



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
15 May 2025

Original: English

---

## Human Rights Council Fifty-eighth session

### Summary record of the 59th meeting

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Friday, 4 April 2025, at 3 p.m.

*President:* Mr. Lauber ..... (Switzerland)

## Contents

Agenda item 4: Human rights situations that require the Council's attention (*continued*)

Agenda item 7: Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories

Agenda item 9: Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance:  
follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action

Agenda item 10: Technical assistance and capacity-building

Agenda item 1: Organizational and procedural matters

Closure of the session

---

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

(continued) (A/HRC/58/L.25 as orally revised)

*Draft resolution A/HRC/58/L.25, as orally revised: Situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic (continued)*

1. **The President** invited the Council to resume its consideration of draft resolution A/HRC/58/L.25, as orally revised, which had been introduced at the previous meeting.
2. **Ms. Li Xiaomei** (China), speaking in explanation of position before the decision, said that China wished to reaffirm its support for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States and to emphasize that the Syrian interim authorities should strive to ensure the security and protect the rights of all persons in the Syrian Arab Republic without discrimination based on religion or ethnicity. China was concerned by the fact that foreign terrorists had spread throughout the Syrian Arab Republic and posed a serious threat to the Syrian people and to regional and international peace and security. The indiscriminate killings of civilians in the coastal region were atrocious and inhumane. The international community must remain extremely vigilant in the face of the terrorist threat. China urged the Syrian interim authorities to effectively fulfil their counter-terrorism obligations by taking all measures necessary to combat all terrorist groups on the United Nations Security Council Consolidated List, including the Eastern Turkistan Islamic Movement. Her delegation believed that the situation in the Syrian Arab Republic was still evolving and that the draft resolution contained inaccurate references to the Syrian interim authorities that exceeded the mandate of the Council. For those reasons, it would not join the consensus on the draft resolution.
3. *Draft resolution A/HRC/58/L.25, as orally revised, was adopted.*
4. **The President** invited delegations to make statements in explanation of vote or position or general statements on any of the draft resolutions considered under agenda item 4.
5. **Mr. Daka** (Ethiopia), reaffirming his country's unwavering commitment to the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, said that his delegation believed that the promotion and protection of human rights must be undertaken in accordance with the principles of universality, objectivity and non-selectivity. It was concerned by the increasing politicization of agenda item 4, which undermined the very purpose of the Council. The proliferation of resolutions and mandates under that agenda item, many of which had been adopted without the consent of the States concerned, was counterproductive and contradicted the principle of constructive dialogue. Interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States through selective and discriminatory practices only exacerbated existing tensions and created divisions, rather than fostering understanding and cooperation.
6. His delegation considered that the primary responsibility for promoting and protecting human rights lay with States themselves. Strengthening national and regional mechanisms would be a more effective means of addressing human rights concerns and ensuring the peaceful settlement of disputes than externally imposed mandates that had proven to be resource-draining and detrimental to the promotion of human rights. The Council must operate in an impartial and objective manner. The selective approach currently employed by certain States undermined the Council's credibility and effectiveness. Moreover, peace and security issues fell within the purview of the Security Council, as stated by the Charter. It was not the role of the Human Rights Council to engage in such issues.
7. Ethiopia was not a State Party to the Rome Statute and was therefore not bound by the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court. The mandate and practices of the Court must be consistent with the principle of State sovereignty and must ensure the balanced and fair administration of international justice. Ethiopia dissociated itself from any resolutions, decisions or other documents considered by the Council, by other United Nations bodies or in other international forums, that referred to the Court, as they were inconsistent with its position.

**Agenda item 7: Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories** (A/HRC/58/L.19, A/HRC/58/L.31 and A/HRC/58/L.32/Rev.1 as orally revised)

*Draft resolution A/HRC/58/L.19: Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan*

8. **Mr. Hasnain** (Observer for Pakistan), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the main sponsors, namely the States Members of the United Nations that were members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, except Albania, said that the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force was central to international law. The ongoing illegal occupation of the Syrian Golan by Israel continued to give rise to a grave human rights situation, characterized by changes to the demographic composition, the separation of families, arbitrary detention, torture, the exploitation of natural resources and the illegal imposition of Israeli citizenship on Syrian nationals and of Israeli legislation on the territory. The illegal occupation and the Israeli policies and practices aimed at doubling the number of Israeli settlers in the occupied Syrian Golan must end. The implementation of relevant Security Council resolutions on the matter remained critical in addressing the situation.

9. Against the backdrop of recent promising developments in Syria, the Organization of Islamic Cooperation condemned in the strongest terms the ongoing Israeli attacks on the country, including the deadly bombardment of Koya on 25 March 2025. His delegation called on the Council not to reward Israeli aggression and illegal actions with continued impunity and to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

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

11. **Mr. Alramzi** (Kuwait), making a general statement before the voting, said that his delegation wished to reiterate the importance of agenda item 7, which served as a crucial platform for addressing ongoing violations committed by the occupying Power, and reaffirm its unwavering commitment to the principles of international law and the protection of human rights. The draft resolution was firmly grounded in the principles of international law and rightly highlighted the illegal measures being imposed by the occupying Power. His delegation was deeply concerned at efforts to alter the demographic and geographic character of the occupied Syrian Golan, particularly through initiatives such as the wind turbine project. In line with its principled and long-standing position on the Syrian cause, it would vote in favour of the draft resolution and urged all members of the Council to do likewise.

12. **The President** said that it was his understanding that one of the States concerned by the draft resolution, Israel, did not have a representative in attendance to make a statement. He invited the other State concerned to make a statement.

13. **Mr. Ahmad** (Observer for the Syrian Arab Republic) said that his statement addressed draft resolutions A/HRC/58/L.19 and A/HRC/58/L.32/Rev.1. All measures taken by the occupying Power, including the decision to annex the occupied Syrian Golan, were null and void and without international legal effect, in line with Security Council resolution 497 (1981), and must not be allowed to undermine his country's right to recover the Syrian Golan. Since the fall of the Assad regime, Israel had escalated its aggression, conducting air strikes and incursions in areas including Qunaytirah and Dar'a in an attempt to destabilize reconstruction efforts in Syria following 14 years of war, threatening peace and stability in the country and the wider region and violating Syrian sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, as well as the Agreement on Disengagement between Israeli and Syrian Forces. The international community must take steps to stop Israel from acting outside the law and to put an end to the occupation of Arab territories.

14. Draft resolution A/HRC/58/L.19 examined the repercussions of the Israeli occupation since 1967 and shed light on the continued expansion of settlements through the confiscation of land, the theft of natural resources and discriminatory practices against Syrian citizens. Draft resolution A/HRC/58/L.32/Rev.1 dealt with aspects of the settlement project in the occupied Syrian Golan, which constituted a continuous war crime, and contained a call for the occupying Power to cease immediately and unconditionally all actions causing the alteration of the character of the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and of the occupied Syrian Golan, as well as its systematic violations of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. His delegation

called on Council members to vote in favour of draft resolutions [A/HRC/58/L.19](#) and [A/HRC/58/L.32/Rev.1](#).

*Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting*

15. **Ms. Del Colle** (Kingdom of the Netherlands) said that the situation in Syria had changed drastically since the Council's adoption of the previous year's resolution on the same topic. Her Government welcomed the fact that the Syrian delegation now represented the transitional Government rather than the Assad regime. Syria was at a turning point in its history, and it was important to safeguard the country's sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity. All parties must act according to international law. Her Government did not recognize Israeli sovereignty over the occupied Syrian Golan. While acknowledging Israeli security concerns, it strongly urged Israel not to take actions that risked further destabilizing an already fragile situation, heightening regional tensions and undermining the efforts of the transitional Government to engage in a sustainable and inclusive political transition. As the draft resolution did not sufficiently reflect the changed reality on the ground, her delegation would abstain from voting and hoped to have the opportunity to engage constructively on an updated text the next time a draft resolution on the same topic was presented.

