resolution.

280. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Ecuador made a general comment on the draft resolution as orally revised.

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 as orally revised.

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

283. 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 draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.14 as orally revised. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

France, Germany, Latvia, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Belgium, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Morocco, Portugal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

284. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised by 32 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions (resolution 32/12).

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

285. At the 43rd meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representative of Sweden, also on behalf of Brazil, Nigeria, Tunisia, Turkey and the United States of America, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.20, sponsored by Brazil, Nigeria, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey and the United States of America, and co-sponsored by Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Botswana, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, the Dominican Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Israel, Kenya, Maldives, Mongolia, Morocco, New Zealand, Panama, Peru, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Togo and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

286. At the same meeting, the representative of Sweden orally revised the draft resolution.

287. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced amendments A/HRC/32/L.85, A/HRC/32/L.86 and A/HRC/32/L.88 to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.20 as orally revised, and announced that amendment A/HRC/32/L.85 had been withdrawn. Subsequently, the representative of China, also on behalf of Cuba, Iran

(Islamic Republic of), the Russian Federation, South Africa and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), introduced amendment A/HRC/32/L.87 to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.20 as orally revised.

288. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.85 was sponsored by China and the Russian Federation, and co-sponsored by Belarus. Subsequently, Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.86 was sponsored by China and the Russian Federation, and co-sponsored by Belarus. Subsequently, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela joined the sponsors. Amendments A/HRC/32/L.87 and A/HRC/32/L.88 were sponsored by China and the Russian Federation, and co-sponsored by Belarus and Iran (Islamic Republic of). Subsequently, Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

289. At the same meeting, the representative of Nigeria made a statement on the proposed amendments to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.20 as orally revised.

290. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of France, Latvia, Paraguay and the Republic of Korea made general comments on draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.20 as orally revised and on the proposed amendments.

291. 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.

292. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Nigeria, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.86. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Mongolia, Namibia, Philippines, Togo

293. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.86 by 23 votes to 15, with 9 abstentions.

294. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Nigeria, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.87. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Kyrgyzstan, Togo

295. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.87 by 25 votes to 17, with 5 abstentions.

296. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Nigeria, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.88. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Namibia, Togo

297. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.88 by 24 votes to 18, with 5 abstentions.

298. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of China, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf) and South Africa made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.20 as orally revised. In its statement, the representative of China disassociated the member State from the consensus on the seventeenth preambular paragraph and paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

299. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.20 as orally revised without a vote (resolution 32/13).

**Protection of the human rights of migrants: strengthening the promotion and protection of the human rights of migrants, including in large movements**

300. At the 43rd meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representative of Mexico introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.22, sponsored by Mexico and co-sponsored by Angola, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cameroon, Ecuador, Germany, Haiti, Honduras, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay and the United States of America. Subsequently, Argentina, Armenia, Benin, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Guatemala, Ireland, Maldives, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Tunisia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

301. 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.

302. 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.

303. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 32/14).

**Access to medicines in the context of the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health**

304. At the 43rd meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representatives of Brazil and India, also on behalf of China, Egypt, Indonesia, Senegal, South Africa and Thailand, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.23/Rev.1, sponsored by Brazil, China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Senegal, South Africa and Thailand, and co-sponsored by Haiti, Paraguay, Peru, Sri Lanka and Turkey. Subsequently, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Maldives, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, the Philippines, Qatar (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Timor-Leste, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

305. At the same meeting, the representative of Brazil orally revised the draft resolution.
306. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.
307. 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.
308. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico and the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.
309. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 32/15).

**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**

310. At the 43rd meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representative of China, also on behalf of Algeria, Brazil, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Pakistan and South Africa, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.24/Rev.1, sponsored by Algeria, Brazil, China, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Pakistan and South Africa, and co-sponsored by Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Haiti, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), the Russian Federation, Singapore, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Thailand, Turkey and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Belarus, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Guatemala, Indonesia, Maldives, Nicaragua, Panama, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia and Sri Lanka joined the sponsors.
311. At the same meeting, the representative of China orally revised the draft resolution.
312. 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.
313. 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.
314. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 32/16).

**Addressing the impact of multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination and violence in the context of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance on the full enjoyment of all human rights by women and girls**

315. At the 43rd meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representative of Brazil, also on behalf of Argentina, Colombia, Paraguay, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.25, sponsored by Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Paraguay and Uruguay, and co-sponsored by Angola, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Denmark, France, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Luxembourg, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Spain and Turkey. Subsequently, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Cabo Verde, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Mongolia, Pakistan, the Philippines, Slovenia, Thailand, Tunisia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.
316. At the same meeting, the representative of Paraguay made a general comment on the draft resolution.
317. 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.
318. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 32/17).

### **Mental health and human rights**

319. At the 43rd meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representatives of Brazil and Portugal introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.26, sponsored by Brazil and Portugal, and co-sponsored by Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Fiji, France, Greece, Israel, Monaco, Montenegro, Peru, the Philippines, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, the Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Ecuador, Georgia, Germany, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Lithuania, Maldives, Malta, Mozambique, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Serbia, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

320. 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.

321. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote and disassociated the member State from the consensus on the draft resolution.

322. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 32/18).

### **Accelerating efforts to eliminate violence against women: preventing and responding to violence against women and girls, including indigenous women and girls**

323. At the 43rd meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representative of Canada introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.28/Rev.1, sponsored by Canada and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Norway, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay. Subsequently, Botswana, Burkina Faso, the Central African Republic, Colombia, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Guatemala, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Mauritius, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Poland, San Marino, Sierra Leone and Zambia joined the sponsors.

324. At the same meeting, the representative of Canada orally revised the draft resolution.

325. Also at the same meeting, the President of the Human Rights Council announced that amendments A/HRC/32/L.38, A/HRC/32/L.39, A/HRC/32/L.41, A/HRC/32/L.45 and A/HRC/32/L.46 had been withdrawn by the sponsor.

326. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.38 was sponsored by the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Cuba joined the sponsor. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.39 was sponsored by the Russian Federation. Subsequently, the Islamic Republic of Iran joined the sponsor. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.41 was sponsored by the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Belarus and Iran (Islamic Republic of) joined the sponsor. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.45 was sponsored by the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Belarus, China and Iran (Islamic Republic of) joined the sponsor. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.46 was sponsored by the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Belarus and Iran (Islamic Republic of) joined the sponsor.

327. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced amendments A/HRC/32/L.36, A/HRC/32/L.37, A/HRC/32/L.42 and A/HRC/32/L.43 to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.28/Rev.1 as orally revised, and announced that amendments A/HRC/32/L.40 and A/HRC/32/L.44 had been withdrawn.

328. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation orally revised amendment A/HRC/32/L.37 to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.28/Rev.1 as orally revised.

329. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.36 was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by China. Subsequently, Cuba and Iran (Islamic Republic of) joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.37 was sponsored by the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of) and Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf) joined the sponsor. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.40 was sponsored by the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Belarus and Egypt joined the sponsor. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.42 was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by China. Subsequently, Belarus and Egypt joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.43 was sponsored by the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Belarus, Egypt and Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf) joined the sponsor. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.44 was sponsored by the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Belarus joined the sponsor.

330. At the same meeting, the representative of Panama made a statement on the proposed amendments to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.28/Rev.1 as orally revised.

331. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of France, Latvia, the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Paraguay and the Republic of Korea made general comments on draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.28/Rev.1 as orally revised and on the proposed amendments.

332. 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.

333. At the same meeting, the representatives of France, Panama and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.36.

334. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Panama, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.36. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Morocco, Nigeria, Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Burundi, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Namibia, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam

335. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.36 by 22 votes to 12, with 13 abstentions.

336. At the same meeting, the representatives of Albania and Germany made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.37 as orally revised.

337. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Panama, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.37 as orally revised. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

*Against:*

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines,

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

*Abstaining:*

China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Viet Nam

338. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.37 as orally revised by 22 votes to 15, with 9 abstentions.<sup>20</sup>

339. At the same meeting, the representatives of Georgia and Mexico made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.42.

340. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Panama, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.42. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Burundi, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

341. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.42 by 23 votes to 14, with 10 abstentions.

342. At the same meeting, the representatives of Slovenia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.43.

343. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Panama, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.43. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Burundi, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Morocco, Namibia, Togo, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

344. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.43 as orally revised by 24 votes to 10, with 12 abstentions.<sup>20</sup>

345. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman and Qatar) and Togo made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.28/Rev.1 as orally revised. In its statement, the representative of China disassociated the member State from the consensus on paragraph 4 of the draft resolution as orally revised. In its statement, the representative of Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman and Qatar) disassociated the



member States from the consensus on paragraphs 7–9 of the draft resolution as orally revised.

346. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.28/Rev.1 as orally revised without a vote (resolution 32/19).

#### **Realizing the equal enjoyment of the right to education by every girl**

347. At the 44th meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representative of the United Arab Emirates introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.30/Rev.1, sponsored by the United Arab Emirates and co-sponsored by Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, China, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Paraguay, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Slovenia, Spain, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Subsequently, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Costa Rica, Czechia, France, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Japan, Liechtenstein, Malta, Mongolia, Nigeria, Norway, Romania, Rwanda, Slovakia, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

348. 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.

349. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 32/20).

#### **Elimination of female genital mutilation**

350. At the 44th meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representative of South Africa, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.31/Rev.1, sponsored by South Africa, on behalf of the Group of African States. Subsequently, Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Maldives, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

351. At the same meeting, the representative of South Africa orally revised the draft resolution.

352. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Belgium and the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

353. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 32/21).

#### **The right to education**

354. At the 44th meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representative of Portugal introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.33, sponsored by Portugal and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, the Philippines, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukraine, Uruguay, Viet Nam and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Angola, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, China, Colombia, Czechia, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, Guatemala, Iceland, Indonesia, Japan, Maldives, Mongolia, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Rwanda, San Marino, Serbia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden and Timor-Leste joined the sponsors.

355. At the same meeting, the representative of Portugal orally revised the draft resolution.

356. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made a general comment on the draft resolution as orally revised.

357. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 32/22).

**Protection of the family: role of the family in supporting the protection and promotion of human rights of persons with disabilities**

358. At the 44th meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representatives of Belarus, Egypt and Qatar, also on behalf of Bangladesh, China, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Mauritania, Morocco, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia and Uganda, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.35, sponsored by Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, El Salvador, Mauritania, Morocco, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia and Uganda, and co-sponsored by Afghanistan, Angola, the Congo, Fiji, Kenya, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, with the exception of Albania), Qatar (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Zambia and Zimbabwe. Subsequently, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Guatemala, Hungary, Jamaica, Nicaragua, Poland and Sri Lanka joined the sponsors.

359. At the same meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland introduced amendments A/HRC/32/L.82, A/HRC/32/L.83 and A/HRC/32/L.84 to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.35. Subsequently, the representative of Switzerland, also on behalf of Norway, introduced amendment A/HRC/32/L.89 to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.35.

360. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.82 was sponsored by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and co-sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United States of America and Uruguay. Subsequently, Cyprus, Greece, Lithuania and Portugal joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.83 was sponsored by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and co-sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United States of America. Subsequently, Cyprus, Greece, Lithuania, Malta and Portugal joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.84 was sponsored by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and co-sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United States of America. Subsequently, Cyprus, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania and Portugal joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.89 was sponsored by Norway and Switzerland, and co-sponsored by Belgium. Subsequently, Latvia and Portugal joined the sponsors.

361. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Morocco, Qatar, the Russian Federation and Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, El Salvador, Mauritania, Tunisia and Uganda) made statements on the proposed amendments to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.35.

362. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Côte d'Ivoire, Indonesia, Kenya, Maldives, Namibia, Nigeria, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia and the United Arab Emirates made general comments on draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.35 and on the proposed amendments.

363. 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.

364. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation, also on behalf of Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, El Salvador, Mauritania, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia and Uganda, made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.82.

365. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the Russian Federation, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.82. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Paraguay, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

*Abstaining:*

Georgia, Mongolia, Philippines, Viet Nam

366. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.82 by 25 votes to 16, with 4 abstentions.<sup>21</sup>

367. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation, also on behalf of Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, El Salvador, Mauritania, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia and Uganda, made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.83.

368. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Qatar, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.83. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Georgia, Mongolia, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Viet Nam

369. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.83 by 27 votes to 13, with 5 abstentions.<sup>21</sup>

370. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation, also on behalf of Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, El Salvador, Mauritania, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia and Uganda, made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.84.

371. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Saudi Arabia, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.84. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan,

<sup>21</sup> The delegations of Bolivia (Plurinational State of) and Cuba did not cast a vote.

Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Paraguay, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

*Abstaining:*

Georgia, Mongolia, Philippines, Viet Nam

372. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.84 by 27 votes to 14, with 4 abstentions.<sup>21</sup>

373. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation, also on behalf of Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, El Salvador, Mauritania, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia and Uganda, made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.89.

374. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Morocco, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.89. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Georgia, Mongolia, Philippines, Viet Nam

375. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.89 by 27 votes to 14, with 4 abstentions.<sup>21</sup>

376. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico, Panama and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.35.

377. 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 draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.35. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Georgia, Mexico, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

378. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.35 by 32 votes to 12, with 3 abstentions (resolution 32/23).

379. At the 46th meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

### Civil society space

380. At the 46th meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representatives of Ireland and Sierra Leone, also on behalf of Chile, Japan and Tunisia, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.29, sponsored by Chile, Ireland, Japan, Sierra Leone and Tunisia, and co-sponsored by Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, the United States of America and Uruguay. Subsequently, Angola, Argentina, Botswana, Burkina Faso, the Congo, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Panama, Senegal, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

381. At the same meeting, the representative of Ireland orally revised the draft resolution.

382. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced amendments A/HRC/32/L.52, A/HRC/32/L.53, A/HRC/32/L.54, A/HRC/32/L.55, A/HRC/32/L.56, A/HRC/32/L.59, A/HRC/32/L.60, A/HRC/32/L.61, A/HRC/32/L.62, A/HRC/32/L.63, A/HRC/32/L.64 and A/HRC/32/L.65 to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.29 as orally revised, and announced that amendments A/HRC/32/L.51, A/HRC/32/L.57 and A/HRC/32/L.58 had been withdrawn.

383. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.51 was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by China. Subsequently, Belarus, Cuba, Egypt and Iran (Islamic Republic of) joined the sponsors. Amendments A/HRC/32/L.52 and A/HRC/32/L.64 were sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by China. Subsequently, Belarus, Egypt and South Africa joined the sponsors. Amendments A/HRC/32/L.53, A/HRC/32/L.59 and A/HRC/32/L.65 were sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by China. Subsequently, Belarus and Egypt joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.54 was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by China. Subsequently, Belarus, Iran (Islamic Republic of) and South Africa joined the sponsors. Amendments A/HRC/32/L.55 and A/HRC/32/L.58 were sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by China. Subsequently, Belarus, Cuba, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of) and South Africa joined the sponsors. Amendments A/HRC/32/L.56 and A/HRC/32/L.60 were sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by China. Subsequently, Belarus, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of) and South Africa joined the sponsors. Amendments A/HRC/32/L.57 and A/HRC/32/L.62 were sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by China. Subsequently, Belarus, Cuba, Egypt and South Africa joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.61 was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by China. Subsequently, Belarus, Cuba and South Africa joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.63 was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by China. Subsequently, Belarus and South Africa joined the sponsors.

384. At the same meeting, the representative of Switzerland, also on behalf of Chile, Ireland, Japan, Sierra Leone and Tunisia, made a statement on the proposed amendments to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.29 as orally revised.

385. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Belgium, Paraguay, Portugal, the Republic of Korea and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made general comments on draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.29 as orally revised and on the proposed amendments.

386. 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.

387. At the same meeting, the representatives of Albania and Mexico made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.52.

388. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.52. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Namibia, Viet Nam

389. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.52 by 22 votes to 12, with 12 abstentions.<sup>22</sup>

390. At the same meeting, the representatives of Panama and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.53.

391. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.53. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Burundi, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Namibia, Nigeria, South Africa

392. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.53 by 23 votes to 12, with 12 abstentions.

393. At the same meeting, the representatives of Latvia, the Netherlands and Slovenia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.54.

394. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.54. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

<sup>22</sup> The delegation of Cuba did not cast a vote.

Algeria, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria

395. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.54 by 23 votes to 13, with 11 abstentions.

396. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.55.

397. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.55. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Botswana, Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Philippines

398. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.55 by 21 votes to 17, with 9 abstentions.

399. At the same meeting, the representatives of Germany and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.56.

400. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.56. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria

401. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.56 by 22 votes to 16, with 9 abstentions.

402. At the same meeting, the representatives of Belgium and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.59.

403. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.59. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, India, Indonesia, Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kyrgyzstan, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates

404. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.59 by 22 votes to 9, with 15 abstentions.<sup>22</sup>

405. At the same meeting, the representatives of Latvia and Mexico made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.60.

406. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.60. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Morocco, Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Burundi, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Namibia, Nigeria, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

407. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.60 by 22 votes to 13, with 12 abstentions.

408. At the same meeting, the representatives of Germany and Latvia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.61.

409. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.61. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Togo

410. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.61 by 22 votes to 15, with 10 abstentions.

411. At the same meeting, the representatives of Belgium and the Republic of Korea made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.62.



412. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.62. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria

413. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.62 by 22 votes to 15, with 10 abstentions.

414. At the same meeting, the representatives of France and Slovenia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.63.

415. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.63. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Burundi, Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Togo

416. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.63 by 22 votes to 13, with 12 abstentions.

417. At the same meeting, the representative of Albania made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.64.

418. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.64. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Burundi, Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

419. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.64 by 23 votes to 11, with 13 abstentions.

420. At the same meeting, the representatives of Georgia and Germany made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/32/L.65.

421. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/32/L.65. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, India, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam

422. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/32/L.65 by 22 votes to 9, with 15 abstentions.<sup>22</sup>

423. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Cuba, India, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman and the United Arab Emirates), South Africa, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Viet Nam made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.29 as orally revised. In its statement, the representative of India disassociated the member State from the consensus on the thirteenth preambular paragraph and paragraphs 8, 14 and 16 of the draft resolution as orally revised. In its statement, the representative of Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman and the United Arab Emirates) disassociated the member States from the consensus on the sixth, eighth, ninth, eleventh and fourteenth preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 1, 4, 7, 8, 13 and 14 of the draft resolution as orally revised.

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

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

China, Congo, Cuba, Nigeria, Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

*Abstaining:*

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam

425. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.29 as orally revised by 31 votes to 7, with 9 abstentions (resolution 32/31).

### **The rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association**

426. At the 46th meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representatives of Maldives and the United States of America (also on behalf of Czechia, Indonesia, Lithuania and Mexico) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.32, sponsored by Czechia, Indonesia, Lithuania, Maldives, Mexico and the United States of America, and co-sponsored by Albania, Angola, Australia,

Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay. Subsequently, Afghanistan, Argentina, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Honduras, Japan, Mongolia, New Zealand, Panama, Peru, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Switzerland and Tunisia joined the sponsors.

427. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America orally revised the draft resolution.

428. Also at the same meeting, the President of the Human Rights Council announced that amendments A/HRC/32/L.47, A/HRC/32/L.48, A/HRC/32/L.49 and A/HRC/32/L.50 to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.32 as orally revised had been withdrawn by the sponsors.

429. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.47 was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Belarus and China. Subsequently, Cuba, Iran (Islamic Republic of) and South Africa joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.48 was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Belarus and China. Subsequently, Iran (Islamic Republic of) and South Africa joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.49 was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Belarus and China. Subsequently, South Africa joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/32/L.50 was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Belarus and China. Subsequently, Cuba and South Africa joined the sponsors.

430. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation made a general comment on the draft resolution as orally revised.

431. 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.

432. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 32/32).

### **Human rights and climate change**

433. At the 46th meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representatives of Bangladesh, the Philippines and Viet Nam introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.34, sponsored by Bangladesh, the Philippines and Viet Nam, and co-sponsored by Angola, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Georgia, Germany, Haiti, Ireland, Kenya, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Peru, Portugal, Romania, Seychelles, the Sudan, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Algeria, Andorra, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Dominican Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Italy, Mauritius, Mexico, the Netherlands, Panama, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Uruguay and Vanuatu joined the sponsors.

434. At the same meeting, the representative of the Philippines orally revised the draft resolution.

435. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and the Russian Federation made general comments on draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.34 as orally revised.

436. 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.

437. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 32/33).

## **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**

438. At the 20th meeting, on 21 June 2016, the Chair of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic, Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro, provided, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 31/17, an oral update.

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

440. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 20th and 21st meetings, 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, Belgium, Botswana, China, Cuba, Ecuador, France, Germany, Ghana, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Estonia, Finland (also on behalf of Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sudan, Turkey, United States of America;

(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, European Centre for Law and Justice, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Presse emblème campagne, United Nations Watch, World Evangelical Alliance.

441. At the 21st meeting, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic made final remarks as the State concerned.

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

443. At the 22nd meeting, on 21 June 2016, the representative of Turkey made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

### **B. Interactive dialogue with the commission of inquiry on human rights in Eritrea**

444. At the 22nd meeting, on 21 June 2016, the Chair of the commission of inquiry on human rights in Eritrea, Mike Smith, presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 29/18, the report of the Commission (A/HRC/32/47).

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

446. 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: Belgium, Botswana, China (also on behalf of Pakistan), Cuba, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ghana, Kenya, Portugal, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belarus, Djibouti, Ireland, Nicaragua, Norway, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Ukraine, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Center for Global Nonkilling, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Conscience and Peace Tax International, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Human Rights Watch, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, United Nations Watch, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

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

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

### **C. Interactive dialogue with a special procedure mandate holder**

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

449. At the 21st meeting, on 21 June 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus, Miklós Haraszti, presented his report (A/HRC/32/48).

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

451. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 21st and 22nd meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Belgium, China, Cuba, France, Germany, Russian Federation (also on behalf of Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, India, Nicaragua, the Russian Federation, the Sudan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zimbabwe), Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan (also on behalf of Pakistan), Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Kazakhstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lithuania, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Spain, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, United States of America, Uzbekistan, State of Palestine;

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

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

452. At the 22nd meeting, the representative of Belarus made final remarks as the State concerned.

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

### **D. Enhanced interactive dialogue on the human rights situation in South Sudan**

454. At its 23rd meeting, on 22 June 2016, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 31/20, an enhanced interactive dialogue on the human rights situation in South Sudan.

455. The Deputy High Commissioner made an opening statement for the enhanced interactive dialogue.

456. At the same meeting, the following made statements: Chargé d'Affaires of the Permanent Mission of South Sudan to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Akech Chol Ahou; Chair of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, Pansy Tlakula;

Deputy Chair of the Joint Monitoring and Evaluation Commission for the Agreement of the Resolution of the Conflict in the Republic of South Sudan, Francois L. Fall; Acting Chair of the Commission on Human Rights in South Sudan, Nyuol Justin Yaac Arop; Director of Human Rights at the United Nations Mission in South Sudan.

457. During the ensuing discussion, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked questions:

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

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Czechia, Denmark, Ireland, New Zealand, Norway, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Spain, Sudan, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa culture internationale, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project (also on behalf of CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation), Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Service for Human Rights, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, VIVAT International.

458. At the same meeting, the presenters answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

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

459. At the 23rd and 24th meetings, on 22 June 2016, and at the 27th meeting, on 23 June, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 4, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Belgium, Cuba, China, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of) (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union), Russian Federation, Slovenia, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Canada, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Egypt, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Japan, Montenegro, Norway, Solomon Islands, Spain, Ukraine, United States of America, Vanuatu;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Africa culture internationale, African Development Association, African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, African Regional Agricultural Credit Association, Agence internationale pour le développement, Agence pour les droits de l'homme, Al-Hakim Foundation, Alliance Defending Freedom, Alsalam Foundation (also on behalf of Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain), Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Associação Brasileira de Gays, Lésbicas e Transgeneros, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association burkinabé pour la survie de l'enfance, Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association Dunenyo, Association mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Baha'i International Community, B'nai B'rith, British Humanist Association, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Canners International Permanent Committee, Center for Inquiry, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (also on behalf of the Colombian Commission of Jurists, the Robert F. Kennedy Center for Justice and Human Rights and the Washington Office on Latin America), 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, Conseil

international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Federation of Cuban Women, France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Franciscans International (also on behalf of the Minority Rights Group and the Swiss Catholic Lenten Fund), Fundación Latinoamericana por los Derechos Humanos y el Desarrollo Social, Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights Watch, Il Cenacolo, Indian Council of South America, Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, Institute on Human Rights and the Holocaust, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Commission of Jurists, International Educational Development, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations, International-Lawyers.Org, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, International Muslim Women's Union, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International PEN, International Service for Human Rights, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Iraqi Development Organization, Jubilee Campaign, 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, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Pan African Union for Science and Technology, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Prahar, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Reporters sans frontières international (also on behalf of the International Press Institute), Society for Development and Community Empowerment, Society for Threatened Peoples, Syriac Universal Alliance, 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 Evangelical Alliance, World Federation of Democratic Youth, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress.

460. At the 24th meeting, on 22 June 2016, the representatives of China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Indonesia, Japan, Latvia, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uzbekistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

461. At the 27th meeting, on 23 June 2016, the representatives of Brazil, Burundi and Nigeria made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

### **Situation of human rights in Eritrea**

462. At the 45th meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representative of Somalia introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.5/Rev.1, sponsored by Djibouti and Somalia. Subsequently, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Czechia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

463. At the same meeting, the representative of Somalia orally revised the draft resolution.

464. 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.

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

466. 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.

467. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ecuador and the Russian Federation made statements in explanation of vote before the vote. In their statements, the representatives of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba and Ecuador disassociated the member States from the consensus on paragraph 17 of the draft resolution as orally revised.

468. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 32/24).

469. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

#### **The human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic**

470. At the 45th meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, also on behalf of France, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and the United States of America, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.9, 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, Bulgaria, Czechia, Denmark, Finland, Georgia, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine. Subsequently, Andorra, Bahrain, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Hungary, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway, the Republic of Korea, San Marino and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors.

471. 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), Qatar and the Russian Federation made general comments on the draft resolution.

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

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

474. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the Russian Federation, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.9. The voting was as follows:

##### *In favour:*

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

##### *Against:*

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

##### *Abstaining:*

Bangladesh, Burundi, Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Nigeria, Philippines, South Africa, Viet Nam

475. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 27 votes to 6, with 14 abstentions (resolution 32/25).

476. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation, also on behalf of Algeria, Iran (Islamic Republic of) and Iraq, made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

#### **Situation of human rights in Belarus**

477. At the 45th meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representative of the Netherlands, on behalf of the European Union, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.10/Rev.1, sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav



Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Subsequently, Iceland, Japan, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Norway, San Marino and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

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

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

480. 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.

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

482. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the Russian Federation, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.10/Rev.1. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Botswana, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Georgia, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Togo, United Arab Emirates

483. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 15 votes to 9, with 23 abstentions (resolution 32/26).

## V. Human rights bodies and mechanisms

### A. Panel discussion on the contribution of parliaments to the work of the Human Rights Council and its universal periodic review

484. At its 25th meeting, on 22 June 2016, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 30/14, a panel discussion on the contribution of parliaments to the work of the Human Rights Council and its universal periodic review.

485. The Director of the Human Rights Council and Treaty Mechanisms Division of OHCHR and the Secretary-General of the Inter-Parliamentary Union made opening statements for the panel. The Permanent Representative of Maldives to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Hala Hameed, moderated the discussion for the panel.

486. The following panellists made statements: Member of the National Assembly of Ecuador and President of the Parliamentary Group for the Rights of Peoples and Nationalities, Alexandra Ocles Padilla; President of the Chambre des conseillers of Morocco and Member of the Superior Council of Education and Vocational Training, Hakim Benchamach; Senior Deputy Minority Leader, Philippines House of Representatives, Neri J. Colmenares; Director of the Division of Programmes at the Inter-Parliamentary Union, Kareen Jabre; Legal Adviser to the Joint Committee on Human Rights of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Visiting Professor of Human Rights Law at the University of Oxford, Murray Hunt.

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Georgia, India, Nigeria, Pakistan<sup>23</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Slovenia, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Spain<sup>23</sup> (also on behalf of Ecuador, Italy, Maldives, Morocco, the Philippines and Romania);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia (also on behalf of Canada and New Zealand), Egypt, Sierra Leone;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, Korea Center for United Nations Human Rights Policy, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme.

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

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, China, Maldives, Namibia, Republic of Korea, South Africa, Tunisia;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Libya, Pakistan, Sudan;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Espace Afrique International, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

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

<sup>23</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

## **B. Forum on Business and Human Rights**

491. At the 27th meeting, on 23 June 2016, the Chief ad interim of the Special Procedures Branch of OHCHR presented, on behalf of the Chair-Rapporteur of the Forum on Business and Human Rights, the report containing a summary of discussions at the fourth annual Forum on Business and Human Rights, held from 16 to 18 November 2015 (A/HRC/32/46).

## **C. Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples**

492. At the 18th meeting, on 20 June 2016, the Deputy High Commissioner presented the report containing a summary of the discussions held and the proposals made at the workshop to review the mandate of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, held on 4 and 5 April 2016 (A/HRC/32/26) (see chap. II, sect. B).

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

493. At its 27th meeting, on 23 June 2016, and at its 31st meeting, on 24 June, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 5, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Dominican Republic<sup>23</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ecuador, India (also on behalf of Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Egypt, Eritrea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Malaysia, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, the Sudan, Tajikistan, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe), Mexico, Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Norway<sup>23</sup> (also on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Sweden), Pakistan<sup>23</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Portugal (also on behalf of Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Egypt, Finland, France, Italy, Mexico, Namibia, Spain and Uruguay), Russian Federation, Slovenia (also on behalf of Costa Rica, Maldives, Morocco and Switzerland), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Chile, Hungary, Ireland, New Zealand, Norway, United States of America, Holy See;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence internationale pour le développement, Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association burkinabé pour la survie de l'enfance, Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of the Center for Global Nonkilling), Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights (also on behalf of Al-Haq), Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, China NGO Network for International Exchanges, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Fundación Latinoamericana por los Derechos Humanos y el Desarrollo Social, Indian Council of South America, Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, International Human Rights Association of American Minorities, International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations, International Muslim Women's Union, International Service for Human Rights, Iraqi Development Organization, Kham Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada, Liberation, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Prahar, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Society for Development and Community Empowerment, United Nations Watch, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization, World Muslim Congress.

## E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

### The Social Forum

494. At the 45th meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.17, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Eritrea, Mexico, Nicaragua, the Philippines and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Argentina, Belarus, Chile, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Indonesia, Malaysia, Maldives, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

495. 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.

496. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 32/27).

### Declaration on the right to peace

497. At the 45th meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.18, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Nicaragua, the Sudan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Angola, Belarus, Cabo Verde, Colombia, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Malaysia, Pakistan, Qatar (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), South Africa and the Syrian Arab Republic joined the sponsors.

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

499. 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.

500. 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 Russian Federation and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

501. 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 draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.18. The voting was as follows:

#### *In favour:*

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

#### *Against:*

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

#### *Abstaining:*

Albania, Georgia, Portugal, Switzerland

502. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 34 votes to 9, with 4 abstentions (resolution 32/28).

## VI. Universal periodic review

503. 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-fourth session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, held from 18 to 29 January 2016.

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

### A. Consideration of the universal periodic review outcomes

505. The section below contains, in accordance with paragraph 4.3 of President's statement PRST/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.

#### Namibia

506. The review of Namibia was held on 18 January 2016 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 Namibia 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.6/24/NAM/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.6/24/NAM/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.6/24/NAM/3).

507. At its 26th meeting, on 23 June 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Namibia (see sect. C below).

508. The outcome of the review of Namibia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/32/4), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/32/4/Add.1).

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

509. The delegation of Namibia, headed by the Minister for Justice, Albert Kawana, stated that Namibia was honoured to participate in the universal periodic review mechanism and to present its report to the Human Rights Council. The delegation thanked OHCHR for its assistance in that endeavour.

510. Namibia had always been a proponent of the universal periodic review mechanism since its inception in 2006. It valued the distinct universal and peer review nature of the mechanism, which was supported by many countries, and which provided a platform for engagement among States on issues of concern. As a member of the Human Rights Council, Namibia recognized the importance of the mechanism for preventative intervention.

511. The delegation stated that Namibia had received 219 recommendations and confirmed the State's position on those recommendations, as indicated in the addendum to the report of the Working Group. Those recommendations that had been noted were still the subject of consultation since some of them would require constitutional amendments prior to their implementation. Namibia had an established democratic culture and therefore constitutional amendments required wide consultations, including consultations with all political parties, and such amendments could only be made through consensus. It was a time-consuming process.

512. Namibia attached great importance to strengthening and promoting human rights for all in the country. However, the delegation emphasized that no country was free from allegations of human rights abuses and Namibia was no exception. Namibia had continued to strengthen its legal and policy framework, as well as those institutions responsible for combating human rights abuses. The Government remained committed to delivering on its promises. It would continue to build on the progress made during the era of peace and stability, and it would also focus on economic emancipation and prosperity for all citizens. The responses by Namibia to the recommendations received were based on the best interests of the Namibian people, the country and the broader international community.

