



General Assembly

Distr.: General
15 May 2025

Original: English

Human Rights Council Fifty-eighth session

Summary record of the 57th meeting

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Thursday, 3 April 2025, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Lauber (Switzerland)

Contents

Agenda item 3: Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development (*continued*)

Agenda item 4: Human rights situations that require the Council's attention

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of the present record to the Documents Management Section (DMS-DCM@un.org).

Any corrected records of the public meetings of the Council at this session will be reissued for technical reasons after the end of the session.



The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

Agenda item 3: Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development (*continued*)
([A/HRC/58/L.15](#) and [A/HRC/58/L.26/Rev.1](#))

Draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.15](#): Women, diplomacy and human rights

1. **Mr. Zniber** (Morocco), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the main sponsors, namely Chile, Maldives, Mauritius, Mexico, Slovenia, Spain and his own delegation, said that the achievement of gender equality and women's empowerment had been put at risk by increasingly complex global challenges. Achieving sustainable development, peace and the realization of human rights required the equal and inclusive participation of all women at all levels of society, alongside the elimination of all forms of violence and discrimination against women. Despite international commitments in that regard, women remained underrepresented in diplomacy and multilateral spaces, and only 20 per cent of ambassadors worldwide were women. The draft resolution marked a historic step forward in placing the systemic underrepresentation of women in diplomacy and multilateralism at the centre of the Council's agenda. It underscored not only the need for the full, equal, meaningful and safe participation of women, but also the structural transformation required to achieve gender parity and equality in global decision-making spaces. On 24 June 2024, the first celebration of the International Day of Women in Diplomacy had been held in Geneva. The draft resolution sought to institutionalize that celebration by holding discussions on the elimination of discrimination and structural barriers that hindered women's participation and representation in decision-making. In the context of the liquidity crisis facing the United Nations, the draft resolution would also help the Council to rationalize its resources by consulting with existing initiatives in order to avoid the duplication of work. He called on the States members of the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

2. **The President** announced that 46 States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which had no programme budget implications.

General statements made before the decision

3. **Ms. Fuentes Julio** (Chile) said that the draft resolution shone a light on the underrepresentation of women in international spaces, where decisions affecting the entire world were made. That underrepresentation was not a neutral phenomenon; it was a reflection of political, economic and social structures that must be transformed. The draft resolution not only made the gender gap visible, but also positioned it as a human rights issue. Promoting women's participation in diplomacy was key to redefining global governance, peacebuilding, conflict prevention and international justice. It was not only a question of justice but also of efficiency and legitimacy. Moreover, as recalled in the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and general recommendation No. 40 (2024) on the equal and inclusive representation of women in decision-making systems of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, achieving parity was an ethical and legal obligation incumbent on States. She invited the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

4. **Ms. Mandel Barros** (Brazil) said that her country reaffirmed its strong commitment to advancing gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in all their diversity, both nationally and internationally. Her delegation was especially pleased with the recognition in the draft resolution of initiatives that encouraged women's leadership in diplomacy, including support for associations of women diplomats. Such provisions were vital to promote institutional change and the advancement of foreign services, contributing to more diverse, inclusive, democratic, effective and sustainable multilateralism. She encouraged the States members of the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

5. **Ms. Thuaudet** (France) said that women and girls were always the first victims of humanitarian crises, conflicts, climate change, poverty, discrimination, sexual and gender-based violence and human rights violations. Thirty years after the adoption of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, significant progress had been made, but there was still a long way to go to honour the commitments made at the fourth United Nations World Conference on Women. At the current rate, according to the United Nations Entity for Gender

Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women), it would take another 300 years for the international community to achieve gender equality. Moreover, the progress made was fragile, as patriarchy and conservatism had begun to rear their heads across the world once again. The persistent and structural underrepresentation of women in decision-making systems undermined the legitimacy, quality and acceptability of those systems, and no country could promote sustainable development without the participation of half its population. Respect for the rights of women and girls and the fight against all forms of discrimination against them should always be the subject of consensus; her delegation therefore called on all States members of the Council to support the draft resolution.

6. **Mr. Gómez Martínez** (Spain), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Union that were members of the Council, said that ensuring women's participation in diplomacy and leadership was a matter of justice and effective governance. The European Union remained committed to accelerating progress towards the full, equal, meaningful, and safe participation of all women and young people in decision-making and leadership by removing structural obstacles. There was a need to advance towards parity democracy by fostering women's equal representation and agency in all spheres of society and levels of political office, including international bodies in the multilateral system. The draft resolution contributed to that goal by reaffirming the relevance of the international framework on gender equality, linking the commitments made under the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the women and peace and security agenda. The European Union welcomed the recognition in the draft resolution of the relevance of general recommendation No. 40 of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women and the decision to commemorate the International Day of Women in Diplomacy within the Council. Discussions on the elimination of discrimination and structural barriers that hindered women's participation and representation in decision-making would strengthen the Council's contribution in that regard. The delegations of the States members of the European Union that were members of the Council would join the consensus on the draft resolution.

7. **Ms. Amoako-Atta** (Ghana) said that her delegation welcomed the call in the draft resolution for States to undertake national and international initiatives that promoted women's leadership in diplomacy. The International Day of Women in Diplomacy must go beyond symbolic recognition and serve as a visible platform for addressing systemic barriers to women's representation. Her delegation remained committed to fostering a safe environment that empowered women and looked forward to continued collaboration in that regard. She called on the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

8. **Mr. Benítez Verson** (Cuba) said that his delegation's first thought went to the Palestinian women and girls who were suffering in a merciless and brutal genocide. No one in the world should be indifferent to such barbarism. Cuba had been and would continue to be an active defender of gender equality and the empowerment of women. In an increasingly unequal world, it was imperative to promote greater participation of women in all spheres, including diplomacy, and ensure the effective participation of women in the design and implementation of foreign policy. Cuban women were the architects and protagonists of Cuban revolutionary diplomacy, and made up 45 per cent of all its ambassadors. Despite recent advances, difficulties and challenges remained, especially the extreme tightening of the economic blockade imposed on his country by the United States of America, which had a significant impact on Cuban women and girls. The role of women in peace efforts and the peaceful resolution of conflicts was essential. For those reasons, his delegation supported the draft resolution, without prejudice to the position of Cuba on Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) on women and peace and security.

9. **Mr. Guillermet Fernández** (Costa Rica) said that his country was committed to achieving gender equality in multilateral spaces, as reflected by the fact that 48 per cent of its ambassadors were women. His delegation supported the mention in the draft resolution of Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) on women and peace and security, which stressed the fact that women's leadership was essential to achieve lasting peace. Evidence showed that negotiation and decision-making processes were more effective and sustainable when women were actively involved in them. The draft resolution highlighted the need for the Council to continue discussing the importance of removing the structural barriers that limited

women's representation and participation in decision-making. For decades, women had played a crucial role in building peace, promoting human rights and formulating policies that had transformed societies around the world without due recognition. His delegation therefore fully supported the draft resolution and encouraged all States members of the Council to adopt it by consensus to promote more equitable and representative diplomacy. The next Secretary-General should be a Latin American woman.

10. **Mr. Sterk** (Bulgaria) said that his delegation strongly believed that effective policies to promote gender equality and empower women were essential to foster sustainable progress and build a more just and prosperous future for all. Breaking down gender stereotypes and encouraging more women to pursue leadership remained at the heart of his country's values, as exemplified by its commitment to gender equality within its diplomatic service. Significant progress had been made in advancing the status of women since the adoption of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action. Women's voices were increasingly acknowledged and there was widespread recognition that the human rights of women and girls were indivisible from universal human rights. However, challenges persisted, particularly in securing women's equal participation in decision-making and leadership. His delegation therefore welcomed the draft resolution's focus on gender parity and reaffirming the relevance of the international framework on gender equality. The observance of the International Day of Women in Diplomacy within the Council would present an opportunity to foster discussions on eliminating discrimination and structural barriers that hindered women's participation. Such efforts would further enhance the Council's role in advancing gender equality and reinforce its commitment to that vital agenda. For those reasons, his delegation would join the consensus on the draft resolution and hoped other members of the Council would do the same.

11. **Mr. Oike** (Japan) said that structural barriers that hindered women's participation in decision-making must be removed. As the international peace and security situation deteriorated owing to new and prolonged conflicts and other crises, women and girls were being pushed into increasingly vulnerable situations. The world was witnessing a global rollback of women's and girls' rights. Women's increased participation in diplomacy was therefore strongly needed. His delegation supported the draft resolution and hoped that the younger generation would be inspired by activities stemming from it.