16. **Ms. Boiteux Pilná** (Czechia) said that her Government was deeply concerned about the critical situation of the civilian population in Gaza and stood ready to support meaningful efforts to end violence in the region. It nevertheless maintained its principled opposition to agenda item 7, which was the only agenda item devoted to a single human rights situation. For that reason, her delegation opposed all the draft resolutions considered under that agenda item and called for a vote on them. Her Government attached great importance to the pursuit of a two-State solution and took the position that a negotiated agreement remained the only way to guarantee security, political stability and democratic development for Israel and Palestine.

17. **Ms. Gillhoff** (Germany) said that her Government deplored the Israeli annexation and ongoing illegal occupation of the Syrian Golan and was concerned about the expansion of Israeli settlements since the fall of the Assad regime. It called on all parties to fully respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Syria. As it had not been possible to adapt the text of the draft resolution to reflect the recent developments in Syria, her delegation would vote against it.

18. *At the request of the representative of Czechia, a recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Burundi, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Indonesia, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Morocco, Qatar, South Africa, Sudan, Thailand, Viet Nam.

*Against:*

Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czechia, Georgia, Germany, North Macedonia.

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Belgium, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominican Republic, France, Iceland, Japan, Kenya, Malawi, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Republic of Korea, Romania, Spain, Switzerland.

19. *Draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.19](#) was adopted by 27 votes to 6, with 14 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.31](#), as orally revised: Right of the Palestinian people to self-determination*

20. **Mr. Ahmad** (Observer for Pakistan), introducing the draft resolution, as orally revised, on behalf of the main sponsors, namely the States Members of the United Nations that were members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, except Albania, said that without the inalienable right to self-determination, which was the cornerstone of the Charter of the United Nations, human rights law would largely ring hollow. As the International Court of Justice had done in its landmark advisory opinion rendered on 19 July 2024 on the legal consequences arising from the policies and practices of Israel in the Occupied Palestinian

Territory, including East Jerusalem, the draft resolution reaffirmed that right for the Palestinian people, who had sought and been denied it for almost 80 years.

21. The text of the draft resolution had remained largely unchanged even as human suffering in the Occupied Palestinian Territory continued to grow. The end of the occupation, without delay, and the upholding of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and statehood were the preconditions for peace and justice. There was no more compelling case on which the Council should reach consensus. Putting the draft resolution to a vote would further highlight the fault lines in the international community. The adoption of the draft resolution by consensus would have contributed to restoring faith in international law and the multilateral system, at the centre of which lay the United Nations.

22. **The President** announced that 17 States had joined the main sponsors of the draft resolution, which had no programme budget implications.

*General statements made before the voting*

23. **Mr. Benítez Verson** (Cuba) said that his delegation welcomed the practical measures outlined in the draft resolution that were aimed at guaranteeing the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. His Government demanded an end to the illegal settlement policy. Israel must respect international law. The genocide being committed against the Palestinian people was the result of the impunity Israel enjoyed with the support of the United States of America and the complicit silence of other States. Those responsible would be held accountable. The Council must do more in the face of such brutality, including the use of hunger and restrictions on water as weapons of war. Any reconstruction plan must set out guarantees for the safe return of the Palestinian people and the exercise of their right to self-determination. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution and called on all members of the Council to stand on the right side of history and support the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

24. **Mr. Nkosi** (South Africa) said that all fundamental human rights and freedoms flowed from the right to self-determination, as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Nevertheless, some parties wilfully ignored or selectively invoked that inalienable right, which must not be sacrificed for the sake of expediency. Numerous resolutions of the organs of the United Nations had reaffirmed that right for the Palestinian people and emphasized their permanent sovereignty over the natural resources in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem. The International Court of Justice, too, in its advisory opinion rendered on 19 July 2024, had found that the policies and practices of Israel violated international law and obstructed the realization of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination. The unlawful Israeli occupation had led to an unprecedented human tragedy. His Government called on Israel to bring the occupation to an immediate end and withdraw its forces from the Occupied Palestinian Territory. The Member States had a legal and moral duty not to aid or abet the continued Israeli occupation of, and expansion and presence in, the Occupied Palestinian Territory.

25. **Ms. Fuentes Julio** (Chile) said that her delegation appreciated the fact that the draft resolution reflected the advisory opinion rendered on 19 July 2024 by the International Court of Justice. The Court's finding that the continued presence of Israel in the Occupied Palestinian Territory gave rise to international responsibility and an obligation to provide full reparation constituted a step forward in ensuring accountability. Given that such accountability had not yet been achieved, her delegation invited all members of the Council to support the draft resolution and call for Israel to end the occupation as soon as possible, in line with the advisory opinion.

26. **Mr. Bladehane** (Algeria) said that for almost 80 years, the Palestinian people had been subjected to the most heinous crimes before the eyes of the world. The occupying Power had now opened a new chapter in the tragedy of the Palestinian people, namely the commission of genocide. His Government stood in full solidarity with the Palestinian people in their pursuit of an independent State within the 1967 borders and with Jerusalem as its capital. His delegation called on all members of the Council to support the draft resolution in

order to enhance the Council's credibility in defending the principles on which it had been established.

27. **Mr. Habib** (Indonesia) said that his Government unwaveringly supported the Palestinian people's inalienable right to self-determination and the establishment of an independent and sovereign State of Palestine within the 1967 borders, with East Jerusalem as its capital. The International Court of Justice had made it crystal clear, in its advisory opinion of 19 July 2024, that the unlawful policies and practices of Israel were in breach of its obligation to respect the Palestinian people's right to self-determination. Israel, as the occupying Power, must cease all actions that impeded the exercise of that right. His Government called on the international community to fully support the Palestinian struggle for independence, freedom and sovereignty. Palestinian refugees must not be denied their right to return to their homeland.

28. His Government unequivocally rejected all personal attacks and smear campaigns against special procedure mandate holders who advocated for the rights of the Palestinian people. Despite years of deliberations, some Council members continued to oppose draft resolutions on the topic. His delegation urged all Council members to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

29. **Mr. Chen Xu** (China) said that peace, security and stability would never be achieved in the region until the occupation of the Palestinian territory came to an end. His Government called on the international community to take measures to establish an independent Palestinian State and achieve a political settlement rooted in international law to enable the Palestinian people to realize their inalienable right to self-determination. A two-State solution was the only realistic solution to the Palestinian issue. His Government supported the State of Palestine in its efforts to become a full member of the United Nations. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution and called on all Council members to do likewise.

30. **Mr. Gunnarsson** (Iceland) said that his country had recognized Palestine as an independent State in 2011 and was opposed to the illegal settlement activities conducted by Israel in the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan. The humanitarian crisis in the Occupied Palestinian Territory was unprecedented, and the resumption of attacks by Israel following the recent collapse of the ceasefire in Gaza had further exacerbated the death toll and internal forced displacement. His Government urged both sides to resume talks to implement the second phase of the ceasefire deal.

31. Although there was no logic behind dedicating a standing agenda item to one situation, the situation in Palestine was extraordinarily grave and required the Council's undivided attention. His Government strongly condemned the further escalation of settler violence and urged Israel to protect the population in the occupied territory, in accordance with the law of occupation. All parties to the conflict must be guided by international law, including international humanitarian and human rights law. His Government supported a credible pathway to peace on the basis of a two-State solution. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution and called on all Council members to do likewise.

32. **Mr. Torrejon Alcoba** (Plurinational State of Bolivia) said that his Government recognized the Palestinian people's inalienable right to self-determination and to an independent State. Atrocities were being committed by the occupying Power, as well as by allies and transnational corporations that, by act or omission, were part of the occupation. His Government had presented arguments before the International Court of Justice in the case concerning the legal consequences arising from the policies and practices of Israel in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and joined the Hague Group, thereby reaffirming its commitment to invoking international law to put an end to the Israeli occupation of Palestine. The State of Palestine should be permitted to join the United Nations as a full member. His Government wished to express its support for the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967, who had faced harassment on account of her work, and urged the international community to support the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). It called for justice and accountability in the recent killing in Gaza of eight doctors from the Palestine Red Crescent Society, six civil defence rescue workers and a United Nations staff member. The international community must push for the

implementation of relevant resolutions adopted by various organs of the United Nations and a negotiated solution entailing full recognition of the State of Palestine based on the pre-1967 borders, with East Jerusalem as its capital.