513. The delegation urged the Human Rights Council to take into account that, for the past three consecutive years, Namibia had experienced a severe drought. The Government was committed to ensuring that no citizen died of hunger as a result of the drought. Consequently, the Government was compelled to, inter alia, redirect resources from education, health and infrastructure development to drought relief. That state of affairs had naturally affected the international commitments of Namibia, including those in areas of further enhancing the enjoyment of human rights of its citizens. In that context, the implementation of the National Human Rights Action Plan, which focused mainly on access to health services, justice, education, water and sanitation, housing and land, was likely to be adversely affected.

514. In addition to the challenges arising from the ongoing drought, Namibia faced the challenges of unemployment and persistent poverty. Those challenges were compounded by the fact that the State was regarded as an upper-middle-income country, which had resulted in the withdrawal of many social development partners.

515. The delegation stated that one of the issues raised was the absence of specific legislation criminalizing torture, and it informed the Human Rights Council that legislation to that effect would be tabled in Parliament before the end of the year. The envisaged legislation would define the crime of torture as that explicitly provided for in the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

516. The Government was aware of the need to speed up law reform initiatives in order to implement some of the recommendations accepted. To that end, some draft bills would be tabled in Parliament that year.

517. The implementation of the Child Care and Protection Act was one of the main priorities and the Government was working tirelessly to finalize the outstanding regulations so that the Act would be brought into operation. As a commitment to further enhance the rights of the child, the Child Justice Bill had been drafted and would be tabled in Parliament that year.

518. The recommendations on repealing the criminal law provisions that criminalized sodomy, as well as the recommendations calling for the recognition of the rights of same-sex couples, had been noted. The Constitution of Namibia did not permit marriage of same-sex couples. The delegation emphasized that individuals in same-sex relationships were not persecuted and that the victimization of or violence against any person was prohibited.

519. Namibia has accepted the recommendations on acceding to the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure, the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness, among others.

520. Violence against women and girls remained a serious concern, and the Government would continue to consult with all stakeholders on finding ways beyond progressive legislation to curb that evil.

521. The universal periodic review mechanism provided Namibia with an opportunity to acknowledge its shortcomings and request assistance, where needed, to effectively implement the recommendations accepted.

522. On behalf of the Government, the delegation expressed its sincere appreciation to its social development partners and to the international community at large for their cooperation, assistance and partnership with Namibia in its efforts to strengthen its capacity to promote and protect the rights of its citizens.

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

523. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Namibia, 20 delegations made statements.

524. Haiti encouraged Namibia to continue national consultations, particularly with civil society, and to work on the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. It welcomed the determination of Namibia to build hospitals throughout the country for persons with mental disabilities. It encouraged the State to have a continued national dialogue to reduce social inequalities and thus contribute to economic development.

525. India commended Namibia for the receptive and constructive manner in which the State had participated in the universal periodic review mechanism. The review reflected the intense participation and engagement by peer countries, with as many as 96 delegations having taken the floor and 219 recommendations having been made, which had covered a range of human rights issues. India was encouraged by the number of recommendations accepted by Namibia. The State had gained much from the review and would continue to implement the recommendations accepted.

526. Latvia commended Namibia for its constructive engagement with the universal periodic review process and its commitment to address gender-based violence. It further noted the constructive engagement of Namibia with the special procedures of the Human Rights Council, as demonstrated by the recent visit to the country by special procedures. However, full cooperation was necessary, and Latvia regretted the fact that Namibia had not accepted its recommendation on extending a standing invitation to all special procedures, and it encouraged the State to do so.

527. Pakistan welcomed Namibia and thanked the State for having provided an update on the recommendations accepted and for having accepted the majority of the recommendations made during the review, including those made by Pakistan. It praised Namibia for its achievements in economic and social development, despite the challenges it had faced, thereby further contributing to the promotion and protection of the rights of all of its citizens.

528. The Republic of Korea thanked Namibia for its constructive engagement with the universal periodic review and it welcomed the acceptance of its recommendations on adopting the Child Care and Protection Act, eliminating gender-based violence and revising the Married Persons Equality Act of 1996.

529. Sierra Leone commended Namibia for its current efforts to criminalize torture and it referred to the State's implementation of free and universal primary and secondary education as a good example to follow. It recognized Namibia as having ranked first in Africa for freedom of the press and for its strategic long-term health road map. Sierra Leone encouraged Namibia to address the consequences of the severe drought the country was experiencing through relevant partnerships.

530. South Africa welcomed the positive developments in Namibia since its first universal periodic review and it congratulated the State on its acceptance of a large number of recommendations. It noted the State's commendable progress in the field of human rights, particularly in gender parity, universal access to education, reduction in HIV infection rates, the provision of safe drinking water, sanitation and the robust legal

protection of women. South Africa encouraged the international community to renew global partnerships for development in support of those efforts.

531. Sri Lanka noted the significant efforts made by Namibia to pursue its human rights obligations, despite the challenges posed by the severe droughts associated with climate change. It further recognized the Government's efforts to eradicate poverty and unemployment and it encouraged Namibia to implement the initiatives the State had put in place, including the National Human Rights Action Plan for 2015–2019, the revised National Gender Policy for 2010–2020 and the Child Care and Protection Act of 2015.

532. Togo welcomed the numerous measures taken by Namibia to implement the recommendations from the first cycle, particularly the establishment of a ministry to combat poverty and the adoption of an act to govern juvenile justice. Togo commended Namibia for having accepted the majority of the recommendations from its second review and it invited the international community to contribute its support towards the implementation of those recommendations.

533. The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) was working closely with the Government and development partners to accelerate the enforcement of the Child Care and Protection Act of 2015. It looked forward to the enactment of the proposed Combating of Trafficking in Persons Bill and the Child Justice Bill, and the updating of the Education Act of 2001. The inequalities in income were reflected in inequalities in social outcomes. The Government had declared a "war on poverty", which provided an opportunity to address those inequalities. UNICEF encouraged the Government to address key human rights capacity gaps, improve the monitoring of outcomes for children and evaluate financial resource allocations.

534. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the open-mindedness and the willingness shown by Namibia to take advice in the course of the review. The State had provided specific answers to all of the questions posed and had supported the vast majority of the recommendations made during the review. Namibia had taken major initiatives to help the poorest and had successfully carried out plans, programmes and projects focused on improving social well-being, particularly the well-being of the family. It encouraged the State to continue to strengthen and implement social policies, with a particular emphasis on the most vulnerable groups.

535. Zimbabwe commended Namibia for having supported most of the recommendations from the second review. The State was committed to the promotion and protection of human rights and to the fulfilment of its regional and international obligations, which was evidenced by, among other things, its adoption of the National Human Rights Action Plan for 2015–2019 and its submission of all outstanding reports on the human rights instruments to which it was a party.

536. Algeria stated that Namibia had made major efforts to promote and protect human rights, particularly to fight poverty and to guarantee the right to health, access to education, clean drinking water and a healthy environment. The launch of the National Human Rights Action Plan for 2015–2019 indicated the depth of the State's commitment to human rights. It welcomed the acceptance of two recommendations on universal education for children and on the fight against traditional practices that tolerated sexual violence and discrimination against women.

537. Angola expressed support for the efforts made by Namibia to protect and promote human rights, particularly its adherence to international and regional human rights instruments. It expressed appreciation for the strengthening of the national programme for gender equality. Namibia had accepted many recommendations, including those made by Angola. It encouraged and supported Namibia in its future efforts to implement the recommendations accepted.

538. Botswana stated that Namibia had taken legislative and policy measures to address education, gender-based violence and children's rights, and it noted the adoption of the Sector Policy on Inclusive Education and the Child Care and Protection Act. It also noted the continued strengthening of human rights institutions, including the Office of the Ombudsman.

539. Burundi noted with satisfaction the efforts made by Namibia to guarantee access to education, which included free education in primary and secondary schools. It welcomed



the efforts to ensure access to health care for all, and the establishment of the Office of the Ombudsman and the increased budget for that Office. The adoption of the National Human Rights Action Plan would further improve the situation in the country.

540. China expressed appreciation for the good progress made in the development of the judicial system, the reduction of poverty, the promotion of gender equality and the rights of indigenous peoples, and the improvement in access to education and public health services. It encouraged the Government to continue to intensify its efforts to address unemployment and protracted poverty and to reduce gender-based violence.

541. Cuba was grateful that Namibia had accepted the two recommendations it had made. It commended the State for its actions to fight poverty and the lack of development. It emphasized the importance of land distribution programmes, the building of inexpensive housing and the water supply systems, and environmental improvements. It underscored the efforts made to eliminate gender-based violence and to improve the protection of children.

542. Egypt congratulated Namibia on its efforts to promote human rights and particularly to eliminate discrimination against women through its National Gender Policy for 2010–2020. It was impressed by the efforts made to get poor children into the education system, by having provided access to education for all and having a mobile education component in the programme. Namibia had accepted many of the recommendations made, including the three made by Egypt.

543. Ethiopia noted with satisfaction the acceptance by Namibia of a considerable number of recommendations, including those made by Ethiopia on introducing civic and human rights education in the school curriculum and on submitting outstanding reports to the relevant treaty bodies. It commended Namibia for having established the Ministry of Poverty Eradication and Social Welfare.

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

544. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Namibia, no other stakeholders made statements.

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

545. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 219 recommendations received, 190 recommendations had enjoyed the support of Namibia and 29 had been noted.

546. The delegation thanked the President of the Human Rights Council for his leadership and all the delegations that had participated in the review. It assured the international community that the issues of concern raised by the delegations were taken seriously and that those recommendations that had not been accepted would be considered in due course after the relevant stakeholders had been consulted. Namibia would be submitting a midterm implementation report to the Human Rights Council.

### **Niger**

547. The review of the Niger was held on 18 January 2016 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 Niger 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.6/24/NER/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.6/24/NER/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.6/24/NER/3).

548. At its 26th meeting, on 23 June 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the Niger (see sect. C below).

549. The outcome of the review of the Niger comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/32/5), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/32/5/Add.1).

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

550. The delegation stated that the Niger attached great importance to the universal periodic review, which made it possible to bring the different human rights stakeholders together on a regular basis and to review how States were fulfilling their common responsibilities to ensure the promotion and protection of human rights.

551. The promotion and protection of human rights was a priority for the Government of the Niger, which was working hard to improve the human rights situation on the ground.

552. Further to its second review, the Niger continued to achieve substantive progress in the area of human rights. Thus, the people of the Niger were able to express freely their choice during the presidential and legislative elections in 2016 and to ensure the establishment of all of the institutions provided for by the Constitution.

553. The Niger had also reviewed its Criminal Code and Criminal Procedure Code with a view to tackling the issue of young people involved in terrorism and in an attempt to prevent terrorism and transnational organized crime in a more effective manner. The courts of the Niger had also been provided with universal competency in the area of the elimination of torture.

554. The terrorist group Boko Haram had launched a full-scale war on the Niger. It continued to be a major concern for the country due to the resulting numerous deaths, refugees and internally displaced persons. The situation was highly alarming.

555. In order to address the situation, the Niger and the other countries in the region were mobilized through the Multinational Joint Task Force. In addition, the Government of the Niger and its partners had made significant efforts to address the humanitarian crisis that had resulted from that war. The Niger would like to call upon the international community to provide further support to the affected countries in the region and their populations.

556. The current trafficking of migrants, which had resulted in more and more victims, was a challenge for the Niger, which was a country of origin, transit and destination of migrants due to its geographical location and long borders. In order to address the situation, the Niger had reinforced its legal and institutional framework against trafficking in persons, including migrants. The Niger would like to acknowledge the constant and important contributions received from its partners and it urged them to continue to provide their support.

557. Regarding its second universal periodic review, the Niger had received 168 recommendations. Of those, the Niger had accepted 164 further to its review, one had been noted, and the State's position on three recommendations had been postponed. With regard to the three postponed recommendations, the first one was related to the adoption of implementing decrees of the ordinance on pastoralism, which guaranteed the protection of land rights. In that respect, in 2013, the Niger had already adopted two decrees. The first one had established the modalities of the functioning of the parity commissions in charge of the conciliation of conflict resolutions among farmers and ranchers. The second one had established the practical modalities for the national inventory of rangelands and pastoral resources. Five decree implementing projects had also been drafted and were in the process of being adopted. Consequently, the Niger had accepted the recommendation contained in paragraph 121.2 on adopting decrees to implement the ordinance on pastoralism.

558. The Niger had also accepted the recommendation contained in paragraph 121.3 on protecting the rights of pastoralists. According to the delegation, the rights of nomadic populations were protected in the same manner as the rights of other populations in the Niger, without distinction. In order to ensure the protection of nomadic populations' rights directly relating to animal herding, the Government had carried out during the past five years a number of actions to modernize that sector, to secure agricultural and pastoralism

systems, to control the sanitary conditions of the animals and to increase animal production. In order to continue those actions, the Niger had accepted the recommendation contained in paragraph 121.3.

559. The third postponed recommendation had requested the Niger to avoid criminalizing the activities of human rights defenders and to repeal or amend all laws and policies that restricted their activities or their rights, including by ensuring that anti-terrorism legislation was not misused. In that regard, the delegation stated that human rights defenders operated freely in compliance with the laws and regulations in force. Consequently, the Niger had accepted the recommendation contained in paragraph 121.1 on the freedoms of human rights defenders.

560. The delegation stressed that the Niger had accepted in total 167 recommendations, which had addressed several themes. Many of those recommendations were related to cooperation with the human rights mechanisms, equality and non-discrimination, human security, prison administration, freedom of expression, the rights to work, to an adequate standard of living, to health and to education, to development, environmental issues, and the rights of migrants and refugees.

561. The areas referred to above reflected the concerns of the second Government of the Republic and the goals of the Renaissance of the Niger Programme, adopted by the President of the Niger. The country would make efforts to take the measures necessary to implement the recommendations. To that end, an action plan for 2016–2020 would soon be developed, involving all stakeholders, in particular civil society and the National Human Rights Commission.

562. The committee responsible for drafting the reports of the Niger to the treaty bodies and the universal periodic review would monitor the implementation of that plan, which would be evaluated in 2019 as part of a midterm review. That report would help to measure the progress achieved and the challenges that remained.

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

563. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Niger, 15 delegations made statements.

564. Cuba acknowledged the acceptance by the Niger of a large majority of the recommendations made, including three that the State had deferred. It thanked the Niger for its acceptance of the two recommendations made by Cuba, which were on strengthening awareness-raising and training of women for leadership and on the right to food. Cuba also drew attention to the progress made by the Niger regarding economic and social rights, particularly in terms of health, education, jobs and food.

565. Djibouti congratulated the Niger on all of the efforts made to end child marriage. It noted the awareness-raising activities regarding the *Wilayah* and the fight against genital mutilation practices undertaken by the Niger and its successes in that area. Lastly, Djibouti congratulated the Niger on its efforts in the area of education.

566. Egypt drew attention to the efforts made to promote human rights in the Niger, including the establishment of a national human rights institution and the finalization of a plan for the implementation of the recommendations from the current universal periodic review cycle, including those on eliminating slavery and trafficking in persons and on promoting good governance. Egypt congratulated the Niger on its acceptance of the five recommendations made by Egypt, which were on promoting the participation of women in decision-making, combating Boko Haram and eliminating all forms of slavery.

567. Ethiopia noted the acceptance by the Niger of the recommendations made by Ethiopia on counter-terrorism measures and on fighting poverty through economic and social development programmes. Ethiopia encouraged the Niger to take all the measures necessary for the full implementation of the recommendations accepted during its second universal periodic review.

568. Ghana commended the Niger for the steps taken to evaluate its progress on the recommendations accepted during its first review and it recalled the State's historic commitment to human rights since the days of the liberation struggle. Ghana was pleased

that the Niger had accepted its recommendations on ratifying the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and on acceding to the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity.

569. Pakistan commended the Niger for having accepted the majority of the recommendations made during the session of the Working Group. It appreciated the State's efforts to promote and protect the rights of its citizens, including women, children and persons with disabilities.

570. Sierra Leone commended the Niger for its ongoing efforts to improve the human rights situation of its people, and particularly its work to combat trafficking in persons by having collaborated with stakeholders and by having developed strategies through its national coordination committee and national agency. Sierra Leone also recognized the peaceful elections held in the Niger since the State's last review and the revision of its Penal Code and penal procedures. Sierra Leone concluded by encouraging the Niger to continue its reform process and to foster technical partnerships with OHCHR to that end.

571. South Africa welcomed the positive developments in the Niger since the first universal periodic review, including the efforts to establish a national human rights commission and the adoption of the economic and social development plan, a national policy on justice and human rights, and the "3N Initiative". South Africa encouraged the international community to support renewed partnerships so that the Niger could resolve its current challenges, which had been exacerbated by its external debt and food crises.

572. Togo noted the measures taken by the Niger to implement the recommendations from the State's first universal periodic review and the establishment of democratic institutions provided for in its Constitution. It thanked the Niger for its acceptance of the recommendations made by Togo on withdrawing reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, and it invited the international community to offer support to the Niger in implementing the recommendations accepted.

573. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the fact that the Niger had implemented the large majority of the recommendations accepted during its first review, which clearly demonstrated the State's commitment to human rights. It noted the ratification by the Niger of major international instruments in the area of human rights, the establishment of a national human rights commission consistent with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles), and the significant progress made in areas of education, health and food. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela encouraged the Niger to promote its successful social policies with a view to achieving the full inclusion of the most vulnerable sectors of the population.

574. Algeria thanked the Niger for having submitted supplementary information during its second review and it congratulated the State on the steps taken to combat modern slavery and the practice of child marriage. It welcomed the State's cooperation with regional and United Nations human rights mechanisms and it noted the acceptance of both of the recommendations made by Algeria, which were on adopting a family code and on continuing its efforts to improve education and literacy among nomad populations.

575. Angola welcomed the fact that the Niger had organized free, transparent and inclusive general elections, which had been held in a calm atmosphere. It supported the State's determination to continue to cooperate with the international mechanisms for the promotion and protection of human rights, and its implementation of the provisions contained in the Convention on the Rights of the Child and its Optional Protocols, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

576. Botswana noted that the Niger had enacted legislation in the area of human rights, which included the adoption of the action plan of the national commission to coordinate the fight against trafficking in persons for 2014–2019, the act establishing the ombudsman of 2011 and the act establishing the regulations of the High Court of Justice of 2011. Botswana commended the State for having signed the Declaration of Table Mountain in order to protect journalists further.

577. Burundi congratulated the Niger on its efforts and progress in protecting human rights despite the major challenges the State faced as a result of the acts of Boko Haram. It welcomed the establishment of a national human rights commission, the legislative and institutional measures taken to combat slavery and trafficking in persons, and the various measures adopted to combat corruption.

578. China commended the Niger for its progress in fighting slavery, trafficking in persons and terrorism, and the improvements in health care, education, employment and access to food. It thanked the Niger for having accepted its recommendations on promoting women's rights and eliminating discrimination against women, and on continuing efforts to promote economic and social development. China recognized the challenges faced by the Niger and called upon the international community to aid the State in its efforts and to promote sustainable development in the country.

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

579. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Niger, two other stakeholders made statements.

580. The Indian Council of South America referred to the recommendation made by Switzerland to the Niger on ensuring that mining companies respected human rights. It recommended that the Niger ensure that the recommendation was implemented in accordance with the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. That was consistent with the recommendation of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, which had stressed that the exploitation of uranium should not be made to the detriment of the health of the population or of the protection of the environment.

581. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme noted the measures taken by the Niger to improve the human rights situation since the State's first universal periodic review. While noting the low rate of participation, it congratulated the Niger on having held peaceful elections. It welcomed the ratification of treaties and the efforts made to eliminate the death penalty. However, it remained concerned by the persistence of early marriage, trafficking in persons, slavery and the harassment of human rights defenders and journalists. It urged the Niger to put in place a programme for victims of Boko Haram and it called upon the international community to assist the State in its efforts in that regard.

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

582. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 168 recommendations received, 167 had enjoyed the support of the Niger, and 1 had been noted.

583. The delegation of the Niger thanked the States that had made recommendations whose implementation would certainly improve the human rights situation in the Niger, and it would ensure the State's commitment to implement the recommendations. The Niger was also pleased with the non-governmental organizations that had made comments, particularly those relating to the impact of the activities of mining companies on human rights and to the fight against terrorism.

584. The Niger was already taking actions to continue the implementation of the recommendations and it would continue to do so.

#### **Mozambique**

585. The review of Mozambique was held on 19 January 2016 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 Mozambique 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.6/24/MOZ/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.6/24/MOZ/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.6/24/MOZ/3).

586. At its 26th meeting, on 23 June 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Mozambique (see sect. C below).

587. The outcome of the review of Mozambique comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/32/6), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/32/6/Add.1).

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

588. The delegation of Mozambique reiterated the State's firm commitment to the universal periodic review process, which it considered as a special and important mechanism for the continued promotion and protection of human rights and as an opportunity to share best practices in the field of human rights throughout the world.

589. The exercise was in line with the State's five-year programme for 2015–2019, which, among other things, called for the consolidation of the rule of law, good governance and decentralization through the establishment of a set of strategic objectives that contributed to the promotion and protection of human rights.

590. Referring to the statement of Mozambique from last January, the delegation stressed that the State's report was the result of broad consultations at the national level with all the relevant stakeholders, including civil society organizations working in the field of human rights in the country. Mozambique had participated in the process with an open and transparent spirit and had benefited from all the contributions made during the interactive debate.

591. The delegation of Mozambique intended not only to respond to the recommendations but also to confirm the State's commitment to the promotion and protection of the human rights of all Mozambicans in all dimensions with a view to cooperating constructively with the Human Rights Council in the exercise of its mandate.

592. The recommendations of States contributed to the enrichment of the achievements of Mozambique in the ongoing struggle for the full realization of human rights in the country.

593. The majority of the 210 recommendations had already been framed in the State's five-year programme and were being implemented through various sectoral plans. It was on that basis that, during the session of the Working Group, Mozambique had accepted 158 recommendations, postponed until the current plenary session 38 recommendations and rejected only 14.

594. Mozambique had given its position on each of the recommendations in the addendum to its national report, with a particular emphasis on the postponed recommendations.

595. The delegation then spoke about the deferred recommendations. With regard to the recommendations on ratifying and acceding to international legal human rights instruments, including the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, a thorough process of evaluation and harmonization of positions with the relevant institutions to identify all domestic implications was being considered.

596. The National Human Rights Commission had received all the necessary conditions to become a truly operational institution in line with the Paris Principles.

597. With regard to the recommendations on visits by special procedure mandate holders, including special rapporteurs and independent experts, Mozambique remained open to welcoming them, based upon mutually agreed agendas. In its firm commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights, the Government was willing to receive the special procedure mandate holders who had already expressed their intention to visit the

country, with a particular emphasis on the Independent Expert on the enjoyment of human rights by persons with albinism in August and the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions on dates to be agreed upon.

598. Concerning the issue of business and human rights, there was an ongoing joint initiative involving the Government and civil society, based on the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. A number of activities had been implemented, including training workshops and a baseline study on business and human rights in Mozambique. Those activities would lead to the development of an action plan that would provide for, among other things, the accountability of stakeholders.

599. Concerning citizens' access to justice, the services of the institute for legal aid covered all provincial capitals and 140 of the 150 districts in the country. In the remaining 10 districts assistance was provided on a roving basis. For that task, a partnership with civil society organizations and higher education institutions had been established.

600. The Government and various civil society organizations had paid particular attention to women's rights by training different actors and providing legal assistance and advocacy for the promotion and protection of women's rights.

601. In Mozambique, the death penalty was constitutionally prohibited. As such, summary executions constituted a crime. Any action of that nature was punished. Cases of death involving prison or police officers were promptly and properly investigated and the offenders were held accountable.

602. The arrests of people suspected of committing crimes occurred under the law within the scope of criminal liability. All criminal cases were undertaken according to legal procedures and the executive branch followed its course in compliance with the principle of the separation of powers.

603. As part of the general reform of the public sector, the Government of Mozambique had defined the fight against corruption as a priority in its development agenda, and to that end it had adopted a legislative and institutional framework, including, among others, guidelines for the development of a national anti-corruption strategy.

604. In that area, as part of its obligations under the United Nations Convention against Corruption, the Government had created the central office for combating corruption, a unit dedicated to investigating corruption cases. In that regard, laws on public integrity and money laundering had been adopted.

605. Mozambique had an adequate legal framework that defined, prevented and punished civil and criminal practices of corruption. In that regard, the process for the adoption of the new Criminal Procedure Code, now underway, would be of great value to the strengthening of the existing framework.

606. Meanwhile, efforts were underway to conduct a national study on the causes, incidence and best ways to deal with the phenomenon of corruption. The results of that study would deepen knowledge about that phenomenon and allow for the adoption of the measures necessary to combat it effectively.

607. In 2015, legislation that criminalized corruption in the private sector was passed, followed by awareness-raising campaigns. In addition, coordination activities between the public and private sectors were underway.

608. In the framework of poverty reduction, the Government had defined agricultural development and the development of fisheries, employment promotion, and human and social development, among others, as priority areas.

609. Those priorities were founded on policies and strategies that had contributed to the promotion of development, particularly in social sectors such as education, health, access to infrastructure and other basic services. One of those instruments was the local investment fund, which had a positive impact on food production, job creation and income generation in rural districts in the country.

610. The Constitution of Mozambique stated in its article 35 that all citizens were equal before the law, and article 88 added that education was a right and a duty of every citizen. That meant that children, young people and adults of both sexes had the same opportunities

to access education. Girls had the same opportunities as boys in terms of access to education and they were encouraged to complete their studies.

611. There were ongoing awareness-raising campaigns in schools and communities, and the launch of advertising spots on radio and television was part of a national “zero tolerance” campaign against sexual harassment and the abuse of students in schools and communities. The aim was to ensure that schools were healthy and safe places, free of abuse and violence.

612. The Ministry for Education and Human Development recognized that the guidance set out in Order No. 39/2003 of 5 December, which also provided for the transference of pregnant girls to night classes, required improvement. Thus, a group had been created to conduct hearings with various stakeholders at schools and within school communities and society at large on the content of that document for its review. The work being done by that team was aimed at improving strategies to combat violence, sexual harassment and abuse in schools, and at preventing early pregnancies and early marriages.

613. Concerning sexual offences against children, the Criminal Code, which highlighted the legal definition of crimes such as rape, and rape of a minor under 12 years of age, framed prison sentences from between 2 and 8 years, and between 8 and 12 years, respectively.

614. The crimes referred to above, when associated with the crime of trafficking in persons, were punished in aggravated form by Law No. 6/2008 of 9 July, which stipulated prison sentences ranging from 12 to 16 years and 16 to 20 years.

615. That showed the progressive movement regarding the adoption of instruments safeguarding the rights of children and the suppression of conduct relating to sexual crimes against children.

616. With regard to early marriages, the Government of Mozambique had launched a national strategy against such practices. It contained measures and preventive actions intended to combat harmful conduct against children.

617. There were recommendations that the State had wished to partially accept or completely reject, but due to procedure limitations, Mozambique had decided to take note of them.

618. Turning lastly to the rejected recommendations, which the Government considered it was not able to implement either because of their incompatibility with domestic law, or disharmony with the cultural, traditional and religious values of the country, or other conditions, Mozambique pointed out that those recommendations had been thoroughly debated during the presentation of the report.

619. Regarding the increase in the maternity leave period, the country supported the recommendation in principle; however, it was not able to guarantee the resources necessary for its implementation. Thus, further studies were needed in order to assess the financial impact.

620. With regard to the recommendation on discriminatory measures, Mozambique accepted the idea of strengthening anti-discrimination measures for vulnerable groups. However, it noted that there was no discrimination in Mozambique relating to the recognition of civil society organizations. With regard to the recognition of Lambda and other similar associations, the position of Mozambique was that the non-registration of those associations did not imply discriminatory practice. Internal consultations with the relevant administrative services and other mechanisms were underway. In the meantime, people with a different sexual orientation were enjoying their privacy rights.

621. The delegation confirmed the determination of the Government to honour all of its commitments under the universal periodic review process, with the support and cooperation of the Human Rights Council, OHCHR and all member States, and the international community in general.

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

622. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Mozambique, 22 delegations made statements.



623. India appreciated the constructive participation of Mozambique in the universal periodic review process and it noted the State's willingness to accept over 85 per cent of the recommendations made.

624. Norway was pleased to note that Mozambique had accepted three of its recommendations on new penal procedures, a national human rights institution and using grant funding to ensure access by women to the rights guaranteed to them by law. It noted the State's explanations in the addendum regarding the recommendations made by Norway on freedom of expression, criminal defamation laws and the right of non-governmental organizations to work on issues of sexual identity and gender identity – Norway believed there was room for further cooperation and discussion in those fields.

625. Pakistan appreciated the fact that Mozambique had accepted a large number of recommendations and it noted the State's commitment to promote and protect the rights of its citizens, based on the positive measures the Government had taken in recent years, including the strengthening of national institutions.

626. Portugal saw the large number of recommendations accepted by Mozambique, including all of those made by Portugal, as a clear sign of the State's commitment to protect human rights. It wished Mozambique success in implementing the recommendations and it restated its availability to cooperate with the State bilaterally, multilaterally and within the context of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries.

627. Sierra Leone noted that Mozambique had accepted its recommendations on prosecuting all incidents of violence perpetrated against persons with albinism and on harmonizing laws to prevent and end the practice of child, early and forced marriage. It commended the State for its effort to fight corruption and the sexual harassment and abuse of children, including in their schools and communities.

628. South Africa welcomed the positive efforts made by Mozambique in the field of human rights, namely the implementation of the five-year programme for 2015–2019, which would improve the delivery of public services and contribute to economic and social development efforts. South Africa further welcomed successes in achieving universal access to antiretroviral treatment for HIV-positive pregnant women.

629. Togo welcomed the progress of Mozambique in implementing the recommendations accepted in the first cycle and the measures taken to submit reports to the treaty bodies. It congratulated the State on having accepted the majority of the recommendations from the second cycle and it invited the international community to aid Mozambique in implementing the recommendations accepted.

630. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela noted the dedication of Mozambique to the field of human rights and commended the State for its cooperation with the universal periodic review. It drew attention to the State's ratification of a series of international instruments on human rights and it welcomed the establishment of the National Human Rights Commission and the Office of the Ombudsman consistent with the Paris Principles.

631. Viet Nam commended Mozambique for having ratified most international legal instruments on human rights and for its cooperation with special procedure mechanisms. It further commended Mozambique for its efforts to improve gender equality and the advancement of women, and to eliminate discrimination against women and to protect them from trafficking, sexual abuse and gender-based violence.

632. Zimbabwe considered Mozambique to have been open and constructive in its engagement with all stakeholders and it took that as proof that the country took its human rights obligations seriously. It noted that Mozambique continued to strengthen the relevant State institutions and encouraged the participation of civil society in all human development activities. Lastly, Zimbabwe noted the efforts to regularize the reporting obligations to the treaty bodies.

633. Algeria commended Mozambique for having submitted additional information during its second review. It noted that the majority of the recommendations had been accepted by Mozambique, including two made by Algeria on access to health care, and in particular combating malaria, HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis, and on combating the early marriage of girls.

634. Angola commended Mozambique for the precise information contained in its report and for having accepted the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Angola. It noted that Mozambique had ratified the majority of the international instruments in the area of human rights, notably the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. Angola encouraged Mozambique to continue its efforts to promote economic, social and cultural rights.

635. Botswana welcomed the establishment by Mozambique of the National Human Rights Commission in accordance with the Paris Principles and the establishment of the Office of the Ombudsman. It commended Mozambique for its development of the government programme for 2015–2019 and the significant increase in the number of women holding senior positions in Parliament.

636. Brazil noted that Mozambique had accepted the large majority of the recommendations, as it had done in the first cycle, but it also noted the content of those recommendations, which revealed the unequivocal commitment of Mozambique to the protection and promotion of human rights. It concluded by reiterating its readiness to cooperate with Mozambique, in part through the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries.

637. Burundi welcomed the establishment of the National Human Rights Commission and the Office of the Ombudsman consistent with the Paris Principles and it was further pleased to note the efforts made by Mozambique to ensure access to legal aid for detainees who could not afford a lawyer. Burundi encouraged Mozambique to continue that practice to ensure justice for all.

638. Cabo Verde was pleased with the large number of recommendations that Mozambique had accepted and it noted that the scope of the recommendations accepted had increased. It further noted with interest that the recommendation on ratifying the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance had not been rejected and was currently undergoing review with a view to a final decision.

639. China welcomed the progress made by Mozambique in areas such as the ratification of international legal human rights instruments, the protection of refugees, anti-corruption efforts, the protection of women's rights and the improvement of education, housing and public health services. China thanked Mozambique for having accepted its recommendations, including those on adopting measures to eliminate discrimination and violence against women and on dealing with overcrowding in prisons.

640. Cuba commended Mozambique for its work on encouraging the participation of women in politics and its efforts to end poverty and improve health coverage. Cuba urged Mozambique to continue to make that a priority and it thanked the State for having accepted its recommendations in those areas.

641. Djibouti noted with satisfaction the ratification by Mozambique of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. It encouraged the State to step up its efforts to end discrimination against women and to promote gender equality in the country.

642. El Salvador recognized that the acceptance of 158 recommendations clearly demonstrated the commitment of Mozambique to pursue development and the promotion of human rights in the country. It urged Mozambique to continue to advance in that direction and to undertake to ratify the human rights protection instruments that it had not yet ratified.

643. Ethiopia commended Mozambique for its acceptance of most of the recommendations from the second review, including those made by Ethiopia, which called upon the State to continue to provide law enforcement agencies with capacity-building, and to take consistent anti-corruption measures to enhance good governance and to promote transparency in the delivery of public services. Lastly, Ethiopia commended Mozambique for its efforts to strengthen State institutions.