12. **Ms. Mañon Mora** (Dominican Republic) said that recognition of the role of women in diplomacy had gained ground in the international sphere. In the Dominican Republic, women such as Minerva Bernardino Evangelista, who had played a crucial role in the drafting of the Charter of the United Nations and had also signed it, had paved the way for future generations of women diplomats who were currently actively contributing to building a more just, peaceful and sustainable world. However, challenges remained. According to UN-Women, between 1992 and 2019, women had accounted for only 13 per cent of negotiators and 6 per cent of mediators in peace processes. The Dominican Republic reaffirmed its strong commitment to a foreign policy that promoted gender equality, women's empowerment and the eradication of violence against them and would support any initiative aimed at strengthening women's leadership in the international arena. The draft resolution should be adopted by consensus.

13. **Ms. Macdonal Alvarez** (Plurinational State of Bolivia) said that systemic barriers continued to impede the participation of women in decision-making spaces, particularly in diplomacy, politics, finance and trade. It was necessary to continue efforts to promote women's and girls' leadership to close gaps and build more just, peaceful societies with a greater impetus for development. The Bolivian Government was committed to continuing to promote women's full, meaningful and confident equal participation and leadership in advancing multiple international agendas. All women had to overcome barriers to participation, but some also faced multiple challenges that had to be addressed according to an intersectional approach. Her Government advocated for equitable representation in leadership positions and multilateral decision-making with the participation of Indigenous, Afrodescendent and campesino women and women from linguistic minorities in rural and remote areas. Her delegation was pleased to support such an important draft resolution and hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

14. **Ms. Too** (Kenya) said that her delegation welcomed the emphasis in the draft resolution on the full, equal and meaningful participation of women in international agendas, including the women and peace and security agenda. Only 12 per cent of ambassadors in sub-Saharan Africa were women, and women of African descent had even lower rates of representation in other parts of the world. General recommendation No. 34 (2016) on the rights of rural women of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women explicitly called on States to address intersecting discrimination against women of African descent. In that regard, her delegation hoped that, in the future, the discussions held to commemorate the International Day of Women in Diplomacy would consider issues such as the multiple and aggravated forms of discrimination faced specifically by women of African descent. While the draft resolution focused broadly on gender disparities, there was value in addressing how race, colonialism and class compounded barriers affecting Afrodescendent women. Men and boys also had a role to play as allies and partners in challenging gender stereotypes, promoting shared responsibilities and creating an inclusive environment. Her delegation looked forward to the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus.

15. **Mr. Alhayen** (Kuwait) said that the draft resolution highlighted the need to address the situation of women and to support their empowerment and active participation in all international forums, which was a priority for his country. His delegation endorsed the draft resolution and its goal of promoting the participation of women in diplomacy in order to achieve peace, security, progress and prosperity throughout the world. He called on the States members of the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

16. **Ms. Chen Jiawen** (China) said that, over the past 30 years, thanks to common efforts on all sides, the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action had been promoted and implemented, generating positive change in the world. Her delegation welcomed the draft resolution, which reaffirmed the international commitment to enhancing women's representation in multilateral diplomacy. In late 2025, China would hold another summit on women's issues in Beijing, at which States would be invited to renew their commitment to the spirit of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action.

17. *Draft resolution A/HRC/58/L.15 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/HRC/58/L.26/Rev.1: The human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment: the ocean and human rights

18. **Ms. Rasheed** (Maldives), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the main sponsors, namely Costa Rica, Morocco, Slovenia and her own delegation, said that the focus of the draft resolution was on the ocean, in recognition of its vital importance to the enjoyment of human rights. By sustaining life and livelihoods and regulating the climate, the ocean played a central role in the realization of the right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment. However, growing threats such as climate change, ocean acidification and marine biodiversity loss posed serious risks to ecosystems and undermined the well-being of current and future generations. The main objective of the draft resolution was to highlight the deep and multifaceted connection between the ocean and the enjoyment of human rights. Through the draft resolution, the Council would also acknowledge the crucial contributions of civil society and Indigenous knowledge in advancing ocean protection and the unique vulnerabilities faced by coastal communities, small island developing States and marginalized populations.

19. **Ms. Pipan** (Observer for Slovenia), continuing the introduction of the draft resolution, said that the draft resolution was based on Human Rights Council resolution 52/23, adopted by consensus at the Council's fifty-second session, and drew inspiration from the latest report of the Special Rapporteur on the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment, which specifically focused on the interlinkages between the ocean and human rights. The main sponsors deeply appreciated the constructive engagement of all delegations throughout the negotiations on the text and invited all States members of the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

20. **The President** announced that 22 States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which had no programme budget implications.

General statements made before the decision

21. **Mr. Da Silva Nunes** (Brazil) said that his delegation reiterated its commitment to the right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment, which was essential to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. In the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, States had made a commitment to protect the health and biodiversity of marine ecosystems, enabling their conservation and sustainable use for present and future generations. In order to achieve that purpose, States must comply with the obligations and principles contained in international environmental agreements, including the 1992 Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, in particular the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. His delegation was concerned about attempts to change language agreed upon by the General Assembly. Likewise, the Council should not pronounce itself on elements still under negotiation in the run-up to the third United Nations Ocean Conference. For that reason, while his delegation endorsed initiatives that promoted the right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment, it regretfully wished to dissociate itself from the sixth preambular paragraph, which introduced a non-consensual definition of oceans diverging from the approach adopted in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and relevant General Assembly resolutions; the seventh preambular paragraph, which modified agreed language from General Assembly resolution 79/144 and did not take due account of the economic and social aspects of oceans; the twelfth preambular paragraph, which prejudged ongoing negotiations within the intergovernmental negotiating committee to develop an international legally binding instrument on plastic pollution, including in the marine environment, by referencing the full life cycle of plastics; the thirteenth preambular paragraph, which modified agreed language from Sustainable Development Goal 14 related to the conservation and sustainable use of oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development; and the fourteenth preambular paragraph, which, in addition to modifying language agreed upon by the General Assembly, presented an incomplete approach to the advisory opinion of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea in respect of the request for an advisory opinion submitted by the Commission of Small Island States on Climate Change and International Law by failing to mention the finding that States' responsibilities varied according to their capabilities and the obligation to assist developing countries.

22. **Ms. Fuentes Julio** (Chile) said that her delegation welcomed the inclusion of key references to fundamental instruments for ocean governance and access to information, such as the Agreement on Marine Biological Diversity of Areas beyond National Jurisdiction and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, which had significantly strengthened the text. It also welcomed the inclusion of key elements highlighted in the report of the Special Rapporteur on the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment, which urged States to cooperate to advance the protection and conservation of the ocean and coastal areas through the implementation of international law and the incorporation of international human rights law obligations and standards for ocean management. The draft resolution represented a contribution towards the consolidation of an international normative framework that promoted the protection of the ocean and provided human rights guarantees in that regard. Its adoption would contribute to forging a more sustainable and equitable future for all. For those reasons, her delegation called on the States members of the Council to support the draft resolution and allow its adoption by consensus.

23. **Mr. Islam** (Bangladesh) said that his delegation had engaged constructively in the informal consultations on the draft resolution and was disappointed that its textual suggestions on the marine ecosystem and the human rights consequences of overfishing were not reflected in the revised text. While the guiding role of the Paris Agreement in global action on the climate, based on the principles of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, was recognized implicitly in the text, it was important for Bangladesh, as one of the most climate-vulnerable countries in the world, that those principles should be referred to explicitly in the next iteration of the resolution. His delegation welcomed the reference in the draft resolution to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, which contributed greatly to the sustainable use of marine resources, the protection of biodiversity and the containment of all types of marine pollution, including plastic pollution.

24. **Mr. Guillermet Fernández** (Costa Rica) said that a substantial proportion of his country's population depended for its daily food on its marine territory, which was ten times larger than its land area; one third of that territory had been designated as protected zones. The Constitutional Congress had also ratified the Agreement on Marine Biological Diversity of Areas beyond National Jurisdiction. A healthy ocean was essential to food, leisure and transport, represented a crucial part of the traditional knowledge of many Indigenous peoples and was still the world's greatest ally in combating climate change. The international community must stop thinking and acting in silos and acknowledge that the full enjoyment of human rights required a healthy environment. The draft resolution recognized that the adoption of a human rights-based approach was the best way to ensure the effectiveness of measures for the conservation and sustainable use of the ocean. His delegation urged the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

25. **Mr. Alhayen** (Kuwait), speaking on behalf of the States members of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf, said that his delegation welcomed the inclusion in the draft resolution of their substantive proposals, including a reference to the fundamental principles of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, essential to addressing the adverse effects of climate change. However, the States members of the Cooperation Council still had concerns regarding the content of the twenty-sixth, thirtieth and thirty-seventh preambular paragraphs, which they would interpret in accordance with their obligations under the international agreements to which they were parties and their national legislation. They reaffirmed their strong support for all efforts to strengthen international cooperation to protect the environment and combat the negative effects of climate change.