33. **The President**, noting that one of the States concerned by draft resolutions [A/HRC/58/L.31](#) and [A/HRC/58/L.32/Rev.1](#), Israel, did not have a representative in attendance to make a statement. He invited the other State concerned by the two draft resolutions to make a statement.

34. **Mr. Khraishi** (Observer for the State of Palestine) said that the suffering of the Palestinian people had begun long before 7 October 2023, with the Balfour Declaration of 1917, the decision of the United Nations to partition the land of Palestine, the Nakbah of 1948 and the occupation of their land since 1967. He was pleased to note that some Council members had, at the current session, changed the way they had voted on draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.30/Rev.1](#) on the human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory under agenda item 2, from opposition to abstention, although the 16 abstentions demonstrated the Council's persisting inability to agree on accountability mechanisms. He would have liked the Council members, notably those newly elected, that had voted against that draft resolution to explain their reasons for doing so. The delegation of Czechia had requested a vote on draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.31](#) concerning the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination; questioning of that right, from which many of the current Council members had benefited in the past, highlighted a double standard and a lack of respect for the institution-building package contained in Council resolution 5/1 and was thus incompatible with membership of the Council. Some States would also abstain or vote against draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.32/Rev.1](#) on Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, even though such settlements contravened the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and articles 7 and 8 of the Rome Statute; any vote that did not support the draft resolution was therefore in effect a vote against the right to self-determination. Although the International Court of Justice had made clear in its advisory opinion of 9 July 2004 that such settlements were illegal and in its subsequent advisory opinion, of 19 July 2024, that Israeli presence in the Occupied Palestinian Territory was unlawful, some parties were still questioning whether it was illegal or unlawful. The law should not be subject to negotiation but must simply be respected and implemented; such conversations were futile.

35. There had been an unprecedented increase in the rate of settlement since 7 October 2023, and just the previous week, the Israeli authorities had recognized a further 13 neighbourhoods as separate settlements, making a total of over 180 settlements. Palestinian citizens continued to be forcibly displaced, with about 50,000 persons forced out of Jenin camp over the previous 70 days and even residents of the city of Tulkarm displaced from their homes. Such mass displacement was certainly intended by the Israeli authorities to pave the way for further settlement and annexation.

36. *At the request of the representative of Czechia, a recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Albania, Algeria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Ethiopia, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Iceland, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Malawi, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Viet Nam.

*Against:*

Czechia, North Macedonia.

*Abstaining:*

Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominican Republic.

37. *Draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.31](#) was adopted by 43 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.*



*Draft resolution A/HRC/58/L.32/Rev.1, as orally revised: Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan*

38. **Mr. Ahmad** (Observer for Pakistan), introducing the draft resolution, as orally revised, on behalf of the main sponsors, namely the States Members of the United Nations that were members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, except Albania, said that the perpetuation and continued expansion by Israel of its illegal settlements in illegally occupied territories, even as the world's attention had been riveted for the previous 18 months by the ongoing genocide in Gaza, underscored the disregard of the country's Government for international law. The draft resolution, which had been updated on the basis of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 19 July 2024, noting that continued displacement, dispossession and disenfranchisement of people under occupation ran counter to everything the Council stood for, offered the Council an opportunity to align its action with its words.

39. **The President** announced that nine States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, as orally revised, which had no programme budget implications.

*General statements made before the voting*

40. **Ms. Pita Rodríguez** (Cuba) said that her Government demanded the full and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from the Occupied Palestinian Territory and other occupied Arab territories and an end to its illegal settlements and its criminal policy of removing the Palestinian people from their land, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and international law. There could be no legitimization of illegal Israeli settlements, nor could the Palestinians' inalienable right to self-determination be undermined. Cuba condemned the genocide and the collective punishment of the Palestinian people by Israel, which, with its accomplices, must be held accountable for the systematic flagrant violations of human rights, international law and international humanitarian law. The Palestinian people had the right to an independent sovereign State, within the pre-1967 borders, with East Jerusalem as its capital, and the right of return for refugees. Her delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution and called on other members of the Council to do likewise.

41. **Mr. Gómez Martínez** (Spain) said that his Government condemned in the strongest possible terms the adoption of plans to expand illegal Israeli settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem and called on Israel to rescind that decision immediately. The settlements were an additional obstacle to peace and undermined efforts to bring about a two-State solution. Alongside the increase in detentions, arbitrary stops and searches and restrictions on freedom of movement of the Palestinian population, the violent actions of settlers were met with impunity. Spain rejected the systematic violence against and segregation facing millions of innocent civilians in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, in clear contravention of international law, international humanitarian law, international justice and human rights, and expressed its abhorrence at the destruction of thousands of Palestinian homes and infrastructure for humanitarian aid distribution, water and sanitation, which particularly affected the most vulnerable sectors of society. His Government called on Israel to respect international law, the resolutions of United Nations bodies and the pronouncements of the main international judicial organs, including the advisory opinion issued by the International Court of Justice on 19 July 2024, which determined that the occupation of Palestinian territories was unlawful.

42. He agreed with the Ambassador of the State of Palestine that, in the light of the serious situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, to which the world was witness, any questioning of whether item 7 had its place on the agenda of the Human Rights Council was irrelevant. It was the Council's role and responsibility to speak out about the most serious violations of human rights around the world. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

43. **Mr. Gallón** (Colombia) said that his Government recognized the adverse impact on the rights of the Palestinian people of the prolonged occupation and the expansion of settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory and appealed urgently to the Israeli Government to respect and uphold international humanitarian law, guarantee the protection



of the civilian population, without any distinction, facilitate the access of humanitarian aid and put an end to the mindless and disproportionate violence. The occupation, the illegal settlements, the genocide and the apartheid regime inflicted on the Palestinian people all must end.

44. He called on the Council to fulfil its role by ensuring that war crimes and crimes against humanity did not go unpunished. A lasting ceasefire must be achieved and then, through diplomacy, multilateralism and dialogue, a solution must be found. His Government called for full application of the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, which recognized the need for the peaceful coexistence of two States within safe and secure duly internationally recognized borders. It also called for the release without delay of all those abducted by Hamas, including one Colombian citizen, Elkana Bohbot, on 7 October 2023, in a horrific act which was a clear violation of international humanitarian law. His delegation called on the members of the Council to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

45. **Mr. Alkhubaizi** (Kuwait), reaffirming his Government's unwavering support for agenda item 7, said that it was striking that some Council members still questioned the importance of maintaining it as a standing item, even as Palestinians were being forcibly displaced or killed, their homes demolished, humanitarian aid obstructed, humanitarian personnel targeted and internationally protected facilities bombed. Massacres and acts of genocide against the Palestinian people were being committed, while the occupying Power enjoyed total impunity and the complete absence of accountability. The expansion of illegal settlements in the West Bank was continuing, in flagrant defiance of international law and the resolutions of United Nations bodies, posing a serious threat to the multilateral international order and entrenching double standards. The Government of Kuwait urged the international community to exert maximum pressure on the occupying Power to agree to a permanent ceasefire and to ensure the immediate and safe delivery of humanitarian assistance. The international community must also assume its legal, moral and humanitarian responsibilities and support all resolutions aimed at guaranteeing the accountability of the occupying Power and justice for the Palestinian people. Any undermining of the issue's inclusion on the Council's agenda as a separate item represented not merely a retreat from the Council's responsibilities, it perpetuated a dangerous culture of impunity.

*Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting*

46. **Mr. Chen Xu** (China) said that the Government of China was extremely concerned about the Palestinian-Israeli situation, the continuous expansion of settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory and the occupied Syrian Golan and the destruction of many Palestinian homes in the West Bank. It condemned the violence by settlers and serious violations of the basic human rights of the Palestinian people and the population of the Syrian Golan. China firmly supported the just cause of the Palestinian people in restoring their legitimate national rights and the establishment of an independent Palestinian State with full sovereignty based on the 1967 borders, with East Jerusalem as its capital. It called on all parties to implement the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Human Rights Council, stop the attacks and settlement activities in the West Bank and effectively curb settler violence. His delegation called on all Council members to vote for the draft resolution.