644. Ghana commended Mozambique for the positive spirit with which it had engaged in the universal periodic review process, which was testimony to the country's commitment to

expand its human rights work. Ghana wished Mozambique success in its renewed commitment to strengthen State human rights institutions and in encouraging civil society participation in all human rights development activities.

### 3. General comments made by other stakeholders

645. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Mozambique, three other stakeholders made statements.

646. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland, in a joint statement with the International Lesbian and Gay Association, noted that there were still many human rights offences based on sexual orientation and gender identity, including violence and discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. Non-governmental organizations were still not able to register, operate freely or receive the necessary legal protection. It called upon Mozambique to accept and act on all the recommendations on sexual orientation and gender identity from the universal periodic review cycles.

647. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme congratulated Mozambique on the acceptance of 90 per cent of the recommendations. It urged the State to enter into a prompt national dialogue to consider the rejected recommendations. It was concerned about the resurgence of the demon of civil wars in some provinces. It referred to the hostilities between the armed forces and the Mozambican National Resistance having created numerous cases of human rights violations. It urged Mozambique to have a political dialogue to promote peace and security and to fight against sexual violence and corruption, and to protect persons with albinism.

648. Amnesty International was concerned about the number of reports of extrajudicial executions, torture and other ill-treatment by State actors and continued impunity for such abuses. It referred to the cases of two opposition activists: Benedito Sabao, who had been arbitrarily arrested, ill-treated and shot but who had survived; and Professor Gilles Cestac, who had been killed. It urged Mozambique to reconsider the rejection of the recommendation on having effective complaint and redress mechanisms for victims of human rights abuses by business enterprises.

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

649. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 210 recommendations received, 180 had enjoyed the support of Mozambique, and 30 had been noted.

650. Mozambique thanked the intervening States and reiterated that, for the recommendations noted, the dialogue would continue in collaboration with the relevant institutions and civil society. Mozambique would launch a national action plan for the implementation of the recommendations accepted and it would present a midterm review to assess the progress made.

#### Estonia

651. The review of Estonia was held on 19 January 2016 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 Estonia 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.6/24/EST/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.6/24/EST/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.6/24/EST/3).

652. At its 28th meeting, on 23 June 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Estonia (see sect. C below).

653. The outcome of the review of Estonia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/32/7), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/32/7/Add.1).

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

654. The delegation recalled that Estonia had received a total of 181 recommendations during its universal periodic review in January 2016. The State had promptly supported 126 of those recommendations. After a thorough examination and consultations with all the relevant authorities, the Government had presented its position on the remaining 55 recommendations in written form before the session of the Human Rights Council in June 2016. Of the remaining recommendations, 16 had enjoyed the support of Estonia and 39 had been noted. The delegation confirmed that Estonia would continue to pay attention to those recommendations that had been noted. That included in particular a consistent review of the State's international human rights obligations and consideration of the ratification of the human rights treaties to which it was not yet a party.

655. The delegation provided additional information on several human rights areas that had been covered in the recommendations. Concerning gender equality as a priority area, the Government was currently preparing its first comprehensive welfare development plan, including plans for the implementation of gender equality policies. Several measures had been envisaged to reduce the gender pay gap and to address gender stereotypes. The mandate of the labour inspectorate would be broadened to scrutinize the implementation of the legal requirement of equal pay. Furthermore, Estonia would take steps to ratify the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention).

656. Several recommendations covered issues relating to the protection of the rights of the child, which remained a priority for the Government. The new Child Protection Act contained the strict prohibition of corporal punishment of children. Various campaigns on positive parenting had been carried out in recent years. The Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Ministry of Social Affairs had been preparing a case-handling model to assist in avoiding repeated victimization in cases where families suffered from domestic violence.

657. Estonia had paid great attention to ensuring a bullying-free education environment and to preventing violence in schools. The Ministry of Education and Research had been implementing programmes to prevent bullying in schools.

658. Special classes and programmes had been taught in schools to enhance life skills and competences of young persons. For example, within the health and security programme of the school curricula, students were acquiring skills on how to avoid various dangers, including safe communication on the Internet, and to recognize situations that might involve risks relating to trafficking in persons.

659. In the crime prevention sphere, grants had been allocated in 2015 for activities that were aimed at preventing sexual abuse of children up to 10 years old. The legal protection available to victims of violence was also being improved. Information materials on child-friendly court proceedings had been prepared to explain to child witnesses, in a simple manner, the process of giving a testimony in court. Trainings had been organized for investigators who worked with minors. The delegation reported on various measures taken by the Government to improve the identification of cases of child abuse and the provision of assistance to child victims of violence.

660. The delegation confirmed the commitment of Estonia to continue to motivate persons with undetermined citizenship to obtain citizenship as quickly as possible. The Government had been supporting a campaign that was launched by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees on eradicating statelessness.

661. The delegation emphasized that Estonian citizens and persons with undetermined citizenship enjoyed equal rights in practice, with the exception of the rights to establish or join a political party, to stand in elections or to vote in parliamentary elections, and to work

in public (State) service. Long-term residents of Estonia, regardless of their citizenship and including persons with undetermined citizenship, enjoyed the right to vote in local government council elections. In some areas, they enjoyed more rights than Estonian citizens, as the number of States to which they could travel without visas was greater than that of Estonian citizens. Persons with undetermined citizenship could travel visa-free in both the European Union and the Russian Federation.

662. The Government had taken various measures to increase the motivation of persons with undetermined citizenship to apply for Estonian citizenship. At the same time, the Government maintained its position that citizenship could not be forced on anyone and that everyone had the right to choose his or her citizenship. Several legislative changes, described in detail in the national report, had been adopted to facilitate naturalization procedures, especially for children and older persons. As a result, the number of persons with undetermined citizenship had decreased from 32 per cent in 1992 to 6 per cent in June 2016.

663. While noting a decrease in discrepancies of unemployment rates between Estonian and ethnic minorities, the delegation reiterated that the status and rights of national, ethnic and linguistic minorities were guaranteed by the Constitution and legislation. Estonia was currently preparing a new employment initiative that would target mainly ethnic minorities and would provide additional measures to address the difficult situation of the labour market in Ida-Virumaa County (a border area with a high concentration of minorities). The employment situation in the area had recently deteriorated due to several large-scale collective redundancies in some manufacturing sectors, and those measures would provide support in creating jobs in the region and in providing additional training for the dismissed workers.

664. All applicants seeking international protection were always guaranteed access to effective legal remedy and translation services, as well as free daily counselling services and legal advice upon arrival and during their stay at a detention or accommodation centre. Asylum seekers were provided with comprehensive information about their rights and legal remedies in a language they could understand. They could be detained only on a concrete and limited number of grounds. The special needs of minors, persons with disabilities, older persons, pregnant women, single parents with children and persons who had been subjected to torture, rape or other serious forms of psychological, physical or sexual violence were taken into account during the detention of those persons.

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

665. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Estonia, 13 delegations made statements.

666. Botswana commended Estonia for having accepted many of the recommendations received during the universal periodic review held in January 2016. It also commended the State for its efforts to promote tolerance and cultural diversity by having criminalized incitement to hatred, violence and discrimination. While noting the efforts of the Government in the area of gender equality, Botswana encouraged Estonia to finalize and implement its equality policies.

667. Burundi commended Estonia for having issued a standing invitation to special procedure mandate holders. It noted with appreciation the development of an action plan concerning policies on equal opportunities and gender equality for 2016–2023, as well as the adoption of measures to combat discrimination against women. Burundi welcomed the measures taken to promote and protect children's rights, in particular by having established the Ombudsman for Children. It commended the State for its efforts to encourage the integration of ethnic and linguistic minorities. It noted the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the measures taken to combat domestic violence.

668. China thanked Estonia for having accepted a recommendation made by China on improving the submission of reports to the treaty bodies and on strengthening its capacity-building in that sphere. It encouraged the State to adopt legislative, judicial and policy measures to further guarantee the status and rights of national ethnic and linguistic minorities.

669. The Council of Europe welcomed the measures taken to address some of the recommendations made by its various monitoring bodies regarding several issues, including the large number of stateless persons, discrimination against national minorities and allegations of excessive use of force by law enforcement officers in prisons and in the police force. The Council of Europe invited Estonia to ratify the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages and the Istanbul Convention.

670. Ghana noted with appreciation that Estonia gave priority to democracy, the rule of law, and the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms at the national and international level. It commended Estonia for having issued a standing invitation to special procedure mandate holders. Ghana welcomed the acceptance by Estonia of over 80 per cent of the recommendations made during the second review, including those made by Ghana.

671. The Islamic Republic of Iran took note of the acceptance by Estonia of its recommendations on respecting freedom of expression, on curtailing the stereotyping of minorities, and on taking measures to address discrimination based on ethnic, religious and linguistic origin. It shared the concerns expressed in various recommendations relating to discrimination against Roma communities, domestic violence and in particular violence against children, as well as racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, and it urged Estonia to address those issues as a matter of priority.

672. Latvia stated that the comprehensive report and the wide consultations with different stakeholders and the thorough attention paid to all the recommendations demonstrated the constructive engagement of Estonia with the universal periodic review process. It noted with satisfaction the State's acceptance of the recommendations made by Latvia. It was confident that the Government would benefit from the valuable discussions and useful remarks made during the Working Group and that the successful review would further contribute to the efforts of the Government to protect and promote human rights.

673. Norway stated that, during the review in January 2016, it had made four recommendations on minority groups, access to citizenship, combating hate speech and the allocation of resources to the Gender Equality and Equal Treatment Commissioner. It noted with satisfaction that three of those recommendations had been accepted immediately and that Estonia had provided explanations regarding the fourth recommendation in the addendum document, which had been noted.

674. Pakistan commended the Government for having accepted the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Pakistan. It noted with appreciation that Estonia had made efforts to protect its citizens, including women, children and persons with disabilities.

675. The Russian Federation noted that Estonia had accepted three recommendations made by the Russian Federation on banning organizations that promoted and incited racial discrimination, and on fighting hate speech and trafficking in persons. It noted with concern that Estonia had not supported the recommendations on establishing the post of ombudsman for the issues of national minorities, on addressing discrimination in employment on the grounds of ethnic origin and language, and on stopping the participation of members of the Estonian armed forces in annual so-called "remembrance events" glorifying former Nazi collaborators.

676. Sierra Leone noted that many of the 181 recommendations received during the review had enjoyed the support of Estonia. It encouraged the State to ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and to implement policies to better protect against statelessness, including the applicable United Nations conventions on statelessness, the ILO Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169), and the ILO Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189).

677. Tajikistan noted the steps taken by Estonia to promote tolerance and cultural diversity by having further improved legislation and education, the rights of national minorities and gender equality.

678. Albania congratulated Estonia for the progress made in human rights. It noted with satisfaction that Estonia had taken into consideration the recommendations made by Albania on improving the situation of the Roma community and adopting a comprehensive strategy, and on improving access, particularly for disadvantaged and marginalized

individuals and groups. It also complimented the State on its ongoing progress with regard to the Ombudsman for Children and on having taken the relevant measures to reform the social welfare framework for persons with disabilities and other vulnerable groups.

### 3. General comments made by other stakeholders

679. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Estonia, one other stakeholder made a statement.

680. Human Rights Watch noted the plans of the Government to adopt an action plan for employment, social protection, inclusion, gender equality and equal opportunities. While welcoming the fact that Estonia had supported a recommendation on reducing statelessness and on facilitating access to citizenship for long-term residents, it recommended that the State prioritize the protection of the rights of stateless persons and ethnic minorities. Human Rights Watch noted that language requirements remained a challenge for naturalization, as did the relative costs of naturalization and the income requirements for citizenship for poorer long-term residents. Stateless residents did not enjoy full political rights and could not occupy a number of professions. The Government should do more to protect lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons from homophobic and transphobic violence by explicitly including sexual orientation and gender identity as a crime motive in legislation, in line with several recommendations made during the debate of the universal periodic review.

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

681. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 181 recommendations received, 142 had enjoyed the support of Estonia, and 39 had been noted.

682. In conclusion, the delegation thanked all the participants in the universal periodic review of Estonia for their cooperation and contributions, including for the encouraging statements delivered during the adoption of the outcome of the review. Such active participation made the review a valuable experience for Estonia and would help the Government to continue to improve the human rights situation in the country. The Government would continue its efforts to fulfil the human rights commitments made under the review and to report back in the third cycle of the review. Estonia considered the process of the universal periodic review a success story of the Human Rights Council.

### Paraguay

683. The review of Paraguay was held on 20 January 2016 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 Paraguay 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.6/24/PRY/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.6/24/PRY/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.6/24/PRY/3).

684. At its 28th meeting, on 23 June 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Paraguay (see sect. C below).

685. The outcome of the review of Paraguay comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/32/9), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/32/9/Add.1).

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

686. The Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Paraguay to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed the Human Rights Council to present the response of Paraguay to the conclusion of its second universal periodic review.

687. The delegation reiterated the importance of the universal periodic review mechanism for the promotion and protection of human rights. Paraguay had accepted all of the recommendations received during its first review, and 187 out of 193 recommendations received during its second review. It had also complied with its commitment to present a progress report to highlight the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations.

688. The preparation of the national report for the second review involved consultations with more than 30 national institutions, as well as a drafting team composed of representatives of the executive, legislative and judicial branches. Consultations were held with civil society organizations and national human rights institutions, which were part of the human rights network of the executive power.

689. The report was prepared by the inter-institutional coordinating mechanism, using an online system to monitor the implementation of the recommendations (called “SIMORE” in Spanish). In that regard, the delegation reiterated the State’s satisfaction with the recognition Paraguay had received during the previous review by more than 45 States.

690. The delegation reiterated the State’s appreciation for the interest shown by States and observers during the second review through the 193 recommendations made. Of those, Paraguay had accepted 187 recommendations. That was in recognition of the constructive spirit of the mechanism.

691. Paraguay had taken note of the recommendations contained in paragraphs 105.1–105.6. With regard to the recommendations contained in paragraphs 105.1 and 105.2, it was important to reiterate that Paraguay had ratified two optional protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child and had signed the third optional protocol, whose ratification process was ongoing. More specifically, the recommendations contained in paragraphs 105.1, 105.2 and 105.4–105.6 were incompatible with constitutional provisions and with the international obligations that guaranteed the right to life.

692. The delegation also reported on some progress made since the review in January 2016.

693. In April 2016, the first draft of the legislation on freedom of expression and protection of journalists and the media was presented by the Human Rights Commission of the Legislative Assembly. That proposal also included the creation of a national mechanism for the protection of journalism. Broad consultations in that regard were envisaged to take place during the second semester of 2016, in particular with the union of journalists.

694. The Legislative Assembly was currently undertaking the selection process for a new ombudsperson, in accordance with the law. The appointment of a new ombudsperson was expected to be completed during the second semester of 2016.

695. With regard to references made by some delegations, the delegation stated that no killings of human rights defenders had been registered in the country. Paraguay wished to confirm that all human rights defenders in the country enjoyed all freedoms and constitutional guarantees.

696. Concerning labour rights, a 5 per cent decrease in child labour had been achieved through the implementation of the national strategy for the eradication of child labour and the protection of youth employment.

697. Reference had also been made to the practice of *criadazgo* (a form of child labour). A draft law to incorporate that as a crime in the Penal Code had been prepared and would be submitted to Parliament for its adoption.

698. The delegation highlighted the entry into force of legislation on domestic work, which prohibited the recruitment of persons under the age of 18 years to perform domestic work.



699. The delegation reported on legislation that required teachers at private and public schools to have social security.

700. The delegation also reported on a programme to promote formal employment and to combat illegal work as a way to address income inequalities in the labour market.

701. Reporting on the human rights of indigenous populations, the delegation reported on the follow-up on and the progress made in the implementation of sentences of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights in the cases involving the Sawhoyamaxa, Xákmok Kásek and Yakye Axa communities.

702. The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights had also issued preventive measures with regard to the indigenous community of the Ayoreo Totobiegosode, which lived in isolation. Efforts were under way to comply with those measures.

703. The delegation reiterated the voluntary commitment of Paraguay and reported on progress made, such as the approval of the new national migration policy, the national action plan on the human rights of persons with disabilities and the legislation adopted for the promotion and protection of, and support for, maternal breastfeeding.

704. The delegation reiterated the commitment of Paraguay to continue to encourage initiatives to promote and protect human rights, in line with the State's international obligations. It encouraged States to continue to support the universal periodic review mechanism. Paraguay called upon States to work towards the implementation of the universal periodic review recommendations through effective systems that could have an impact in the countries.

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

705. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Paraguay, 10 delegations made statements.

706. Brazil welcomed the participation of Paraguay in the universal periodic review. The participation of the State reflected its level of commitment and openness to dialogue and cooperation, which served as an encouragement and a good example for all those that worked towards the improvement of the international human rights system. The decision to accept almost all of the recommendations, as well as to provide comments on the actions taken to implement the recommendations, strengthened the transparency and good faith that had oriented the State's participation in the exercise. Brazil appreciated the State's commitment to submit a midterm progress report on the implementation of the recommendations. It was convinced that the State's system to monitor the implementation of the recommendations was an important tool to strengthen the effectiveness of the international human rights system, including its preventive dimension. It welcomed the willingness of Paraguay to share that experience.

707. Cuba praised Paraguay for its development and implementation of a national system to follow up and monitor the implementation of the recommendations received in the State's first review as a useful tool that had been shared with other countries. Cuba appreciated the State's acceptance of its recommendations relating to discrimination, violence against women and child labour. It wished Paraguay success in the implementation of all of the recommendations accepted.

708. El Salvador congratulated Paraguay on its compliance with its commitments regarding the protection and promotion of human rights. In having supported 187 out of 193 recommendations, Paraguay had demonstrated its political will to improve the human rights situation in the country. The presentation of reports and the ratification of the core international human rights instruments demonstrated the clear political will to advance in the promotion and protection of human rights. It urged Paraguay to continue to advance the protection and promotion of the human rights of the Paraguayan population.

709. Ghana applauded Paraguay for having recognized the use of dialogue and cooperation at the international level to improve the promotion and protection of human rights in the country. It noted in particular the development in Paraguay of a guide aimed at harmonizing State justice with indigenous justice, as well as the guidelines on access to justice by older persons and persons with disabilities. Ghana noted with appreciation that its

recommendations had enjoyed the support of Paraguay, in particular the recommendation on ratifying the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and it wished Paraguay well with the implementation of the recommendations accepted.

710. Haiti congratulated Paraguay on having accepted 187 out of the 193 recommendations. It welcomed the continued efforts to strengthen and apply laws on child labour and to combat violence against children. Haiti encouraged Paraguay to pursue national consultations, especially with civil society, for a better follow-up to the provisions contained in the optional protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. It congratulated the State on the creation of an inter-institutional coordinating mechanism and online system called Sistema de Monitoreo de Recomendaciones (SIMORE). Haiti called upon the international community to support the implementation of the recommendations and to work in close collaboration with national bodies, including civil society organizations, with the aim of improving the situation of human rights.

711. The Islamic Republic of Iran took note of the responses of Paraguay to the recommendations, including those on adopting a law prohibiting all forms of discrimination against indigenous communities and guaranteeing access to comprehensive quality education for Guarani speakers, on adopting legislation clearly prohibiting all corporal punishment of children and on putting an end to trafficking in persons. It shared the concern of several States regarding the level of trafficking in persons, widespread pretrial detention and the high maternal mortality rate in the country. It urged Paraguay to take legal and practical steps to implement the recommendations, and it looked forward to seeing that those issues of concern remained areas of vital importance for Paraguay during the period leading up to the third review.

712. Kyrgyzstan noted that the majority of the recommendations had been accepted by Paraguay, which demonstrated the State's commitment to promote and protect human rights. It noted with appreciation that Paraguay had accepted its recommendations on allocating sufficient financial and human resources to national human rights institutions, on elaborating and implementing an effective strategy to fight child poverty, and on taking additional measures for the full enjoyment of the right to education by children. Kyrgyzstan was convinced that the implementation of those recommendations would enhance the protection of children's rights. It wished Paraguay success in the implementation of the recommendations.

713. The Lao People's Democratic Republic noted with appreciation that Paraguay had accepted a large number of recommendations, including two made by the Lao People's Democratic Republic. It commended the State for the progress made in promoting education, health care, and the rights of women, children and persons with disabilities, in addressing domestic violence and in combating poverty.

714. Pakistan appreciated the fact that Paraguay had accepted the majority of the recommendations and it wished the State every success in their implementation. It also appreciated the fact that Paraguay had made progress in the promotion and protection of human rights, especially of women, children and persons with disabilities. It welcomed the State's continued engagement with human rights mechanisms, including the treaty bodies. Pakistan commended Paraguay for its commitment to consider ratifying human rights instruments and promoting economic, social and cultural rights. It wished the State every success in the implementation of the recommendations.

715. Tajikistan highlighted the efforts made by Paraguay to implement the national programme on poverty reduction, to encourage the better use of land and to ensure better environmental sustainability. It also noted that a lot had been done to prevent trafficking and to improve the State's education system. Tajikistan wished Paraguay further success in improving its human rights protection and promotion system.

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

716. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Paraguay, six other stakeholders made statements.

717. The International Service for Human Rights considered it important that Paraguay had received 13 recommendations on the issue of protecting human rights defenders, none of which it considered as having been fully implemented. It thanked the States that, through their recommendations, had recognized the serious risks that human rights defenders faced. It considered that, in order for Paraguay to build an adequate environment for the implementation of the recommendations accepted, it must urgently adopt policies and legislation for there to be a safe environment for those who defended human rights.

718. Action Canada for Population and Development appreciated the commitment of Paraguay to the universal periodic review process. It welcomed the State's support for various recommendations relating to sexual rights. However, while Paraguay had identified some recommendations as having been implemented or as being in the process of implementation, there were still laws, policies and practices that showed gender inequalities and discrimination against the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex population. It regretted the fact that Paraguay had not supported the recommendations calling for legislation on abortion and it encouraged Paraguay to reconsider its position in that regard.

719. The International Humanist and Ethical Union was deeply concerned about the rights of women and girls in Paraguay, particularly in the area of sexual and reproductive rights. It noted the lack of proper education on sexual and reproductive rights. It urged Paraguay to repeal all legislation criminalizing women and girls for having an abortion and those performing such services, to adopt a law on sexual and reproductive health, to harmonize its domestic legislation with the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, and to implement policies to advance women's rights and eradicate violence against women.

720. The International Catholic Child Bureau welcomed the engagement of Paraguay with the universal periodic review and it congratulated the State on the creation of the online system called SIMORE to facilitate the follow-up to the universal periodic review recommendations. However, efforts were still needed to give effect to the accepted recommendations relating to the abuse of and sexual violence against children.

721. The British Humanist Association was concerned about the highly restrictive and punitive abortion laws, which seriously undermined the sexual and reproductive health rights of women and girls in the territory. It urged Paraguay to reconsider its opposition to relaxing its abortion legislation and to bring its laws and policies into line with its human rights obligations as laid out in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

722. Amnesty International welcomed the intention of Paraguay to adopt legislation to combat all forms of discrimination. It urged the State to guarantee the prompt adoption and implementation of such a law, in conformity with international human rights. It regretted the lack of commitment of Paraguay to promote the rights of women and girls, in particular their sexual and reproductive rights. It stressed the need for Paraguay to recognize the legitimate work of human rights defenders and to adopt the measures necessary to guarantee them a safe environment for their work.

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

723. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 193 recommendations received, 187 had enjoyed the support of Paraguay, and 6 had been noted.

724. To conclude, the delegation thanked the other delegations for their contributions and constructive engagement with the review. It also thanked all the civil society organizations and other institutions that had contributed with their analyses of the human rights situation, as submitted in their reports. Paraguay hoped to continue to work with all actors in a constructive and positive manner to promote and protect human rights.

725. The delegation wished to highlight the cooperation received from OHCHR, which had played an important role during the State's second review. It had contributed not only to the elaboration of the report but also to the follow-up on the implementation of the recommendations. Paraguay valued that important support.

726. The delegation reiterated the State's commitment to follow up on and implement the human rights recommendations.

## Belgium

727. The review of Belgium was held on 20 January 2016 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 Belgium 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.6/24/BEL/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.6/24/BEL/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.6/24/BEL/3 and Corr.1).

728. At its 28th meeting, on 23 June 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Belgium (see sect. C below).

729. The outcome of the review of Belgium comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/32/8), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/32/8/Add.1).

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

730. The delegation recalled that, during its second universal periodic review, Belgium had been represented by the Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister, which illustrated the importance the Government attached to the mechanism and the Human Rights Council. The delegation also reiterated that Belgium was actively committed to the promotion and protection of human rights, which was an integral part of its foreign and domestic policies.

731. Belgium had immediately accepted 161 recommendations out of the 232 received during the review, which had taken place in January 2016. The delegation highlighted two recommendations that were often made by intervening States and that Belgium was committed to implement. First, the Government had accepted the recommendations on establishing, before the end of its mandate, a national human rights institution in compliance with the Paris Principles. Second, Belgium had agreed to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The Government was currently processing those two files.

732. Belgium had reserved its position regarding 35 recommendations. After careful consideration by all competent authorities, the Government had responded through an addendum submitted to the Human Rights Council. The State's position on the recommendations noted was clearly explained in the document. Belgium was committed to implementing 26 of the deferred recommendations, of which 2 had been partially accepted and 4 others had been accepted on the understanding that they had already been implemented or were in the process of implementation. The delegation referred to one recommendation that had been mentioned by a number of delegations regarding the adoption of a national action plan against racism, xenophobia and intolerance. In the following months, the federal Government and the governments of the federal entities would work to elaborate that action plan.

733. Before concluding, the delegation informed the Human Rights Council that in February 2016 all the concerned authorities had reviewed the recommendations received and started the work to implement the ones that had been accepted. Also in April 2016, the Government had organized a meeting with civil society organizations concerning the results and follow-up on the second review of Belgium.

734. The delegation reiterated that, at the closing of the second review, Belgium had announced that the preparation for the third cycle of the universal periodic review had already begun. That would be done through concrete measures to continue to strengthen the

human rights framework in Belgium and to ensure that those human rights were fully observed. The follow-up on the recommendations was already taking place in a systematic manner through internal consultations on an administrative level every six months. The Minister for Foreign Affairs had committed to bringing the consultations to the political level, to reviewing the status of the implementation of the recommendations received from the universal periodic review mechanism, the treaty bodies and other human rights bodies such as the Council of Europe, and to ensuring progress without delay. Civil society would also be involved in the follow-up to the universal periodic review.

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

735. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Belgium, 16 delegations made statements.

736. The Republic of Korea welcomed the fact that Belgium had accepted the recommendations it had made on establishing a national human rights institution and on respecting human rights in the implementation of counter-terrorism measures. It recognized the efforts of Belgium to combat gender-based violence, despite the fact that the State had not supported the recommendation of the Republic of Korea on that issue.

737. The Russian Federation was pleased to note that Belgium had accepted a large number of recommendations, including those made by the Russian Federation on the employment of young persons, persons with disabilities and migrants, on fighting discrimination against Roma, and on providing assistance to victims of sexual abuse and violence.

738. Sri Lanka noted the efforts of Belgium to enhance the legal and institutional frameworks for the protection of human rights, including the creation of an independent national human rights mechanism. It also welcomed the attention given by Belgium to combat poverty, to strengthen the focus on children's rights and to combat trafficking in persons.

739. Tajikistan was pleased to note that Belgium had developed a national action plan against racism, xenophobia and intolerance, but also to fight radicalism, and that the State had decided to conduct awareness-raising campaigns on that topic.

740. Togo commended Belgium for the numerous initiatives it had taken to implement the recommendations it had accepted during its first universal periodic review, and it congratulated the State on having accepted most of the recommendations made in the second review.

741. Albania congratulated Belgium on the progress it had made in the protection of human rights and it welcomed the fact that the State had accepted its recommendations, including those on ratifying the Istanbul Convention and on protecting migrant women from domestic violence. It also acknowledged the commitment of Belgium to combat racism.

742. Botswana noted with satisfaction the legislative and policy measures that Belgium had taken to address gender-based violence, racial discrimination and xenophobia, and it encouraged the State to continue to address the remaining challenges, including trafficking in persons and terrorism.

743. China hoped that Belgium would take further measures to reach the internationally agreed official development assistance target of 0.7 per cent of gross domestic product and encouraged the State to take further measures to eliminate racial discrimination and xenophobia from political statements and public life.

744. The Council of Europe recalled the recommendations made by its monitoring bodies regarding several issues, including discrimination against ethnic and religious groups, marked in particular by a sharp rise in racist websites; detention conditions in prisons and psychiatric establishments, marked by the persistent problem of overcrowding and worsened by the lack of activities outside the cell and recurrent prison staff strikes; and inadequate and insufficient asylum procedures and protection of migrants, limited reception and registration capacities, and automatic detention at airports coupled with the absence of

systematic judicial review of detention. It invited Belgium to ratify the Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism and its Additional Protocol.

745. Egypt stated that the review of Belgium had provided an opportunity to point out the rise in racism and racial discrimination in that country and it called upon the Government to lift the ban on the use of headscarves and to address racially motivated police brutality. It regretted the fact that Belgium had not accepted the recommendation it had made requesting the alignment of the legal definition of torture with the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

746. Estonia commended Belgium for its constructive participation in the universal periodic review process and noted with appreciation that all communities and regions in Belgium had been mobilized in the preparation of the national report. Estonia welcomed the measures taken to combat terrorism and the adoption of the national action plan on the rights of persons with disabilities. It acknowledged that Belgium continued to work on the recommendations it had accepted in its first review, such as one on ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

747. Ghana noted the recognition by Belgium of the universal periodic review as an important process to improve human rights situations. It commended the State for having strengthened its legal arsenal to address racial discrimination and xenophobia, and for having adopted a new comprehensive action plan on combating gender-based violence. It encouraged Belgium to continue to strengthen the action plan on combating radicalization and violent extremism of 2006.

748. India appreciated the receptive and constructive approach of the Government to the universal periodic review mechanism. The second review of Belgium showed the strong engagement of peer countries, with as many as 100 intervening delegations and 232 recommendations covering a range of human rights issues. It welcomed the fact that Belgium had accepted as many as 187 of the recommendations, including those made by India. It believed that Belgium had gained much from its participation in the universal periodic review and would continue to do so with the implementation of the recommendations accepted.

749. The Islamic Republic of Iran hoped that Belgium would fully and effectively implement the recommendations it had accepted during the second review. It expressed concern about the alarming existence of manifestations of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, racially motivated violence and ill-treatment by police officers of persons with an immigrant background.

750. Kyrgyzstan appreciated the positive engagement of Belgium with the Human Rights Council and the universal periodic review process. It commended Belgium for having accepted a number of recommendations, including those made by Kyrgyzstan on establishing a national human rights institution and on combating racism, extremism and xenophobia, which demonstrated the commitment of the Government to promote and protect diversity and tolerance among different ethnic groups living in the country.

751. Pakistan praised Belgium for having accepted most of the recommendations, including those on establishing a national human rights institution and on better addressing the issues of racism, xenophobia and discrimination in the country.

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

752. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Belgium, three other stakeholders made statements.

753. Action Canada for Population and Development urged Belgium to invest in decent housing, employment, education and social participation, and to ensure sexual and reproductive health services for undocumented migrants, refugees and asylum seekers. It also urged the State to make a clear distinction between accessing health services and the procedures linked to residence status, making sure that undocumented migrants were not deported if they sought medical services. It encouraged Belgium to initiate a debate about the possibility of legally allowing abortions beyond 12 weeks. It urged the State to ensure that its regional governments set standards and guidelines for the provision of comprehensive sexuality education.

754. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme was surprised that Belgium had not given clear answers to several recommendations relating to the freedom of religious practices. Notwithstanding the possibility of an inter-federal plan to fight racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and intolerance, the rise in Islamophobic acts was concerning. It encouraged Belgium to ensure the better protection of migrants' rights and it hoped that the national plan for 2015–2019 would significantly contribute to eradicating sexism and gender-based violence. It appreciated the efforts made to reduce prison overcrowding and called upon the authorities to further improve conditions in prisons, centres for asylum seekers and administrative detention centres for migrants in irregular situations.

755. Amnesty International welcomed the commitment of Belgium to involve civil society in the follow-up to the universal periodic review. It looked forward to contributing to the implementation of the recommendation on upholding human rights in measures to fight against terrorism. It was extremely concerned by the continuing violations of human rights of detainees, in particular during strikes by prison staff. It was surprised that Belgium considered that it had already carried out an evaluation of ethnic profiling within the police organization and asked that the findings be made public. Amnesty International urged the State to abolish sterilization and surgery requirements, as well as mandatory psychiatric assessment and diagnosis, as preconditions for legal gender recognition for transgender persons, and it welcomed the acceptance of the related recommendations.

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

756. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 232 recommendations received, 185 had enjoyed the support of Belgium, and 45 had been noted. Additional clarification had been provided on two recommendations, indicating which part of those recommendations had been supported and which part had been noted.

757. The delegation thanked all the delegations that had made the effort to look through the reports of the second review of Belgium. The State considered that the process was useful in identifying the areas where there could be improvement.

758. The delegation referred to some of the issues mentioned by intervening States. With regard to the criminalization of domestic violence and gender-based violence, it indicated that the legislation in force contained the tools necessary to ensure that it addressed the phenomenon without the need for legislative amendments.