26. **Ms. Cordero Suárez** (Cuba) said that the right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment was enshrined in the Cuban Constitution. Her delegation welcomed the action-oriented stance of the draft resolution, which called for States to take practical measures, but would have liked to see explicit mention of the principles of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities, to avoid any possible misinterpretation that could undermine the fundamental relevance of the text. The industrialized States had achieved economic advantage by exploiting the planet's natural resources and emitting greenhouse gases; they must now assume their historic responsibility by providing financing for climate action and the operationalization of the Fund for Responding to Loss and Damage. Her delegation would have welcomed a more direct mention in the draft resolution of the importance of international cooperation in technology transfer and capacity-building. It supported the continued efforts of the Special Rapporteur on the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment, which would contribute to ensuring a healthier planet for future generations, guided by the principles of cooperation and the protection of collective interests rather than national interests and greed.

27. **Mr. Gallón** (Colombia) said that Colombia recognized the right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment as vital to the protection and effective enjoyment of all human rights. It acknowledged the specific vulnerabilities of the small island developing States and the least developed countries, subgroups within the broader category of the developing countries, as correctly expressed in the twenty-seventh and thirty-first preambular paragraphs of the draft, which faithfully reflected the agreed language. It was prepared to accept the wording of the twenty-first preambular paragraph on the understanding that the language on coastal States and small island developing States reflected only what was expressed in the outcome document of the Fourth International Conference on Small Island Developing States, which recognized them as having particular vulnerabilities, without specifically stating that they were a subcategory of developing countries that also had vulnerabilities. As Colombia had not taken part in the Conference, those references should be interpreted restrictively and could not constitute a precedent for any future negotiations.

28. Colombia dissociated itself from the reference in the nineteenth preambular paragraph to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and its portrayal as the only legal framework for the conservation and sustainable use of the ocean and its resources, which was not the case, as it ignored the importance of other instruments that were fundamental to the ocean protection regime and the fact that the protection and conservation obligations laid out in the Convention were insufficient to avoid serious damage to the marine environment and

must necessarily be complemented. His delegation's participation in the discussions on the draft resolution and its decision not to block consensus should not be interpreted as any tacit acceptance of the provisions of the Convention, which had not become customary law and were part of an instrument to which Colombia was not a party.

29. **Mr. Gunnarsson** (Iceland) said that Iceland was steadfast in its support for collective and concrete actions in response to the increasingly evident negative effects of environmental and climate change on the enjoyment of human rights worldwide. It welcomed the focus of the draft resolution on the ocean and human rights, a subject fundamental to human well-being that deserved increased attention. His delegation appreciated the main sponsors' response to the comments made to the initial draft of the resolution, in particular concerning the centrality of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea to the Council's work on the ocean, and read the relevant provisions of the draft resolution, including those concerning the obligations and rights of States in respect of the ocean, in the context of that Convention. Oceans could be protected for sustainable development only through balanced conservation and sustainable use, as outlined in Sustainable Development Goal 14; he encouraged all Council members to approach the draft resolution in that light and to adopt it by consensus.

30. **Mr. Kah** (Gambia) said that the identity, economy and way of life of the population of the Gambia, a coastal State, were deeply tied to the ocean: the marine environment was not just a resource but a lifeline that sustained livelihoods, including fisheries, regulated the climate and provided food security. His delegation therefore welcomed the reaffirmation in the draft resolution of the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment and the recognition of the vital role played by oceans in the realization of that right. The draft resolution also rightly underscored the disproportionate impact of marine pollution and climate change on vulnerable populations, including those in small coastal States such as his own. He particularly welcomed the call for ecosystem-based approaches, inclusive participation and stronger protection for environmental human rights defenders. In the spirit of multilateralism and shared responsibility, the Gambia urged the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

31. **Ms. González Nicasio** (Dominican Republic) said that, for the Dominican Republic, a coastal island State that was very vulnerable to climate change, the link between the health of the oceans and the dignity of its communities was not an abstract idea, but an urgent reality. As the first Caribbean country to protect one third of its marine areas, the Dominican Republic had the largest number of protected marine areas in the Antilles and had led negotiations regarding single-use plastics and their impact on oceans. Her delegation welcomed the acknowledgement in the draft resolution of the role of the oceans in food security, the fight against climate change and the need to ensure sustainable livelihoods, particularly for women, young people, fisherfolk and coastal communities. Through a human rights-based approach, environmental policies could benefit the most vulnerable. Recognition of the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment, a stronger legal framework and public participation were essential in promoting equitable, resilient and people-centred ocean governance. For small island States, the draft resolution was a vital tool in demanding fair climate action, appropriate funding, acknowledgement of their daily reality and access to the necessary financial and technical cooperation to address the challenges of climate change. Her delegation urged all Council members to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

32. **Ms. Too** (Kenya) said that, as the host country of the United Nations Environment Programme, Kenya continued to play a central role in advancing global environmental sustainability and governance and shaping the global environmental agenda. It had hosted the 2018 inaugural Sustainable Blue Economy Conference, which had considered how to harness the potential of the oceans, seas, lakes and rivers to improve the lives of all, while conserving aquatic ecosystems for future generations, and, together with Portugal, the second United Nations Ocean Conference in 2022.

33. Her delegation appreciated the inclusion in the draft resolution of some of its proposals, particularly concerning the Early Warning for All initiative championed by President William Rutter and spearheaded by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, which aimed to protect vulnerable populations, notably the coastal communities that were

disproportionately affected by environmental degradation and climate change, from climate-induced risk through robust early warning systems. It noted, however, the omission of some key proposals, concerning transboundary marine issues, including illegal and unreported and unregulated fishing and maritime security threats which undermined regional stability, and of any explicit reference to common but differentiated responsibility and respective capabilities; it looked forward to engaging on those issues in the future. The delegation of Kenya would support the draft resolution.

34. **Mr. Payot** (Belgium) said that a healthy and sustainably managed ocean was key to upholding the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment and would contribute to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals, including through sustainable food systems, the protection of ecosystems and the fight against climate change. The draft resolution underlined the crucial role of multilateralism in advancing ocean protection and human rights. 2025 represented the midpoint in the decade of action towards the Sustainable Development Goals and a critical year for ocean protection and diplomacy, with key milestones, such as the third United Nations Ocean Conference in June, anticipated progress toward the entry into force of the Agreement under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine Biological Diversity of Areas beyond National Jurisdiction and the expected adoption of a global treaty on plastics, based on a comprehensive approach addressing the full life cycle of plastics. Belgium remained firmly committed to those efforts and would join the consensus on the draft resolution.

35. **Ms. Li Xiaomei** (China) said that China supported the concerns of small island developing States in respect of climate change and the marine environment, issues to which the international community should pay greater attention. The conferences of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Paris Agreement were the most authoritative platforms for addressing the problem. The principles of common but differentiated responsibilities, equity and respective capabilities were the bedrock of global climate governance. Welcoming the inclusion of those key elements in the text, her delegation called on all parties to promote international cooperation on that basis and address climate change and environmental issues in a fair and equitable manner. China had reservations about the operational paragraphs containing language relating to environmental human rights defenders and other non-consensual language but would, nonetheless, join the consensus on the draft resolution. It attached great importance to combating climate change and protecting the environment and was committed to achieving carbon peaking and carbon neutrality in record time, while accomplishing a drastic reduction in carbon intensity globally. It would continue to participate actively in global environmental governance and strengthen international cooperation in the field of climate action and marine pollution control.