47. **Ms. Gillhoff** (Germany) said that her delegation welcomed the constructive engagement by the delegation of the State of Palestine on the draft resolution and the good faith shown during the negotiations. Sharing the sense of urgency expressed in the draft resolution regarding settlements, she noted that the situation in the West Bank had deteriorated further since the terrorist attack by Hamas on Israel on 7 October 2023. The German Government was deeply concerned about the escalation of settler violence in the West Bank and, together with its partners in the European Union, had imposed sanctions on a number of violent settlers. It considered that the decisions of the Israeli Government to act in violation of international law, by granting new construction permits for settlements, legalizing outposts and building roads that jeopardized the territorial integrity of the Occupied Palestinian Territory, undermined the pursuit of a two-State solution – the only way towards peace, security, dignity and prosperity – and posed a threat to peace and security for all people in the region. Germany, together with the European Union, had engaged

actively in the consultations on the draft resolution and thanked the Palestinian delegation for accommodating many of its suggestions. However, while fully agreeing with the core message of the draft resolution – that the settlements were illegal under international law and must be stopped – it would abstain from the voting.

48. **Mr. Tummers** (Kingdom of the Netherlands) said that his delegation was extremely concerned about the rapidly deteriorating situation in the Palestinian territories, specifically the West Bank and East Jerusalem. In accordance with the 19 July 2024 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, the Kingdom of the Netherlands considered the Israeli occupation of the Palestinian territories to be unlawful; he therefore called for the advisory opinion to be implemented. The expansion of settlements, the legalization of outposts and evictions all went against international law and undermined the prospects of a viable two-State solution. The Kingdom of the Netherlands would continue to work with all parties towards a negotiated and sustainable two-State solution.

49. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, in line with the guiding principles of the United Nations and without prejudice to the accepted limits to State jurisdiction. His delegation also strongly reiterated its view that the topic should be included under a different agenda item of the Human Rights Council, as its place as a separate agenda item accorded disproportionate attention to Israel. The singling out of one country under a dedicated agenda item should be discontinued.

50. *At the request of the representative of Czechia, a recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Burundi, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, France, Gambia, Ghana, Iceland, Indonesia, Japan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Qatar, Republic of Korea, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Viet Nam.

*Against:*

Czechia, Ethiopia, North Macedonia.

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Bulgaria, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominican Republic, Georgia, Germany, Kenya, Malawi, Marshall Islands, Romania.

51. *Draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.32/Rev.1](#), as orally revised, was adopted by 34 votes to 3, with 10 abstentions.*

52. **The President** invited delegations to make statements in explanation of vote or general statements on any of the draft resolutions considered under agenda item 7.

53. **Mr. Da Silva Nunes** (Brazil) said that his Government wished to emphasize that the Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory and the occupied Syrian Golan were strictly prohibited under international law, as the International Court of Justice had made clear in its recent advisory opinion. Brazil was extremely concerned about the steady expansion of illegal settlements in those areas and the forced displacement of Palestinians. Together with the threat of annexation, they constituted a major obstacle to the achievement of a two-State solution and a just, lasting and comprehensive peace. That situation resulted in numerous violations of human rights of the Palestinian people, including the rights to food, water, education, development and, in many cases, the right to life. The Palestinian people must be allowed to enjoy the inalienable right to self-determination, including the right to live in freedom, justice and dignity in an independent State of Palestine with permanent sovereignty over their own natural wealth and resources. Brazil remained committed to a two-State solution, with an independent and viable State of Palestine existing side by side with Israel in peace and security within the 1967 borders, which included the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, with East Jerusalem as its capital. Brazil had thus been one of the main sponsors of all three resolutions under agenda item 7.

54. **Mr. Oike** (Japan) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.19](#), but wished to point out that, while the people of the Syrian Arab Republic continued to face a dire human rights and humanitarian situation, the country's

future was of great importance to the achievement of peace and stability throughout the entire Middle East and should be determined by the Syrian people themselves. Hoping to see a peaceful and stable transition of power in the country, Japan called on all parties concerned to preserve the territorial integrity and national unity of the Syrian Arab Republic and respect its independence and sovereignty and avoid impeding the steps being taken by the people themselves towards domestic stabilization.

55. His delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.32/Rev.1](#). It wished to express its concern about the continuing settlement activities being undertaken by the Government of Israel, despite repeated calls from the international community, including Japan, to end those violations of international law, which undermined the viability of a two-State solution, by reversing its decision to permit the settlements. Japan called on the Government of Israel to take appropriate measures to prevent violence by extremist settlers. On the wording of the resolution, it considered that certain terms used in the resolution such as “settlement products” were unclear. It also took it that the measures to be taken against business enterprises and individuals would be implemented in line with existing national legislation and policies.

**Agenda item 9: Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance: follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action (A/HRC/58/L.18)**

*Draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.18](#): Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping and stigmatization of, and discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against, persons based on religion or belief*

56. **Mr. Ahmad** (Observer for Pakistan), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the main sponsors, namely the States Members of the United Nations that were members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), said that the text consisted of a technical update of Council resolution 16/18, adopted annually since 2011, which voiced the concerns of the international community on an issue of growing relevance and concern. It was mirrored by a resolution adopted annually by the General Assembly, cementing the status of the actions envisaged as norms of international human rights law to be operationalized. His delegation encouraged all Council members to support the dialogue process catalysed by the annual adoption of the resolution, review its outcomes periodically, galvanize action and assist the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) in reporting on the implementation of actions agreed on over a decade previously.

57. Many delegations had expressed the hope that the Council would resume its annual adoption of the resolution, which the OIC members had decided not to present to the fifty-seventh session of the Council pending further consultations. The annual adoption was not a mere ritual or footnote that could be taken for granted, but rather both a success story from the early years of the Council and a concrete call to action whose absence was keenly felt, both when the draft resolution was not presented and when it was not implemented.

58. The enjoyment of rights and freedoms without distinction on the basis of religion was proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. States Parties to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights were obligated to prohibit the advocacy of religious hatred and incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence. Implementation of the resolution was the bare minimum required to combat intolerance, stereotyping, stigmatization, discrimination, incitement or violence based on religion or belief, and more needed to be done by States, both internally and in cooperation with other States, to address the growing occurrences of those phenomena. The States members of OIC therefore urged the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

59. **The President** said that 11 States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which had no programme budget implications.

*General statements made before the decision*

60. **Mr. Soto Martínez** (Cuba) said that his Government robustly rejected any act of religious hatred or intolerance, including in the form of Islamophobia. Acts of discrimination,

intolerance, segregation and violence based on religious grounds seemed to be proliferating, particularly in developed countries. Public institutions and authorities needed to do more to prevent the despoiling of religious and sacred symbols and put an immediate halt to hate speech and to the spreading of discriminatory news and opinions for political purposes. The exercise of freedom of opinion and expression should not be used as a pretext to violate the individual and collective rights of others. His Government deplored the manipulation of religious belief to promote political agendas that were a violation of what should be the religious principle of peaceful coexistence and the defence of human rights. It rejected the politically motivated unilateral list that the Government of the United States of America had drawn up with its customary arrogance to restrict religious practices in other countries. That Government had no authority to act as a guarantor of religious beliefs nor in any other sphere. The Government of Cuba was committed to religious freedom and stood firm against intolerance, stigmatization, violence and any other form of discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief.

61. **Ms. Fuentes Julio** (Chile) said that Chile was committed to combating all forms of violence and discrimination on grounds of religious belief. The Council itself had to be a space for dialogue where parties with divergent perspectives could come together to promote the human rights of all persons. In that connection, she particularly appreciated the fact that the sponsors had submitted a consensual text that struck a balance between the differing views that existed among Council members. Her delegation hoped that the draft resolution could be adopted by consensus.