759. Regarding the target of 0.7 per cent of gross domestic product for official development assistance, the delegation stated that that was a long-term target and the Government strived to improve its record, notably through support in areas such as climate change and assistance to conflict-stricken countries. With regard to the fight against poverty, Belgium had decided that its assistance would target the least developed countries more and more.

760. The Government was working on a national action plan against racism, xenophobia and intolerance that would incorporate measures to tackle racist or xenophobic speeches and the upsurge in racist Internet sites in the country.

761. Regarding prison conditions, major investments had been made to increase the number of prisons, which had led to a significant decrease in prison overcrowding.

762. Belgium was faced with a high number of asylum applications – some 35,000 in the last 12 months – and it was a challenge to ensure that housing and other social and basic needs services were available for refugees. However, Belgium could be proud of the large number of asylum seekers that had a roof, food and access to health and education.

763. The delegation acknowledged that the family was a cornerstone of Belgian society. However, there were different forms of families. There was therefore the need to avoid acting in a discriminatory way and to ensure full respect for individual rights within families.

764. Regarding the wearing of headscarves, the delegation reiterated that there was no legislation banning it. Schools in Belgium were left with the judgment and decision on how to better address that issue, taking into consideration the policies on education and the principle of non-discrimination.

765. In conclusion, the delegation stated that the statements of the non-governmental organizations had been duly noted. The issues raised by civil society, in particular the question regarding police ethnic profiling, would be forwarded to the relevant authorities.

### **Denmark**

766. The review of Denmark was held on 21 January 2016 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 Denmark 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.6/24/DNK/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.6/24/DNK/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.6/24/DNK/3).

767. At its 29th meeting, on 24 June 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Denmark (see sect. C below).

768. The outcome of the review of Denmark comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/32/10), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/32/10/Add.1).

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

769. The delegation of Denmark was pleased to address the Human Rights Council on the occasion of the consideration and adoption of the outcome of the State's second universal periodic review. It recognized how much the review had contributed to highlighting areas where the State's human rights record could be improved and that it acted as a catalyst to tackle those issues.

770. The national universal periodic review process of Denmark had been conducted in an open, inclusive and transparent manner. Throughout the process, the Government of Denmark had cooperated with its National Human Rights Institution to organize countrywide public hearings, the outcome of which was reflected in its national report. There had been good interest and engagement in the process from Danish civil society organizations, and the head of the delegation thanked all for the inputs and contributions received during the process.

771. Regarding the review itself on 21 January, Denmark had received 199 recommendations on a variety of issues. As described in its addendum to the report of the Working Group, Denmark had accepted 120 recommendations and partially accepted 14. It had noted 44 recommendations. In its response to the 21 recommendations that it had accepted in principle, Denmark made the clarifications found below.

772. Concerning eight recommendations on anti-discrimination legislation, Denmark attached great importance to combating discrimination. All citizens were equal before the law, and public authorities must not discriminate on any ground. Danish law also contained a number of acts on non-discrimination. With regard to discrimination based on disability, the Government was currently considering adequate measures to address the question of discrimination outside of the labour market.

773. Concerning eight recommendations on developing a national action plan to combat racism, Denmark had taken and would continue to take a number of measures to prevent discrimination, intolerance and racism, to preserve freedom of belief and to promote intercultural dialogue. Minority groups and non-citizens legally residing in Denmark



enjoyed equal access to, inter alia, employment, education, housing, health services and justice.

774. Concerning one recommendation on victims of trafficking in persons, Denmark found its legislation to be in accordance with the State's international obligations and would consider all treaty body recommendations on that matter.

775. Concerning a recommendation on the criminal justice system, Denmark was planning to carry out a reform relating to youth crime. If the reform were carried out, the age of criminal responsibility would be in line with international standards.

776. Concerning one recommendation on family reunification, Denmark found its regulation on family reunification to be in accordance with the State's international obligations, including the right to family life. As the main rule, refugees had the right to family reunification with their spouse or partner and children in Denmark if they could not live together in, for example, the country of origin of the spouse or partner. For foreigners with temporary protection status, the right to family reunification was in general postponed for three years in the light of the special temporary residence status. However, exceptions to the postponement would be made in all cases where the State's international obligations so required.

777. Concerning the recommendation contained in paragraph 120.197 on evaluating Danish anti-terrorism legislation, substantive counter-terrorism initiatives had been launched since the attacks in Copenhagen in 2015. Once the effects of those were known, Denmark would launch a review of the legal framework for Danish counter-terrorism efforts to ensure that the right balance between effective measures and legal certainty for citizens had been found. Therefore, that recommendation, which had originally been "accepted in principle", should now be changed to "accepted".

778. Concerning the recommendation contained in paragraph 120.142 on amending the marriage law in the Faroe Islands to allow same-sex marriage, the delegation reported that, in April 2016, the Faroese Parliament had approved a proposal on amending the marriage law to allow civil same-sex marriages. Therefore, that recommendation, which the Faroese government had originally "accepted in principle", should now be changed to "accepted".

779. To sum up, the delegation clarified that, out of the 21 recommendations that Denmark had accepted in principle, 2 recommendations had now been fully accepted. It was understood that those remaining would be registered in line with Human Rights Council resolution 5/1.

780. Denmark reiterated the pledge the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Denmark had made during the review on 21 January that, following internal consultations, a plan to implement the recommendations accepted in close cooperation with all national stakeholders would be set in motion and that a midterm report accounting for the progress made would be submitted in due course.

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

781. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Denmark, 15 delegations made statements.

782. The Council of Europe referred to some of the issues identified by several of its monitoring bodies: first, concerns regarding undue restrictions for immigrants; second, the threat of corruption, with low levels of penal sanctions for corruption and a lack of transparency in political party funding; and third, discrimination against ethnic minorities, particularly regarding equal treatment in social security matters and family reunification. It welcomed the measures already taken in order to address those issues, and it invited Denmark to swiftly ratify the revised European Social Charter and the Additional Protocol to the Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism.

783. Egypt noted the important positive developments in several areas, including the rights of children and persons with disabilities. It considered the universal periodic review as an opportunity for an open discussion about the growing concerns about refugees and migration policies and the rising trends of xenophobia, racism, hate speech and racial profiling, and it urged urgent action vis-à-vis those issues. It welcomed the acceptance of its

recommendations on protecting the family and on setting an age limit on non-therapeutic circumcision of boys, while it was disappointed that other recommendations on prohibiting organizations from promoting racial hatred and profiling, on amending the law allowing the confiscation of valuable belongings of refugees, and on ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families had been rejected, and it invited Denmark to consider revisiting its position on those recommendations.

784. Estonia commended Denmark for its role as an international humanitarian aid donor, and it highly valued the State's global efforts to fight torture and to help victims of torture. It welcomed the fact that Denmark had accepted its recommendation on promoting better access to education for children in Greenland and the Faroe Islands, but it regretted the fact that the recommendation on decriminalizing defamation had not enjoyed the State's express support. Estonia wished Denmark success in implementing the recommendations and in further improving human rights practices.

785. Ghana applauded Denmark for having taken a number of initiatives aimed at promoting and protecting human rights, including, among others, the adoption of an action plan to address issues of domestic violence and the establishment of a consultancy unit to assist social services in improving their performance on cases involving children. Ghana remained confident that Denmark would continue to deepen the frontiers of democratic governance through good human rights practices. It wished the State success with the implementation of the recommendations accepted.

786. Indonesia welcomed the continuous efforts of Denmark to strengthen the promotion and protection of human rights and it appreciated the measures adopted to prevent discrimination, intolerance and racism, among others, by having accepted its recommendation on enhancing the promotion of dialogue among societies, including interreligious and intercultural dialogue in Denmark. Indonesia recognized that its recommendation on considering ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families had been noted, and it encouraged Denmark to continue to take the necessary initial steps towards the ratification of that Convention in the future. It wished Denmark success in implementing all of the recommendations accepted.

787. The Islamic Republic of Iran expected that the recommendations accepted would be fully and effectively implemented. It expressed concern about a number of issues and urged Denmark to boost its efforts to address those issues, including: discrimination against minorities, especially Muslims and migrants, particularly in employment, education and housing; persistent xenophobia and hate speech and expression against minorities, especially Muslims through, inter alia, Islamophobic and defamatory cartoons and statements under the pretext of freedom of expression; the progressive deterioration in conditions for asylum seekers and immigrants, particularly migrant children; and the disturbing violence against women, particularly domestic violence.

788. Maldives was pleased to see that Denmark had accepted 120 recommendations, including three recommendations made by Maldives, on highlighting the need for greater attention to be paid to ensuring the rights of vulnerable populations, including persons with disabilities and migrants. It believed that comprehensive legislation and concerted efforts were imperative to ensure that discrimination, hatred and violence were reduced. It commended the Government of Denmark for its proactive engagement in and dedication to improving the situation of human rights in the country.

789. Pakistan thanked Denmark for having provided an update on the recommendations that the State had received during the universal periodic review. It appreciated the decision of Denmark to accept the majority of the recommendations the State had received. It commended Denmark for its commitment to promote and protect human rights and it hoped that the State would continue to make efforts for the realization of economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to the development of its citizens, and to combat discrimination against minorities. It noted with appreciation the continued cooperation of Denmark with the human rights mechanisms, including the treaty bodies. It wished Denmark success in the implementation of the recommendations accepted.

790. The Republic of Korea commended Denmark for having accepted the large majority of the recommendations received, and it welcomed in particular the acceptance of its

recommendation on stepping up efforts to tackle the structural discrimination faced by minority groups, non-citizens and refugees, especially with regard to employment, education, housing, health services and access to justice. It endorsed the adoption of the report and wished Denmark every success in implementing the recommendations.

791. Sierra Leone noted with interest that most of the recommendations received by Denmark had been accepted. It was noteworthy that an action plan against violence, with a particular focus on domestic violence, had been adopted. Sierra Leone commended the Government for having engaged constructively with various stakeholders to investigate and prosecute hate speech and various forms of discrimination perpetuated against minorities or vulnerable groups. It encouraged Denmark to ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and to bring its Criminal Code fully into line with the provisions of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

792. Sri Lanka noted with appreciation the constructive engagement of Denmark during its second review. It recognized the efforts made by the State since its first review, including the adoption of the fourth action plan against violence in the family and domestic violence and the special attention given to the protection of children, including by providing early support for the most vulnerable. It commended Denmark for the steps it had taken to combat trafficking in persons for sexual exploitation and forced labour through the implementation of the national action plan to combat trafficking in persons, which included strengthening awareness-raising campaigns and training of professionals.

793. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela was pleased with the approach taken by Denmark during the review, which had made it possible to have positive interaction on the human rights achievements of and the challenges faced by the State. Denmark had approved the law on gender equality and a new national direct service 24-hour call centre for victims of domestic violence, which was in addition to the legal and social assistance programme for those victims. Another positive aspect had been the adoption of the disability pension plan and flexible work programme, which provided aid to the most vulnerable in society and persons with limited work capacity. It appreciated the State's efforts to overcome obstacles in implementing the recommendations accepted during its first review.

794. Albania welcomed the universal periodic review outcomes and commended the Government of Denmark for its commitment to implement the recommendations made during the second review, including those made by Albania. It commended the Government for its high assessment and appreciation of the recommendations from civil society, considering them as extremely useful to promote all human rights. Regarding the overall measures taken to protect and promote human rights in Denmark, Albania commended the achievements and encouraged the Government in its further progress in the area of promoting gender equality, targeting women from ethnic minority groups and informing them of their rights according to the family law.

795. Botswana thanked the delegation for the additional information provided and commended Denmark for having accepted many of the recommendations received during its second review in January, which demonstrated the State's commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights. It noted with appreciation that Denmark had taken steps to combat hate speech and hate crimes. That would go a long way in cultivating a culture of tolerance and cultural diversity. Botswana wished the State a successful implementation phase.

796. China noted the efforts made by Denmark to promote the rights of women, children and persons with disabilities. It was concerned with chronic issues of racial discrimination, xenophobia and hate crimes, which were on the rise. It urged the State to attach importance to the recommendations made by countries by actively fulfilling its international obligations and commitments and effectively combating hate crimes with greater vigour, especially those hate crimes directed at immigrants and refugees and based on religious background. Denmark also needed to continue to implement its development aid assistance to help developing countries to eliminate poverty and achieve sustainable development.

### 3. General comments made by other stakeholders

797. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Denmark, six other stakeholders made statements.

798. The Danish Institute for Human Rights (by video message) regretted the fact that recommendations relating to six issues had not been accepted by the Government, namely, developing a national human rights action plan; protecting children from solitary confinement and the deprivation of their liberty in institutions for adults; granting speedy family reunification to all refugees; undertaking an evidence-based evaluation of Danish anti-terror legislation and other initiatives; prohibiting discrimination on all grounds outside the labour market; and allowing all persons with psychosocial disabilities to vote in parliamentary elections. It was committed to continue to fight for human rights and cooperate with the Government and other public authorities and civil society.

799. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland, in a joint statement with the International Lesbian and Gay Association and LGBT Denmark: National Organization for Gay Men, Lesbians, Bisexuals and Transgendered People, applauded the commitment of Denmark to ensure non-discrimination in health care, and the support for lifting the 18-years-of-age requirement for legal gender change. It was disappointed that Denmark was not willing to review the law to address the lack of protection from discrimination due to sexual orientation and gender identity, as recommended by several States, having stated that they were protected under existing non-discrimination and equal treatment legislation. The lack of an explicit prohibition of discrimination outside the labour market meant that the Danish Board of Equal Treatment could not rule on discrimination outside the workplace. A further concern was that gender identity or gender expression was not mentioned in legislation, thereby running the risk that the rights of trans persons were not being protected. It thanked Governments for having raised specific sexual orientation, gender identity and expression and sexual characteristics issues with Denmark.

800. The International Humanist and Ethical Union was concerned about the increase in discrimination against minorities and it emphasized the interpretation of freedom of religion and belief. It referred to the visit by the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, emphasizing the need to broaden the understanding of the term “belief”, so as to align it with international human rights law. The term needed to incorporate identity-shaping convictions beyond traditional forms of monotheistic faith and worship. As stated by the Special Rapporteur, the existing system was obviously non-egalitarian. The State-church institution was fundamentally unfair and privileged one belief group over others. It called upon the Government to ensure equal rights for all life-stance organizations, both religious and non-religious. It encouraged the broadening of the concept of “Danishness” so as to include all citizens of all religions and beliefs. It called for the abolishment of the blasphemy law, reminding Denmark of its responsibility in promoting and protecting the right to freedom of expression, since the law, among other things, legitimized the persecution of minorities.

801. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l’homme congratulated Denmark on its cooperation with the Human Rights Council, its role in the fight against impunity and its promotion of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. It favourably mentioned the State’s development assistance budget, its reception of asylum seekers, and legislation guaranteeing protection against racial and ethnic discrimination. However, it noted an increase in hate speech in social media and the worsening of discrimination against migrants, refugees, and ethnic and religious minorities in areas of employment and education. It welcomed civil society initiatives to promote tolerance and peaceful coexistence. It urged Denmark to abrogate the draft bill authorizing the confiscation of refugees’ money and personal effects, to adopt a national action plan to implement the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, and to pursue its efforts to prevent sexual and gender-based violence and to bring the perpetrators of such acts to justice.

802. Amnesty International welcomed the decision by Parliament to remove “transsexualism” from the official list of diagnosable mental illnesses, thereby recognizing transgender persons as persons with a physical disorder. The State’s practice in asylum cases did not allow for sufficient consideration of the best interests of the child. Amnesty

International welcomed the acceptance by Denmark of the recommendations on ensuring that the best interests of the child were fully considered in asylum cases. It was concerned, however, by the State's rejection of the recommendations on granting expedited family reunification to refugees, and it urged Denmark to reconsider those recommendations. Despite an amendment to the Aliens Act providing temporary protection to certain nationals fleeing widespread human rights violations, those granted protection as "war refugees" were entitled to family reunification only after three years. The separation of families was a violation of the right to family life. Amnesty International welcomed the Faroese government's acceptance of the recommendations on bringing the definition of rape into line with international standards and on criminalizing rape in all circumstances, and it urged the Government to strengthen the legal protection of rape victims. It also urged the Faroe Islands to implement the new law to amend the marriage law for same-sex marriage.

803. The World Jewish Congress commended Denmark for its positive responses to the recommendations, particularly the recommendation against the ban of religious male circumcision, noting that there had been ongoing attempts to ban the practice, a cornerstone of Jewish identity that had been carried out safely for thousands of years. Anti-circumcision campaigners cited a variety of reasons, including the argument that the practice caused harm to children. Such arguments were baseless. It noted a concern that had also been raised by the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, who had emphasized the growing concern of the Jewish and Muslim communities over a ban on religious circumcision. The World Jewish Congress welcomed the fact that Danish society had rallied around its Jewish community after last year's brutal attack on the main synagogue in Copenhagen. It stressed that the right of Jews to lead a Jewish life must also be protected, and it hoped that any attempt to single out Jews or Muslims in Denmark by criminalizing well-established religious practices be stopped.

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

804. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 199 recommendations received, 122 had enjoyed the support of Denmark, and 73 had been noted. Additional clarification had been provided on another four recommendations, indicating which part of those recommendations had been supported and which part had been noted.

805. The head of the delegation thanked all the member States that had participated in the discussions and in the review of Denmark in January. Denmark considered the process and the discussion in line with the intention of the universal periodic review process to have been constructive, informative and valuable to the Government of Denmark. The head of the delegation reiterated his appreciation for the constructive engagement of civil society in the process, including the good and constructive collaboration and ongoing dialogue with the Danish Institute for Human Rights. Denmark also thanked the troika and the secretariat for their excellent work in having prepared and implemented the whole universal periodic review process of Denmark.

806. The head of the delegation underlined the fact that all the recommendations made had been taken as an important input for the State's continuous work on improving human rights standards in Denmark. Respect for the rule of law and a high human rights standard were cornerstones of Danish society.

807. The head of the delegation recalled that Denmark was a candidate for membership of the Human Rights Council for 2019–2021. The State had been deeply engaged in the creation of the Council 10 years before and had contributed actively to its further development as an observer. If elected, Denmark would have the possibility to contribute more profoundly to the important work of the Council, of which Denmark had not yet been a member.

#### **Palau**

808. The review of Palau was held on 21 January 2016 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 Palau 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.6/24/PLW/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.6/24/PLW/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.6/24/PLW/3).

809. At its 29th meeting, on 24 June 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Palau (see sect. C below).

810. The outcome of the review of Palau comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/32/11), the views of Palau 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/32/11/Add.1).

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

811. The delegation of Palau thanked the States that had participated constructively in the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, the troika and the secretariat. It acknowledged civil society for its hard work and the many contributions to the State's review.

812. The delegation had found the universal periodic review to be a useful tool to assess the State's progress in achieving its human rights goals. It had also found that the universal periodic review process had been a powerful agent in uniting Government and community in human rights work, and in allowing the State to identify human rights priorities and to take the steps necessary to ensure that human rights were not only realized but also promoted and protected in Palau.

813. The delegation underscored that the National Congress and the leadership of Palau placed a high priority on the 125 recommendations received during the State's review early in 2016. In one of the immediate responses to the recommendations, the House of Delegates of the 9th National Congress had changed the name of the standing committee "Judiciary and Governmental Affairs" to "Judiciary, Governmental Affairs and Human Rights". That was now a specific committee in the House of Delegates that dealt directly with matters relating to human rights. That was an important stepping stone in addressing the recommendations. It acknowledged the Paris Principles and stated that Palau would establish a human rights institution.

814. The delegation indicated that in 2011 Palau had signed all of the core human rights treaties and in 2013 it had ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Owing to its limited resources, the State sought the Human Rights Council's community assistance with its expertise to carry out consultations and programmes in Palau to provide the counsel and guidance necessary for further actions on the remaining signed human rights treaties. In that regard, it acknowledged the assistance of the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat and the Regional Rights Resource Team of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community for their support in the universal periodic review process for Palau.

815. The delegation pointed out that, when it had presented its initial report in January 2016, the State had received 125 recommendations. It had not given its official response on those recommendations and had asked to bring them back to Palau for consideration and consultation in line with the requirements and specific guidelines for the universal periodic review. The delegation was pleased to report that a consultation process with government agencies had been held to assess the various recommendations and it was honoured to give the official response of the Government.

816. Regarding treaties, Palau had accepted the recommendations on acceding to or ratifying treaties in general because its position was to ratify the core human rights treaties,

on ratifying the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and on supporting the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Palau had accepted that recommendation, as it had already ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child and it would strengthen its efforts towards ratifying the three Optional Protocols thereto. Meanwhile, some of the articles of the Convention had been domesticated through the enactment of the Family Protection Act. It had also accepted the recommendations on supporting the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, as it had ratified the Convention in 2013 and the drafting of a national policy on disability was near finalization, and on ratifying the Convention against Discrimination in Education.

817. Regarding treaties, Palau had noted the recommendations on ratifying the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. Palau continued to work especially with the women's group on the awareness of that treaty. In the meantime, some provisions of the treaty had been domesticated into its laws. It had noted the recommendations on ratifying the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The Constitution of Palau, under section 10, article 4, stated that torture, cruel, inhumane or degrading treatment or punishment, and excessive fines were prohibited. Palau had also noted the recommendations on ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, the conventions of the International Labour Organization, the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, and the Convention relating to the status of Refugees and its Protocol. For those treaties, Palau had sufficient legislative safeguards to address human rights violations.

818. For the treaties on which Palau was accepting or noting the recommendations, it would conduct leadership and public awareness education in order to provide Congress with support for ratification, and it would assess the resource implications of ratification, such as the technical and human capacity needed to meet the treaty obligations.

819. Regarding institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures, it was the position of Palau to accept the recommendations on implementing laws to protect human rights, ensuring their alignment with international human rights standards, and on establishing a national human rights institution in full compliance with the Paris Principles. That would require specialized resources, and Palau continued to look for assistance from its partners. The concept of establishing a national human rights institution was fully supported by members of National Congress and the community at large.

820. Regarding cooperation with the treaty bodies, it was the position of Palau to accept the recommendations on engaging with international and regional partners. Palau recognized the importance of that recommendation and would continue to forge genuine and durable partnerships with international and regional partners.

821. Regarding equality and non-discrimination, it was the position of Palau to accept the recommendations on protecting vulnerable groups. Palau continued its efforts to mainstream gender equality into the programmes and policies of the Government, and it recognized the importance of linking financing for development with the Sustainable Development Goals, including Goal 5 on gender equality, and those relating to marginalized groups. In that regard, the Human Rights Council had a real opportunity, through the universal periodic review process, to strengthen its monitoring of the progress being made to achieve human rights within the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals. The delegation underscored the fact that that was a thought it wished to share with the Council during the review, for it to reflect upon. It was the position of Palau to accept the recommendation on taking measures on women's participation in public offices. Support for women in leadership roles in Palau was growing and women were being encouraged to assume leadership positions in public offices.

822. It was the position of Palau to take note of the recommendations relating to legislation on anti-discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity.

823. Regarding the right to life, liberty and security of the person, Palau had accepted the recommendations on establishing shelters for victims of domestic violence. The Government was exploring ways to improve services for victims, such as safe houses, counselling, immediate health responses and protection orders for victims and children. Funding and technical assistance from partners and organizations for the establishment of a centre for victims of domestic violence were always genuinely appreciated. Palau had also accepted the recommendations on taking measures on domestic violence. It would take appropriate measures to adopt and amend its laws to combat domestic violence. It had accepted the recommendations on training on the Family Protection Act. Capacity-building for the relevant agencies and officers on the implementation of the Family Protection Act was one of its priorities. Palau had also accepted the recommendations on amending laws to criminalize spousal rape, and its laws had been amended through the new Penal Code to criminalize spousal rape. It had accepted the recommendations on taking measures relating to corporal punishment. It would modify as appropriate legislation in line with international standards. Palau had also accepted the recommendations relating to trafficking in persons. It would ensure compliance with international standards.

824. Regarding the administration of justice, including impunity and the rule of law, the delegation underscored the fact that it was the position of Palau to accept the recommendations on improving prison conditions to ensure that the human rights of the prisoners were protected.

825. Regarding freedom of religion of belief, expression, association and peaceful assembly, and the right to participate in public and political life, Palau had accepted the recommendations on freedom of information. The delegation considered that that was protected in the Constitution and it stated that it would take appropriate measures to ensure that its laws on freedom of information were in compliance with international standards.

826. Regarding the right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work, Palau had taken note of the recommendations on taking measures on migrant workers. That was an area in which Palau would require assistance to review its laws to ensure compliance.

827. Regarding the right to social security and to an adequate standard of living, Palau had accepted the recommendations on social protection programmes for the advancement and well-being of all people in Palau.

828. Regarding the right to education, Palau had accepted the recommendations on education and human rights, and it looked to OHCHR to continue its programmes for training and capacity-building on human rights.

829. Regarding persons with disabilities, Palau had accepted the recommendations on taking measures relating to persons with disabilities and had ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in 2013 and was in the process of finalizing the national policy on disability.

830. Palau had noted the recommendations on migrants, refugees and asylum seekers.

831. Regarding the right to development, including environmental issues, Palau had accepted the recommendations on the environment. It was the second nation in the world to ratify the Paris Agreement and it looked forward to its full implementation so that, in the fight against climate change, it would be able to secure a healthy future for its children, its environment and its culture.

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

832. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Palau, 10 delegations made statements.

833. Fiji stated that, notwithstanding the fact that Palau had not accepted its recommendation on spousal rape, it urged Palau to consider spousal rape as a crime and to take the measures necessary in order that its definition be gender neutral. In addition, Fiji encouraged Palau to be committed to reviewing its legal framework and to taking steps to pursue cases of the bribery of foreign officials and to allow for the forfeiture of unexplained wealth by public officials. Fiji remained available to provide assistance or partnership in such matters.



834. Indonesia welcomed the continuous efforts of Palau in the promotion and protection of human rights and it appreciated the State's acceptance of many recommendations, including its own recommendation on establishing a national human rights institution in line with the Paris Principles and with the full participation of civil society. It referred to the State's position regarding its recommendation on ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, which had been duly noted. Indonesia encouraged Palau to continue in the future to take the steps necessary to overcome the technical and resource challenges in initiating the ratification of the Convention.

835. Kiribati commended Palau for its efforts in the promotion of human rights in the country, and especially the passing of the Family Protection Act. Furthermore, it acknowledged the enactment of the Open Government Act of 2014, which indicated a strong commitment to transparency and accountability. Kiribati commended Palau for its efforts in continuing its work with the people of Palau, especially the women's group on the awareness of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. It encouraged Palau to work closely with the regional bodies of the United Nations and OHCHR in the Pacific.

836. Maldives appreciated the commitment of Palau to the universal periodic review, despite the difficulties it faced in meeting its international obligations. Maldives was pleased that Palau had reviewed the 125 recommendations and it noted that two of the recommendations accepted had been made by Maldives, where it had sought to encourage greater provisions for vulnerable populations, including persons with disabilities and children.

837. The Marshall Islands welcomed the establishment by Palau of a human rights reporting committee, and it noted and shared its goal to ratify a large number of core human rights treaties. As small nations, many in the Pacific faced a high "treaty per capita" threshold. There appeared to be a substantial overlap and duplication between reporting as part of the universal periodic review process and reporting under the treaty bodies; however, the time frames for reporting were different. Often, the people reporting and implementing in their small Governments were the same. It called upon members of the Human Rights Council to take into account that, for small nations, the reporting burden could be a major barrier to assuring basic human rights.

838. Pakistan commended Palau for having decided, despite resource constraints, to accept the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Pakistan on further strengthening and promoting human rights. It noted with appreciation that Palau had supported the recommendations accepted and was committed to developing socioeconomic strategies and plans that would take care of human rights considerations. It commended Palau for having continued to engage with human rights mechanisms, including the treaty bodies.

839. Sierra Leone stated that, as a relatively young independent State and with its small population, Palau had made good progress in implementing measures and policies aimed at improving human rights standards nationally. The willingness of the State to ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights was encouraging, as well as the intention to establish a national human rights mechanism. The delegation encouraged Palau to ratify the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women at its earliest possible convenience in order to ensure more comprehensive protection for women. It encouraged Palau to seek, through OHCHR and other relevant stakeholders, the technical assistance needed to be able to incorporate its human rights commitments into national laws and strategies. Sierra Leone called upon the international community to assist Palau in its efforts towards mitigation and adaptation in the light of climate change.

840. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela put positive emphasis on the State's having ratified various international human rights treaties, among them the International Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which strengthened domestic legislation in that area. It appreciated the steps taken to establish a national human rights institution. Palau had successfully completed its second review, giving proof of its work in favour of vulnerable groups. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela recognized the State's

efforts to comply with its human rights commitments, despite economic difficulties. It urged the community of nations to provide the support, cooperation and technical assistance that the country needed in that area, and it recommended the adoption of the report.

841. China stated that, in the national human rights report submitted by Palau, the relevant wording violated the One-China principle established in General Assembly resolution 2758. Therefore, China would disassociate the member State from the consensus on the adoption of the universal periodic review report on Palau.

842. Cuba stated that Palau had demonstrated its commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights, which was reflected in the national report and in its active participation in the Working Group. Cuba highlighted the signing of international human rights instruments and the promulgation of laws that respected human rights to combat domestic violence, sexual exploitation of women and children, and trafficking in persons. It reiterated its call for the international community and the United Nations, in the manner in which the Government solicited, to support Palau in its efforts to improve the lives of the population.

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

843. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Palau, one other stakeholder made a statement.

844. Allied Rainbow Communities International was pleased to see small Pacific Island Countries such as Palau engaging actively with the universal periodic review process, and it could appreciate the challenges in the Pacific to engage in those spaces. It commended Palau for its continued commitment to equality and non-discrimination and its leadership within the region in implementing the universal periodic review recommendations that were deeply important for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. It welcomed the fact that the new criminal laws, which had come into force at the end of July 2014, no longer criminalized same-sex consensual conduct in Palau.

845. While highlighting the above accomplishments, Allied Rainbow Communities International noted that it had observed very limited development between the last two universal periodic review cycles regarding another recommendation accepted on combating discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons through political, legislative and administrative measures. That issue had been raised a number of times in submissions and during the review of the Working Group the current year by both States and stakeholders.

846. Allied Rainbow Communities International stated that the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex community in Palau faced discrimination and security threats and required the Government to fulfil its commitments to combat discrimination and ensure the safety of all its citizens. It urged Palau to bring its legislation into conformity with its commitment to equality and non-discrimination and its international human rights obligations by developing anti-discrimination laws that prohibited discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status. It also recommended that the Human Rights Council urge Palau to develop or support initiatives regarding hate crimes, such as legislation, that referenced sexual orientation and gender identity.

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

847. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 125 recommendations received, 82 had enjoyed the support of Palau, and 43 had been noted.

848. The delegation of Palau thanked all the member States and civil society, which had actively participated in the review and had made constructive recommendations. Palau viewed the universal periodic review process and the contributions by all as meaningful guideposts for the State in the achievement of human rights for all in the young nation.

849. The delegation confirmed that Palau was fully committed to its human rights obligations and responsibilities and it reiterated its appeal to the international community to assist the country, both technically and financially, in its efforts to carry out its human rights responsibilities in the implementation of those human rights instruments and the Universal Declaration on Human Rights.

850. The delegation sought the support of the Human Rights Council in the final adoption of the State's second universal periodic review report and it looked forward to coming back to report on its next universal periodic review, and to share its stories and the progress made.

### **Somalia**

851. The review of Somalia was held on 22 January 2016 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 Somalia 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.6/24/SOM/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.6/24/SOM/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.6/24/SOM/3).

852. At its 29th meeting, on 24 June 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Somalia (see sect. C below).

853. The outcome of the review of Somalia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/32/12), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/32/12/Add.1).

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

854. At the outset, the head of the delegation of Somalia conveyed warm regards from Zahra Samantar, Minister for Women and Human Rights Development.

855. Somalia had consistently endeavoured to do the best of its ability to uphold its commitment to the cause of universal human rights and to the esteemed Human Rights Council through persistent efforts aimed at cultivating a pluralistic Somali society and through cooperation with the member States of the Council. Somalia shared the vision of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to ensure human rights for all, even with the overwhelming odds against the Government. Somalia welcomed the engagement with all stakeholders during the current session and beyond.

856. In its comprehensive national report, Somalia had stated that it had implemented many of the recommendations from the previous cycle and that it was in the course of implementing the remaining recommendations. Of the 228 recommendations Somalia had received, the delegation had taken 121 recommendations back to the capital for further consideration. That review had been done taking different aspects into account, one of which was how realistic it was that Somalia could implement the recommendations it had accepted, considering the current situation and the capacity of the Government.

857. After the current review cycle, Somalia had noted just 60 recommendations, having accepted 168 recommendations. That was more than the 155 recommendations the State had accepted during the previous review cycle. The most important lesson Somalia had learned from the previous review had been to focus on what was achievable, considering the Government's capability to implement recommendations.

858. Just two weeks before, Parliament had passed the Independent Human Rights Commission Bill, which was in line with the Paris Principles. The Cabinet had also endorsed the first ever National Gender Plan, taking serious steps towards having gender equality as part of government policy. The Government of Somalia had made progress in building effective institutions by having increased the number of qualified judges, prosecutors and investigators. Somalia was also working hard to better mainstream gender

equality in the justice sector, for example, by hiring female judges to better address impunity regarding violence against women.

859. Regarding the recommendations that Somalia had noted, the head of the delegation highlighted the fact that the death penalty was one of the issues addressed. The dialogue on the issue of the death penalty was a long process. Currently, the implementation of the death penalty had dropped significantly due to the strict application of the burden of proof.