36. **Mr. Oike** (Japan), speaking in explanation of position before the decision, said that, while recognizing the importance of working together to address the impact of environmental changes on human rights, Japan wished to emphasize that the issues addressed in the draft resolution regarding the legal basis, content and scope of the right to a healthy environment had not been settled internationally; it could therefore not be considered as an established right under international law. Discussions related to the ocean, assessment of the impact of plastic pollution and any related regulations should therefore be conducted primarily within forums other than the Council. Furthermore, the scientific basis and accuracy of the information contained in the reports of the Special Rapporteur on the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment should be carefully examined. His delegation also disagreed with the inclusion in the draft resolution of references to articles of the Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Paris Agreement relating to principles that did not inherently concern human rights, as they could not be applied to any aspect of State responsibilities related to human rights. The text mentioned principles that could lead to differences between developing and developed countries in the area of climate change. The inclusion of wording that could imply such controversial principles, and the fact that it had been done at the very end of the negotiations, was problematic and could, potentially, raise a procedural concern. Japan would, nevertheless, in the light of its commitment to continuing to address environmental issues, join the consensus on the draft resolution.

37. *Draft resolution A/HRC/58/L.26/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Agenda item 4: Human rights situations that require the Council's attention

(A/HRC/58/L.2, A/HRC/58/L.3, A/HRC/58/L.10, A/HRC/58/L.11/Rev.1 as orally revised, A/HRC/58/L.20/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/HRC/58/L.2: Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

38. **Mr. Broilo** (Observer for Poland), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the main sponsors, namely Australia and the States members of the European Union, said that they were steadfast in their commitment to keep the human rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea high on the Council's agenda. He commended the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for her unwavering efforts to investigate and report on the situation in the country, despite the complete absence of cooperation from the authorities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The work of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) was fundamental to ensuring that all victims of the repressive policies of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would obtain justice for the pain and suffering inflicted on them. The European Union remained deeply concerned about the persistence of systematic, widespread and gross human rights violations, some of which might amount to crimes against humanity. Freedom of expression and other fundamental rights remained severely restricted, and harsh new laws were enforced through heavy punishments and public trials. His delegation strongly condemned the forcible return of escapees to the country, who were then subjected to torture and to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment and punishment, as well as other grave human rights violations. It was vital that the international community should not lose sight of the ongoing human crisis in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. In adopting the draft resolution, the Council would renew the mandate of the Special Rapporteur and the capacity of OHCHR, including its field-based structure in Seoul. He urged the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

39. **The President** said that 11 States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which had programme budget implications amounting to \$1,448,700.

General statements made before the decision

40. **Mr. Gunnarsson** (Iceland) said that, 11 years after the commission of inquiry on human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had published its landmark report (A/HRC/25/63), it was crucial that the draft resolution should continue to shed light on the systematic widespread and grave human rights violations that persisted in the country, some of which might amount to crimes against humanity. Iceland shared the concerns regarding the widespread impunity and absence of criminal accountability for such human rights violations. No robust or effective accountability process could take place without the efforts of OHCHR and its field-based structure in Seoul to independently gather centralized and preserved information. In a context where the Democratic People's Republic of Korea remained almost entirely shut off from the rest of the world, including humanitarian aid, the Council could not afford to ignore the dire human rights situation in that country. His delegation therefore called on the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

41. **Mr. Bilali** (North Macedonia) said that his delegation welcomed the draft resolution and was especially concerned about the use of forced labour to support the militarization of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, to the detriment of basic individual human rights and fundamental freedoms, and about the violations of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of children, particularly those in a vulnerable situation. It called on the authorities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to initiate comprehensive institutional, legal and policy reforms to improve the human rights situation and immediately take all necessary steps to put an end to such crimes, abuses and violations, to investigate them and to bring those responsible to justice. It urged the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

42. **The President** invited the State concerned by the draft resolution to make a statement.

43. **Mr. Jo Chol Su** (Observer for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his delegation condemned and categorically rejected the draft resolution, which was a politicized document that had no relevance to the genuine promotion and protection of human rights. The social system in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea enjoyed the absolute support and trust of the entire population, investing all its efforts in safeguarding their true dignity, rights and interests and promoting their peaceful life and welfare. The report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea ([A/HRC/58/11](#)) included many positive assessments by other States of the country's policies and human right situation and noted its willingness to engage in constructive cooperation with the international community, representing an impartial and objective testimony of its human rights system, based on the "people-first" principle.

44. However, the Western forces, accustomed as they were to viciously disparaging the actual human rights situation of sovereign States for political purposes, had once again produced the so-called "human rights resolution" against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, based on groundless and fabricated materials, once again proving their intention to isolate and stifle the country's system through defamation and demonization. Adoption of the draft resolution would only incite confrontation; it was a malicious practice that ran counter to any genuine efforts to promote and protect human rights. The international community should be aware that insidious forces were abusing the United Nations as a platform for interfering in the internal affairs of sovereign States and exerting political pressure. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea would continue to thoroughly safeguard its social system and join the international community in its endeavours to promote and protect human rights. His delegation would view the adoption of the draft resolution as an act of serious political provocation insulting the dignity of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and as a mockery of the Charter of the United Nations and its principles of respect for sovereignty and non-interference in internal affairs, as well as of the universal definition of human rights. It urged the Council to reject the draft resolution.

Statements made in explanation of position before the decision

45. **Ms. Li Xiaomei** (China) said that her Government had always advocated constructive dialogue and cooperation on human rights issues and opposed any politicization, double standards, selectivity or confrontational approaches. All parties should fully respect the sovereignty and independence of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and should objectively assess the country's achievements in the promotion and protection of human rights. The draft resolution under consideration was neither fair nor objective. It failed to take account of the real situation on the ground and sought to extend the mandate of country-specific mechanisms without the consent of the country concerned. Politicizing human rights issues in that way did not help to further dialogue and cooperation. Her delegation would therefore not join the consensus on the draft resolution.

46. **Mr. Benítez Verson** (Cuba) said that his Government opposed selective and politicized mandates such as the one referred to in the draft resolution. Resolutions imposed against the will of the country concerned were ineffective and a waste of resources, and did not contribute to the promotion of human rights. Rather than promoting the implementation of the 132 recommendations accepted by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea under the universal periodic review process, the draft resolution continued to prioritize confrontation, hostility and antagonism; it defied logic to think that the same action as taken in the past would achieve different results. His delegation called on the Council to reject the unilateral coercive measures – of which no mention was made in the draft resolution – against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea because they violated its people's human rights. It noted, however, the references to issues unrelated to human rights, which were outside the scope of the Council's mandate. His delegation therefore dissociated itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

47. *Draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.2](#) was adopted.*

Draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.3](#): Promotion and protection of human rights in Nicaragua

48. **Mr. Guillermet Fernández** (Costa Rica), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the main sponsors, namely Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador,

Paraguay, Peru and his own delegation, said that the extremely serious human rights situation in Nicaragua had continued to deteriorate. The recent announcement by the Government of Nicaragua of its increased disengagement from the Council and its mechanisms was a cause of particular concern and, together with dozens of eyewitness accounts and reports by human rights defenders, reinforced the conviction that the situation must remain high on the Council's agenda, in line with its mandate. Issues of particular concern included the arbitrary closure of dozens of universities and the deletion of academic records, which directly affected the right to education of thousands of students, and the persecution and criminalization of artists and cultural workers.

49. The draft resolution expressed particular alarm at the centralization and absolute monopoly of State power in two persons, the sociopolitical and human rights crisis and the dismantling of the rule of law, the independence of the judiciary and the separation of powers. The recent introduction of amendments to 100 articles of the Constitution was having a multidimensional impact on the enjoyment of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights. In particular, the removal of the constitutional prohibition of torture was unjustifiable and unprecedented. The text of the draft resolution, which reflected the gravity of the situation, included a proposal for the Council to renew the mandate of the Group of Human Rights Experts on Nicaragua. His delegation urged the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

50. **The President** announced that 10 States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which had programme budget implications amounting to \$4,197,300.

General statements made before the voting

51. **Mr. Gallón** (Colombia) said that reports from the Group of Human Rights Experts on Nicaragua and OHCHR pointed to a deteriorating human rights situation in Nicaragua marked, for example, by a dramatic increase in political persecution, the freezing or expropriation of assets of natural and juridical persons and restrictions on civil liberties. Moreover, recent constitutional reforms had eliminated the separation of powers, undermined the foundations of democracy and abolished the prohibition against torture. It was particularly troubling that hundreds of persons, including human rights defenders, had had their nationality withdrawn and been rendered stateless, in violation of the country's international obligations in that regard. Colombia regretted the decision of Nicaragua to withdraw from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the Human Rights Council. The country's most recent decision not to complete the current cycle of the universal periodic review further underscored its intention to turn its back on multilateralism and the international protection of human rights. At the same time, the Government was reportedly persecuting persons who worked or collaborated with international mechanisms, including members of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. His delegation supported the draft resolution and invited the members of the Council to adopt it by consensus.