62. **Mr. Chen Xu** (China) said that the global rise in religious hatred, intolerance and stigmatization and the growth in violent crimes against religious minorities should be causes of concern to everyone. The draft resolution sought to raise awareness about religious intolerance, discrimination and related violence, and to promote coexistence, exchange and mutual understanding among different civilizations and beliefs. His delegation would join the consensus on the draft resolution, which he hoped would enjoy the support of all members of the Council.

63. **Ms. Arrous** (Algeria) said that her delegation supported the draft resolution, which was particularly significant given the worrying global rise in religiously motivated hate speech, discrimination and violence. Freedom of religion and belief was a basic right enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Religious intolerance not only threatened the fundamental rights of individuals but compromised the social cohesion and stability of societies. By contrast, respect for diversity and interreligious dialogue were essential for promoting inclusivity, peace and resilience. It was the collective responsibility of States to reject religious hatred and to advance tolerance, mutual respect and peaceful coexistence. By supporting the draft resolution, the Council would be reaffirming its attachment to equality, dignity and freedom of conscience.

64. *Draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.18](#) was adopted.*

**Agenda item 10: Technical assistance and capacity-building ([A/HRC/58/L.8](#), [A/HRC/58/L.23](#) and [A/HRC/58/L.28](#))**

*Draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.8](#): Technical assistance and capacity-building for Mali in the field of human rights*

65. **Mr. Antwi** (Ghana), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of African States, said that the text was similar to one adopted by the Council at its fifty-fifth session but had been updated to reflect developments on the ground and to highlight the progress and challenges in the ongoing peace process in Mali. Among the challenges were asymmetric attacks in the centre and north of the country perpetrated by armed terrorist groups. Intercommunal conflicts involving the same groups also led to serious and repeated violations. The draft resolution also emphasized the need to fight against impunity and to address the humanitarian needs of vulnerable populations, particularly refugees and displaced persons.

66. The African Group welcomed the initiatives taken by the Government of Mali, despite the difficulties it was facing, to recover from the crisis and improve the human rights situation in the country via ongoing political reforms including territorial and administrative reorganization, the implementation of recommendations made by the national reconciliation conference, the promulgation of the Criminal Code and the Code of Criminal Procedure and the strengthening of the fight against corruption and impunity. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus, as had been the case in previous years.

67. **The President** announced that three States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which had programme budget implications amounting to \$421,000. He invited the State concerned by the draft resolution to make a statement.

68. **Mr. Sissoko** (Observer for Mali) said that his delegation had nothing to add to the remarks made by the Minister of Justice and Human Rights during the interactive dialogue earlier in the session.

69. *Draft resolution A/HRC/58/L.8 was adopted.*

*Draft resolution A/HRC/58/L.23: Technical assistance and capacity-building for South Sudan*

70. **Mr. Antwi** (Ghana), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of African States, said that he wished to thank all the delegations that had made constructive contributions to the text, which largely mirrored Council resolution 55/26, with some new paragraphs and technical updates that reflected recent progress and developments in South Sudan. The African Group firmly believed that technical assistance and capacity-building was the ideal way to assist the rule of law institutions and enhance the promotion and protection of human rights in a post-conflict country such as South Sudan. He called upon the Council to adopt the draft resolution without a vote as had always been the case in the past.

71. **The President** announced that three States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which had programme budget implications amounting to \$1,376,400.

72. **Mr. Peruch Viana** (Brazil), making a general statement before the decision, said that his delegation remained concerned about the situation of human rights in South Sudan, especially in the light of the recent intensification of violence across multiple regions of the country. It urged all sides to respect human rights and international humanitarian law and to ensure that the protection of civilians remained their central priority. The authorities needed to honour their commitment to conclude the political transition and hold elections within the agreed time frame. In that regard, the postponement of the country's first elections appeared to be a missed opportunity. Nonetheless, South Sudan had recently made important progress, notably by acceding to the two International Covenants as well as to the Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons and the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness. Brazil also welcomed the continued cooperation between the Government of South Sudan and OHCHR.

73. It was unfortunate that the Council had once again been unable to adopt a unified resolution on South Sudan at its current session, as the existence of different proposals weakened the key role the Council was supposed to play. Brazil appreciated the flexibility shown by the sponsors who had introduced the draft resolution on advancing human rights in South Sudan under agenda item 2. While understanding concerns regarding the extension of the mandate of the Commission on Human Rights in South Sudan, his delegation nonetheless believed that the Commission remained necessary to monitor the situation on the ground. The draft resolution under agenda item 10 also envisaged monitoring measures and, as an initiative led by the regional group of the concerned country, it deserved the Council's support. For that reason, Brazil had decided to join the consensus on the current draft resolution and to abstain from voting on the draft resolution under agenda item 2.

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

75. **Mr. Deng** (Observer for South Sudan) said that he wished to thank the main sponsors of the draft resolution and all the delegations that had made constructive contributions to the text, which used language similar to that of the previous resolution with some additions and

changes to match the progress made in South Sudan and to reflect developments and regional perspectives. The draft resolution also specified some new areas in which South Sudan required technical assistance and capacity-building.

76. He wished to reiterate his Government's consistent position that provision of technical assistance and capacity-building was the best way to assist the rule of law institutions and enhance the promotion and protection of human rights in the country, particularly as the alleged human rights violations were chiefly attributable to a lack of training among law enforcement officials. It was for that reason that his delegation had always called upon the Council to discuss the draft resolution under agenda item 10 rather than agenda item 2. Merging the two under a single agenda item – preferably item 10 – would avoid duplication and render the Council more efficient.

77. He wished to express his appreciation to OHCHR for the technical assistance and capacity-building it had been providing and to reassure all international partners of his country's political commitment and will to make better use of the support provided. His delegation called upon the Council to adopt the draft resolution without a vote, as it always had in the past.

78. *Draft resolution A/HRC/58/L.23 was adopted.*

*Draft resolution A/HRC/58/L.28: Technical assistance and capacity-building to improve the situation of human rights in Haiti, in connection with a request from the authorities of Haiti for coordinated and targeted international action*

79. **Ms. Lassegue** (Observer for Haiti), introducing the draft resolution, said that her country was making an appeal for solidarity and for action. The first free Black nation in the world, which had proclaimed the universality of human rights in 1804, Haiti was currently in the throes of a multidimensional crisis. Armed gangs controlled entire neighbourhoods, using terror, violence and rape to impose their control. Hospitals had become theatres of violence, schools were closed and an entire generation of children was being deprived of an education and a future. Some children were forcibly recruited and used as instruments of war. That state of affairs was inconsistent with the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which Haiti had ratified in 1995.

80. The chaotic security situation was being aggravated by climate catastrophes such as cyclones, floods and drought, which placed an additional burden on a population that was already at the limit. The people of Haiti had to rebuild their country, but they could not do so alone. They needed the solidarity of the international community and, specifically, the work of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Haiti, whose mandate was not a formality but a living symbol of engagement. Renewal of that mandate was a moral and strategic imperative.

81. Haiti did not need pity but support. It needed greater technical assistance and an international presence that accompanied the country without imposition or domination as it moved forward on faltering steps. Thus, Haiti could become once again a symbol of freedom and progress, an example not of suffering but of renaissance. International solidarity needed to be translated into concrete and coordinated actions that were aligned with the real needs of the people, and the United Nations needed to continue its efforts to hold accountable those who promoted the chaos and impunity. She hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

82. **The President** announced that 40 States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which had programme budget implications amounting to \$741,600.

*General statements made before the decision*

83. **Mr. Benítez Verson** (Cuba) said that, although the international community owed a historic debt to Haiti, the country had become an unacceptable symbol of the incapacity and indifference of many States and of the United Nations. Cuba defended the legitimate right of the Haitian people to find a peaceful and sustainable solution to the challenges they faced, based on full respect for their self-determination, sovereignty and independence. To that end,



they needed better international solidarity, capacity-building, technology transfer, technical assistance and cooperation.