860. Regarding the recommendations relating to international treaties and optional protocols, Somalia had accepted that, in its current situation, it simply could not ratify other treaties and conventions as its capacity to implement them would be limited in the near future.

861. The head of the delegation emphasized the fact that Somalia had aimed to be practical by not having accepted recommendations it deemed currently or in the near future unimplementable, considering its post-civil war situation.

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

862. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Somalia, 17 delegations made statements.

863. UNICEF confirmed its continuing support to Somalia in ensuring that the rights of Somali children were realized through the implementation of the provision of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, in particular by developing a juvenile justice act and a child rights act. UNICEF highlighted its ongoing support in developing an alternative care policy and in advocating with Somalia to ratify the optional protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

864. The United Arab Emirates appreciated the commitments and efforts made by Somalia to implement the recommendations accepted during its second universal periodic review. In particular, it applauded the adoption of the action plan to implement the human rights road map. It invited Somalia to consolidate its efforts to establish security and stability and to move towards a state of reconstruction and development.

865. Algeria welcomed the cooperation of Somalia with the United Nations human rights mechanisms and the acceptance of most of the recommendations, including those on the participation of women in public life. Algeria thanked Somalia for its efforts to implement the recommendations accepted and it urged the international community and OHCHR to provide the State with the support it needed to strengthen State institutions and to fully ensure security throughout the country.

866. Botswana appreciated the fact that, despite the enormous challenges, Somalia continued to make efforts to promote and protect human rights for the good of its people. It welcomed in particular the creation of the Provisional Constitution, which guaranteed rights and freedoms to the people of Somalia. Botswana noted with appreciation the many legislative measures adopted since the formation of Parliament in 2012, including the Sexual Offence Bill, the Public Procurement Bill and the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

867. Burundi applauded the efforts made by Somalia to improve the human rights situation in the country, in spite of the challenges it faced as a consequence of acts of violence committed by armed groups. It applauded Somalia for the measures it had taken to protect minorities and to improve gender equality. It also welcomed the organization of human rights trainings for prosecutors and the police, and the efforts made to combat terrorism.

868. Djibouti noted that, despite the difficulties in terms of political and security instability, Somalia had made significant progress. It highlighted the accession in 2015 to the Convention on the Rights of the Child as a significant step forward, especially as far as the reintegration of child soldiers was concerned. It also welcomed the progress made in the area of the rights of women, particularly by reserving quotas for seats in Parliament.

869. Egypt acknowledged that Somalia had taken legislative and procedural measures within the Provisional Constitution of 2012. It encouraged the international community to support Somalia in implementing the recommendations accepted during the second review,

to promote and protect human rights, to combat poverty, and to ensure full security and services for its people.

870. Ethiopia noted with satisfaction the acceptance by Somalia of its recommendations on mobilizing national and international stakeholders for the continued implementation of the human rights road map and on using international financial and technical assistance to discharge the human rights reporting obligation. Ethiopia called upon the international community and the Human Rights Council to enhance its cooperation with Somalia in the area of capacity-building and technical assistance programmes.

871. Ghana commended Somalia for having committed to upholding human rights and the rule of law despite the challenges the State faced. It invited the international community to provide Somalia with support in implementing the four priority areas outlined in the action plan on human rights, namely the establishment of an independent human rights commission, capacity-building for the Ministry for Women and Human Rights Development, the protection of vulnerable groups and civilians, and compliance with international humanitarian law.

872. Kuwait paid tribute to the achievements made by Somalia in the sphere of human rights and its positive engagement with the universal periodic review process. It welcomed the decision of Somalia to accept both recommendations made by Kuwait.

873. Latvia congratulated Somalia on its commitment to create secure working conditions for media workers and it shared the concern of UNESCO about recent reports of violence against journalists. Such attacks had a chilling effect on freedom of the media and freedom of expression, and they represented an attack on democracy. Latvia also appreciated the commitment of Somalia to extend a standing invitation to all special procedure mandate holders.

874. Libya appreciated the fact that a large number of recommendations had been accepted and the commitment of Somalia to continue their implementation in spite of the State's challenges and instability. It also highlighted the level of commitment showed by Somalia to continue efforts to promote and protect human rights through the universal periodic review.

875. Maldives urged Somalia to reach out to its international partners regarding technical cooperation and other assistance in the implementation of the recommendations accepted and to further promote and protect human rights in the country. It wished Somalia success in the implementation of the recommendations and it looked forward to progressive days for the people of Somalia.

876. Morocco commended Somalia for the significant efforts made by the State, including the development of a road map and a national action plan that placed human rights at the heart of the policy of peacebuilding and building the rule of law. It reiterated the importance of granting Somalia the assistance necessary to allow it to implement those strategies and programmes. It congratulated the State on its positive collaboration with the universal periodic review process.

877. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela was pleased by the adoption of the Provisional Constitution of 2012 and the national road map of 2013, together with the action plan to promote and protect human rights. International assistance and cooperation should be provided to Somalia without conditions.

878. South Africa was pleased to have heard of the recent passing of the Independent Human Rights Commission Bill, as well as information on the National Gender Plan. It welcomed additional positive developments, including the progress in consolidating peace and in increasing security countrywide. It encouraged further dialogue on the death penalty and it wished Somalia well in the implementation of the recommendations.

879. Qatar appealed to Somalia to make greater efforts to create institutions that further respected human rights and to strengthen the rule of law in the country. It hoped that Somalia would take seriously the recommendations accepted during the review, which would further galvanize its commitment to promote and protect human rights. Qatar appealed to the international community to encourage and support Somalia in defending human rights in the country.

### 3. General comments made by other stakeholders

880. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Somalia, nine other stakeholders made statements.

881. The Arab Commission for Human Rights welcomed the acceptance by Somalia of the recommendations on ratifying human rights treaties and on ending the recruitment of children in the armed forces and armed groups. Nevertheless, it regretted the fact that Somalia had “taken note of” many recommendations relating to the normative framework. It also regretted the lack of implementation of the recommendations accepted in the previous review. Their non-implementation, after four years, threatened the credibility of the State, the recommendations and the review itself. It hoped to see practical measures taken to follow up on the implementation of the recommendations accepted from both the previous and current reviews. It recommended that all stakeholders be involved in monitoring their implementation and inform the Human Rights Council a year later of the progress, challenges and obstacles so that the Council and OHCHR would be able to provide Somalia with technical expertise.

882. International Educational Development was deeply concerned about the human rights situation in Somalia and the essentially non-existent compliance with internationally recognized norms. It had submitted a number of written statements on the situation and had cooperated with the independent experts for many years. The head of the United Nations Assistance Mission in Somalia had stated that the upcoming election would not be one based on the popular vote and that the President would be chosen by the new Parliament. Al-Shabaab was able to carry out terrorist attacks over a wide expanse of territory, and 1.7 million people in the north faced serious food shortages due to drought. Somalia had not submitted reports to the treaty bodies, had only recently issued a standing invitation to the special procedure mandate holders and had not responded to urgent communications. The Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Somalia had indicated that serious resource problems in the Ministry for Women and Human Rights Development and in other government departments had had a negative impact on the human rights road map.

883. Article 19: International Centre against Censorship was concerned that the law on the media in Somalia reinforced State control over the media and put too much power in the Ministry of Information. It called for the urgent review of those provisions to safeguard the independence of the media. Since 2011, at least 38 media professionals had been killed, and in only three cases had individuals been held to account so far at the federal and regional levels. Journalists were routinely harassed, arbitrarily arrested and detained by Somali security forces and non-State actors. Al-Shabaab and other armed militias continued to abusively restrict freedom of expression. Impunity for murders and other attacks against journalists had led to many media workers and journalists fleeing the country, with others self-censoring. Judicial harassment was also a concern. Reforming the Penal Code was urgent. In the autonomous region of Somaliland, defamation was a criminal offence. Article 19 called upon Somalia to create and maintain a safe and enabling environment where human rights defenders, journalists and civil society could operate freely and unhindered.

884. Human Rights Watch stated that the universal periodic review of Somalia had taken place against the backdrop of ongoing abuses against its internally displaced population, with large-scale forced evictions. Government forces, clan militias and al-Shabaab continued to commit serious violations of the laws of war with no accountability. Fighting had resulted in civilian deaths, injuries and the destruction of property. Alarming rates of sexual violence continued to be reported. All Somali parties to the conflict continued to commit serious abuses against children. Somalia had not established a moratorium on the death penalty, despite pledges made during its first universal periodic review, in 2011. The Government relied on the military court to prosecute defendants for a broad range of crimes in proceedings that fell short of international fair trial standards. The authorities had also used abusive tactics to curtail freedom of the media. Parliament had not passed legislation to establish a strong national human rights commission or followed up on commitments made during the previous review to set up an independent international commission of inquiry to investigate grave abuses committed by all parties.

885. CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation urged Somalia and the international community to take concerted measures to implement the important progressive recommendations on civic space. In the past five years, at least 23 journalists

had been killed. While it recognized the Government's recent steps to address impunity, including the conviction of six individuals for the murder of a journalist, it urged Somalia to ensure international due process and fair trial standards. To that end, it urged Somalia to engage with civil society and members of the media to ensure the full realization of all the recommendations on protecting journalists and other media workers. Somalia, in justifying its rejection of the recommendation contained in paragraph 136.105, had invoked the need to find an appropriate balance between safeguarding national security and human rights. However, laws governing national security and freedom of expression must be subject to a strict proportionality test in line with international human rights law and should never be used to criminalize dissent or independent reporting.

886. *Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme* noted that Somalia continued to face extreme poverty and that a lack of resources seriously prevented the realization of the most essential human rights. Somalia must benefit from the solidarity of its rich neighbours in order to eradicate pockets of poverty and tribalism. It appreciated the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the continuing operation to release children recruited by armed groups and to reintegrate them into society. Given the intensification of attacks by al-Shabaab, it called for an inclusive dialogue with all tribal leaders to guarantee peace and security. It encouraged Somalia to combat sexual violence, early marriage, abuse of girls and female genital mutilation. Efforts must be made to eliminate corruption in the administration, the judiciary and the management of international humanitarian aid. It hoped that the Government would meet the conditions necessary to hold elections in August 2016.

887. *Africa culture internationale* commended Somalia for the positive substantial advancement in the transformation of the country and for having developed the country's legal infrastructure to facilitate the proper practice of human rights even during the crisis. It thanked Somalia for having made a number of positive reforms and especially for its efforts to actively engage in the United Nations mechanism, and for having considered the promotion of human rights by having adopted recommendations from the previous review. However, it noticed the continuous existence of breaches in civil society law, with restrictions preventing political opposition parties, human rights groups and other independent civil society organizations from legally operating in the country. Freedom of expression, association and assembly had been ignored by the authorities, with the continuous repression of women in society. *Africa culture internationale* encouraged Somalia to strongly prioritize the development and promotion of human rights, women's participation in political activities, and child security and protection in the country.

888. The East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project noted that human rights defenders and media workers continued to face threats to their security. Although al-Shabaab had claimed responsibility for the majority of human rights violations, the Government itself had placed unacceptable restrictions on the right to freedom of expression, with closures of radio stations, arrests of journalists, and the introduction of laws and policies, such as the law on the media. It strongly urged Somalia to take effective steps to implement the universal periodic review recommendations in order to create a safe and enabling environment for media workers and human rights defenders. Additionally, there had been well-documented human rights violations committed against civilians by the African Union Mission in Somalia and the State's own security forces. It urged Somalia to raise awareness among its forces and those of the African Union Mission in Somalia about international humanitarian and human rights law, and to conduct investigations into those violations. It also noted that the law on nationality resulted in statelessness for children of Somali women and it urged the State to make the necessary reforms to its laws.

889. Amnesty International welcomed the acceptance by Somalia of the recommendations on protecting the human rights of internally displaced persons, on ending the use of child soldiers and on implementing a zero tolerance policy on gender-based violence. However, it was concerned about the lack of support for the recommendations on ratifying key international human rights treaties, and it called upon Somalia to fast-track their ratification. The protection of civilians, especially internally displaced persons, was an important aspect of peacebuilding. They faced limited access to health care, education and equal employment opportunities, as well as the recruitment of child soldiers by both al-Shabaab and government forces. In January 2016, Somalia passed a law on the protection and rehabilitation of internally displaced persons and refugees. However, the implementation of the law had been encumbered by delays. Amnesty International was

concerned that Kenya was attempting to close the Dadaab refugee camp and forcefully return the affected refugees to Somalia. Forced return not only violated international law but risked converting the refugees into internally displaced persons in Somalia.

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

890. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 228 recommendations received, 168 had enjoyed the support of Somalia, and 60 had been noted.

891. The delegation addressed the comments made by several stakeholders. As comprehensively explained in the national report, many of the recommendations accepted by Somalia had been implemented. However, the post-civil war situation had made it difficult to implement all the recommendations. That was due to the lack of technical and financial capacity, even though there was a strong political will to promote and protect human rights, as shown by the number of recommendations accepted in the previous cycle. The Government strongly condemned attacks against freedom of expression and impunity in cases of sexual offenses. The Office of the Attorney General worked tirelessly to address impunity in such cases. However, the lack of resources and capacity to investigate remained a problem. The delegation urged partners to assist Somalia in that regard.

892. The Somali justice system had put into place several measures focused on addressing sexual violence and preventing those crimes. One of the measures was hiring women judges, prosecutors and police officers to investigate those heinous crimes. The Government in no way condoned impunity in any case. However, the current situation in Somalia posed serious challenges, which the Government was working to address appropriately.

893. Regarding the elections in 2016, the President had appointed a committee to work on realizing women's political participation at all levels of Parliament and Government. The appointment of that committee demonstrated the State's commitment to seriously address the marginalization of women. Somalia firmly believed that women's political participation should be advanced in order to enable a responsive political environment for the enjoyment of all Somalis.

894. In conclusion, the delegation thanked the Human Rights Council for its contributions and reiterated the commitment of Somalia to ensure that the culture of human rights was cultivated in the country. In the coming years, until the next universal periodic review of Somalia, the Government would work hard to implement the recommendations that Somalia had accepted. As the delegation had emphasized during the review in January 2016, Somalia required significant assistance in the implementation of the recommendations accepted. The State would do everything in its capacity, but it would not be able to do it alone.

#### Seychelles

895. The review of Seychelles was held on 25 January 2016 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 Seychelles 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.6/24/SYC/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.6/24/SYC/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.6/24/SYC/3).

896. At its 30th meeting, on 24 June 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Seychelles (see sect. C below).

897. The outcome of the review of Seychelles comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/32/13), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/32/13/Add.1).

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

898. The delegation, headed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Barry Faure, stated that the session had come at a symbolic moment for Seychelles, as on 29 June the country would be celebrating 40 years as an independent nation. The past four decades had seen Seychelles steadily progressing into becoming a country that embodied the values of democracy, good governance and the rule of law. Like any other young democracy, Seychelles had faced complex challenges, and the country continued to address them in its pursuit of the full realization of human rights for all persons.

899. Seychelles had participated at the twenty-fourth session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, where the country had received 150 recommendations from 60 States, and the head of the delegation extended his appreciation to all the States that had participated in the interactive dialogue. The Government of Seychelles considered the universal periodic review to be an exceptional opportunity to assess the progress made and the challenges faced with regard to the promotion and protection of human rights.

900. Seychelles had carefully studied each of the 150 recommendations received and had held consultations with government representatives, civil society organizations and members of the National Assembly. The position taken on each of the recommendations was a result of the extensive consultation process.

901. Seychelles had accepted 142 recommendations on the basis that the country had made a commitment to implement the recommendations in the belief that their implementation could be achieved within the four-year period, or where the recommendations had already been fully addressed and implemented by Seychelles. The State had noted only 7 out of 150 recommendations, having considered that those recommendations might not be feasibly implemented in the upcoming four years. Seychelles had also chosen to partly accept or partly note certain recommendations in instances where the recommendation had addressed more than one issue.

902. Seychelles had accepted all the recommendations relating to the core United Nations human rights instruments and their optional protocols. It had taken note of the recommendations from Iraq and Uruguay on becoming a party to all international human rights instruments because each and every instrument must undergo the necessary vetting and approval processes, and Seychelles therefore could not commit to becoming a party to all instruments at the present stage.

903. The delegation indicated that the recommendation from Chile on ratifying the Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons would be studied in line with domestic procedures. Seychelles had taken note of the recommendation from the Philippines on speeding up domestic processes to ratify international human rights instruments, as it considered the process to take place in a timely manner and in line with international standards.

904. Seychelles had accepted all of the recommendations on reviewing and strengthening its national human rights institutions, and it was keen to ensure that such institutions were well placed not only to address potential human rights violations but also to prevent them through effective awareness and educational programmes. The Government was working towards making the institutions compliant with the Paris Principles and it pledged its commitment to have an institution with A status by the third cycle of the universal periodic review.

905. Seychelles had also accepted all the recommendations relating to the non-discrimination of persons based on their sexual orientation and gender identity. The delegation stated that, the previous month, Parliament had passed a bill to repeal section 151 (a) and (c) of the Penal Code of Seychelles – provisions that had the potential to criminalize same-sex relationships and foster homophobic sentiments. That significant change demonstrated the proactive and leading role that Seychelles continued to play in the promotion and protection of human rights for all.

906. On the issue of gender discrimination, gender-based and domestic violence, and gender empowerment, Seychelles had also accepted all the recommendations. The State was acutely aware of the tremendous cost that the violation of the rights of women and girls had for communities, and it was determined to ensure that strong action was taken, including through the development of legislation specifically targeting domestic violence.

907. The delegation emphasized the fact that the rights of the child continued to be of the highest priority on the State's national agenda. It was in that view that Seychelles had also accepted all of the recommendations relating to education and corporal punishment.

908. Seychelles had noted the recommendations from Chile, France, Mexico and Uruguay on raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility. As national legislation stood, a child between the ages of 7 and 12 years could be criminally responsible only if it were demonstrated that he or she had the capacity to know that he or she should not have carried out an act or made an omission. No child under the age of 12 years had been convicted in Seychelles in the past 40 years.

909. Seychelles was determined to combat trafficking in persons effectively, based on the pillars of prevention, protection, prosecution and partnership, and it had accepted all of the recommendations on that subject.

910. Seychelles had accepted the recommendation from the United States of America on fully investigating alleged election irregularities and on ensuring court cases followed due process. The delegation indicated that the Constitutional Court, in finding for the defendant and reaffirming the legitimacy of the presidential elections, had followed all due procedures and processes in its deliberations and decisions.

911. Seychelles had accepted the recommendations on taking effective measures against illicit drug consumption. The Misuse of Drugs Act of 2016 had been passed in April in order to repeal and replace previous legislation on the matter dating from 1990. The new legislation was modern and comprehensive and covered various aspects of drug related issues, allowing domestic courts flexibility to impose sentences with an emphasis placed on rehabilitation rather than incarceration.

912. Seychelles had accepted all of the recommendations on corruption and money laundering, and a new anti-corruption commission would be established under a newly enacted anti-corruption law, which would be tasked with receiving complaints and investigating, detecting and preventing practices relating to corruption.

913. Seychelles had accepted all of the recommendations relating to freedom of assembly and expression, as they were the cornerstones of its vibrant democracy. The State would ensure that legislative instruments protecting those freedoms were in line with international standards, and it continued to work towards having legislation promoting access to information, elaborating the standards already captured within the Constitution.

914. Seychelles had accepted all of the recommendations concerning persons with disabilities, and the delegation confirmed the State's determination to accelerate progress to ensure that all persons with disabilities were able to benefit from economic opportunities and social development and to participate fully at all levels.

915. Seychelles appreciated the recommendations from Fiji and Haiti on climate change. It called upon the international community to recognize the irrefutable link between climate change and human rights, and to take immediate and effective action to ensure that the world was inhabitable for the next generation.

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

916. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Seychelles, 15 delegations made statements.

917. Pakistan appreciated the decision of the Seychelles to accept most of the recommendations received during the Working Group, including those it had made. It valued the constructive engagement of Seychelles with the human rights machinery, including the treaty bodies and the universal periodic review. Pakistan noted the commitment of Seychelles to promote and protect the rights of its citizens, including by strengthening its national institutions.

918. Sierra Leone noted that progress had been made since the review, including the passing of the Anti-Corruption Act and the Misuse of Drugs Act. It also took note of the fact that Seychelles was reviewing its human rights institutions with a view to ensuring their independence and that those institutions were adequately resourced in line with the Paris Principles. It urged Seychelles to submit outstanding reports to the treaty bodies, with the assistance of OHCHR if necessary. It noted the threat of climate change to Seychelles and urged the international community to provide the State with assistance for mitigation and adaptation activities.

919. Togo congratulated Seychelles on its engagement with the universal periodic review mechanism. It appreciated the measures taken to implement the recommendations received during the first cycle, in particular the adoption of legislation on trafficking and the creation of a committee to combat that phenomenon. Togo congratulated Seychelles on having accepted the majority of the recommendations it had received during the second cycle, and it called upon the international community to support the State in the implementation of the recommendations accepted.

920. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela noted that Seychelles had cooperated openly with the universal periodic review mechanism, making possible a frank dialogue on the progress made and the challenges faced in the area of human rights. It highlighted 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 implementation of the national action plan on gender-based violence for 2011–2015, which was aimed at eliminating all forms of violence against women. Seychelles had successfully completed its second universal periodic review exam, demonstrating the country's commitment to human rights with a focus on the protection of vulnerable groups.

921. Angola congratulated Seychelles on having accepted most of the recommendations received, including those it had made. It noted with satisfaction the State's firm commitment to cooperate actively with the treaty bodies, particularly through 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 Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure. It welcomed the efforts made to ensure free education up to the secondary level, which would allow the country to combat illiteracy and to overcome challenges to economic, social and cultural development, particularly through the inclusion of young persons in the educational and professional systems.

922. Botswana thanked the delegation for the additional information provided, particularly on the recommendations accepted following the State's review. It commended Seychelles for having taken measures aimed at promoting and protecting human rights, such as combating trafficking in persons, domestic violence and protecting children. Furthermore, it encouraged Seychelles to continue its efforts to improve in areas in which it was lagging behind in the field of human rights.

923. Burundi commended the Government for its determination to ensure the full enjoyment of the rights of the child, noting in that regard the establishment of a police unit charged with the protection of children. It noted the different measures taken by Seychelles to fight trafficking in persons, including the creation of a high-level national committee to coordinate action against trafficking. It welcomed the efforts made by Seychelles to prevent and eliminate all forms of violence against women and to reintegrate detainees through a number of specific programmes.

924. Cabo Verde thanked Seychelles for the positive responses to the recommendations it had received, including those made by Cabo Verde. It noted that the constructive engagement of Seychelles with the universal periodic review during the session in January and the planned implementation of the recommendations accepted would result in significant progress in the human rights situation in the country. The legal and institutional framework would thereby be strengthened. Noting the difficulties faced by small island States, it expressed solidarity with Seychelles, wishing it every success with the appropriate support of the international community.

925. China welcomed the constructive participation of Seychelles in the universal periodic review mechanism and its comprehensive and positive feedback on the recommendations it had received. It appreciated the fact that, through the promotion in

recent years of people's rights to education, health and adequate living standards, Seychelles had made much progress, and it hoped that further progress would be made in the area of human rights.

926. Cuba welcomed the presentation by Seychelles of its position on the recommendations received. It thanked Seychelles particularly for its acceptance of the recommendations it had made on human rights education and the promotion of the right to health. Cuba highlighted the progress made in the promotion and protection of children's rights, the free provision of health services to the population and the protection of the rights of persons with disabilities. It reiterated its call upon the international community to continue to provide Seychelles with technical assistance.

927. Ethiopia appreciated the acceptance by Seychelles of its recommendations on expediting the review of the effectiveness of the current framework of the National Human Rights Commission and the Office of the Ombudsman, and on finalizing the ongoing five-year national action plan on human rights and putting in place the mechanisms necessary for its implementation. Ethiopia commended Seychelles for its commitment to improve human rights and it encouraged the State to take all the measures necessary for the full implementation of the recommendations accepted in the second universal periodic review.

928. Ghana noted with satisfaction the commitment of Seychelles to fight gender-based violence, as evidenced by the country's national action plan for gender-based violence for 2011–2015, which, among other things, was aimed at reviewing and harmonizing existing laws on gender-based violence and at mainstreaming gender perspectives into national development plans. Ghana expressed the hope that Seychelles would continue to enrich its human rights credentials by ensuring that government actions confirmed the State's democratic tenets built on a culture of respect for human rights, social justice, equality and non-discrimination.

929. Haiti welcomed the acceptance by Seychelles of the majority of the recommendations received during its second universal periodic review. It thanked the Government for having taken into account the five recommendations it had made. Haiti encouraged Seychelles to follow up on its commitment to ensure the independence of its National Human Rights Commission, the Office of the Ombudsman and the new anti-corruption commission, and to allocate appropriate resources to those institutions.

930. India thanked Seychelles for having provided its response to the recommendations. It had taken positive note of the receptive and constructive manner in which Seychelles had participated in the universal periodic review mechanism. The review had reflected the active participation and engagement by peer countries, with as many as 60 interventions delivered from the floor and 150 recommendations made. It trusted that Seychelles would further intensify its efforts to implement the recommendations it had accepted.

931. Maldives appreciated the constructive engagement of the delegation during the review and was pleased that Seychelles had accepted the great majority of the recommendations made by 60 States during the review, including the recommendations made by Maldives. It was encouraged by the commitment of Seychelles to further education and gender equality. It was also pleased by the country's commitment to combat the effects of climate change. It encouraged the Government to continue its efforts to promote human rights.

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

932. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Seychelles, one other stakeholder made a statement.

933. *Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme* expressed satisfaction with the Government's commitment to promote the rights of children, women and persons with disabilities, and to cooperate with the special procedures. It also noted the political maturity of the people of Seychelles, who had participated in peaceful elections despite the restrictions imposed on the freedoms of expression and association of opposition candidates during the campaign. It noted that the Government had taken crucial measures to ensure the right to access drinking water at a time when the country was faced with the threat of climate change. It called upon the international community to provide Seychelles with the support necessary to reduce the effects of climate change on human rights. It asked that the

Government take all the measures necessary to reduce prison overcrowding, effectively ensure freedom of expression and promote universal education.

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

934. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 150 recommendations received, 142 had enjoyed the support of Seychelles, and 7 had been noted. Additional clarification had been provided on one recommendation, indicating which part of that recommendation had been supported and which part had been noted.

935. Seychelles was committed to fully implementing the recommendations accepted, which would most certainly inform its national strategies and priorities. The delegation emphasized that civil society, Parliament and other relevant stakeholders would be fully involved in the elaboration of the State's universal periodic review strategies.

936. Seychelles pledged to provide the Human Rights Council with the relevant updates, including through a voluntary midterm report, on the measures taken to implement the recommendations.

937. The head of the delegation reiterated his appreciation to the President and members of the Human Rights Council and Working Group for the opportunity to exchange best practices and engage in constructive dialogues to improve the protection and promotion of human rights in his nation. He thanked all the stakeholders who had engaged with Seychelles in the review process since it had begun.

938. Lastly, the head of the delegation extended his sincere gratitude to the secretariat for its invaluable support and assistance throughout the process.

#### **Solomon Islands**

939. The review of Solomon Islands was held on 25 January 2016 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 Solomon 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.6/24/SLB/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.6/24/SLB/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.6/24/SLB/3).

940. At its 30th meeting, on 24 June 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Solomon Islands (see sect. C below).

941. The outcome of the review of Solomon Islands comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/32/14), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/32/14/Add.1).

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

942. The delegation of Solomon Islands was led by the Minister for Foreign Affairs and External Trade, Milner Tozaka. Solomon Islands had received a total of 139 recommendations during the interactive dialogue. It had postponed the consideration of some recommendations in order to consult with relevant government agencies further. A total of 89 recommendations had been accepted as ongoing government activities and 50 had been noted.

943. The delegation recalled that Solomon Islands was a party to four main international human rights instruments, namely the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of

Discrimination against Women, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

944. The implementation of those conventions continued to be a challenge. Solomon Islands was committed to progressively addressing its overdue reports through planning and budgeting, and to managing its limited resources within a good time frame.

945. The delegation reminded the participants that, since its first review, Solomon Islands had grappled with a number of natural disasters, including four tropical cyclones, a flash flood, earthquakes, tsunamis, wave surges and landslides. Those events had had a crippling effect on the economy and infrastructure and had already stretched human and financial resources.

946. The State's topography of scattered islands and populations, as well as its inadequate infrastructure and communications, had the effect of limiting the delivery of basic services. The delegation emphasized the fact that the Government would continue to work on better managing its limited resources in its efforts to address all of its overdue human rights reports within the next 10 years before it would consider acceding to or ratifying any additional international human rights instruments.

947. The delegation highlighted the fact that Solomon Islands had accepted the recommendations on ratifying the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, given that much work had already been done since it had signed the Convention. The government agency responsible was presently discussing future institutional reforms and resource capacities to prepare for the process of ratification.

948. The Ministry for Women, Youth, Children and Family Affairs remained the focal point for the implementation of the recommendations accepted from the universal periodic review process and from the concluding observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women.

949. One of the objectives of the Law Reform Commission's process of reviewing laws was to ensure that laws were more current and guided by international human rights standards. The Government was committed to working to ensure that the promotion and protection of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all its citizens were respected through law reform processes.

950. Solomon Islands had accepted the recommendations on establishing a national human rights institution. The Government would be in continuous discussions with relevant existing institutions to look at options, including the possibility of expanding the mandate of existing institutions to cover human rights. The delegation emphasized the progressive nature of such a process for Solomon Islands and the fact that the Government would ensure efforts were taken to address that issue.

951. Regarding the recommendation relating to the national development strategy, Solomon Islands reported that it had recently launched its national development strategy for 2016–2035, which provided a broad scope for long-term and medium-term strategies and space for integrating a human rights agenda.

952. Solomon Islands had accepted the recommendations relating to a national monitoring, reporting and follow-up system. It referred to the recently launched aid management policy, which would assist the Government in monitoring donor funding support. That policy would assist the Government in its plans to establish a national monitoring, reporting and follow-up mechanism within the next five years and a development budget to assist in its treaty reporting processes.

953. Solomon Islands had also accepted recommendations relating to a national human rights strategy and human rights training programmes. The Ministry for Foreign Affairs would be discussing with relevant government agencies the commitment to put in place a national human rights strategy covering training across the public sector within the next five years.

954. Solomon Islands had accepted the recommendations on the protection of children. The Ministry for Women, Youth, Children and Family Affairs had worked in close collaboration with the Social Welfare Division of the Ministry for Health on the Child and

Family Welfare Bill, which had been submitted to Cabinet. It was envisaged that it would soon be tabled in Parliament.

955. Regarding the recommendation accepted on corporal punishment, the delegation reiterated the State's clear policy of prohibiting corporal punishment in schools and it stated that guidance for all teachers was provided in teaching service handbooks. The review of the Education Bill made further provision for ending corporal punishment, while "fair discipline" was addressed in the Child and Family Welfare Bill. Solomon Islands was committed to ensuring greater community awareness on the prohibition of corporal punishment.

956. Solomon Islands had accepted the recommendation on the reform of the Penal Code with the provision of a definition and the criminalization of all forms of sexual violence, including rape. The Penal Code (Sexual Offences Amendment) Act of 2016 addressed that matter.

957. Solomon Islands had accepted the recommendation relating to violence against women, and the delegation highlighted the broad scope of protection of persons under the Family Protection Act of 2014. Solomon Islands was currently carrying out advocacy work on implementation plans for that Act with all relevant stakeholders and service providers throughout the country.

958. Solomon Islands had accepted the recommendations on trafficking. The new Penal Code (Sexual Offences Amendment) Act of 2016 provided for a wider scope of sexual offences and the Immigration Act of 2012 also provided punitive measures for trafficking offences. The Government was also committed to raising more community awareness on trafficking.

959. Solomon Islands had accepted the recommendations on compulsory education. The State had a fee-free basic education policy. There was an ongoing review of the Education Bill and the Government was committed to seeing the implementation of provisions for the compulsory enrolment of students in primary education by taking steps to discuss that issue continuously with different education authorities. The delegation also reported on the development of an inclusive education policy (supported by the gender in education policy), which was aimed at providing scope for the inclusion of girls and boys with disabilities in schools and for relevant facilities and amenities to accommodate their special needs.

960. Solomon Islands had accepted the recommendation on reducing emissions, and the Cabinet had approved the reducing emissions from deforestation, forest degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and carbon enhancement (REDD-plus) road map of Solomon Islands. Awareness-raising and the piloting of REDD-plus activities were currently underway.

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

961. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Solomon Islands, 11 delegations made statements.

962. Pakistan appreciated the acceptance by Solomon Islands of many of the recommendations made during the universal periodic review and it wished the State success in their implementation. It appreciated the State's constructive engagement with the human rights machinery, including the treaty bodies and the universal periodic review mechanism, as well as the efforts to improve the situation of women and girls.

963. Palau commended Solomon Islands for having accepted most of the recommendations made, despite having faced difficulties due to climate change and natural disasters and their critical impact on the economy and society. Palau commended Solomon Islands for its carbon emissions plan and its national development strategy for 2016–2035. It called for the provision of technical assistance and support for the full implementation of the recommendations and it stood ready to assist in the implementation process.