52. **Ms. Fuentes Julio** (Chile) said that the deteriorating situation of human rights in Nicaragua merited the Council's continued attention. The sponsors of successive resolutions on the country had taken an incremental approach. In 2019, 2020 and 2021 they had limited themselves to requesting OHCHR to report on the human rights situation in the country and to calling for an interactive dialogue. In 2022, in the face of the worsening crisis and the lack of cooperation on the part of Nicaragua, the Group of Human Rights Experts had been established with a mandate to investigate violations since 2018. The Group's mandate had then been extended in 2023.

53. She agreed with the views Nicaragua itself had expressed in November 2024, during the forty-seventh session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, that only authentic, respectful and constructive dialogue, without interference and on terms of equality, would facilitate friendly relations between States. The problem was that Nicaragua was not engaging in any form of dialogue with any United Nations human rights mechanisms. The country had opted for an unprecedented isolationism, and the situation had deteriorated with its decision to disengage from the Council, not to proceed with the universal periodic review and to expel FAO and the Red Cross. The main sponsors of the draft resolution had therefore

decided that the text needed to be submitted under item 4 of the agenda. Her delegation hoped that the request for an interactive dialogue before the General Assembly at its eightieth and eighty-first sessions would open a space for engagement that had been closed at the Human Rights Council. Her Government would continue to pursue every avenue to interact with Nicaragua and to support the return of democracy and the rule of law. She called upon members of the Council to support the draft resolution.

54. **Mr. Gómez Martínez** (Spain), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Union that were members of the Council, said that he wished to echo the concerns raised in the draft resolution regarding issues such as forced displacement, arbitrary withdrawal of nationality, the implications of recent constitutional reforms and the ongoing repression of dissent. Those worrying developments warranted the decision to submit the draft resolution under item 4 of the agenda. The European Union welcomed the proposal to renew the mandate of the Group of Human Rights Experts for a further two years and to strengthen the engagement of OHCHR.

55. He wished to reaffirm his delegation's support for efforts aimed at finding a democratic, peaceful, consensual and Nicaraguan-led solution to the ongoing political crisis. He also wished to reiterate the call to Nicaragua to cooperate with all international human rights mechanisms, including by completing its universal periodic review, and to release all political prisoners immediately and unconditionally. If a vote was called on the draft resolution, his delegation urged the States members of the Council to vote in favour of it.

56. **Ms. Neocleous** (Cyprus) said that her delegation fully supported the draft resolution, which took a balanced and progressive approach to addressing the human rights crisis in Nicaragua. Despite efforts by the international community to maintain an open door for dialogue, Nicaragua had been declining engagement. Her delegation was particularly troubled by the country's refusal to engage with OHCHR coupled with its recent decision to disengage from various specialized agencies of the United Nations and from the Human Rights Council. Cyprus was alarmed by the ongoing systematic human rights violations documented by the Group of Human Rights Experts and OHCHR, and recent constitutional reforms appeared to cement the dismaying trajectory of the country's human rights situation. Her delegation therefore supported the proposal to renew the mandate of the Group of Human Rights Experts for a further two years and the decision to move the resolution to item 4 of the agenda. The people of Nicaragua deserved the solidarity of Council members to ensure their rights and freedoms were respected. If a vote was called on the draft resolution, her delegation urged the Council to vote in favour.

57. **Mr. Gunnarsson** (Iceland) said that the human rights situation in Nicaragua had, unfortunately, deteriorated since the previous resolution on the country had been adopted. The ongoing practice of targeting real or perceived political opponents through withdrawal of nationality, forced deportation, asset confiscation and the erasure of civilian records had now left almost 550 persons stateless. Moreover, arbitrary detention, torture and the widespread closure of civic space continued to be reported. The argument had been made that the promotion and protection of human rights should be advanced only through dialogue and collaboration, and that mandates of the Human Rights Council should systematically be rejected if not supported by the country concerned. If, however, the country concerned refused every attempt at dialogue or collaboration, what was the Council to do?

58. The truth was that the Council had a responsibility to promote and protect the human rights of all persons. It was, therefore, of the utmost concern that Nicaragua had chosen to disengage from the Council, even taking the unprecedented step of refusing to submit its positions on the recommendations it had received under the universal periodic review. It was important, nonetheless, to keep the door open to technical assistance and capacity-building whenever Nicaragua was ready to collaborate again. Iceland called on the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus or, if a vote was called, to vote in favour.

59. **The President** said that the country concerned did not have a representative in attendance to make a statement.

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

60. **Mr. Benítez Verson** (Cuba) said that his delegation believed that international law and the Charter of the United Nations had to be respected in all circumstances and without exception. As a matter of principle, Cuba would always reject all interventionist, politicized and biased resolutions and would defend the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and the self-determination of peoples. Nicaragua had demonstrated its openness to dialogue and cooperation, it had replied to the requests it had received and it had participated in the first stage of the universal periodic review. All it had received in return, however, had been hostility and confrontation. Under such conditions dialogue was impossible.

61. The draft resolution under consideration reflected the punitive and confrontational approach that the Council continued to use as a tool of coercion against States of the global South. Cuba urged members to abandon such antagonism and to engage in impartial and constructive dialogue and cooperation, which time and again had shown itself to be the only way to promote human rights in any country of the world. Every year millions of dollars were wasted on ineffective mechanisms, such as the one envisaged in the draft resolution, which were condemned to failure because they closed the way to any possibility of dialogue and cooperation. Cuba called for the sovereignty of Nicaragua to be respected and for an immediate end to the arbitrary and illegal unilateral coercive measures imposed against the country. Inexplicably, but unsurprisingly, the draft resolution made no mention of the harmful impact such measures had on the Nicaraguan people. For those reasons, his delegation called for a vote on the draft resolution and hoped that other delegations would join Cuba in voting against it.

62. **Ms. Li Xiaomei** (China) said that China respected the right of the people of Nicaragua to determine their own future independently. Human rights issues needed to be addressed through constructive dialogue and cooperation; they should not be politicized and used to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. Impartiality, objectivity and non-selectivity were necessary preconditions for constructive dialogue among States. Any other approach would merely increase confrontation and waste resources. The countries concerned should desist in their baseless accusations regarding Nicaragua and lift the unilateral measures which violated the human rights of the Nicaraguan people. China would vote against the draft resolution.

63. *At the request of the representative of Cuba, a recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Albania, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechia, Dominican Republic, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Iceland, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Malawi, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), North Macedonia, Republic of Korea, Romania, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand.

Against:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Viet Nam.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Benin, Burundi, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Qatar, South Africa, Sudan.

64. *Draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.3](#) was adopted by 29 votes to 4, with 14 abstentions.*

Draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.10](#): Situation of human rights in Belarus

65. **Mr. Broilo** (Observer for Poland), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the European Union, said that the severity and magnitude of the gross and systematic human rights violations in Belarus had been documented by a number of United Nations bodies, including the Group of Independent Experts on the Situation of Human Rights in Belarus, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus, OHCHR and others. The text sought to reflect those findings accurately, including with regard to violations that might amount to crimes against humanity. He greatly regretted the fact that certain States sought to

question the findings and to invoke the lack of consent of the country concerned. By doing so they were undermining the impartial and fact-based work of the United Nations, helping perpetrators evade accountability and enabling the country concerned to bypass its international obligations.

66. The work of the Group of Independent Experts was indispensable to ensure justice for victims of human rights violations, while the mandate of the Special Rapporteur – one of the last resorts for the voice of Belarusian civil society to be heard – was vital in order to monitor the compliance of Belarus with its international human rights obligations. Yet, Belarus persisted in its refusal to engage with either mandate. Nor did it cooperate with other United Nations human rights mechanisms or with ILO. That approach was incompatible with the Council's principle of constructive international dialogue and cooperation, which were a key part of every multilateral process. By adopting the draft resolution, the Council would stand firmly alongside victims, uphold the principles of international human rights law and express a loud, clear no to impunity. His delegation called upon all members of the Council to support the adoption of the draft resolution.

67. **The President** announced that seven States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which had programme budget implications amounting to \$4,026,600. He invited the State concerned by the draft resolution to make a statement.

68. **Ms. Belskaya** (Observer for Belarus) said that Belarus respected all its obligations under international law, including on human rights. The sponsors of the draft resolution were deliberately abusing United Nations human rights mechanisms to make false statements about the situation in her country, spread propaganda and distort reality. The work of the Group of Independent Experts and the Special Rapporteur served merely to provide a patina of objectivity to the politically motivated accusations that the West had been making against Belarus for over 20 years. The true goal of the accusations contained in the draft resolution was to overturn the country's political system and to deviate it from the path of development selected by its people.