84. Haiti should be given at least part of the abundant financial resources that the Council regularly wasted on interventionist mechanisms that were not supported by the countries concerned and that produced no results. Resources provided by the international community had to be used efficiently, yet in the past the monies and materials allocated to Haiti had often been either insufficient, not forthcoming or absorbed by innumerable, foreign non-governmental organizations (NGOs) which, in many cases, had failed to respect the priorities set by the Haitian authorities. OHCHR and the Independent Expert, working in close coordination with the national authorities, needed to continue their efforts to identify what practical actions would best support Haiti. Cuba would join the consensus on the draft resolution, without prejudice to its position concerning the deployment of the Multinational Security Support Mission in Haiti mandated by the Security Council.

85. **Ms. Fuentes Julio** (Chile) said that her delegation supported the draft resolution, which sought to provide a coordinated technical response to the grave situation in Haiti. She had been happy to see that the text incorporated references to the need to halt the illicit trafficking of firearms, which was fuelling violence, instability and human rights violations. She also welcomed the renewal of the mandate of the Independent Expert, whose vital work facilitated more coherent and effective international action, in coordination with regional and international stakeholders.

86. Her delegation remained profoundly concerned about the situation in Haiti, which was marked by human rights violations such as the use of sexual violence as an instrument of control, the displacement of more than 1 million persons and increasing restrictions on essential services such as healthcare, education and access to food. To overcome that situation required international solidarity, coupled with the firm and constant commitment of the Haitian authorities. Chile invited all members of the Council to support the draft resolution and to continue collaborating with Haiti.

87. **Ms. Thuaudet** (France) said that her delegation congratulated the Haitian authorities for the remarkable degree of collaboration they had shown with OHCHR and the Independent Expert, and welcomed their decision to request the extension of those mandates. It was, in fact, essential to continue documenting the abuses and human rights violations taking place in an increasingly dramatic situation where, between July 2024 and February 2025, 4,239 persons had been killed, including more than 600 women and 150 children. Recent months had also witnessed the lynching of gang members by self-defence groups and angry crowds.

88. The rights to life, security and justice were being sorely tested in present-day Haiti but, as the Independent Expert had said, the crisis could be overcome if immediate and decisive action was taken. The solution lay, in the first instance, in a strict respect for the decisions taken by the international community and in the full enforcement of the arms embargo, travel ban and assets freeze mandated by the Security Council. After that, Haiti itself had to address the underlying causes of the crisis, first and foremost by eradicating corruption and impunity. For the future of Haiti, France called upon all members of the Council to support the draft resolution.

89. **Mr. Ogando Lora** (Dominican Republic) said that his delegation strongly supported the text, which was consistent with the repeated calls of the Government of Haiti for coordinated international action to help it in the complex process of transition towards sustainable socioeconomic development. The Council was well aware of the gravity of the current security situation, which was beyond the country's institutional capacities to contain and which was leading to systematic human rights violations due, above all, to the action of armed criminal gangs.

90. The Dominican Republic therefore welcomed the draft resolution, which promoted a comprehensive, multisectoral human rights-based approach to the situation in Haiti, coupled with technical assistance and independent monitoring, with a view to reinforcing the country's own institutional capacities. His delegation also supported the renewal of the mandate of the Independent Expert and drew attention to the importance of establishing an OHCHR office in Haiti.



91. Socioeconomic stability was impossible without security, but there could be no sustainable security unless the human rights of all Haitians were guaranteed. He therefore renewed his call to the international community to support the country's own efforts by providing technical and financial resources for the effective reconstruction of democratic national institutions. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

92. **Mr. Gallón** (Colombia) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution which, by envisaging concrete mechanisms to help the national authorities protect and promote human rights, sought to respond to the gravity of the problems Haiti was facing. OHCHR, United Nations agencies and the international community as a whole needed to provide more technical assistance and capacity-building to help the Government address a situation marked by generalized violence and illegal arms trafficking. His delegation also welcomed the extension of the mandate of the Independent Expert, which was a vital way to keep the Council's attention focused on Haiti. The mandate holder needed to focus on the protection of children, the impact of arms trafficking and the need to support national, regional and international engagement.

93. Colombia had strengthened its own relations with Haiti, opening a consular office there in 2023 and holding a bilateral council of ministers in 2024. In addition, a new Haitian ambassador had recently been installed in Bogotá and the President of Colombia, Gustavo Petro Urrego, had visited Haiti in early 2025. On that occasion, the President had reaffirmed his country's solidarity with Haiti and its willingness to offer humanitarian assistance and institutional capacity-building, with a view to promoting regional peace and security. Lastly, it was important to ensure that any international action was oriented, not just to stabilizing the security situation, but also to overcoming the dire socioeconomic straits in which most of the population of Haiti were living.

94. **Mr. Guillermet Fernández** (Costa Rica) said that Costa Rica was grateful to the delegation of Haiti for its unwavering desire to cooperate with OHCHR to improve its human rights situation, as a step towards peace, development and robust democracy. He wished to highlight the fact, reported by OHCHR and others, that, although Haiti was not itself a firearms producer, the country was nonetheless inundated with an alarming quantity of arms and ammunition. That weaponry had enabled criminal gangs to strengthen their control and to commit grave human rights violations, including sexual violence against women and girls, mutilation, torture and murder. The situation in Haiti was of the utmost concern to his country and to all States of Latin America and the Caribbean. The Council should continue to concern itself with that situation while the international community needed to take action to reduce the flow of arms into the country and to identify those responsible and hold them accountable.

95. The draft resolution was an authentic expression of the principle underlying agenda item 10 in that it reflected the will of the Government of Haiti to work with the international community to overcome the challenges it was facing. Certain States in particular had a historical responsibility and should demonstrate their support – particularly in financial terms, given the financial crisis currently facing the United Nations – for a people who were suffering daily violations of their human rights.

96. **Ms. Too** (Kenya) said that her delegation supported the draft resolution and recognized the urgent need for a multifaceted approach to address the dire human rights situation in Haiti. Kenya was playing a leading role in the Multinational Security Support Mission, which faced significant challenges as it sought to restore security and protect civilians. In fact, several Kenyan officers had lost their lives while serving on the Mission, most recently on 25 March. Their sacrifice underscored the urgent need for enhanced international support to bolster the Mission's effectiveness. Her delegation urged the international community to provide robust financial, logistical and technical assistance to the Mission to enable it to deal with the evolving security situation. It also called for greater coordination between the Mission, the Haitian authorities and international partners to address security challenges and build lasting stability. Her delegation called for the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus.

97. *Draft resolution A/HRC/58/L.28 was adopted.*

98. **The President** invited delegations to make statements in explanation of position or general statements on any of the draft resolutions considered under agenda item 10.

99. **Mr. Dan** (Benin), welcoming the adoption by consensus of the three draft resolutions in question, said that technical assistance and capacity-building were essential to support the promotion and protection of human rights worldwide. Such measures were particularly relevant when they were adopted in response to structural or situational needs expressed by the countries concerned and implemented in cooperation with them. Least developed countries and small island developing States were eligible for support from the Voluntary Technical Assistance Trust Fund to Support the Participation of Least Developed Countries and Small Island Developing States in the Work of the Human Rights Council, the success of which could be measured by the growing number of States that had either benefited from or contributed to it. As a regular beneficiary and recent contributor to the Fund, Benin was looking forward to hosting a regional workshop for the Fund in May 2025. The workshop, which would bring together representatives from over 20 African countries, would be an opportunity to assess the impact of the Fund's activities and to identify areas for improvement.

### **Agenda item 1: Organizational and procedural matters**

#### *Appointment of mandate holders*

100. **The President** said that, on the basis of the recommendations of the Consultative Group and following broad consultations, he wished to propose the appointment of the candidates whose names were indicated in the letters that had been circulated to all delegations on 14 February 2025. He took it that the Council wished to endorse those candidates and appoint them as mandate holders.

101. *It was so decided.*

#### *Report on the fifty-eighth session*

102. **The President**, introducing the draft report of the Human Rights Council on its fifty-eighth session ([A/HRC/58/2](#)) in the absence of the Vice-President and Rapporteur, said that the structure of the report reflected the 10 items on the Council's agenda. A list of the resolutions adopted during the session would be included in the first part of the report. During the session, the Council had adopted 32 resolutions and had considered and adopted the outcomes of the universal periodic review in respect of 14 countries. It had also appointed three mandate holders to the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. He took it that the Council wished to adopt the report ad referendum, on the understanding that it would be finalized with the assistance of the secretariat.