964. Sierra Leone noted the commitment made by Solomon Islands to draw up a national human rights plan, to pass the Child and Family Welfare Bill, to establish a national human rights institution and to provide human rights training. It called for the provision of international assistance to enable Solomon Islands to meet its human rights obligations and

implement the recommendations accepted from the universal periodic review. Sierra Leone also called for continued support from the international community to address the impact of climate change through mitigation and adaptation measures.

965. UNICEF welcomed the ratification by Solomon Islands of four core human rights treaties, including the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and the related implementation efforts. It also welcomed the enactment and implementation of the Family Protection Act of 2014 and the Government's efforts to promote universal birth registration. It highlighted the positive partnerships created in the health sector, which targeted increased immunization coverage and support to community-based health, hygiene and water supply plans and programmes. In relation to the education sector, UNICEF welcomed the removal of tuition fees at the primary level, increased enrolment rates and reform processes for early care and education. While significant progress had been made in some areas, some concerns remained. UNICEF strongly encouraged the Government to submit its overdue periodic report on the Convention on the Rights of the Child and to ratify its three optional protocols. It called upon the Government to strengthen its child protection system through laws compliant with the Convention on the Rights of the Child. It urged Solomon Islands to facilitate access to non-formal education programmes for over-aged out-of-school children who had yet to complete primary level education. In the health sector, geographic dispersion offered particular challenges and UNICEF called upon Solomon Islands and partners to invest in acquiring suitable technologies and to build human resources capacity on the immunization supply chain. It strongly recommended sustainable and equitable budgetary allocation from the national budget and the inclusion of priorities for children in national strategic plans.

966. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela acknowledged that, despite the economic crisis and climate change related challenges, Solomon Islands had made notable efforts to implement the recommendations accepted during the universal periodic review. The State had implemented significant legislative reforms to bring domestic legislation into compliance with international norms, with concrete progress having been made in the policies aimed at protecting the rights of women. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela acknowledged the political will of Solomon Islands to honour its human rights commitments and it encouraged the Government to continue to strengthen its social policies for the broader inclusion of the neediest in the population, with the support and solidarity of the international community.

967. Cuba welcomed the delegation of Solomon Islands and acknowledged the efforts made by the State to progressively achieve the implementation, promotion and protection of human rights. It highlighted the improvements in correctional services for persons in detention and the initiatives adopted to counter the effects of climate change through different adaptation methodologies. Cuba further acknowledged the improvements in the area of the right to health. It reiterated its call upon the international community to continue to support the efforts of small island developing States such as Solomon Islands in order to create a favourable environment and living conditions for the well-being of its people.

968. Fiji thanked Solomon Islands for its positive engagement with the universal periodic review process. It welcomed the State's commitment to ensure the rights of children and women and it noted that Solomon Islands had accepted the recommendations made by Fiji on that issue. Fiji encouraged Solomon Islands to continue to take concrete and rapid measures to achieve substantial protection for children against all forms of violence at home and at school, and to ensure equal and substantive access to justice for women. Solomon Islands had also accepted the recommendations made by Fiji on police and judicial training in cases of gender-based violence and violence against children. Fiji stated that, as a fellow Pacific Island Country, it remained available to provide assistance or partnership on such matters.

969. Ghana appreciated the fact that Solomon Islands had taken steps to align the implementation of the recommendations from the universal periodic review process to key priority areas in the country's national development strategy. It further recognized the significant human rights progress made despite such challenges as budgetary, capacity and resource constraints and the shifting priorities of successive governments. It noted in particular the enactment of the Family Protection Act of 2014, the Political Parties Integrity Act, the Police Act and the Correctional Services Act. Ghana urged Solomon Islands to



continue the initiative to pass into law the Child and Family Welfare Bill, the Whistleblowers Protection Bill and the Anti-Corruption Bill.

970. Indonesia noted the acceptance of four of its recommendations on improving the human rights situation in Solomon Islands. Nevertheless, it was concerned about the implementation of the human rights commitments made by Solomon Islands. It noted that cases of corruption, trafficking in persons and harsh corporal punishment of children still existed. It highlighted in particular the serious situation of women in Solomon Islands, where violence and unfair treatment continued, and it called upon the Human Rights Council to give urgent attention to that matter. Indonesia strongly urged Solomon Islands to pay attention to the promotion of gender equality in its policies and legislation. The acceptance of recommendations should be followed with commitment to and an action plan for implementation, and focused attention and resources should be directed towards those efforts. It would be better for the citizens of Solomon Islands if the Government focused attention on and prioritized addressing the present human rights situations. Indonesia stood ready to provide assistance in that regard.

971. Kiribati welcomed the efforts of Solomon Islands to promote the human rights of its citizens, particularly women and children, and to ensure they were well protected. It commended the State for the enactment of the Family Protection Act and the criminalization of domestic violence. It also welcomed the adoption of the national strategy for the economic empowerment of women and girls and the Child and Family Welfare Bill, which would support the elimination of domestic violence. As a small island State, Kiribati recognized the challenges faced by Solomon Islands in implementing the recommendations of the universal periodic review. Kiribati encouraged Solomon Islands to work closely with regional bodies, such as United Nations agencies in the Pacific, the Regional Rights Resource Team of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community and OHCHR, as well as development partners, in training stakeholders on legislation, including the police, medical personnel and court officers. Kiribati urged the international community to assist small island developing States such as Solomon Islands in meeting their human rights obligations.

972. Maldives appreciated the support of Solomon Islands for the recommendations made by Maldives during the universal periodic review. It was greatly encouraged by the commitment of Solomon Islands to further education and gender equality and to combat domestic violence. It was pleased by the commitment and the national policies adopted to combat the effects of climate change. Maldives appreciated the State's efforts to achieve gender parity in education and to eliminate violence against women. It urged Solomon Islands to reach out to its international partners for technical cooperation and other assistance in implementing the recommendations and in further promoting and protecting human rights.

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

973. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Solomon Islands, one other stakeholder made a statement.

974. Allied Rainbow Communities International was pleased that Solomon Islands had engaged actively with the universal periodic review process and it appreciated the challenges faced by the Pacific to engage in such spaces. It encouraged the Government to engage with civil society in the region with regard to the implementation of universal periodic review recommendations. It was disappointed that six recommendations concerning discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex individuals had not enjoyed the support of Solomon Islands during the session of the Working Group. Allied Rainbow Communities International reported that lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex colleagues in Solomon Islands were active community members in villages, helping with chores and the raising of children, as well as helping with church activities, even though religion was a tool often used against them when they made a claim to equal and fair treatment. Many faced violence in, and rejection by, their families, which in the most severe cases drove them to harmful behaviour, including suicide. Allied Rainbow Communities International was extremely concerned that, during the current constitutional reform process in Solomon Islands, due to end in 2016, there was proposed language that would specifically exclude "sexual orientation" from constitutional protection. Such a situation would be extremely dangerous and might lead Solomon Islands to be the only country in the world to single out one community in its constitution as not being

entitled to protection – protection that was guaranteed under international law. It urged Solomon Islands to accept and implement all of the universal periodic review recommendations and to ensure that any constitutional reform was inclusive and in conformity with international law.

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

975. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 139 recommendations received, 89 had enjoyed the support of Solomon Islands, and 50 had been noted.

976. Solomon Islands thanked all of the participants for their statements. All of the recommendations received by Solomon Islands had been disseminated and considered by all of the stakeholders regarding their implementation within a manageable time frame.

977. Solomon Islands was committed to continuing its efforts to promote and protect the human rights of all its citizens and it continued to call for bilateral and multilateral assistance.

978. In response to the statement by UNICEF, Solomon Islands reiterated its intention to deal with its overdue reports within the next 10 years before embarking on new ratifications. Replying to Indonesia, Solomon Islands recalled its commitments relating to the protection of women and children.

979. In closing, the delegation acknowledged the work of the OHCHR regional office in Fiji and the Secretariat of the Pacific Community for all of their assistance during the preparations for its second cycle report. The Government appreciated the support of the secretariat and the troika. Solomon Islands would continue to work closely with all in future universal periodic review processes.

#### **Latvia**

980. The review of Latvia was held on 26 January 2016 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 Latvia 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.6/24/LVA/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.6/24/LVA/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.6/24/LVA/3).

981. At its 30th meeting, on 24 June 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Latvia (see sect. C below).

982. The outcome of the review of Latvia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/32/15), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/32/15/Add.1).

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

983. The delegation of Latvia expressed its appreciation to all the delegations for their constructive engagement in the interactive dialogue during the State's review in January 2016. The questions submitted in advance and the submissions from civil society and other stakeholders had also contributed to the dialogue. The delegation also thanked the troika and the secretariat for their assistance.

984. The delegation reiterated the firm commitment of Latvia to the process; the second cycle of the universal periodic review had proved to be a valuable tool for self-assessment and for the evaluation of progress since the first review. Coordination and cooperation in the field of human rights at the national level had been strengthened among institutions and all relevant Government institutions. The Office of the Ombudsman had been closely engaged, and non-governmental organizations had been invited to participate in the preparation of the national report. The process had allowed Latvia to reflect on its policies and to set new goals for continuous improvement in the field of human rights.

985. Latvia had noted the constructive assessment of its accomplishments, including the accreditation of the Office of the Ombudsman by the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions with A status and the ratification of the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty. It appreciated all of the views expressed on areas where improvements were necessary.

986. A part of the 127 recommendations accepted by Latvia had already been implemented or were in the process of implementation. Those recommendations addressed a number of issues, including adherence to international human rights instruments, domestic violence, trafficking in persons, societal integration and others. All had been carefully considered and written responses had been provided.

987. Regarding the recommendations on adhering to the international human rights instruments, Latvia had acceded to the major United Nations human rights instruments and regularly submitted reports to the monitoring mechanisms. It had expressed its commitment to evaluate the possibility to accede to several new instruments as recommended, including the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. The delegation emphasized the fact that the State's criminal law was in full compliance with the provisions of the Convention against Torture.

988. Latvia had signed the Istanbul Convention in May 2016, and the relevant legislation was being drafted to ensure full compliance with the Convention. The State did not envisage developing one comprehensive law to combat violence against women, but its legal framework was constantly being improved in that area. Latvia would also continue to ensure the provision of rehabilitation measures to assist victims.

989. In addition to the recommendations on gender equality that had been accepted during the universal periodic review in January, Latvia had also committed to promoting better political representation of women in elected positions and to paying attention to gender equality in the field of education. It had also made several commitments towards the elimination of discrimination and the fight against hate crimes, and the delegation emphasized the fact that access to employment and social security, as well as equal opportunities for all people, was ensured without any discrimination. Anti-discrimination provisions had been integrated into sectoral laws. The State's criminal law provided for criminal liability for discrimination on the basis of racial, national or ethnic belonging, if substantial harm was caused thereby, as well as for acts inciting national, ethnic, racial or religious hatred or enmity, including hate speech. The racist motive was considered to be an aggravating circumstance.

990. Latvia was ready to consider further legislative and administrative measures to combat violence on the basis of gender identity or sexual orientation, including by assessing the possibility to recognize homophobic and transphobic motivation as an aggravating circumstance. There was a need to continue to strengthen the assistance provided to victims. Latvia would continue to combat hate crimes actively and to educate law enforcement officials in that field.

991. In January 2016 the new law on asylum had entered into force, which further increased the scope of the rights of asylum seekers. Latvia would continue to implement policies aimed at the integration of all vulnerable groups, including by organizing public awareness-raising campaigns to promote tolerance and to counter discrimination and hate speech.

992. Societal integration was a priority for Latvia. Persons belonging to national minorities actively participated in social life and decision-making. The Government also regularly granted financial support for projects of non-governmental organizations working with national minorities.

993. Latvia stressed that non-citizens enjoyed all social and cultural rights, as well as the majority of economic and political rights, such as the right to become members of political parties. They enjoyed full protection under the law both in Latvia and while living or travelling abroad. All preconditions for a successful naturalization process had been created. The indicator measuring the inclusiveness of the naturalization procedure in Latvia was above the European Union average. In case of refusal of naturalization, the possibility to appeal was guaranteed. Free Latvian language courses were provided and there were regular awareness-raising measures on naturalization for the public. The citizenship acquisition and naturalization process had been further simplified in 2013, including by granting citizenship automatically to children of stateless persons and non-citizens; more than 99 per cent of children born in Latvia in 2015 were citizens of Latvia.

994. At the same time, Latvia housed 178 stateless persons and, as a party to the Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, it provided protection to such persons. Latvia requested that the distinction be clearly observed and correct references be made to the above-mentioned groups during the dialogue.

995. The delegation confirmed the State's unwavering commitment to democracy, human rights and the rule of law. Latvia was confident that the process and work to implement the recommendations accepted would serve as the basis for further improvements. Human rights would remain at the centre of all policies, both foreign and domestic. As a member of the Human Rights Council until 2017, Latvia would further its determined efforts to advance the promotion and protection of human rights at the global level.

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

996. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Latvia, seven delegations made statements.

997. Estonia commended Latvia for its openness and transparency in the process, which attested to the State's commitment to make further efforts to improve the protection and full realization of human rights in the country. It welcomed the positive approach taken by Latvia to continue to work on the recommendations accepted on a wide range of issues, including the commitment to accede to the Istanbul Convention and it noted the State's signing of that Convention in May 2016.

998. Kyrgyzstan welcomed the decision of Latvia to accept its recommendation on supporting the teaching of minority languages and cultures in minority schools. It noted that its recommendation on ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families had not been supported, but it hoped nevertheless that Latvia would pay more attention to migrants living in its territory and protect their rights.

999. Norway recalled that it had made four recommendations for the consideration of Latvia on citizenship, prison conditions, Roma children and hate speech against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons. It was pleased that three recommendations had been accepted immediately after the review, one of which was considered to have been already implemented, while a fourth had been left for further consideration. It thanked Latvia for having provided further information on the recommendation on lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons and it noted that that recommendation had been referred to as "partially accepted" by Latvia.

1000. Pakistan thanked Latvia for the updated information. It appreciated the acceptance of many of the recommendations and the consideration of others, including those made by Pakistan. It wished Latvia success in the implementation of the recommendations accepted. Pakistan appreciated the new laws to protect women against violence. It urged Latvia to ensure respect for the rights of migrants and to curtail the increased negative political discourse relating to migrants, especially Muslims.

1001. The Russian Federation regretted the fact that Latvia had not supported a series of recommendations relating to discrimination based on language. It was concerned that the recommendations on preventing the harassment of non-governmental organizations working with minorities and on limiting access to information had been rejected, which was in conflict with the policies of the European Union. It was not convinced by the explanation that there was no official participation in the annual commemoration of Latvian members of the Waffen SS. It was also concerned that many recommendations on discrimination against minorities and on eliminating the degrading status of “non-citizen” had only been partially accepted. It called upon Latvia to reconsider its approach to the recommendations concerning national minorities, the deprivation of citizenship and racial hatred.

1002. Albania congratulated Latvia on the successful universal periodic review outcomes and the importance the State attached to human rights protection and promotion. It mentioned in particular the measures taken to protect the rights and enjoyment of the culture, language and traditions of national minorities, and to engage with them in policy, planning and decision-making processes. It also commended Latvia for its initiative to increase its cooperation with the special procedures and treaty bodies.

1003. The Council of Europe recalled some of the observations of its various monitoring bodies. First, the conditions in prisons in some detention facilities were so poor that they could be considered as amounting to inhuman and degrading treatment. That was aggravated by the lack of investigations of allegations of physical ill-treatment by police officers. Second, various forms of discrimination had been observed, either language-based or directed against “non-citizens”, sexual minorities or Roma. Third, there had been insufficient actions to prevent corruption. The Council of Europe welcomed the measures already taken by Latvia to address those issues and it encouraged the State to ratify the Istanbul Convention and the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages.

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

1004. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Latvia, two other stakeholders made statements.

1005. A representative of the Ombudsman’s Office of Latvia thanked member States for their calls for Latvia to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and to establish an independent national preventive mechanism; that would contribute significantly to respect for human rights in closed institutions in Latvia. The State had indicated that the recommendation on drawing up an adequate legal regulatory framework for mental health institutions and social care institutions had been complied with, and thus the application of coercive measures without permission had now been prohibited. However, the recommendation had not been complied with fully. Amendments that had entered into force in 2013 had improved the procedure for granting citizenship to children born with the status of “non-citizen”; however, the granting of citizenship could not be considered automatic. Therefore, the Ombudsman’s Office urged the Government to improve the legal framework so that children were granted Latvian citizenship automatically at birth, unless the parents renounced it.

1006. The British Humanist Association was concerned about the continuing legal and social discrimination to which lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons were subjected. It noted that measures in the Constitution and legislation might breach the international obligations of Latvia to respect freedom of expression and non-discrimination, in relation to the rights relating to marriage and the family and the right to the highest attainable standard of mental and physical health of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. It was concerned that lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons who had been attacked because of their sexual orientation were unwilling to report the attacks to the police, partly because the legal prohibition on incitement to hatred did not explicitly extend to lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. Noting the negative social attitudes towards lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons shown in opinion polls, it urged Latvia to reconsider discriminatory laws and practices which infringed upon their rights, and to combat effectively the sentiment and stigma against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons present in Latvian society.

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

1007. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 173 recommendations received, 127 had enjoyed the support of Latvia, and 44 had been noted. Additional clarification had provided on another two recommendations, indicating which part of the recommendations had been supported and which part had been noted.

##### Sierra Leone

1008. The review of Sierra Leone was held on 27 January 2016 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 Sierra Leone 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.6/24/SLE/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.6/24/SLE/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.6/24/SLE/3).

1009. At its 31st meeting, on 24 June 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Sierra Leone (see sect. C below).

1010. The outcome of the review of Sierra Leone comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/32/16), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/32/16/Add.1).

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

1011. The delegation, led by the Minister of State, Ministry for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, M. Gibril Sesay, thanked the Human Rights Council, the troika and member States for the constructive review and helpful recommendations during the second cycle of the universal periodic review. The Government of Sierra Leone viewed the universal periodic review process as a critical means of reflecting upon the State's human rights aspirations.

1012. Following receipt of the 208 recommendations made during the State's second review, in January 2016, the Government had committed to responding to those recommendations at the thirty-second session of the Human Rights Council. The Government wished to commend member States for their recommendations on the rule of law, gender equality, women's empowerment, migrant and labour rights, child protection, freedom of expression and religious tolerance.

1013. Upon the return of the delegation to Sierra Leone, a process had been put in place, including plans for a national consultation with all stakeholders, the outcome of which was to provide the Cabinet with an informed analysis to enable it to determine its response to the recommendations from the review.

1014. Consultations on developing a draft response had been held with civil society organizations and government ministries, departments and agencies, including the Ministry for Justice, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, and the Human Rights Commission. Those national institutions had formed a steering committee that had examined the recommendations and, at the end of the process, a draft response had been submitted to the Cabinet. The Cabinet had extensively considered the draft response, the conclusions of which had been duly communicated to the Human Rights Council.

1015. Lastly, Sierra Leone had accepted 177 of the 208 recommendations, as stated in the addendum submitted, representing 85 per cent of all the recommendations. Only 31 of those

recommendations had been noted, the reasons for which had been clarified in the addendum and, if necessary, further details might be provided during the course of the adoption of the report.

1016. The implementation of the recommendations from the State's second review would take place in the challenging post-Ebola context, namely economic challenges due to a fall in the price of the country's major exports, limited fiscal space for government, the introduction of a new constitution, and presidential and parliamentary elections. Despite those challenges, Sierra Leone had considered and had been willing to support the majority of the recommendations.

1017. In that regard, despite the State's having noted some recommendations, the spirit of its response was to endeavour to accept the 208 recommendations. One window of opportunity that now presented itself was the ongoing constitutional review, which would address a number of the issues contained in the recommendations and which would guide future actions. It was the view of the Government that, with regard to human rights, it was better and sustainable to guarantee such rights through entrenched clauses in the Constitution. But it should also be noted that Sierra Leone was consolidating its democracy and whatever the Government did should be aligned with the wishes of the people of Sierra Leone in the context of aspirations for social stability in very fragile times.

1018. The delegation then provided responses relating to human rights matters in thematic groups. With regard to the implementation of international instruments, the delegation stated that the Government would take steps during the implementation period to improve on the signing and ratification of major international instruments. Sierra Leone would ensure that its obligations under those treaties it had ratified were met. In addition, the recommendations that had been accepted on ratifying treaties would be addressed.

1019. Sierra Leone was actively pursuing the review of its Constitution to bring it into line with international human rights standards and to meet the general democratic aspirations of its people.

1020. Sierra Leone also continued to actively enforce the ban on the initiation of girls under 18 years of age while engaging the public on the future of cultural practices such as female genital cutting. The current policy actually criminalized the practice of female genital cutting for children below the age of 18 years, and it remained effective as it enjoyed the support of the public. However, Sierra Leone intended to carry out a review of the policy to inform a future course of action, which would eventually form part of its report during the next review.

1021. Regarding institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures, Sierra Leone had over the years increased funding to the Human Rights Commission and it continued to implement a robust anti-corruption strategy. Despite the challenging prospects in the post-Ebola recovery period, the Government would continue to strengthen the regime of human rights promotion and protection and anti-corruption as part of its democratic future.

1022. Sierra Leone would ensure that discrimination against any class of its citizens was prohibited. Knowing that a review of the Constitution was ongoing, the Government remained confident in the process and in the development of more robust protection for all groups. The recommendations in that category that had been noted would be addressed in due time. The Government would continue to encourage the Human Rights Commission to work with communities to increase awareness of those issues noted.

1023. Sierra Leone confirmed its ongoing commitment to improve human rights. It would continue to consult local stakeholders on a clear and definitive policy regarding harmful cultural practices without depriving any of its citizens of the right to associate or freely participate in their cultures.

1024. As far as the administration of justice was concerned, the Government would continue to promote a robust reform agenda for the justice system as part of the country's constitutional and democratic development, with the support of the member States of the Human Rights Council.

1025. Regarding the right to privacy, marriage and family life, the Government had a non-discriminatory view of citizenship and that issue was under consideration by the Constitutional Review Committee.

1026. On the right to freedom of religion and freedom of expression, Sierra Leone continued to enjoy a high prevalence of religious tolerance. The Government reiterated its open invitation to the special rapporteurs and other mandate holders to visit the country. Moreover, Sierra Leone continued to address concerns relating to the protection of freedom of expression. The Attorney General and Minister for Justice was engaging stakeholders with a view to review, repeal or amend such legislation as the Public Order Act of 1965 that tended to compromise the enjoyment of freedoms.

1027. The Government continued to view the empowerment of women and their increased participation as inviolable to the democratic and socioeconomic development of the country. With regard to constitutional guarantees for particular levels of women's political participation, the issue was now under consideration as part of the constitutional review process, and the Government supported increased rates of women's participation in political, administrative, economic and social life in the country.

1028. With regard to the right to social security and an adequate standard of living, the recommendations under that thematic group captured the political desire of the Government of Sierra Leone, whose post-Ebola recovery programme and Agenda for Prosperity continued to be the motivation for socioeconomic improvement. Social security was a priority area in both programmes.

1029. On the right to health, Sierra Leone had fought a tough battle against an epidemic that ravaged not only the lives of its people but also the foundations of its economy. While the rebuilding process was ongoing, the Government was aware that other States might have best practice models to share, and it welcomed all support in moulding the health sector into one that would afford proper care for all. Building a resilient health system was a priority area in the post-Ebola recovery programme.

1030. Teenage pregnancy continued to be prevalent. While the Government was taking actions to curb it, it also asked for assistance from those who had tried and proved successful to partner with Sierra Leone so that the Government could create a model suitable for the country's own conditions.

1031. Regarding the right to education, the Government was convinced that building a strong economy and a democratic and politically stable society required capable and educated citizens. Sierra Leone would continue to expand the boundaries of education as part of its democratic development and post-Ebola future.

1032. In conclusion, Sierra Leone firmly believed that complying with the universal periodic review created opportunities for the improvement of its human rights regime. Therefore, the Government would work closely with all sectors of society to ensure the full implementation of all of the recommendations supported, while laying the foundation for the acceptance of most of the recommendations noted. The delegation reiterated the full commitment of Sierra Leone to the universal periodic review process and assured the Human Rights Council that Sierra Leone would at all times endeavour to uphold its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations.

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

1033. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Sierra Leone, 16 delegations made statements.<sup>24</sup>

1034. Pakistan stated that it highly valued the engagement of Sierra Leone with the human rights machinery, including the treaty bodies and the universal periodic review mechanism, despite the challenges resulting from the Ebola crisis. Measures to promote and protect

<sup>24</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/32ndSession/Pages/default.aspx>.



human rights particularly targeted women, children and persons with disabilities. Pakistan recommended the adoption of the report of the Working Group on Sierra Leone.

1035. Noting the grave challenges posed by the Ebola crisis, Singapore encouraged Sierra Leone to continue to improve the health-care system and infrastructure, and to ensure the implementation of the recommendations the State had accepted. Singapore noted the achievement in fostering a climate of religious tolerance and it hoped to hear more about the State's best practices in that field. Lastly, Singapore supported the adoption of the report of the Working Group on Sierra Leone.

1036. South Africa was encouraged to hear of initiatives aimed at improving access to justice and human rights, including through the State's Agenda for Change and Agenda for Prosperity. It commended Sierra Leone for its initiatives to ensure the right to education and free health care for children, and the steps taken for the rights of people with HIV/AIDS, Ebola survivors and persons with disabilities.

1037. Togo was pleased with the measures Sierra Leone had taken to implement the recommendations received during the first universal periodic review, particularly the strengthening of the Office of the Ombudsman and the creation of a coordination committee for judicial services. Togo invited the international community to provide support for the implementation of the recommendations made during the second review.

1038. The United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women) commended the Government of Sierra Leone for its progress relating to the ongoing constitutional review process and for having taken affirmative action in appointing women to decision-making positions. UN-Women encouraged Sierra Leone to ensure that the revised Constitution was engendered to improve the lives of women through, inter alia, the gender equality and women's empowerment policy, and ultimately to facilitate the domestication of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. It further encouraged the Government to continue its progress towards the abandonment of female genital mutilation and cutting.

1039. UNICEF welcomed the efforts of Sierra Leone to draw up comprehensive strategies to eliminate harmful practices, including female genital mutilation and cutting, teenage pregnancy and child marriage. Partners, including UNICEF, would continue to fully support the efforts of State and non-State actors of Sierra Leone. UNICEF also welcomed the Government's commitments with regard to the international treaties that Sierra Leone had ratified.

1040. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela positively noted the great efforts made by Sierra Leone to implement the recommendations received in the first cycle, despite the financial burden and human suffering endured by the country during the Ebola crisis. The education system had been strengthened and the Agenda for Prosperity included public policies to benefit the population. It recommended the adoption of the report on Sierra Leone.

1041. Zimbabwe noted that since 2007 Sierra Leone had initiated two inclusive and rights-based development programmes, namely the Agenda for Change and the Agenda for Prosperity. In addition, the country had ratified five of the major international human rights treaties and incorporated their provisions into domestic legislation. Zimbabwe called for the adoption of the report on Sierra Leone.

1042. Albania commended Sierra Leone for the national Ebola recovery plan, which ensured the provision of free education for Ebola orphans and young people, free health care for survivors and other welfare packages. Albania was pleased to see concrete action on the strengthening of the Office of the Ombudsman and the Anti-Corruption Commission, as well as a commitment by the Government to implement a zero-tolerance policy on sexual and gender-based violence, which was one of the recommendations Albania had made.

1043. Algeria was pleased to note the progress made by Sierra Leone in the fight against poverty in the framework of the Agenda for Prosperity and the adoption of strategies on the rights of women and children. While noting the acceptance of a recommendation it had made on gender equality, Algeria urged Sierra Leone to pursue efforts with a view to further strengthening human rights for all its people and to fight against harmful traditional practices, especially female genital mutilation.

1044. Angola welcomed the adoption by Sierra Leone of the majority of the recommendations received during the second review, including its recommendations, and it encouraged Sierra Leone to continue the process of revising the Constitution in order to align national legislation with international human rights norms. Angola also supported the initiatives to make the justice system more effective and transparent, and it requested the Human Rights Council to adopt the report.

1045. Botswana welcomed the legislative reforms in the area of human rights, including the adoption of the Right to Access to Information Act of 2013 and the Sexual Offences Act of 2012. It appreciated the efforts to address gender issues through, for example, the implementation of a national gender strategic plan and the launch of a national action plan on gender-based violence. Botswana supported the adoption of the report on Sierra Leone.

1046. Burundi noted with satisfaction that international humanitarian law had been domesticated in the national legislation of Sierra Leone and that efforts had been made through the adoption of a national policy on children, the strengthening of the judicial system and the improvement of health services. Burundi also noted the good level of cooperation between Sierra Leone and human rights mechanisms.

1047. China commended Sierra Leone for its progress in poverty reduction, the protection of vulnerable groups and the strengthening of the rule of law, and its effective measures to guarantee people's rights to life and to health in the wake of the outbreak of the Ebola epidemics. It called for greater international support for Sierra Leone through financial and technical assistance, with a view to improving capacity-building and speeding up development. China supported the adoption of the report on Sierra Leone.

1048. Cuba noted that Sierra Leone was progressing in its human rights record, despite the major challenges it had faced, such as the Ebola epidemics. Legislative reforms relating to the protection of human rights had been carried out through the adoption in 2011 and 2012 of laws on, inter alia, the protection of the rights of persons with disabilities, the right to access information and sexual offences. Cuba called upon the international community to continue to support Sierra Leone.

1049. Ethiopia noted with satisfaction that Sierra Leone had accepted its recommendations on, inter alia, further improving socioeconomic conditions, in particular in health infrastructure and institutions. It welcomed the State's efforts and commitment to end impunity at all levels during and in the aftermath of the long civil war. Ethiopia supported the adoption of the report on Sierra Leone.

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

1050. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Sierra Leone, six other stakeholders made statements.

1051. The Human Rights Commission of Sierra Leone noted the progress the State had made through, inter alia, the ratification and implementation of several human rights instruments, but it urged the State to further ratify the optional protocols to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, the Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Moreover, the Commission was concerned about such issues as the poor conditions in detention facilities, the banning of pregnant girls and young mothers from education, the provision of water, the implementation of justice and gender equality. Thus, it recommended that Sierra Leone review the Police Act of 1964 in order to ensure transparent recruitment, introduce a national health insurance scheme for all Sierra Leoneans, remove the seditious libel provisions of the Public Order Act of 1965 and fully implement the recommendations from the universal periodic review.

1052. The International Service for Human Rights noted that Sierra Leone had enacted and enforced the right to access information, and it commended the State for safeguarding civil society and protecting human rights defenders. It urged Sierra Leone to repeal the restrictive laws on freedom of expression and assembly and to ensure prompt and transparent investigations in relation to violence against human rights defenders. It also recommended that Sierra Leone ensure the independence and work of non-governmental organizations and civil society organizations.

1053. Save the Children International welcomed the efforts of Sierra Leone to improve the protection of children's rights, and especially the establishment of the National Children's Commission. It encouraged Sierra Leone to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and to end discrimination against women and girls, gender-based violence, child marriage, female genital mutilation, corporal punishment, child labour and other practices that harmed children. It called for the strengthening of health care, the effective implementation of legislation that affected children, and the allocation of sufficient technical, human and financial resources.

1054. CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation recognized the challenges Sierra Leone had faced since the end of the civil war and the Ebola outbreak. However, it noted that civil society in Sierra Leone, including human rights defenders, remained subjected to judicial persecution, intimidation and threats. It was alarmed by restrictions on freedom of expression. Thus, it urged Sierra Leone to guarantee freedom of expression for journalists, to combat impunity for violations against human rights defenders, and to refrain from criminalizing the activities of human rights defenders and journalists.

1055. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme welcomed the ratification of United Nations treaties and the eradication of the use of child soldiers. However, it urged Sierra Leone to fight against family violence and the exploitation of children and girls in mining zones, to ratify outstanding treaties and to implement the universal periodic review recommendations. It called upon the international community to assist Sierra Leone, through capacity-building, in accelerating the harmonization of domestic legislation with international law.

1056. Amnesty International welcomed the steps taken by Sierra Leone towards abolishing the death penalty. However, it was disappointed that the State had not noted the recommendations aimed at protecting the rights of women and girls, such as allowing pregnant girls in the education system and prohibiting female genital mutilation. It thus called upon Sierra Leone to lift the ban on pregnant girls' attending mainstream school and taking exams. It expressed regret that Sierra Leone had not noted the recommendations on guaranteeing the human rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons and on decriminalizing same-sex relations, and it called upon Sierra Leone to reconsider its position on those issues.

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

1057. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 208 recommendations received, 177 had enjoyed the support of Sierra Leone, and 31 had been noted.

1058. The head of the delegation thanked all the participants in the debate, especially the member States of the Human Rights Council and the international organizations for their support and encouragement, which would push Sierra Leone to increase its action for human rights and to move forward in the implementation of the recommendations. The Government was already engaged with civil society to find shared solutions relating to a number of the issues mentioned during the debate, such as education, pregnant women, female genital cutting and the death penalty. Due to the Ebola crisis, the country was still in a difficult position, but the Government's commitment to human rights was unshakeable.

#### **Singapore**

1059. The review of Singapore was held on 27 January 2016 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 Singapore 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.6/24/SGP/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.6/24/SGP/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.6/24/SGP/3).

1060. At its 31st meeting, on 24 June 2016, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Singapore (see sect. C below).

1061. The outcome of the review of Singapore comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/32/17), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/32/17/Add.1).

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

1062. The delegation stated that the starting point and longstanding goal of Singapore had always been to build a strong and progressive nation where Singaporeans could lead meaningful and happy lives in a fair and inclusive society.