69. The economic sanctions, isolation and obstruction of cultural, sporting and interpersonal contacts that the European Union was applying against Belarus violated the very principles of human rights and international cooperation. Belarus was making every effort to uphold peace and protect society in the face of a seriously destabilized regional situation. In that connection, it welcomed and cooperated with mechanisms that worked on the basis of the universality and indivisibility of human rights. Her delegation reaffirmed its readiness and desire to support egalitarian international dialogue on human rights but categorically rejected the draft resolution as an instrument of pressure against a sovereign State. If a vote on the text was called, she urged all members of the Council to vote against it.

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

70. **Ms. Li Xiaomei** (China) said that the draft resolution on the human rights situation in Belarus, which sought to extend the mandates of the Special Rapporteur and the Group of Independent Experts, would not serve to promote and protect human rights. In fact, it constituted an abuse of human rights mechanisms. The text ignored the progress the country had made in the field of human rights and entirely overlooked the repeated and unequivocal opposition of the Government of Belarus to the establishment and renewal of such mandates. The draft resolution, moreover, was silent on the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on the human rights of the Belarusian people. For those reasons, her delegation requested a vote on the draft resolution and urged members of the Council to join her delegation in voting against it.

71. **Mr. Oike** (Japan) said that his delegation welcomed the draft resolution, the overall objectives of which Japan had consistently supported. The text, in fact, expressed serious concern about arbitrary detention and torture as well as about unjustified restrictions on the right to freedom of peaceful assembly, association and expression. It also called for electoral and judicial reforms, urged an end to the repression of civil society and independent media and encouraged cooperation with United Nations human rights mechanisms. His delegation also shared the concern regarding the use of the death penalty in Belarus, especially in a

context where fair trial guarantees were not upheld. It was particularly troubled by the fact that the death penalty was being used widely and was not limited to the most serious crimes. However, paragraph 5 failed to focus on problematic circumstances specific to Belarus and merely urged the abolition of the death penalty without reference to the limitations envisaged in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Such an approach was incompatible with his country's position and, accordingly, his delegation dissociated itself from paragraph 5. Nonetheless, his delegation unwaveringly supported the rest of the text and hoped that its adoption would encourage Belarus to make meaningful efforts to improve its human rights situation. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

72. **Mr. Benítez Verson** (Cuba) said that, in order to uphold international law and the Charter of the United Nations, Cuba would continue to oppose selective, interventionist and politicized draft resolutions that did not enjoy the support of the country concerned. The Council needed to respect the principles of impartiality and objectivity. Confrontational mechanisms, such as those envisioned in the text, were ineffective and destined to fail. The abundant resources regularly wasted on such mechanisms would be better spent on implementing the recommendations emerging from the universal periodic review and on promoting constructive dialogue and genuine cooperation, which were the only way to advance the cause of human rights. Such resources could also be used to alleviate the impact of the unilateral coercive measures which were being applied against a number of States, including Belarus, and which seriously affected the human rights of millions of innocent people around the world. Yet the draft resolution was entirely silent on that subject, further proof of its selective nature. For those reasons, Cuba could not support the draft resolution and would vote against it.

73. **Mr. Simas Magalhães** (Brazil) said that his delegation remained seriously concerned about the human rights situation in Belarus, in particular with regard to civil and political rights, including those of women, journalists, media professionals and human rights defenders. It was particularly alarmed by continued reports of widespread arbitrary detention, ill-treatment and systemic restrictions on civil society. It was regrettable that, despite more than a decade of engagement with the Council, tangible improvements remained limited. Constructive engagement was essential if the promotion and protection of human rights was to advance, and he called upon the Government of Belarus to cooperate fully with United Nations human rights mechanisms. As had been the case in previous iterations of the text, the draft resolution included language that touched on issues typically addressed in peace and security forums. Preserving the distinct role and mandate of the Council was essential to maintaining its credibility and effectiveness as well as to avoiding politicization and selectivity. Brazil had consistently advocated for dialogue and cooperation, including under item 4 of the agenda, and remained convinced that engagement and cooperation rather than isolation offered the best prospect for meaningful progress. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution.

74. *At the request of the representative of China, a recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Albania, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechia, Dominican Republic, France, Gambia, Germany, Iceland, Japan, Malawi, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), North Macedonia, Republic of Korea, Romania, Spain, Switzerland.

Against:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, Viet Nam.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Georgia, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Morocco, Qatar, South Africa, Sudan, Thailand.

75. *Draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.10](#) was adopted by 25 votes to 5, with 17 abstentions.*

Draft resolution A/HRC/58/L.11/Rev.1, as orally revised: Situation of human rights in Myanmar

76. **Mr. Broilo** (Observer for Poland), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the European Union, said that the High Commissioner's recent update on the situation in Myanmar was a litany of human suffering, as reflected in the draft resolution which had been orally revised to reflect the latest calamity to strike the country: the 28 March earthquake. In its increasing desperation, the Myanmar military continued to inflict unbearable levels of cruelty on the country's people, in particular through air strikes. Intensified conflict, transnational crime and forced conscription were pushing Myanmar further down the spiral, while horrific and systematic human rights violations continued to be perpetrated. The military's stranglehold on humanitarian assistance exacerbated the consequences of the crisis; persons in vulnerable situations – in particular those belonging to ethnic and religious minorities, including the Rohingya – continued to bear the brunt; and the voluntary, safe and dignified return of refugees and displaced persons remained impossible.

77. The draft resolution underscored the importance of efforts to ensure accountability, and it called on States to respect their international commitments, notably by taking meaningful action to end access to the arms, jet fuel and foreign currency that the authorities needed to sustain their campaign of repression. The sponsors of the draft resolution had worked with the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) in order to ensure that the Council continued to focus on the situation in Myanmar. Adoption of the draft resolution by consensus would send a strong signal of support to the country's people, and he called on all members of the Council to support the text.

78. **The President** announced that six States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which had programme budget implications amounting to \$1,137,900.

General statements made before the decision

79. **Mr. Kah** (Gambia) said that his delegation strongly supported the draft resolution. As the applicant in the ongoing case before the International Court of Justice under the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the Gambia remained alarmed by the persistent grave violations of human rights and international humanitarian law in Myanmar, particularly against the Rohingya and other minority groups. It strongly condemned the widespread use of force against civilians, arbitrary detention, torture, sexual and gender-based violence and the use of antipersonnel mines. It was also concerned about restrictions on civic space and on media freedom and about forced conscription and the targeting of children. By reinforcing the role of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, the Independent Investigative Mechanism for Myanmar and the High Commissioner, the draft resolution rightly underscored the importance of justice and accountability. His delegation hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

80. **Mr. Espinosa Olivera** (Mexico) said that he first wished to communicate his delegation's solidarity and condolences to the people of Myanmar following the terrible earthquake of 28 March. Mexico supported both the spirit and the letter of the draft resolution, which reflected the international community's profound concern in the face of the persistent human rights violations in Myanmar, in particular following the military coup of 2021. His Government appreciated the work of the Special Rapporteur and of the Independent Investigative Mechanism, and all efforts being made at the regional level to ensure peace with justice for the people of Myanmar. It condemned the disproportionate use of force against civilians, arbitrary detention and attacks against journalists and human rights defenders, among others. His delegation had been pleased to see that the text recognized the role played by International Court of Justice and the universal jurisdiction of national courts, which were fundamental ways of promoting justice and accountability. It also welcomed the reference to articles 6 and 7 of the Arms Trade Treaty, although it was unfortunate that the references to the illicit transfer and diversion of arms, munitions and other military equipment to the de facto authorities in Myanmar were not more robust.