103. *It was so decided.*

#### *Statements by observer delegations on the resolutions and decisions considered at the session*

104. **Mr. Bachtobji** (Observer for Tunisia) said that his delegation supported draft resolutions [A/HRC/58/L.30/Rev.1](#) [A/HRC/58/L.31](#) and [A/HRC/58/L.32/Rev.1](#) related to the Palestinian issue, with the exception of the references to the 1967 borders, East Jerusalem and the two-State solution. Tunisia wished to reiterate its solidarity with the Palestinian people as they sought to establish an independent State covering their entire territory with East Jerusalem as its capital.

105. His delegation fully supported draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.16](#) on the impact of the non-repatriation of funds of illicit origin and was grateful to the Group of African States for hosting consultations on it. Certain European countries had voted against the resolution even though it was abundantly clear that illicit financial flows deprived countries of the conditions they needed to ensure the realization of human rights, including economic, social and cultural rights and the right to development. African countries lost billions of dollars every year to illicit financial flows. Their right to recover those assets was inalienable and should not be subject to any statute of limitations.

106. **Ms. Atteya** (Observer for Egypt) said that Egypt deeply regretted the continued divisiveness within the Council regarding the situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, particularly in the light of the persistent, grave violations of international law. Her delegation

was grateful to those who had voted in favour of draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.16](#), on the human rights impact of the non-repatriation of funds of illicit origin to their countries of origin; however, it remained concerned about the lack of consensus on that critical issue. Her delegation welcomed draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.7](#) and reaffirmed the centrality of economic, social and cultural rights in promoting development and reducing inequalities. Her delegation commended draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.15](#) for highlighting the vital role of women in diplomacy and human rights and reiterated its support for the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the outcome documents of its review conferences. Her delegation supported draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.9](#) and stressed the need to ensure that neurotechnology was designed and used in a manner consistent with human rights obligations. Her delegation applauded the main sponsors of draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.21](#) for facilitating its adoption by consensus. It also appreciated the constructive approach taken by the main sponsors of [A/HRC/58/L.29](#) and reaffirmed its support for the important mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism. Her delegation welcomed the focus on education in [A/HRC/58/L.17/Rev.1](#) and underlined the importance of upholding the internationally agreed definition of “youth” and respecting national frameworks on children’s participation in political affairs, in line with international obligations.

107. Egypt reserved the right to interpret and implement adopted resolutions in line with its national laws and universally recognized human rights. It dissociated itself from concepts and references that did not enjoy consensus and were not clearly defined in international human rights law. It reaffirmed its national understanding of gender and associated concepts in line with its cultural and societal context. Its understanding of the concept of human rights defenders and their role in society was strictly based on the Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

108. **Ms. Micael** (Observer for Eritrea), referring to draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.6](#), said that her delegation reaffirmed its position on country-specific mandates and expressed concern at the approach taken by sponsors who appeared to assume the authority to determine which States upheld human rights standards.

109. Regarding draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.30/Rev.1](#), her delegation considered that there was no clearer demonstration of the absurdity of the Council than the ongoing slaughter of innocent Palestinians in the Gaza Strip. It was incomprehensible that the very States that had extended country-specific mandates for decades were the same ones that had called for a vote on that resolution. It was outrageous that those same States would continue to point fingers at others and claim that they were failing to protect human rights.

110. With respect to draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.7](#), on the realization in all countries of economic, social and cultural rights, her delegation wished to emphasize that its call for language on unilateral coercive measures to be included could not be dismissed as an attempt to obstruct the process. As long as such measures continued to be imposed, it was both necessary and legitimate to call for their recognition in relevant resolutions. Her delegation took offence at the implication by some States that Eritrea was using unilateral coercive measures as a pretext for evading human rights obligations. Such rhetoric was not only offensive but also reflected a lack of understanding of the realities faced by countries affected by such measures.

111. Her delegation was disappointed by the overall handling of draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.20/Rev.1](#), on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, and by the sponsors’ lack of transparency. It remained unclear why the mandate in question – which had been established for a specific purpose and had now concluded – should be renewed without sound justification. It was deeply concerning that the Council permitted such practices without questioning the reasoning behind them. Her delegation urged the Council to uphold accountability and consistency in its decision-making, in accordance with the institution-building package.

112. **Mr. Necmioğlu** (Observer for Türkiye), referring to draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.26/Rev.1](#), said that Türkiye was not a Party to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. It had consistently stated that the Convention did not have a universal

and unified character and was not the only legal framework that regulated all activities in the oceans and seas. Türkiye supported international efforts to establish a regime of the seas that was based on the principle of equity and was acceptable to all States. It considered that the Convention did not provide safeguards for specific geographical situations and therefore did not consider conflicting interests and sensitivities stemming from special circumstances. Furthermore, the Convention did not allow States to enter reservations to its articles. As a result, Türkiye could not become a Party to the Convention, despite agreeing with its general intent and its provisions, and wished to dissociate itself from the reference to the Convention in the resolution. Its participation in the negotiations on the resolution did not change its legal position with respect to the Convention.

113. **Ms. Rivera** (Observer for Canada) said that her delegation welcomed the adoption of draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.3](#) on the promotion and protection of human rights in Nicaragua. It regretted the recent decision of Nicaragua to refrain from taking a position on the recommendations made during the universal periodic review, thus undermining the very essence of the review process. Her delegation was pleased that the main sponsors of draft resolutions [A/HRC/58/L.5](#) and [A/HRC/58/L.18](#), relating to freedom of religion or belief, had once again been able to return to a balanced and consensual approach to the two resolutions. In view of the budgetary situation, her delegation encouraged the Council to consider ways to avoid duplication of effort. Canada was committed to working with the Council to achieve that goal and to advance human rights.

114. **Ms. Al Abtan** (Observer for Iraq) said that draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.4/Rev.1](#) was of great importance, particularly insofar as it dealt with the protection of cultural heritage in times of war. Her country welcomed the adoption of draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.15](#), on women, diplomacy and human rights, and was working hard to empower women and ensure their full participation in decision-making and diplomacy. Iraq was one of the countries most affected by anti-personnel mines and viewed the adoption of draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.21](#) as a positive step towards addressing and curbing their use. States must work together to support the victims of mines and ensure their access to justice. Her delegation hailed the adoption of draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.26/Rev.1](#) on the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment, which dealt with the notion of common but differentiated responsibilities in the area of environmental protection.

115. Lastly, Iraq fully supported agenda item 7 on the human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories and would reject any attempts to dilute it. Iraq deplored the fact that the occupying forces seemed to grow stronger every day and to act with complete impunity, yet the Council seemed unable to adopt a resolution on the situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory by consensus.

116. **Ms. Trkov** (Observer for Slovenia) said that Slovenia was delighted that draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.24/Rev.1](#), on the establishment of an open-ended intergovernmental working group for the elaboration of a legally binding instrument on the promotion and protection of the human rights of older persons, had been adopted by consensus and enjoyed broad cross-regional support. Slovenia looked forward to embarking on a journey that would build bridges across regions and could transform the lives of millions of people.

117. **Mr. Ustinov** (Observer for the Russian Federation) said that his country had consistently opposed the politicization of human rights and the use of human rights to achieve geopolitical goals, as exemplified by the resolutions on the human rights situations in Ukraine, Belarus, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Myanmar, Nicaragua and South Sudan. The Russian Federation dissociated itself from the consensus on draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.21](#), on the impact of anti-personnel mines on the full enjoyment of all human rights, and draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.26/Rev.1](#), on the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment.

118. With regard to draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.24/Rev.1](#), on the establishment of an open-ended intergovernmental working group for the elaboration of a legally binding instrument on the promotion and protection of the rights of older persons, his delegation noted that decisions on participation in international treaties were a sovereign matter. It was regrettable that the mandate of the working group would be limited and would not cover the full range of measures envisaged in decision 14/1 of the Open-ended Working Group on

Ageing. His delegation hoped that the participation of older persons and their representative organizations in the drafting process would be organized in strict compliance with the rules of procedure of the Council and the General Assembly.