1063. Singapore treasured every Singaporean and would protect every Singaporean against any threat, regardless of his or her race, language, religion, social identity or sexual orientation.

1064. Singapore needed to manage the enduring challenges of dealing with primordial and visceral forces of race, language and religion in its diverse society.

1065. That entailed seeking accommodation among the competing rights of the individuals who made up the nation and the interests of society as a whole.

1066. Singapore firmly applied the rule of law, which was a fundamental precondition to protect the human rights and freedoms of Singaporeans as enshrined in its Constitution, and to uphold the core principles of fairness, secularism, meritocracy and multiracialism.

1067. That broad approach to governance remained as relevant as ever, with the State's changing society and globalization having led to greater income and social stratification.

1068. With those principles in mind, the Interministerial Committee on Human Rights had reviewed the 236 recommendations Singapore had received at the twenty-fourth session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review.

1069. Singapore had supported 116 recommendations, supported in part 9 recommendations and noted 111 recommendations.

1070. Singapore had supported the recommendations that complemented its ongoing efforts to build a fair and inclusive society.

1071. In many cases, Singapore was already implementing policies to strengthen social safety nets and enhance social harmony.

1072. However, Singapore had not supported the recommendations predicated on unfounded assertions, inaccurate assumptions or erroneous information. There was a handful of such recommendations relating to freedom of expression and freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

1073. In addition, Singapore could not implement the recommendations that were not appropriate in its national context on issues concerning capital punishment, the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender community and national security.

1074. About one quarter of the recommendations that Singapore had not supported in full were related to the ratification of international human rights treaties.

1075. Singapore took its treaty obligations seriously. It engaged seriously with the relevant treaty bodies, reviewed its reservations where appropriate and welcomed shared learning on implementing human rights.

1076. The State's policy was to actively review its position in respect of human rights treaties. However, in order not to prejudice the outcomes of the review process, it had not committed itself to accede to or ratify treaties ahead of the review.

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

1077. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Singapore, 17 delegations made statements.<sup>24</sup>

1078. Cuba noted the diverse progressive practical policies of Singapore to enhance social protection and preserve social harmony. It appreciated the State's continuing efforts to build a fair and inclusive society through concrete policies in areas such as supporting low-income Singaporeans and supporting its citizens to age with dignity. It encouraged Singapore to adopt a programmatic approach to implement the recommendations the State had supported.

1079. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea noted that the interactive dialogue with Singapore during the Working Group had enabled it to understand the State's experience in furthering human rights through the realization of social harmony and the achievement of socioeconomic progress. It welcomed the acceptance by Singapore of many recommendations as a demonstration of the will to make further efforts in the field of human rights.

1080. Egypt was encouraged by the decision by Singapore to accept the recommendations made by Egypt on combating trafficking in persons, especially women and children, on providing protection for the family, on realizing the right to work and on considering 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. Egypt also encouraged Singapore to share its experience with small island developing States in relation to preparation for, participation in and follow-up to the universal periodic review.

1081. Ethiopia noted with appreciation that Singapore had accepted its recommendations on continuing to preserve social harmony as a diverse cultural and linguistic nation, on building a fair and inclusive society, and on intensifying the fight against radicalization and terrorism at the early stage in order to sustain the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms of all Singaporeans. It encouraged Singapore to take all the measures necessary to implement the recommendations accepted.

1082. Qatar noted that Singapore had accepted many recommendations on building a fair and inclusive society, in particular those relating to maintaining racial and religious harmony and combating trafficking in persons. It encouraged Singapore to maintain its commitment to provide good education, health care and employment opportunities to persons with disabilities, and to provide quality and affordable medical services for all under the Health Care 2020 Master Plan. It commended the Government for its vision to create a nation for all ages and the launch in August 2015 of its action plan to create a workplace favourable for all ages, especially the ageing population.

1083. India noted that Singapore had accepted a large number of recommendations and it expressed the belief that the State would further intensify its efforts to implement those recommendations in the coming years.

1084. Indonesia welcomed the continuing commitment of Singapore to advance the promotion and protection of human rights while upholding fair and inclusive social harmony through the implementation of measures to promote the rights of women, children and persons with disabilities, as well as to preserve racial and religious harmony. Indonesia encouraged Singapore to continue to take the initial steps necessary to accede to the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

1085. The Islamic Republic of Iran noted the steps taken by Singapore since the last review, in 2011, to enhance social protection and preserve social harmony. It appreciated the State's efforts to build a fair and inclusive society through concrete policies in areas such as supporting low-income people and adopting a programmatic approach to realizing the human rights of its citizens.

1086. Kyrgyzstan noted with appreciation that Singapore had accepted numerous recommendations, including those made by Kyrgyzstan on completing the process of accession to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale

of children, child prostitution and child pornography, and on taking additional measures to protect child victims of violence.

1087. The Lao People's Democratic Republic noted with appreciation that Singapore had implemented many progressive policies since its last universal periodic review to enhance social protection and preserve social harmony. It encouraged Singapore to fully implement the recommendations it had supported and to continue to take a forward-looking, whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach to protecting the fundamental rights of its citizens, while preserving common space for Singaporeans.

1088. Malaysia noted the efforts made to implement policies that improved social protection and provided assistance to the low-income segment of society, including in health and education. It also noted the acceptance by Singapore of its recommendation on promoting awareness programmes on HIV/AIDS and addressing the stigma faced by persons with HIV/AIDS. It encouraged Singapore to consider establishing a national human rights institution with a view to expanding the avenues for partnership between the Government and its citizens.

1089. Maldives was greatly encouraged by the commitment of Singapore to provide quality education, health care and employment opportunities to persons with disabilities, and to promote gender equality, the elimination of gender discrimination, and the empowerment of women and girls in the country. It praised Singapore for its efforts to build a fair and inclusive society.

1090. Morocco noted with satisfaction the important and continuing efforts made by Singapore to promote a fair and inclusive society through programmatic approaches aimed at realizing human rights of all citizens in spite of the challenges faced by a multiracial society. It encouraged Singapore to continue its efforts to implement the recommendations it had supported.

1091. Myanmar was pleased that Singapore had implemented policies to enhance social protection and preserve social harmony since the State's first review. It welcomed the State's continuing efforts to build a fair and inclusive society through concrete policies in various sectors.

1092. Oman noted the serious commitment of Singapore to promote and protect human rights in conformity with its international legal obligations. Oman encouraged Singapore to continue that commitment.

1093. Pakistan welcomed the fact that Singapore had implemented many progressive policies since its last review, in 2011, to enhance social protection and preserve social harmony. It appreciated the State's continuing efforts to build a fair and inclusive society through concrete policies in areas such as supporting low-income groups and providing universal health coverage and a lifelong learning programme.

1094. The Philippines acknowledged the significant achievements made by Singapore in advancing the protection of human rights, particularly in eliminating trafficking in persons, protecting the rights of older persons and promoting migrant workers' rights. It welcomed the recent signing of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the intention to ratify the Convention in 2017. It looked forward to the State's continued commitment to engage with bilateral and regional partners to further advance human rights.

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

1095. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Singapore, 11 other stakeholders made statements.

1096. The International Service for Human Rights urged Singapore to ensure the independence of the Interministerial Committee on Human Rights. It was concerned about the challenges faced by those who publicly discussed dissenting views in Singapore, and laws preventing access to foreign funding and information by some individuals and organizations should be reviewed. It was also concerned about the harassment of human rights defenders. It therefore urged Singapore to pay particular attention to the implementation of the recommendations relating to freedom of expression, both online and offline.

1097. The International Commission of Jurists welcomed the recommendations relating to the death penalty and freedom of opinion and expression. It stated that Singapore had recently carried out the execution of Mr. Kho Jabing and it urged Singapore to abolish the death penalty. It also stated that Singapore had implemented tight restrictions on online expression, and it called upon Singapore to refrain from unjustified infringements on freedom of expression.

1098. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues was disappointed that Singapore continued to refuse to ratify human rights instruments such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The State's claim that it substantially complied with the objectives of international human rights treaties was unfounded. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues called for the establishment of a national human rights institution in order to independently verify the State's claims. It stated that prolonged detentions and executions continued in Singapore, and it expressed regret that the State had rejected the recommendations on abolishing the death penalty and corporal punishment. Further, Singapore had ignored calls for the establishment of a minimum wage.

1099. Franciscans International commended Singapore for its efforts to combat trafficking, particularly through its ratification of the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime. However, it was concerned about the lack of guarantees to protect the human rights of migrant workers, some of whom were allegedly victims of trafficking. It recommended that Singapore consider ensuring the prosecution and punishment of individuals involved in trafficking, protection and rehabilitation mechanisms for victims and improvement in the transparency of the hiring process for foreign workers, and redefining enforcement regulations on trafficking.

1100. The International Lesbian and Gay Association was disappointed that Singapore continued to deny the existence of institutionalized discrimination perpetuated by the existence of section 377A of the Penal Code. It highlighted the fact that section 377A had direct consequences for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex rights, such as discriminatory media guidelines and censorship, the refusal to register and formally recognize lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex organizations, the lack of appropriate support and sexuality education for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex youth, the lack of health care and social services to address the needs of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons, and workplace discrimination towards lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. Prejudice towards lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex communities had increased, and additional restrictions had been placed on multinational companies from expressing support for events for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons, such as Pink Dot. It urged Singapore to repeal section 377A.

1101. The Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development was alarmed that Singapore had rejected nearly half of the 236 recommendations it had received, including key recommendations on the restrictions on freedoms of expression, assembly and association. It called upon Singapore to review all existing laws and policies that imposed undue restrictions on those freedoms. It expressed regret that Singapore had merely noted the recommendations on censoring lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex content in the media, and on criminalizing sex between consenting men under section 377A of the Penal Code. It called upon Singapore to take concrete steps and decriminalize and remove all policies that discriminated against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons.

1102. Action Canada for Population and Development regretted the fact that Singapore had only noted the recommendations calling for the reform of existing laws that criminalized homosexuality, including section 377A of the Penal Code. It stated that there was evidence of discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons and it urged Singapore to repeal section 377A.

1103. Human Rights Watch stated that the major human rights issues in Singapore had been raised in the first universal periodic review and they remained unresolved. Those issues included the continued use of the death penalty, as in the case of the execution of

Kho Jabing in May 2016, discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons, severe restrictions on fundamental civil and political rights, such as freedoms of expression, association and peaceful assembly, and the lack of the ratification of international human rights conventions, such as the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

1104. The Association of Women for Action and Research called for the explicit constitutional protection against sex and gender discrimination in Singapore, and it urged the total and unqualified abolition of immunity for marital rape. It called for the elimination of discrimination against single parents, including the prohibitive conditions on public housing for divorced mothers. It called upon Singapore to show respect for the right to family life and the rights of the child, and for migrant spouses. It also urged Singapore to extend fundamental labour protection to live-in domestic workers.

1105. The Singapore Council of Women's Organisations highlighted the issue of the social protection of ageing women in Singapore. The State had a significant ageing population and there was no State-funded minimum pension scheme, which resulted in disadvantages against older women who were homemakers or informal workers. It recommended that Singapore ensure that all families were well supported, reassess the culture of unpaid work in childcare and caring for older or sick persons, and consider initiatives that empowered able but ageing women.

1106. Amnesty International expressed deep regret that Singapore had decided to resume the implementation of the death penalty with the execution of Kho Jabing in May 2016. It opposed the death penalty in all cases without exception and it called upon Singapore to re-establish a moratorium on executions immediately. It stated that opposition bloggers and human rights defenders in Singapore continued to face political repression, reprisals and intimidation, and it highlighted the case of blogger Amos Yee. It expressed concern that Singapore had rejected the recommendations on reviewing existing legislation to enhance the enjoyment of the rights to freedoms of expression, association and peaceful assembly.

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

1107. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 236 recommendations received, 116 had enjoyed the support of Singapore, and 119 had been noted. Additional clarification had been provided on one recommendation, indicating which part of the recommendation had been supported and which part had been noted.

1108. After listening to statements by States and civil society, the delegation of Singapore, led by the Permanent Representative of Singapore to the United Nations Office at Geneva, addressed some issues raised by civil society on recent developments in the State.

1109. Regarding the case of Kho Jabing, the Attorney-General's Chambers of Singapore had explained comprehensively in its press statement on 25 May 2016 why the Court of Appeal had dismissed multiple last minute applications by Mr. Kho's lawyers, who had had no new arguments and who had appeared to be trying to delay the execution. Singapore had also explained its policy on the death penalty extensively during the session of the Working Group and in its national report.

1110. For the cases involving alleged cooling-off day offences, and new offences allegedly committed by Mr. Amos Yee, Singapore noted that investigations were ongoing and it was inappropriate to comment further.

1111. On the issue of foreign sponsorships for Pink Dot, the Ministry for Home Affairs had explained in its press statement of 7 June 2016 that the Government's position was that foreign entities should not interfere in domestic issues, especially political issues or controversial social issues with political overtones. In the context of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transsexual issues, that applied to events that advocated, as well as those that opposed lesbian, gay, bisexual and transsexual causes. Those were political, social or moral choices for Singaporeans to decide for themselves.

1112. Singapore agreed with the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights that human rights were not about "human rights window dressing", that the ratification of treaties and agreements and the acceptance of recommendations from United Nations human rights mechanisms were not in themselves human rights achievements, and that human rights obligations should not be a "tick-the-box" public relations exercise designed



to boost a country's international image. Singapore also did not want the Government's work and continuing efforts to be labelled as "theatre".

1113. The goal of Singapore was to ensure that its policies and programmes continued to be effective in surmounting current and future challenges and to produce good outcomes for its citizens.

1114. While Singapore was not a party to a number of human rights treaties, its policies were already fully or largely consistent with their objectives. Singapore also ranked well on many international indices largely because of its effective policy outcomes.

1115. Singapore was eleventh on the human development index of 2015, ninth on the Rule of Law Index of 2015 of the World Justice Project and thirteenth on the Gender Inequality Index of 2015. Singapore had one of the lowest crime rates in the world and one of the lowest recorded rates of drug abuse.

1116. Singapore knew it had to adapt its policies so that they remained relevant in the ever-changing social, economic and political circumstances.

1117. Singapore had implemented major initiatives in recent years to ensure that it continued to be economically competitive and future-ready, while remaining an inclusive society. Those initiatives included building the world's first "Smart Nation" and launching a S\$3 billion action plan for successful ageing and the Skills Future movement to support lifelong learning.

1118. Singapore had also implemented new policies to enhance social protection for its citizens, in particular the most vulnerable groups, to ensure social mobility and to provide more assistance for older Singaporeans.

1119. Those progressive social policies included the MediShield Life insurance plan, the Pioneer Generation Package, the enhanced Workfare Income Supplement and the Enabling Master Plan for persons with disabilities.

1120. Singapore acknowledged that its principles of governance and the way it protected human rights and preserved its social harmony might not fully conform to how other societies organized themselves.

1121. Singapore therefore believed that every country should be given time and space to deal with its own development and advance human rights in its own way, taking into account its unique and evolving social and cultural context.

1122. Singapore was determined to forge a unique sense of national identity and pragmatic approach to economic and social development to keep Singapore special and exceptional.

1123. Singapore would continue to support and participate in the universal periodic review process in a constructive manner.

1124. At home, the Government of Singapore would continue to consult widely and conduct regular exchanges with Singaporeans and civil society.

1125. Singapore would also work with its partners to ensure that the universal periodic review remained relevant and useful to States in the third cycle, including through the sharing of best practices during the universal periodic review.

## **B. General debate on agenda item 6**

1126. At its 32nd meeting, on 27 June 2016, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 6, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: China, Georgia, India, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Nauru<sup>25</sup> (also on behalf of Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Palau, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Suriname and Tuvalu), Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina,

<sup>25</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), Pakistan<sup>25</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Portugal, Qatar (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belize, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Libya, Nauru, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Tonga, Uruguay;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa culture internationale, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Center for Global Nonkilling, Centre catholique international de Genève (also on behalf of Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, Dominicans for Justice and Peace, Edmund Rice International, Fondazione Marista per la Solidarietà Internazionale, Fracarita International, Franciscans International, the International Federation of ACAT, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, the International Movement of Apostolate in the Independent Social Milieus, New Humanity, Pax Romana, Vie montante internationale), China NGO Network for International Exchanges, International Educational Development, International Service for Human Rights, Iraqi Development Organization, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Society for Development and Community Empowerment, United Nations Watch, UPR Info, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

## C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

### Namibia

1127. At its 26th meeting, on 23 June 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 32/101 without a vote.

### Niger

1128. At its 26th meeting, on 23 June 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 32/102 without a vote.

### Mozambique

1129. At its 26th meeting, on 23 June 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 32/103 without a vote.

### Estonia

1130. At its 28th meeting, on 23 June 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 32/104 without a vote.

### Paraguay

1131. At its 28th meeting, on 23 June 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 32/105 without a vote.

### Belgium

1132. At its 28th meeting, on 23 June 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 32/106 without a vote.

### Denmark

1133. At its 29th meeting, on 24 June 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 32/107 without a vote.

**Palau**

1134. At its 29th meeting, on 24 June 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 32/108 without a vote.

**Somalia**

1135. At its 29th meeting, on 24 June 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 32/109 without a vote.

**Seychelles**

1136. At its 30th meeting, on 24 June 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 32/110 without a vote.

**Solomon Islands**

1137. At its 30th meeting, on 24 June 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 32/111 without a vote.

**Latvia**

1138. At its 30th meeting, on 24 June 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 32/112 without a vote.

**Sierra Leone**

1139. At its 31st meeting, on 24 June 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 32/113 without a vote.

**Singapore**

1140. At its 31st meeting, on 24 June 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 32/114 without a vote.

## **VII. Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories**

### **A. General debate on agenda item 7**

1141. At the 32nd meeting, on 27 June 2016, the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and the State of Palestine made statements as the States concerned.

1142. At its 32nd and 33rd meetings, on the same day, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 7, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ecuador, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)<sup>25</sup> (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan<sup>25</sup> (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa (also on behalf of the Group of African States), United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Brazil, Chile, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Oman, Senegal, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, Yemen;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Adalah: Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel, Al-Haq, American Association of Jurists, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations (also on behalf of B'nai B'rith), Defence for Children International, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (also on behalf of Al-Haq), International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations, International-Lawyers.Org, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Norwegian Refugee Council, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Servas International, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, World Jewish Congress.

## VIII. Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

### A. General debate on agenda item 8

1143. At its 33rd and 34th meetings, on 27 June 2016, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 8, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, China, India, Mexico (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Yemen), Mexico (also on behalf of Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, the Central African Republic, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and the State of Palestine), Morocco, Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Serbia and Ukraine), Pakistan<sup>25</sup> (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovenia, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Denmark, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Spain, Sudan, United States of America;

(c) Observer for a national human rights institution: Commission on Human Rights of the Philippines (also on behalf of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions);

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, Alliance Defending Freedom, Allied Rainbow Communities International, Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists (also on behalf of Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, the Indian Council of South America, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Educational Development, Liberation, the Union of Arab Jurists, the Women's Human Rights International Association and the World Federation of Democratic Youth), Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Association Bharathi centre culturel francotamoul, Association burkinabé pour la survie de l'enfance, British Humanist Association, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Espace Afrique International, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland (also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association), Global Helping to Advance Women and Children, Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations, International-Lawyers.Org, International Lesbian and Gay Association (also on behalf of Allied Rainbow Communities International, the Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland, the Human Rights Law Centre, Human Rights Watch, the International

Federation for Human Rights Leagues, the International Service for Human Rights and LGBT Denmark: National Organization for Gay Men, Lesbians, Bisexuals and Transgendered People), International Service for Human Rights, 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, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Prahar, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Society for Development and Community Empowerment, Swedish Federation of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights (also on behalf of Allied Rainbow Communities International, the Human Rights Law Centre, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, the International Humanist and Ethical Union, the International Lesbian and Gay Association, the Lesbian and Gay Federation in Germany and LGBT Denmark: National Organization for Gay Men, Lesbians, Bisexuals and Transgendered People), United Nations Watch, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization, World Federation of Democratic Youth, World Muslim Congress, World Young Women's Christian Association.

## **IX. Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action**

### **A. Interactive dialogue with a special procedure mandate holder**

#### **Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance**

1144. At the 34th meeting, on 27 June 2016, the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, Mutuma Ruteere, presented his reports (A/HRC/32/49 and Corr.1 and Add.1, and A/HRC/32/50 and Add.1).

1145. At the same meeting, the representative of Greece made a statement as the State concerned.

1146. Also at the same meeting, the Greek National Commission for Human Rights made a statement.

1147. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Kyrgyzstan, Mexico, Namibia, Nigeria, Russian Federation, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Costa Rica, Croatia, Egypt, Fiji, Israel, Malaysia, Senegal, Spain, Thailand, United States of America,

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales, International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Minority Rights Group, United Nations Watch.

1148. At the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

1149. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Latvia and Turkey made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

1150. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Turkey made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

### **B. General debate on agenda item 9**

1151. At its 34th meeting, on 27 June 2016, and at its 35th meeting, on 28 June 2016, 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: Algeria, China, Cuba, Dominican Republic<sup>26</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ecuador, India, Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), Pakistan<sup>26</sup> (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Portugal, Qatar (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia,

<sup>26</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Egypt, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Pakistan, Sudan, Turkey, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Auspice Stella, British Humanist Association, Canners International Permanent Committee, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, China NGO Network for International Exchanges, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, European Union of Jewish Students, Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Educational Development, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations, International-Lawyers.Org, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (also on behalf of International-Lawyers.Org), International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations (also on behalf of Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Africa culture internationale, the African Canadian Legal Clinic, the African Development Association, the Arab Commission for Human Rights, Association Dunenyo, 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, Espace Afrique International, the International Association against Torture, International-Lawyers.Org, the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Servas International, the Union of Arab Jurists and the World Federation of Democratic Youth), Iraqi Development Organization, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Palestinian Return Centre, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Prahar, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Servas International, United Schools International, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization, World Environment and Resources Council, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress.

1152. At the 35th meeting, on 28 June 2016, the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Turkey made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

1153. At the same meeting, the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Turkey made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.



## **X. Technical assistance and capacity-building**

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

#### **Interactive dialogue in the presence of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic and other relevant stakeholders**

1154. At its 35th and 36th meetings, on 28 June 2016, the Human Rights Council held an interactive dialogue in the presence of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic, Marie-Thérèse Keita Bocoum, and other relevant stakeholders to assess the development of the situation of human rights on the ground, with a particular focus on transitional justice.

1155. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert made a statement.

1156. At the same meeting, the coordinator of the Network of NGOs for Human Rights in the Central African Republic, Célestin Nzala, made a statement.

1157. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Central African Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

1158. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 35th and 36th meetings, on 28 June 2016, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert and other stakeholders questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, China, Congo, France, Ghana, Morocco, Portugal, Republic of Korea, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Benin, Egypt, Ireland, Luxembourg, Mozambique, New Zealand, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Save the Children International, World Evangelical Alliance (also on behalf of Caritas Internationalis).

1159. At the 36th meeting, on 28 June 2016, the representative of the Central African Republic made final remarks as the State concerned.

1160. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert and the other stakeholders answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

#### **Independent Expert on the enhancement of capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights**

1161. At the 36th meeting, on 28 June 2016, the Independent Expert on the enhancement of capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights, Mohammed Ayat, presented his report (A/HRC/32/52).

1162. At the same meeting, the representative of Côte d'Ivoire made a statement as the State concerned.

1163. 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, Belgium, China, Congo, France, Ghana, Maldives, Morocco, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Benin, Egypt, Mali, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Espace Afrique International, International Catholic Child Bureau (also on behalf of Franciscans International and the International Movement of Apostolate in the Independent Social Milieus), International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Service for Human Rights, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme.

1164. At the same meeting, the representative of Côte d'Ivoire made final remarks as the State concerned.

1165. Also at the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

## **B. Interactive dialogue on cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights**

1166. At the 38th meeting, on 29 June 2016, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights provided, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 29/23, an oral update on the situation of human rights in Ukraine.

1167. At the same meeting, the representative of Ukraine made a statement as the State concerned.

1168. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Assistant Secretary-General questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, China, France, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Canada, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Lithuania, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Human Rights House Foundation, International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Federation of Journalists, Minority Rights Group, United Nations Watch, World Federation of Ukrainian Women's Organizations.

1169. At the same meeting, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

## **C. Interactive dialogue on technical cooperation and capacity-building for Burundi in the field of human rights**

1170. At its 38th meeting, on 29 June 2016, the High Commissioner presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 30/27 on technical cooperation and capacity-building for Burundi in the field of human rights, the report of the High Commissioner thereon (A/HRC/32/30), followed by an interactive dialogue on the implementation of that resolution.

1171. At the same meeting, the representative of Burundi made a statement as the State concerned.

1172. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 38th and 39th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the High Commissioner questions:

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

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Canada, Croatia, Egypt, Estonia, Greece, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Rwanda, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, United States of America;

- (c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;
- (d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Commission nationale indépendante des droits de l'homme du Burundi;
- (e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa culture internationale, Alliance Defending Freedom, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation (also on behalf of the East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project), Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers (also on behalf of Caritas Internationalis and Franciscans International), Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, World Evangelical Alliance, World Organization against Torture (also on behalf of Fédération internationale de l'Action des chrétiens pour l'abolition de la torture and TRIAL: Track Impunity Always).

1173. At the 39th meeting, on 29 June 2016, the representative of Burundi made final remarks as the State concerned.

1174. At the same meeting, the High Commissioner answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

1175. Also at the same meeting, the Russian Federation made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

#### **D. General debate on agenda item 10**

1176. At the 40th meeting, on 30 June 2016, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 18/18, the annual oral presentation on the overview of and successes, best practices and challenges in technical assistance and capacity-building efforts, particularly those provided by OHCHR and relevant United Nations agencies.

1177. At the same meeting, the Chair of the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Technical Cooperation in the Field of Human Rights, Lin Lim, presented the report of the Board of Trustees (A/HRC/32/51).

1178. At the same meeting, 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: China, France, India, Maldives, Maldives (also on behalf of Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, the Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and the State of Palestine), Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Paraguay, Qatar (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
- (b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Belize, Cambodia, Egypt, Japan, Marshall Islands, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Thailand, Ukraine, United States of America;
- (c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Arab Commission for Human Rights, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, International Federation of Journalists,

International Service for Human Rights, Iraqi Development Organization, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Prahar, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, United Nations Watch, World Barua Organization, World Federation of Democratic Youth.

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

### **Technical assistance and capacity-building in the field of human rights in Eritrea**

1179. As notified to the secretariat, draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.3, sponsored by Eritrea, was withdrawn by the sponsor on 1 July 2016, prior to its consideration by the Human Rights Council.

### **Cooperation with and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights**

1180. At the 45th meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representative of Ukraine introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.21, sponsored by Ukraine and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Subsequently, Israel, Liechtenstein, New Zealand and Thailand joined the sponsors.

1181. At the same meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made a general comment on the draft resolution.

1182. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

1183. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the Russian Federation, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.21. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

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

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Botswana, Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam

1184. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 22 votes to 6, with 19 abstentions (resolution 32/29).

1185. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of China, Cuba, Indonesia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

### **Capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights**

1186. At the 45th meeting, on 1 July 2016, the representative of South Africa, on behalf of States members of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.27, sponsored by South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States) and co-sponsored by Ukraine. Subsequently, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Croatia, Hungary, Italy, Maldives, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland and Turkey joined the sponsors.

1187. 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.

1188. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Côte d'Ivoire made a statement as the State concerned.

1189. 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.

1190. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 32/30).

## Annex I

### Attendance

#### Members

Albania	Germany	Portugal
Algeria	Ghana	Qatar
Bangladesh	India	Republic of Korea
Belgium	Indonesia	Russian Federation
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Kenya	Saudi Arabia
Botswana	Kyrgyzstan	Slovenia
Burundi	Latvia	South Africa
China	Maldives	Switzerland
Congo	Mexico	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Côte d'Ivoire	Mongolia	Togo
Cuba	Morocco	United Arab Emirates
Ecuador	Namibia	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
El Salvador	Netherlands	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
Ethiopia	Nigeria	Viet Nam
France	Panama	
Georgia	Paraguay	
	Philippines	

#### States Members of the United Nations represented by observers

Afghanistan	Democratic People's Republic of Korea	Lao People's Democratic Republic
Andorra	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Lebanon
Angola	Denmark	Lesotho
Antigua and Barbuda	Djibouti	Libya
Argentina	Dominican Republic	Liechtenstein
Armenia	Egypt	Lithuania
Australia	Equatorial Guinea	Luxembourg
Austria	Eritrea	Madagascar
Azerbaijan	Estonia	Malawi
Bahamas	Fiji	Malaysia
Bahrain	Finland	Mali
Belarus	Greece	Malta
Belize	Guinea Bissau	Marshall Islands
Benin	Guyana	Mauritania
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Haiti	Micronesia (Federated States of)
Brazil	Honduras	Monaco
Bulgaria	Hungary	Montenegro
Burkina Faso	Iceland	Mozambique
Cabo Verde	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Myanmar
Cambodia	Iraq	Nauru
Cameroon	Ireland	Nepal
Canada	Israel	New Zealand
Central African Republic	Italy	Nicaragua
Chad	Jamaica	Niger
Chile	Japan	Norway
Colombia	Jordan	Oman
Costa Rica	Kazakhstan	Pakistan
Croatia	Kiribati	Palau
Cyprus	Kuwait	Papua New Guinea
Czechia		Peru
		Poland

Republic of Moldova	Slovakia	Tunisia
Romania	Solomon Islands	Turkey
Rwanda	Somalia	Turkmenistan
Saint Kitts and Nevis	South Sudan	Tuvalu
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Spain	Uganda
Samoa	Sri Lanka	Ukraine
Sao Tome and Principe	Sudan	United States of America
Senegal	Suriname	Uruguay
Serbia	Sweden	Uzbekistan
Seychelles	Syrian Arab Republic	Vanuatu
Sierra Leone	Tajikistan	Yemen
Singapore	Thailand	Zimbabwe
	Tonga	

### **Non-Member States represented by observers**

Holy See  
State of Palestine

### **United Nations**

United Nations Children's Fund	United Nations Population Fund
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	United Nations Research Institute for Social Development
United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women	

### **Specialized agencies and related organizations**

International Organization for Migration

### **Intergovernmental organizations**

Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf	European Union
Council of Europe	International Development Law Organization
	Organization of Islamic Cooperation

### **Other entities**

International Committee of the Red Cross  
International Olympic Committee  
Sovereign Military Hospitaller Order of St. John of Jerusalem of Rhodes and of Malta

### **National human rights institutions, international coordinating committees and regional groups of national institutions**

Asia Pacific Forum	Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain
Australian Human Rights Commission	German Institute for Human Rights
Commission nationale des droits de l'homme de la Mauritanie	Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions
Commission nationale indépendante des droits de l'homme du Burundi	Greek National Commission for Human Rights
Commission on Human Rights of the Philippines	Human Rights Commission of Maldives
Conseil national des droits de l'homme du Maroc	Human Rights Commission of Sierra Leone
Danish Institute for Human Rights	National Human Rights Commission of Mexico
	National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia

National Human Rights Commission of Korea  
 New Zealand Human Rights Commission  
 Office of the Provedor for Human Rights and Justice of Timor-Leste

Office of Public Defender (Ombudsman) of Georgia  
 Ombudsman's Office of the Republic of Latvia  
 Scottish Human Rights Commission

### Non-governmental organizations

Action Canada for Population and Development  
 Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs  
 Action pour la protection des droits de l'homme en Mauritanie  
 Adalah: Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel  
 Africa culture internationale  
 African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters  
 African Development Association  
 African Regional Agricultural Credit Association  
 Africa Youths International Development Foundation  
 Agence internationale pour le développement  
 Agence pour les droits de l'homme  
 Al-Hakim Foundation  
 Al-Haq  
 Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement  
 Al-Khoei Foundation  
 All China Women's Federation  
 Alliance Defending Freedom  
 Allied Rainbow Communities International  
 Alsalam Foundation  
 Al Zubair Charity Foundation  
 American Association of Jurists  
 Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain  
 Amnesty International  
 Anglican Consultative Council  
 Anti-Slavery International  
 Arab Centre for the Independence of the Judiciary and the Legal Profession  
 Arab Commission for Human Rights  
 Arab NGO Network for Development  
 Arab Organization for Human Rights  
 Arab Penal Reform Organization  
 Archbishop E Kataliko Actions for Africa "KAF"  
 Ariel Foundation International  
 Article 19: International Centre against Censorship  
 Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact  
 Asian Centre for Human Rights  
 Asian-Eurasian Human Rights Forum  
 Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development