81. **Ms. Thuadet** (France) said that four years since the coup d'état in Myanmar the country was in a catastrophic situation. The armed forces continued to flagrantly violate

human rights with indiscriminate bombardments that targeted the civilian population and humanitarian personnel alike. Forced conscription, including of children, was widespread and millions of civilians had been displaced. Such acts – which violated international humanitarian law and could amount to war crimes – had created one of the worst human rights situations in any country in the world. Her delegation exhorted Myanmar to put an immediate end to the violence, fully to implement United Nations Security Council resolution 2669 (2022) and to release the more than 20,000 persons being held in arbitrary detention, including State Counsellor Aung San Suu Kyi and President Win Myint. France supported the five-point consensus to resolve the situation in Myanmar, recently adopted by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. Her delegation also wished to express her country's solidarity with the people of Myanmar following the earthquake of 28 March, which had only increased their suffering. In that context, it called upon all sides to put an immediate end to hostilities in the areas affected by the catastrophe and to enable full humanitarian access. In the light of such a difficult situation, her delegation welcomed the draft resolution, which sought to combat impunity, upheld the role being played by International Court of Justice and the International Criminal Court and recognized the importance of universal jurisdiction. It called on all sides to respect their international obligations and to refrain from providing material support to the Myanmar military. Her delegation hoped that the Council would speak with a single voice and duly adopt the draft resolution.

82. **Ms. Berananda** (Thailand) said that her Government wished to see a peaceful, stable and unified Myanmar and continued to play a proactive and constructive role in supporting peace and political processes in the country. Dialogue and engagement were key to achieving a political solution to the conflict. Her delegation welcomed the recognition in the draft resolution of the humanitarian assistance provided by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. Thailand itself attached great importance to providing such assistance to the people of Myanmar in a timely manner and without distinction and had done so in 2024 through bilateral and multilateral channels. Its current focus was on providing medical supplies for vulnerable populations in the vicinity of the border between the two countries and ensuring that children from Myanmar living in Thailand had access to basic education. In the wake of the devastating earthquake that had struck Myanmar one week previously, Thailand stood ready to support disaster relief and reconstruction efforts. The global trend of cuts to humanitarian aid was affecting the available capacity to address humanitarian needs in the region. Her delegation called on the international community to support the peace process in Myanmar and to provide assistance to the population.

83. **Mr. Islam** (Bangladesh) said that his delegation wished to express its condolences and support to the victims and survivors of the devastating earthquake that had struck Myanmar the previous week. His Government had sent rescue experts, health workers, food, medicine and hygiene items to the affected areas. In 2017, Bangladesh had opened its borders to members of the Rohingya community fleeing violence and atrocity crimes in Myanmar, none of whom had yet been able to return to their ancestral lands. While the adoption of General Assembly resolution 79/182, which set out the modalities of a high-level conference aimed at proposing a comprehensive, innovative, concrete and time-bound plan for a sustainable resolution of the crisis, and the decision of the World Food Programme to reverse plans to reduce food aid for persons sheltered in Bangladesh were welcome, greater burden- and responsibility-sharing efforts were required from the international community.

84. While his delegation understood the draft resolution's focus on returning Myanmar to the path to democracy, greater emphasis should be placed on the complementarities between that process and efforts to identify a sustainable solution to the Rohingya crisis. His delegation therefore strongly endorsed the language in the draft resolution reiterating the importance of the full implementation of all recommendations made by the Advisory Commission on Rakhine State to address the root causes of the crisis and create an environment conducive to the return of the forcibly displaced Rohingya population. It invited all members of the Council to join the consensus on the draft resolution.

85. **Mr. Gallón** (Colombia) said that his delegation stood in solidarity with the survivors of the recent earthquake in Myanmar, which had worsened the humanitarian situation in the country. Against the backdrop of the pre-existing crisis in the country, the efforts of the international monitoring and verification missions to document violations were especially

important, in particular with respect to ensuring accountability. It was more vital than ever to urge the authorities and armed groups to ensure unrestricted, impartial and unhindered access to humanitarian aid for everyone. Given its own history, Colombia understood the importance of an effective, prompt and principled humanitarian response and wished to stress the need for international support for humanitarian efforts in Myanmar and for steps to be taken to ensure that assistance reached those who needed it most. Such assistance should be provided through all available mechanisms, including independent local and grass-roots organizations working on the ground. His delegation invited all members of the Council to join the consensus on the draft resolution.

86. **Mr. Guillermet Fernández** (Costa Rica) said that his delegation wished to express its condolences to the victims of the earthquake in Myanmar. As the Special Rapporteur had made clear during the interactive dialogue, the military junta in Myanmar was continuing to commit violations of international humanitarian and human rights law, including by conducting airstrikes that prevented people from cultivating their land. That situation, combined with the cuts to humanitarian aid that had been announced by several countries, was contributing to a real risk of famine. In addition, the junta was blocking access to aid that was being sent to the country following the earthquake. The draft resolution presented an opportunity for the Council to take clear action on a situation of concern. As a Party to the Arms Trade Treaty, Costa Rica welcomed the inclusion in the draft resolution of the reference to the obligations of States Parties with regard to arms transfers in situations where breaches of international humanitarian law were occurring. His delegation echoed the call made by the Special Rapporteur during the interactive dialogue for the Council to issue a declaration of conscience on behalf of those people in Myanmar who had been silenced.

87. **Ms. Li Xiaomei** (China), speaking in explanation of position before the decision, said that her delegation wished to extend its sympathies to the victims of the earthquake in Myanmar, following which China had provided 100 million yuan renminbi in aid. Her delegation was very disappointed with the draft resolution, which would waste a sizeable portion of the limited resources of the United Nations without helping the people of Myanmar. Any action taken by the Council should contribute to bridging differences among the parties in Myanmar and achieving a political settlement that was conducive to peace, stability and development. Regrettably, the draft resolution was extremely unbalanced and contained many controversial points, while ignoring the efforts of the Government of Myanmar to promote and protect human rights. Certain elements lacked any factual basis, and substantive wording had been added by the main sponsors, who were pushing for adoption in a manner that was contrary to the Council's original intent of dialogue and cooperation. Her delegation would not join the consensus on the draft resolution.

88. *Draft resolution A/HRC/58/L.11/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/HRC/58/L.20/Rev.1: Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

89. **Mr. Gunnarsson** (Iceland), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the main sponsors, namely Germany, North Macedonia, the Republic of Moldova, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and his own delegation, said that the text had two clear objectives: to extend the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran and to broaden the mandate of the Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on the Islamic Republic of Iran.

90. The two mandates had very distinct roles. The human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran had deteriorated during the previous two years and required ongoing monitoring by the Special Rapporteur. More than 900 people had been executed in the country in 2024, representing the world's highest death penalty rate per capita. The focus of the Fact-Finding Mission, on the other hand, was on securing accountability for victims by investigating patterns of violations, identifying structural causes and collecting and preserving evidence. Its work was currently the only way for the Iranian people to seek truth and justice. The proposal to broaden the scope of its mandate to allow it to investigate allegations of recent and ongoing serious human rights violations was a direct response to the Mission's findings, which clearly showed that the violations committed in the context of the nationwide protests that had taken place in 2022, and which had been the original focus

of the Mission's mandate, were the tip of the iceberg. To make the most efficient use of scarce financial resources, the draft resolution contained a request for a joint interactive dialogue involving both the Fact-Finding Mission and the Special Rapporteur.

91. In addition to highlighting possible crimes against humanity, including ongoing persecutory conduct against women and girls, widespread discrimination against persons belonging to minorities and sustained and systematic impunity for gross violations of human rights, the text also recognized the progress made, including by welcoming the recent engagement of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran with OHCHR and the Special Rapporteur. His delegation called on all members of the Council to show solidarity with the Iranian people by supporting the draft resolution and, if a vote was called, voting in favour of it.

92. **The President** announced that one State had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which had programme budget implications amounting to \$4,058,000.

General statements made before the voting

93. **Mr. Gómez Martínez** (Spain), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Union that were members of the Council, said that the European Union supported the draft resolution and the extension of the mandates of the Fact-Finding Mission and of the Special Rapporteur, whose reports once again presented a devastating picture of the human rights situation in that country. The increase in executions, repression of the right to freedom of expression, widespread violence and discrimination, both in law and in practice, were among the issues giving rise to grave concern. The European Union called on the Iranian authorities to guarantee all human rights for everyone, including women and girls and persons belonging to religious and ethnic minorities, and to put an end to the hostage policy. The Special Rapporteur's mandate was vital in monitoring and reporting on the persistent structural human rights violations occurring in Iran, while the narrow mandate of the Fact-Finding Mission needed to be expanded to enable it to investigate the breadth and complexity of human rights issues in the country. The European Union called on the Islamic Republic of Iran to cooperate fully with both mechanisms and urged all members of the Council to support the draft resolution.