119. The Russian Federation would continue to interpret references to human rights defenders in resolutions in keeping with the Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. It dissociated itself from any references to the Pact for the Future and the Global Digital Compact. It opposed the use of the phrases “human rights-based approach”, “cultural rights-based approach” and “human rights-based environmental action”. It understood the term “gender” to mean biological sex and did not support the use of ambiguous terms such as “gender-responsive”, “gender-based violence” and “gender parity”.

120. **Mr. Chaves Mendoza** (Observer for the Holy See) said that his delegation had engaged constructively in both the work of the Open-ended Working Group on Ageing and the informal consultations on draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.24/Rev.1](#). It looked forward to cooperating with the open-ended intergovernmental working group and hoped that the process of elaborating a legally binding instrument would be an opportunity to address some of the concerns raised by delegations during the informal consultations. His delegation would like to encourage the open-ended intergovernmental working group to take into account all the recommendations contained in decision 14/1 of the Open-ended Working Group on Ageing. It was important to analyse instruments such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights to identify actual gaps in the legal framework with respect to the rights of older persons, as opposed to problems with the implementation of existing provisions. Any draft legally binding instrument should be considered for adoption by the General Assembly, given its relevance to all Member States. Regarding draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.15](#), on women, diplomacy and human rights, the Holy See dissociated itself from the use of the term “gender”, which it understood to mean biological sex.

121. **Ms. Oduwaiye** (Observer for Nigeria), welcoming the adoption of draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.16](#), said that it was undeniable that illicit financial flows hindered development across the global South and deprived countries of vital resources for healthcare, education and infrastructure. Withholding stolen assets exacerbated inequalities and stalled sustainable development. Her delegation deeply regretted the lack of consensus on the resolution, especially given its alignment with global commitments. The repatriation of illicit funds was not just a matter of financial recovery but a moral and human rights obligation. Nigeria urged all Member States to recognize the urgency of the resolution and commit to its full implementation.

122. Her delegation welcomed the adoption of draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.24/Rev.1](#) and strongly supported the elaboration of a legally binding instrument to address gaps in the international human rights framework for older persons, which would align with the national commitment of Nigeria to their dignity and well-being. Her delegation looked forward to engaging constructively in the process of developing a robust instrument that ensured the full and equal enjoyment of all human rights by older persons. Her delegation also welcomed the adoption of draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.7](#), on the realization in all countries of economic, social and cultural rights, and draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.15](#), on women, diplomacy and human rights.

123. **Mr. Tyagi** (Observer for India), referring to draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.26/Rev.1](#), said that India remained deeply committed to protecting human rights, including in relation to the environment. However, his delegation wished to reiterate that neither Council resolutions nor General Assembly resolutions created legally binding obligations. Terms like “clean”, “healthy” and “sustainable” remained open to subjective interpretation. India had abstained from voting on Council resolution 48/13 and had dissociated itself from paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 76/300, expressing its concerns in terms of both procedure and substance. It had also dissociated itself from the paragraphs of Council resolutions 52/23 and 55/2 that referred to States’ obligations with respect to the right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment without acknowledging that the nature of that right had yet to be agreed upon by States. India supported the adoption of the resolution by consensus but



dissociated itself from the paragraphs that referred to the right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment.

124. Regarding draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.21](#), India remained committed to the eventual elimination of anti-personnel mines, attached great importance to addressing civilian casualties and had extended assistance to international demining and rehabilitation efforts. India considered that the Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-traps and Other Devices as Amended on 3 May 1996 (Protocol II as amended on 3 May 1996) struck a balance between humanitarian concerns and the legitimate defence needs of States, particularly those with long borders. India had fulfilled its obligations by, for example, ensuring that its anti-personnel mines were detectable and observing a complete moratorium on the export and transfer of land mines. Matters related to international humanitarian law and disarmament should be discussed in the appropriate forums. Discussions on topics that fell outside the Council's mandate diverted attention from core human rights issues.

125. **Ms. Macrory** (Observer for the United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom remained fully committed to implementing the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. With respect to draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.7](#), her delegation noted that States took different approaches to implementing the Covenant, in line with their Constitutions. The Covenant was binding on the United Kingdom but had the status of an unincorporated treaty, meaning that it was not justiciable domestically and that national courts would not normally contribute to identifying gaps in legislation in respect of rights enshrined therein. The United Kingdom continued to progressively realize the rights recognized in the Covenant through a combination of legislative and administrative measures, in accordance with article 2 (1) of the Covenant.

126. Although article 2 (1) of the Covenant acknowledged that there were differences in the resources available to States, international human rights law did not provide for the notion of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities. Any attempt to imply, in draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.26/Rev.1](#), that such a concept formed part of international human rights law was a mischaracterization of the law. The United Kingdom recognized that the Paris Agreement would be implemented to reflect equity and the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities in the light of different national circumstances. The United Kingdom remained committed to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, to the Paris Agreement and to accelerating climate action based on the best available science in the context of sustainable development and efforts to eradicate poverty.

127. **Mr. Foradori** (Observer for Argentina), referring to draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.24/Rev.1](#) on the establishment of an open-ended intergovernmental working group for the elaboration of a legally binding instrument on the promotion and protection of the human rights of older persons, said that there were challenges relating both to the institutional framework of the international system and to differences between countries in terms of cultural perspectives and population ageing. The open-ended intergovernmental working group would count on the valuable input of civil society and the expertise of States. The aim was to develop, within the relevant time frame, a truly universal instrument that reflected all voices and perspectives and that did not impose partial or artificial solutions. The vulnerability inherent in all human beings called for a transdisciplinary approach to the protection of human rights. Argentina would continue to work towards the recognition of the rights of older persons without discrimination and the elaboration of a legally binding instrument that enjoyed the support of all Member States.

128. **Mr. Tsymbaliuk** (Observer for Ukraine) said that Ukraine acknowledged the adoption of draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.22](#) and the extension of the mandate of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on Ukraine, which represented a significant step towards bringing the Russian Federation to account for the atrocities inflicted on the people of Ukraine. The adoption of the resolution affirmed the international community's determination and enforced international law. His delegation supported the adoption of draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.4/Rev.1](#), on cultural rights and the protection of cultural heritage, which was crucial for Ukraine amid the systematic attempts of the Russian Federation to erase its cultural identity and heritage.

129. His delegation welcomed the adoption of draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.27/Rev.1](#), as orally revised. It recognized the growing digital threats faced by human rights defenders and underscored the need for robust protection to facilitate their work. The resolution would play a constructive role in monitoring the involvement of Belarus in the transfer of Ukrainian children. Ukraine welcomed the adoption of draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.15](#), on women, diplomacy and human rights, and remained firmly committed to promoting gender equality and women's leadership. The representation of women in senior posts in the Ukrainian diplomatic system had recently risen to 30 per cent. Ensuring gender equality in conflict resolution, peacebuilding and post-conflict recovery and integrating gender perspectives into national security and foreign policy remained a priority.

130. **Ms. Karimdoost** (Observer for the Islamic Republic of Iran) said that draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.20/Rev.1](#), on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, set a new and destructive trend of creating mechanisms without adequate discussion. That trend, which had budgetary implications for all Member States, should be prevented. Regarding draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.7](#), on the realization in all countries of economic, social and cultural rights, her delegation regretted that the very pertinent concept of unilateral coercive measures, which was related to the issue of development financing, had not been considered by the main sponsors. With respect to draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.27/Rev.1](#), on human rights defenders and new and emerging technologies, her delegation considered that the approach taken by the main sponsors had been neither cooperative nor constructive, as they had ignored the concerns raised by non-member States. Lastly, her delegation regretted that it had been necessary to put draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.31](#), on the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, and draft resolution [A/HRC/58/L.32/Rev.1](#), on Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, to a vote.

#### **Closure of the session**

131. After the customary exchange of courtesies, **the President** declared the fifty-eighth session of the Human Rights Council closed.

*The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.*