Asian Legal Resource Centre  
 Associação Brasileira de Gays, Lésbicas e Transgêneros  
 Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul  
 Association burkinabé pour la survie de l'enfance  
 Association des étudiants tamouls de France  
 Association du développement et de la promotion des droits de l'homme  
 Association Dunenyó  
 Association for the Prevention of Torture  
 Association for Progressive Communications  
 Association Ibn Sina pour le traitement des malades et sinistrés  
 Association mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit  
 Association of Women for Action and Research  
 Association "Paix" pour la lutte contre la contrainte et l'injustice  
 Association PANAFRICA  
 Association points-cœur  
 Association pour les victimes du monde  
 Association pour l'action sociale et le développement  
 Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique  
 Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII  
 Auspice Stella  
 Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights  
 Baha'i International Community  
 Beijing NGO Association for International Exchanges  
 B'nai B'rith  
 British Humanist Association  
 Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies  
 Canners International Permanent Committee  
 Caritas Internationalis  
 Center for Economic and Social Rights  
 Center for Global Nonkilling  
 Center for Inquiry  
 Center for Reproductive Rights  
 Centre catholique international de Genève  
 Centre Europe-tiers monde  
 Centre for Environmental and Management Studies  
 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 Derechos Humanos Miguel Agustín Pro Juárez  
 Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales  
 Centro Regional de Derechos Humanos y Justicia de Género  
 Chant du guépard dans le désert  
 Child Rights Connect  
 China Association for Preservation and Development of Tibetan Culture



- China Foundation for Poverty Alleviation  
China NGO Network for International Exchanges  
China Society for Human Rights Studies  
CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation  
Colombian Commission of Jurists  
Comisión Jurídica para el Autodesarrollo de los Pueblos Originarios Andinos – “Capaj”  
Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos  
Comité international pour le respect et l’application de la charte africaine des droits de l’homme et des peuples  
Comité Permanente por la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos  
Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches  
Commission to Study the Organization of Peace  
Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul  
Conscience and Peace Tax International  
Conseil de jeunesse pluriculturelle  
Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l’homme  
Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations  
December Twelfth Movement International Secretariat  
Defence for Children International  
DiploFoundation  
Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers  
East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project  
Eastern Sudan Women Development Organization  
Ecumenical Alliance for Human Rights and Development  
Ecumenical Federation of Constantinopolitans  
Edmund Rice International  
Espace Afrique International  
European Centre for Law and Justice  
European Law Students’ Association  
European Solidarity towards Equal Participation of People  
European Union of Jewish Students  
European Union of Public Relations  
Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos  
Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland  
Federation of Cuban Women  
Fondation pour l’étude des relations internationales et du développement  
Fondazione Marista per la Solidarietà Internazionale  
Foodfirst Information and Action Network  
France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand  
Franciscans International  
Freedom Now  
Friedrich Ebert Foundation  
Friends World Committee for Consultation  
Fundación Latinoamericana por los Derechos Humanos y el Desarrollo Social  
Fundalatin  
Genève pour les droits de l’homme: formation internationale  
Global Helping to Advance Women and Children  
Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights  
Global Network for Rights and Development  
Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights  
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 Now  
Human Rights Watch  
Il Cenacolo  
Indian Council of Education  
Indian Council of South America  
Indian Law Resource Centre  
Indigenous Information Network  
Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee  
Initiatives of Change International  
Institut de Drets Humans de Catalunya  
Institut de la démocratie et de la coopération  
Institute for Planetary Synthesis  
Institute for Policy Studies  
Institute on Human Rights and the Holocaust  
Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l’homme  
Integrated Youth Empowerment – Common Initiative Group  
Inter-African Committee on Traditional Practices Affecting the Health of Women and Children  
International Association against Torture  
International Association for Democracy in Africa  
International Association of Democratic Lawyers  
International Bar Association  
International Bridges to Justice  
International Career Support Association  
International Catholic Child Bureau  
International Catholic Migration Commission  
International Center for Not-for-Profit Law  
International Commission of Jurists  
International Council of Women  
International Detention Coalition  
International Educational Development  
International Federation for Human Rights Leagues  
International Federation for the Protection of the Rights of Ethnic, Religious, Linguistic and Other Minorities  
International Federation of Journalists

International Fellowship of Reconciliation  
 International Humanist and Ethical Union  
 International Human Rights Association of American Minorities  
 International Human Rights Observer, Pakistan  
 International Institute for Non-Aligned Studies  
 International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations  
 International-Lawyers.Org  
 International Lesbian and Gay Association  
 International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism  
 International Movement ATD Fourth World  
 International Movement for Fraternal Union among Races and Peoples  
 International Muslim Women's Union  
 International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination  
 International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education  
 International Peace Bureau  
 International PEN  
 International Publishers Association  
 International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims  
 International Service for Human Rights  
 International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development  
 International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations  
 Iranian Elite Research Center  
 Iraqi Development Organization  
 Islamic Human Rights Commission  
 Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco  
 Iuventum  
 Journalists and Writers Foundation  
 Jssor Youth Organization  
 Jubilee Campaign  
 Kham Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture  
 Korea Center for United Nations Human Rights Policy  
 Korean Council for the Women Drafted for Military Sexual Slavery by Japan  
 Labour, Health and Human Rights Development Centre  
 La Brique  
 Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada  
 Liberal International (World Liberal Union)  
 Liberation  
 Lutheran World Federation  
 Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development  
 Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights  
 Make Mothers Matter International  
 Maryam Ghasemi Educational Charity Institute  
 Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association  
 MINBYUN: Lawyers for a Democratic Society  
 Minnesota Citizens Concerned for Life Education Fund  
 Minority Rights Group  
 Mothers Legacy Project  
 Nonviolent Radical Party; Transnational and Transparty  
 Nord-Sud XXI  
 Norwegian Refugee Council  
 Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie  
 ONG Hope International  
 Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés  
 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  
 Peace Brigades International Switzerland  
 Penal Reform International  
 People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy  
 Plan International  
 Prahar  
 Presse emblème campagne  
 Pure in Heart America  
 Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme  
 Reporters sans frontières international  
 Réseau international des droits humains  
 Réseau unité pour le développement de Mauritanie  
 Save the Children International  
 Schweizerische Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Jugendverbände  
 Servas International  
 Shivi Development Society  
 Singapore Council of Women's Organisations  
 Sisters of Mercy of the Americas  
 Society for Development and Community Empowerment  
 Society for Threatened Peoples  
 Society Studies Centre  
 Soka Gakkai International  
 Solidarité pour un monde meilleur  
 Solidarité Suisse-Guinée  
 Sudan Council of Voluntary Agencies  
 Swedish Association for Sexuality Education  
 Swedish Federation of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights  
 Swiss Catholic Lenten Fund  
 Syriac Universal Alliance  
 Terre des hommes fédération internationale  
 Tides Center  
 TRIAL: Track Impunity Always  
 Union internationale des avocats  
 Union of Arab Jurists

---

United Nations Association in Canada  
United Nations Watch  
United Schools International  
Universal Peace Federation  
UPR Info  
Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik  
Victorious Youths Movement  
Villages unis  
VIVAT International  
Women's Federation for World Peace  
International  
Women's Human Rights International  
Association  
Women's International Democratic  
Federation  
Women's International League for  
Peace and Freedom  
World Association for the School as an  
Instrument of Peace  
World Barua Organization  
World Environment and Resources  
Council  
World Evangelical Alliance  
World Federation of Democratic Youth  
World Federation of Ukrainian  
Women's Organizations  
World Federation of United Nations  
Associations  
World Jewish Congress  
World Medical Association  
World Muslim Congress  
World Organization against Torture  
World Young Women's Christian  
Association

## **Annex II**

### **Agenda**

- Item 1. Organizational and procedural matters.
- Item 2. Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General.
- Item 3. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development.
- Item 4. Human rights situations that require the Council's attention.
- Item 5. Human rights bodies and mechanisms.
- Item 6. Universal periodic review.
- Item 7. Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories.
- Item 8. Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action.
- Item 9. Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action.
- Item 10. Technical assistance and capacity-building.

## Annex III

[English, French and Spanish only]

### Documents issued for the thirty-second session

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/32/1	1	Annotations to the agenda for the thirty-second session of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/32/2	1	Report of the Human Rights Council on its thirty-second session
A/HRC/32/3-E/CN.6/2016/8	2	Report of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women on the Activities of the United Nations Trust Fund in Support of Actions to Eliminate Violence against Women
A/HRC/32/4	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Namibia
A/HRC/32/4/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/32/5	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on the Niger
A/HRC/32/5/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/32/6	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Mozambique
A/HRC/32/6/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/32/7	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Estonia
A/HRC/32/7/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/32/8	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Belgium
A/HRC/32/8/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/32/9	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Paraguay

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/32/9/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/32/10	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Denmark
A/HRC/32/10/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/32/11	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Palau
A/HRC/32/11/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/32/12	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Somalia
A/HRC/32/12/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/32/13	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Seychelles
A/HRC/32/13/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/32/14	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on the Solomon Islands
A/HRC/32/14/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/32/15	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Latvia
A/HRC/32/15/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/32/16	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Sierra Leone
A/HRC/32/16/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/32/17	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Singapore

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/32/17/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/32/18	2	Situation of human rights of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/32/19	2, 3	Improving accountability and access to remedy for victims of business-related human rights abuse: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/32/19/Corr.1	2, 3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/32/19/Add.1	2, 3	Improving accountability and access to remedy for victims of business-related human rights abuse: explanatory notes for guidance
A/HRC/32/20	2, 3	Practical recommendations for the creation and maintenance of a safe and enabling environment for civil society, based on good practices and lessons learned: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/32/21	2, 3	Human rights and the regulation of civilian acquisition, possession and use of firearms: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/32/22	2, 3	Best practices to counter the negative impact of corruption on the enjoyment of all human rights: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/32/23	2, 3	Analytical study on the relationship between climate change and the human right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/32/24	2, 3	Outcome of the panel discussion on the adverse impact of climate change on States' efforts to progressively realize the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health and related policies, lessons learned and good practices: summary report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/32/25	2, 3	Summary of the Human Rights Council panel discussion on the progress in and challenges of addressing human rights issues in the context of efforts to end the HIV/AIDS epidemic by 2030

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/32/26	2, 5	Expert workshop to review the mandate of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/32/27	2, 6	Operations of the Voluntary Fund for Participation in the Universal Periodic Review: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/32/28	2, 6	Operations of the Voluntary Fund for Financial and Technical Assistance in the Implementation of the Universal Periodic Review: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/32/29	2, 9	Panel discussion on the incompatibility between democracy and racism: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/32/30	2, 10	Human rights situation in Burundi: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/32/31	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights
A/HRC/32/31/Add.1	3	Mission to Chile
A/HRC/32/31/Add.2	3	Mission to Romania
A/HRC/32/31/Add.3	3	Mission to Chile: comments by the State
A/HRC/32/31/Add.4	3	Mission to Romania: comments by the State
A/HRC/32/32	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health
A/HRC/32/32/Add.1	3	Visit to Paraguay
A/HRC/32/32/Add.2	3	Report of the Special Rapporteurs on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography and on contemporary forms of slavery, including its causes and consequences on their joint visit to Nigeria
A/HRC/32/32/Add.3	3	Mission to Paraguay: comments by the State
A/HRC/32/33	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health
A/HRC/32/34	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers



*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/32/34/Add.1	3	Mission to Guinea Bissau
A/HRC/32/35	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons
A/HRC/32/35/Add.1	3	Mission to Iraq
A/HRC/32/35/Add.2	3	Mission to the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/32/35/Add.3	3	Mission to the Philippines
A/HRC/32/35/Add.4	3	Mission to Honduras
A/HRC/32/35/Add.5	3	Mission to the Philippines: comments by the State
A/HRC/32/35/Add.6	3	Mission to the Syrian Arab Republic: comments by the State
A/HRC/32/35/Add.7	3	Mission to Iraq: comments by the State
A/HRC/32/36	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association
A/HRC/32/36/Add.1	3	Mission to Chile
A/HRC/32/36/Add.2	3	Mission to the Republic of Korea
A/HRC/32/36/Add.3	3	Observations on communications transmitted to Governments and replies received
A/HRC/32/36/Add.4	3	Mission to Chile: comments by the State
A/HRC/32/36/Add.5	3	Mission to the Republic of Korea: comments by the State
A/HRC/32/37	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to education
A/HRC/32/37/Add.1	3	Mission to Fiji
A/HRC/32/38	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression
A/HRC/32/39	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions on the right to life and the use of force by private security providers in law enforcement contexts
A/HRC/32/39/Add.1	3	Mission to Ukraine
A/HRC/32/39/Add.2	3	Follow-up to the mission of the Special Rapporteur to Mexico
A/HRC/32/39/Add.3	3	Observations on communications transmitted to Governments and replies received
A/HRC/32/39/Add.4	3	Revision of the United Nations Manual on the Effective Prevention and Investigation of Extra-legal, Arbitrary and Summary Executions

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/32/39/Add.5	3	Mission to Ukraine: comments by the State
A/HRC/32/39/Add.6	3	Mission to Mexico: comments by the State
A/HRC/32/40	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants on the impact of bilateral and multilateral trade agreements on the human rights of migrants
A/HRC/32/41	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children
A/HRC/32/41/Add.1	3	Mission to Jordan
A/HRC/32/42	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences
A/HRC/32/42/Corr.1	3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/32/42/Add.1	3	Mission to the Sudan
A/HRC/32/42/Add.2	3	Mission to South Africa
A/HRC/32/42/Add.3	3	Mission to Georgia
A/HRC/32/42/Add.4	3	Mission to the Sudan: comments by the State
A/HRC/32/42/Add.5	3	Mission to South Africa: comments by the State
A/HRC/32/42/Add.6	3	Mission to Georgia: comments by the State
A/HRC/32/43	3	Report of the Independent Expert on human rights and international solidarity
A/HRC/32/43/Add.1	3	Mission to Morocco
A/HRC/32/44	3	Report of the Working Group on the issue of discrimination against women in law and in practice
A/HRC/32/44/Add.1	3	Mission to Senegal
A/HRC/32/44/Add.2	3	Mission to the United States of America
A/HRC/32/44/Add.3	3	Mission to Senegal: comments by the State
A/HRC/32/45	3	Report of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises
A/HRC/32/45/Add.1	3	Mission to Brazil
A/HRC/32/45/Add.2	3	Report of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises on the Asia Forum on Business and Human Rights
A/HRC/32/45/Add.3	3	Report of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises on multi-stakeholder engagement across “Protect, Respect and Remedy” – reflections from

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		discussions at the 2015 annual United Nations Forum on Business and Human Rights
A/HRC/32/45/Add.4	3	Informe del Grupo de Trabajo sobre la cuestión de los derechos humanos y las empresas transnacionales y otras empresas sobre la “Consulta regional para América Latina y el Caribe: Políticas públicas para la implementación de los Principios Rectores de las Naciones Unidas sobre Empresas y Derechos Humanos, en el marco de la Agenda 2030 para el Desarrollo Sostenible”
A/HRC/32/46	3, 5	Summary of discussions of the Forum on Business and Human Rights
A/HRC/32/47	4	Report of the commission of inquiry on human rights in Eritrea
A/HRC/32/48	4	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Situation of human rights in Belarus
A/HRC/32/49	9	Report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance on combating glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and other practices that contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance
A/HRC/32/49/Corr.1	9	Corrigendum
A/HRC/32/49/Add.1	3	Mission to Greece: comments by the State
A/HRC/32/50	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance
A/HRC/32/50/Add.1	3	Mission to Greece
A/HRC/32/51	10	Report of the Chair of the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Technical Cooperation in the Field of Human Rights
A/HRC/32/52	10	Report of the Independent Expert on capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d’Ivoire in the field of human rights
A/HRC/32/53	3, 4, 7, 9 and 10	Communications report of special procedures

*Documents issued in the conference room papers series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/32/CRP.1	4	Detailed findings of the commission of inquiry on human rights in Eritrea

*Documents issued in the conference room papers series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/32/CRP.2	4	“They came to destroy”: ISIS Crimes against the Yazidis
A/HRC/32/CRP.4	2	Promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka

*Documents issued in the limited series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/32/L.1	3	Youth and human rights
A/HRC/32/L.2 and Rev.1	3	Protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity
A/HRC/32/L.3	10	Technical assistance and capacity-building in the field of human rights in Eritrea
A/HRC/32/L.4	3	Regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights
A/HRC/32/L.5 and Rev.1	4	Situation of human rights in Eritrea
A/HRC/32/L.6	3	Trafficking in persons, especially women and children: protecting victims of trafficking and people at risk of trafficking, especially women and children in conflict and post-conflict situations
A/HRC/32/L.7 and Rev.1	3	Elimination of discrimination against women
A/HRC/32/L.8	3	Human rights and arbitrary deprivation of nationality
A/HRC/32/L.9	4	The human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/32/L.10 and Rev.1	4	Situation of human rights in Belarus
A/HRC/32/L.11	3	Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights
A/HRC/32/L.12	3	The right to a nationality: women’s equal nationality rights in law and in practice
A/HRC/32/L.13	3	Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons
A/HRC/32/L.14	3	Impact of arms transfers on human rights
A/HRC/32/L.15	3	Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the right to food
A/HRC/32/L.16	3	Human rights and international solidarity
A/HRC/32/L.17	5	The Social Forum
A/HRC/32/L.18	5	Declaration on the Right to Peace
A/HRC/32/L.19	3	Business and human rights: improving accountability and access to remedy

*Documents issued in the limited series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/32/L.20	3	The promotion, protection and enjoyment of human rights on the Internet
A/HRC/32/L.21	10	Cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights
A/HRC/32/L.22	3	Protection of the human rights of migrants: strengthening the promotion and protection of the human rights of migrants, including in large movements
A/HRC/32/L.23 and Rev.1	3	Access to medicines in the context of the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health
A/HRC/32/L.24 and Rev.1	3	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
A/HRC/32/L.25	3	Addressing the impact of multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination and violence in the context of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance on the full enjoyment of all human rights by women and girls
A/HRC/32/L.26	3	Mental health and human rights
A/HRC/32/L.27	10	Capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights
A/HRC/32/L.28 and Rev.1	3	Accelerating efforts to eliminate violence against women: preventing and responding to violence against women and girls, including indigenous women and girls
A/HRC/32/L.29	3	Civil society space
A/HRC/32/L.30 and Rev.1	3	Realizing the equal enjoyment of the right to education by every girl
A/HRC/32/L.31 and Rev.1	3	Elimination of female genital mutilation
A/HRC/32/L.32	3	The rights of freedom of peaceful assembly and of association
A/HRC/32/L.33	3	The right to education
A/HRC/32/L.34	3	Human rights and climate change
A/HRC/32/L.35	3	Protection of the family: role of the family in supporting the protection and promotion of human rights of persons with disabilities
A/HRC/32/L.36	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.28
A/HRC/32/L.37	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.28
A/HRC/32/L.38	3	Amendment to draft resolution

*Documents issued in the limited series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		A/HRC/32/L.28
A/HRC/32/L.39	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.28
A/HRC/32/L.40	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.28
A/HRC/32/L.41	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.28
A/HRC/32/L.42	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.28
A/HRC/32/L.43	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.28
A/HRC/32/L.44	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.28
A/HRC/32/L.45	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.28
A/HRC/32/L.46	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.28
A/HRC/32/L.47	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.32
A/HRC/32/L.48	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.32
A/HRC/32/L.49	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.32
A/HRC/32/L.50	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.32
A/HRC/32/L.51	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.29
A/HRC/32/L.52	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.29
A/HRC/32/L.53	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.29
A/HRC/32/L.54	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.29
A/HRC/32/L.55	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.29
A/HRC/32/L.56	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.29
A/HRC/32/L.57	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.29
A/HRC/32/L.58	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.29
A/HRC/32/L.59	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.29
A/HRC/32/L.60	3	Amendment to draft resolution

*Documents issued in the limited series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		A/HRC/32/L.29
A/HRC/32/L.61	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.29
A/HRC/32/L.62	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.29
A/HRC/32/L.63	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.29
A/HRC/32/L.64	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.29
A/HRC/32/L.65	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.29
A/HRC/32/L.66	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.4
A/HRC/32/L.67	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.7/Rev.1
A/HRC/32/L.68	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.7/Rev.1
A/HRC/32/L.69	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.7/Rev.1
A/HRC/32/L.70	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.7/Rev.1
A/HRC/32/L.71	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1
A/HRC/32/L.72	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1
A/HRC/32/L.73	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1
A/HRC/32/L.74	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1
A/HRC/32/L.75	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1
A/HRC/32/L.76	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1
A/HRC/32/L.77	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1
A/HRC/32/L.78	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1
A/HRC/32/L.79	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1
A/HRC/32/L.80	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1
A/HRC/32/L.81	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.2/Rev.1
A/HRC/32/L.82	3	Amendment to draft resolution

*Documents issued in the limited series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		A/HRC/32/L.35
A/HRC/32/L.83	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.35
A/HRC/32/L.84	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.35
A/HRC/32/L.85	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.20
A/HRC/32/L.86	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.20
A/HRC/32/L.87	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.20
A/HRC/32/L.88	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.20
A/HRC/32/L.89	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/32/L.35

*Documents issued in the Government series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/32/G/1	4	Note verbale dated 12 May 2016 from the Permanent Mission of Armenia to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/32/G/2	4	Note verbale dated 17 May 2016 from the Permanent Mission of Armenia to the United Nations office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/32/G/3	4	Note verbale dated 17 May 2016 from the Permanent Mission of Armenia to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/32/G/4	3, 9	Note verbale dated 26 May 2016 from the Permanent Mission of Armenia to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/32/G/5	4	Note verbale dated 24 May 2016 from the Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/32/G/6	4	Letter dated 7 June 2016 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



*Documents issued in the Government series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/32/G/7	4	Letter dated 10 June 2016 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/32/G/8	4	Letter dated 13 June 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Georgia to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/32/G/9	2	Note verbale dated 18 June 2016 from the Permanent Mission of Myanmar to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/32/G/10	4	Note verbale dated 16 June 2016 from the Permanent Mission of Eritrea to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/32/G/11	4	Note verbale dated 21 June 2016 from the Permanent Mission of Burundi 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/32/G/12	4	Letter dated 24 June 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/32/G/13	4	Letter dated 24 June 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/32/G/14	4	Letter dated 24 June 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/32/G/15	4	Letter dated 24 June 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/32/G/16	4	Letter dated 24 June 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/32/G/17	4	Letter dated 24 June 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/32/G/18	4	Letter dated 24 June 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the

*Documents issued in the Government series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/32/G/19	4	Letter dated 24 June 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/32/G/20	4	Letter dated 29 June 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/32/G/21	4	Letter dated 29 June 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/32/G/22	4	Note verbale date 8 July 2016 from the Permanent Mission of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations Office at 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/32/NGO/1	9	Written statement submitted by the Sovereign Military Order of the Temple of Jerusalem (OSMTH), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/2	3	Written statement submitted by the Sovereign Military Order of the Temple of Jerusalem (OSMTH), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/3	3	Joint written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, non-governmental organizations in general consultative status, International Service for Human Rights, Amnesty International, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Baha'i International Community, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociación Civil, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Human Rights Law Centre, Human Rights Watch, International Commission of Jurists, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Article 19 – International Centre Against Censorship, non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/32/NGO/4	3	Joint written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, non-

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		governmental organizations in general consultative status, International Service for Human Rights, Amnesty International, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Baha'i International Community, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociación Civil, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Human Rights Law Centre, Human Rights Watch, International Commission of Jurists, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Article 19: International Centre Against Censorship, non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/32/NGO/5	3	Joint written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, non-governmental organizations in general consultative status, International Service for Human Rights, Amnesty International, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Baha'i International Community, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociación Civil, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Human Rights Law Centre, Human Rights Watch, International Commission of Jurists, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Article 19: International Centre Against Censorship, non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/32/NGO/6	4	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association pour l'action sociale et le développement, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/32/NGO/7	3	Written statement submitted by the World Muslim Congress, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/8	7	Exposición escrita presentada por la Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas (Cuban United Nations Association), organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/32/NGO/9	3	Written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (OIDEF), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/10	4	Written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/11	7	Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), Arab Organization for Human Rights, Organisation Mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale, Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Education Development, Inc., World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/32/NGO/12	3	Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), Arab Organization for Human Rights, Organisation Mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale, Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Education Development, Inc., World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/32/NGO/13	4	Written statement submitted by the World Muslim Congress, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/14	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 organization on the roster
A/HRC/32/NGO/15	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 organization on the roster
A/HRC/32/NGO/16	8	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'Homme-IIPJDH, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/32/NGO/17	4	Written statement submitted by the International Educational Development, Inc., a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/32/NGO/18	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/32/NGO/19	6	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/20	4	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/21	4	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/22	7	Written statement submitted by the Norwegian Refugee Council, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/23	3	Written statement submitted by the Defence for Children International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/24	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/25	4	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/26	4	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/27	4	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/28	3	Written statement submitted by Equality Now and Equal Rights Trust, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/29	4	Written statement submitted by European Centre for Law and Justice/Centre Européen pour le droit, la justice et les droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/30	3	Written statement submitted by European Centre for Law and Justice/Centre Européen pour le droit, la Justice et les droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/31	10	Exposé écrit présenté conjointement par Franciscans International, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif général, International Catholic Child Bureau, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/32/NGO/32	3	Written statement submitted by the International Catholic Child Bureau, 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/32/NGO/33	6	Exposición escrita presentada por International Catholic Child Bureau, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/32/NGO/34	3	Written statement submitted by Reporters sans frontières international, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/35	4	Written statement submitted by Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/36	4	Written statement submitted by Alsalam Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/37	4	Written statement submitted by the Iraqi Development Organization, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/38	4	Written statement submitted by Nazra for Feminist Studies, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/39	3	Written statement submitted by Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/32/NGO/40	3	Written statement submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/41	3	Written statement submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/42	9	Written statement submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/43	7	Written statement submitted by the Palestinian Return Centre, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/44	4	Written statement submitted by the Palestinian Return Centre, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/45	4	Written statement submitted by the Palestinian Return Centre, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/46	3	Written statement submitted by Liberal International (World Liberal Union), 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/32/NGO/47	4	Written statement submitted by Prahar, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/48	3	Written statement submitted by Prahar, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/49	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/50	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/51	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/52	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/53	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/54	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/55	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/56	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/57	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/58	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/59	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/60	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/61	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/62	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/32/NGO/63	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/64	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/65	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/66	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/67	3	Written statement submitted by Jssor Youth Organization, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/68	4	Written statement submitted by Jssor Youth Organization, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/69	3	Written statement submitted by the Marangopoulos Foundation for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/70	3	Joint written statement submitted by Save the Children International, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, the International Detention Coalition, Terre Des Hommes Federation Internationale, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/71	6	Written statement submitted by the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/72	2	Written statement submitted by the Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/73	3	Written statement submitted by the Society Studies Centre (MADA ssc), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/74	3	Written statement submitted by the Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europe, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/75	4	Written statement submitted by the Association des étudiants tamouls de France, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/76	4	Written statement submitted by the Association des étudiants tamouls de France, a non-governmental organization in special



*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/77	3	Joint written statement by Terre Des Hommes Federation Internationale, Defence for Children International, Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, Vienna Institute for Development and Cooperation, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/78	3	Written statement submitted by Child Rights Connect, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/79	4	Joint written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, International-Lawyers.Org, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Organisation Mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale, the Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Education Development, Inc., World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/32/NGO/80	9	Written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/81	9	Written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/82	2	Joint written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY), non-governmental organizations in general consultative status, American Association of Jurists, France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, International-Lawyers.Org., Permanent Assembly for Human Rights, World Barua Organization (WBO), non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, Inc., Liberation, Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/32/NGO/83	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/84	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, 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/32/NGO/85	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/86	4	Written statement submitted by the Association des étudiants tamouls de France, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/87	7	Joint written statement submitted by the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/88	3	Written statement submitted by the Association for Progressive Communications (APC), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/89	3	Written statement submitted by the Association for Progressive Communications (APC), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/90	4	Joint written statement submitted by Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association Solidarité Internationale pour l'Afrique (SIA), Integrated Youth Empowerment – Common Initiative Group (I.Y.E. – C.I.G.), Society for Development and Community Empowerment, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/91	4	Written statement submitted by Association des étudiants tamouls de France, non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/92	9	Written statement submitted by the December Twelfth Movement International Secretariat, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/93	7	Written statement submitted by the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/94	4	Joint written statement submitted by the Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association Bharathi Centre Culturel Franco-Tamoul, Association Burkinabé pour la Survie de l'Enfance, Association Mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit, Association Solidarité Internationale pour l'Afrique (SIA), Integrated Youth Empowerment – Common Initiative Group (I.Y.E. – C.I.G.), Society for Development and Community Empowerment, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/95	7	Written statement submitted by Amuta for NGO Responsibility, 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/32/NGO/96	3	Joint written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, non-governmental organization in general consultative status, International-Lawyers.Org., Arab Organization for Human Rights, the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Organisation mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale, the Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative, Inc., World Peace Council, non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/32/NGO/97	3	Written statement submitted by International-Lawyers.Org, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/98	3	Written statement submitted by International-Lawyers.Org, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/99	3	Written statement submitted by International-Lawyers.Org, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/100	4	Joint written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, International-Lawyers.Org., the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Organisation mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale, the Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, Inc., World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/32/NGO/101	4	Written statement submitted by the Agence pour les droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/102	4	Written statement submitted by the Agence pour les droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/103	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/104	2	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/105	3	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/106	3	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/32/NGO/107	3	Written statement submitted by the International Federation of University Women, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/108	3	Written statement submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights (JKCHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/109	4	Written statement submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights (JKCHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/110	1	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/32/NGO/111	4	Written statement submitted by Shia Rights Watch, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/112	4	Written statement submitted by Shia Rights Watch, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/113	4	Written statement submitted by the Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/114	4	Written statement submitted by the Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/115	4	Written statement submitted by the Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/116	4	Written statement submitted by the Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/117	4	Written statement submitted by the Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/118	4	Written statement submitted by the Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/32/NGO/119	4	Written statement submitted by the Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/120	4	Joint written statement submitted by International PEN, the International Press Institute, Reporters sans frontières, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/121	4	Joint written statement submitted by International PEN, the Center for Inquiry, the International Press Institute, Reporters sans frontières, European Humanist Federation, International Humanist and Ethical Union, Freemuse, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, the International Publishers Association, non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/32/NGO/122	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/123	3	Exposición escrita presentada por la Comité Permanente por la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/32/NGO/124	3	Exposición escrita presentada por la Comité Permanente por la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/32/NGO/125	3	Written statement submitted by Liberation, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/32/NGO/126	4	Written statement submitted by Liberation, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/32/NGO/127	8	Written statement submitted by the Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, a non-governmental organization on in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/128	2	Written statement submitted by the Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, a non-governmental organization on in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/129	9	Written statement submitted by the Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, a non-governmental organization on in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/130	6	Written statement submitted by the Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, a non-governmental organization on in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/131	3	Written statement submitted by the Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, a non-

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		governmental organization on in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/132	4	Written statement submitted by the Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, a non-governmental organization on in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/133	3	Written statement submitted by the Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/134	3	Written statement submitted by the World Barua Organization, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/135	3	Written statement submitted by the World Barua Organization, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/136	3	Written statement submitted by the World Barua Organization, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/137	3, 8	Written statement submitted by the World Young Women's Christian Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/138	3	Exposición escrita presentada por la Federación de Mujeres Cubanas (Federation of Cuban Women), organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/32/NGO/139	2	Written statement submitted by the Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés (OIPMA), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/140	7	Joint written statement submitted by the BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, Al-Haq, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/141	4	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights League of the Horn of Africa, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/142	3	Written statement submitted by Auspice Stella, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/143	3	Exposición escrita presentada por la Permanent Assembly for Human Rights (APDH), organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/32/NGO/144	2, 3	Exposición escrita presentada por la Women's International Democratic Federation, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/32/NGO/145	3	Written statement submitted by the International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/146	2	Written statement submitted by the International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/147	2	Written statement submitted by the International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/148	2	Written statement submitted by the International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/149	4	Written statement submitted by the Sudanese Women General Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/150	4	Written statement submitted by the Association Solidarité Internationale pour l'Afrique (SIA), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/151	4	Written statement submitted by the Association Solidarité Internationale pour l'Afrique (SIA), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/152	3	Exposición escrita presentada por la Comité Permanente por la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/32/NGO/153	3	Written statement submitted by Privacy International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/154	3	Written statement submitted by the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/155	3	Joint written statement submitted by Soroptimist International, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, OIDEL, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, Association Points-Coeur, Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme, Graduate Women International (International Federation of University Women), Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco (IIMA), International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES, Pax Romana (International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs and

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		International Movement of Catholic Students), Soroptimist International and Teresian Association, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/32/NGO/156	3	Exposé écrit présenté par Dreprevie, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif special

*Documents issued in the national institutions series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/32/NI/1	3	Guatemala: Office of the Human Rights Advocate
A/HRC/32/NI/2	3	Written submission by the Azerbaijan Human Rights Commissioner (Ombudsman)
A/HRC/32/NI/3	3	Written submission by the Great Britain Equality and Human Rights Commission
A/HRC/32/NI/4	5	Written submission by the Azerbaijan: Human Rights Commissioner (Ombudsman)
A/HRC/32/NI/5	6	Written submission by the Human Rights Commission of Malaysia (SUHAKAM)
A/HRC/32/NI/6	6	Written submission by the Ombudsman of the Republic of Latvia
A/HRC/32/NI/7	3	Guatemala: Office of the Human Rights Advocate
A/HRC/32/NI/8	3	Written submission by the Working Group on Business and Human Rights of the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions
A/HRC/32/NI/9	3	Written submission by the Republic of Korea National Human Rights Commission
A/HRC/32/NI/10	3	Written submission by the South Africa Human Rights Commission



## **Annex IV**

### **Special procedure mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-second session**

#### **Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions**

Agnes Callamard (France)

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

Ahmed Shaheed (Maldives)

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

Koumbou Boly (Burkina Faso)

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

Tomás Ojea Quintana (Argentina)

#### **Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises (member from Western European and other States)**

Anita Ramasastry (United States of America)

---