94. **Ms. Pizzoferrato** (Switzerland) said that her Government was committed to combating impunity and ensuring accountability. It was vital for the Council to be able to perform its role by documenting human rights violations; indeed, Switzerland had participated in the Council's establishment with that goal in mind. Her delegation remained deeply concerned about the human rights situation in Iran and considered it appropriate for the Council to focus its attention on the matter. It was also important, however, to ensure that the Council remained effective and efficient, particularly in the light of the current budgetary crisis. Her delegation therefore had doubts about the proposed extension and broadening of the mandate of the Fact-Finding Mission, whose work on the events of 2022 should have been completed by the Council's current session. The two mandates should therefore be dealt with separately to avoid overlap and establish synergies.

95. **The President** invited the State concerned by the draft resolution to make a statement.

96. **Mr. Bahreini** (Observer for the Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the draft resolution concerned two discriminatory and unwarranted mechanisms that would take the Council to new depths of inefficiency and wasted resources, risking the erosion of trust in its work. At a time when grave human rights violations were being committed in Palestine by perpetrators who enjoyed full impunity, the main sponsors of the text were attempting to mislead the Council by creating a false picture of the human rights situation in his country and diverting attention away from the events in Palestine. His delegation was familiar with such pressure tactics and wished to remind the instigators of the puppet show that they were responsible for wrongdoing against the Iranian people and humanity as a whole. The proposed mandates were disproportionate, and his delegation called on all members of the Council to oppose the draft resolution.

97. **Mr. Benítez Verson** (Cuba) said that Cuba wished to reiterate its principled position on selective and interventionist resolutions that did not enjoy the support of the States concerned and that were of no practical use on the ground. Rather than meaningless pieces

of paper, what was needed were more dialogue and cooperation. By adopting the draft resolution, the Council would once again seek to impose the same punitive mechanisms on which millions of dollars had already been wasted. If the political will to address the human rights challenges in Iran truly existed, the emphasis would be placed on impartial and non-interventionist dialogue and cooperation, which had been proven to be the only effective way to promote human rights. The focus of the draft resolution should have been placed on facilitating the implementation of the recommendations accepted by Iran in the context of the universal periodic review. The Council must not continue to waste efforts and considerable resources on promoting confrontation, hostility and antagonism, a misguided philosophy that undermined the Council's credibility. The lessons of history must be learned to avoid the Council becoming irrelevant or facing the same fate as its predecessor, the Commission on Human Rights. The draft resolution should be used to denounce the cruel and illegal unilateral coercive measures that had been imposed on Iran and which impacted the human rights of the innocent Iranian people; nevertheless, it was silent on that issue. For those reasons, his delegation called for a vote on the draft resolution, which it would vote against.

98. **Mr. Espinosa Olivera** (Mexico) said that his Government acknowledged the steps taken by the Islamic Republic of Iran to comply with its international human rights obligations, notably its participation in the fourth cycle of the universal periodic review and its accession to five human rights treaties. While Mexico welcomed the pause in implementation of the Law on Protecting the Family through the Promotion of the Culture of Chastity and Hijab, it remained concerned about the documented cases of human rights violations in Iran, not least the increased use of the death penalty, including against a record number of women. The Islamic Republic of Iran should agree to receive visits from the Special Rapporteur and other special procedure mandate holders with a view to establishing objective information on the human rights situation in the country. For those reasons, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

99. **Ms. Li Xiaomei** (China) said that the main sponsors of the draft resolution had failed to fully respect the legitimate concerns of Iran and its opposition to the extension of the mandates of the Fact-Finding Mission and of the Special Rapporteur. The text, which did not contain recognition of the negative impact that the wanton imposition of unilateral coercive measures had on the enjoyment of human rights, was seriously unbalanced and would serve only to undermine dialogue and place increased strain on the resources of the United Nations. Her delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

100. **The President** announced that Belgium, the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Costa Rica had withdrawn their sponsorship of the draft resolution.

101. **Mr. Payot** (Belgium) said that it was regrettable that the delegation of Cuba had called for a vote on the draft resolution. The Fact-Finding Mission and the Special Rapporteur had both documented a persistent and disturbing pattern of serious human rights violations, including repression and discrimination, particularly against women and girls, the use of arbitrary detention and torture, notably against foreign and dual nationals, and restrictions on civic space. Belgium was firmly opposed to the death penalty and was alarmed by the recent increase in the number of executions in Iran, and in particular those involving persons under the age of 18 at the time of their alleged crime. The extension of the Special Rapporteur's mandate was justified by the widespread nature of human rights violations in the country, while the broadening of the mandate of the Fact-Finding Mission was justified by the need to investigate their structural causes and collect and preserve evidence to ensure truth, justice and accountability for the Iranian people. His Government encouraged the Iranian authorities to grant the two mechanisms full access and cooperate with them. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution and called on all members of the Council to do likewise.

102. **Ms. Mandel Barros** (Brazil) said that her country welcomed the recent engagement of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran with OHCHR, the Special Rapporteur and the universal periodic review mechanism, as well as its continued efforts in hosting one of the world's largest refugee populations. It reiterated its call for the Iranian Government to strengthen its collaboration with special procedure mandate holders, including the Fact-Finding Mission and the Special Rapporteur. Despite progress in some areas, such as access to education, serious human rights concerns persisted in the country. Brazil wished to encourage the Government to impose a moratorium on the death penalty with a view to its

abolition. It was also concerned about restrictions on the freedoms of expression and opinion, both online and offline, and the treatment of women and girls, human rights defenders and religious and ethnic minorities. Religious minorities, including Baha'is, must be allowed to practice their faith freely and without discrimination. Laws and practices that gave rise to gender discrimination must be repealed, and the Government should consider ratifying the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. The Council must not serve as an instrument of political confrontation or selective scrutiny. In a spirit of constructive dialogue and engagement, and on the understanding that Iran was committed to strengthening its efforts to improve its human rights situation, her delegation would abstain from voting on the draft resolution.

103. **Mr. Habib** (Indonesia) said that constructive cooperation was vital for meaningful and sustainable human rights progress. It was important for the country concerned by the draft resolution to be permitted to follow up on the human rights situation through its national mechanism, particularly after having been subjected to the Council's scrutiny for years. Indonesia stood ready to engage constructively to support the efforts of Iran, including through the regular bilateral human rights dialogue between the two countries, and encouraged it to strengthen its cooperation with the Council, building on its recent engagement with OHCHR, in particular with a view to repealing laws and policies that discriminated against women and girls. His delegation believed that the provision of technical assistance and capacity-building would be more effective in advancing human rights than the continuation of the Special Rapporteur's mandate. Notwithstanding the main sponsors' comments regarding budget constraints and efficiency, his delegation was also concerned about the proposal to broaden the mandate of the Fact-Finding Mission; to establish what was, in effect, an entirely new mandate required adequate deliberation within the Council. For those reasons, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

104. **Ms. Brand** (Kingdom of the Netherlands) said that her delegation supported the proposal to extend the mandates of the Fact-Finding Mission and of the Special Rapporteur. While the Fact-Finding Mission had focused its efforts on the "Woman, Life, Freedom" protests of 2022, it had concluded that its findings were the tip of the iceberg and that follow-up was needed to investigate the wider context. In the light of the liquidity crisis affecting the United Nations, her delegation appreciated the pragmatic and cost-effective approach proposed in the draft resolution, including the combining of two mandates in one text and the request for a joint interactive dialogue. Both mandates were warranted, with a view to achieving accountability and justice for victims. Her delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution and called on all members of the Council to do likewise.

105. **Mr. Guillermet Fernández** (Costa Rica) said that, despite the positive steps taken by the Iranian authorities to engage with OHCHR, in practice the Fact-Finding Mission and the Special Rapporteur continued to be denied access to the country. State violence had reached alarming levels, not least through the increased use of the death penalty as a political tool. Costa Rica condemned in particular the practice of mock executions, which was akin to torture. Transparent and open cooperation with the mechanisms created by the Council and OHCHR represented the path to egalitarian societies in which everyone, including women and girls, could freely enjoy their human rights. His Government urged Iran to put an end to repression, ensure justice and accountability, cooperate fully with the Council's mechanisms and facilitate their access to the country. The Council should maintain its focus on the crisis in Iran and renew and broaden the mandate of the Fact-Finding Mission.

106. *At the request of the representative of Cuba, a recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Albania, Belgium, Benin, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechia, Dominican Republic, France, Germany, Iceland, Japan, Malawi, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), North Macedonia, Republic of Korea, Romania, Spain, Switzerland.

Against:

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, Indonesia, Sudan, Viet Nam.

Abstaining:

Bangladesh, Brazil, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Qatar, South Africa, Thailand.

107. Draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.20/Rev.1](#) was adopted by 24 votes to 8, with 15 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.