



General Assembly

Distr.: General
29 October 2025

Original: English

Human Rights Council Sixtieth session

Summary record of the 44th meeting

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Tuesday, 7 October 2025, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Lauber (Switzerland)

Contents

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

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

Agenda item 5: Human rights bodies and mechanisms

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 (*continued*)

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

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



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

Agenda item 3: Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development (*continued*)
([A/HRC/60/L.28](#) and [A/HRC/60/L.38/Rev.1](#) as orally revised)

Draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.28](#): Promotion and protection of the human rights of women and children in conflict and post-conflict situations: ensuring justice, remedies and reparation for victims

1. **Ms. Al-Muftah** (Qatar), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the main sponsors, namely Costa Rica and her own delegation, said that the world was currently witnessing an unprecedented surge in armed conflicts, with approximately 130 ongoing worldwide, more than double the number recorded 15 years before, according to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). The majority of victims of those conflicts were civilian women and children, who were disproportionately affected by violence and rights violations. In nearly all armed conflicts, the common factor had been the blatant disregard for basic human rights and international humanitarian law. Mechanisms for justice, remedies and reparation for those harmed remained inadequate. Measures to ensure protection and accountability for gross violations of international human rights law and international humanitarian law continued to fall short, leaving victims without meaningful justice and allowing widespread impunity. She trusted that the Council would adopt the draft resolution by consensus, thereby reaffirming its enduring commitment to promoting and protecting the human rights of women and children.
2. **The President** announced that 20 States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which had programme budget implications amounting to \$137,300.

General statements made before the decision

3. **Ms. Méndez Escobar** (Mexico) said that, by adopting the draft resolution, the Council would reaffirm the need to prevent all forms of violence against women and girls, including sexual and gender-based violence, and acknowledge specific challenges faced by boys in conflict and post-conflict situations. Her delegation would have preferred the text to also reflect the distinct challenges faced by girls and adolescents. Lastly, her delegation welcomed the fact that the draft resolution included an invitation to the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, special procedure mandate holders, commissions of inquiry and treaty bodies to mainstream the promotion and protection of the human rights of women and children into their broader analyses of the situation of human rights in armed conflicts.
4. **Mr. Alhayen** (Kuwait), speaking on behalf of the States members of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf, said that those States attached great importance to the promotion and protection of the rights of women and children in all contexts, including in conflict and post-conflict situations. They had worked to provide humanitarian aid and development assistance that had reached millions of women and children in conflict areas. They had also endeavoured to protect the human rights of women and children in their efforts to put an end to armed conflict. The States of the Gulf Cooperation Council reiterated their support for the draft resolution and urged the Council to adopt it by consensus.
5. **Ms. Neocleous** (Cyprus), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Union that were members of the Council, said that the European Union attached great importance to the situation of women and children in conflict situations. Women and girls were distinctly affected by conflict-related sexual and gender-based violence, arbitrary killings, torture, child and forced marriage and lack of access to health services. Despite their vital role in conflict prevention, conflict resolution and peacebuilding, women were underrepresented in decision-making on matters of peace and security. In that regard, the European Union reaffirmed its commitment to the implementation of Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) on women and peace and security. Given that children were also disproportionately affected by conflict and faced unique vulnerabilities, the European Union would have preferred a draft resolution that did not conflate the distinct rights of women and children, treating women and peace and security, and children and armed conflict, as two

distinct yet complementary agendas. Nevertheless, it was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution.

6. **Mr. Oike** (Japan) said that the draft resolution was a timely initiative, given that 2025 marked the thirtieth anniversary of the adoption of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) and the twentieth anniversary of the adoption of Security Council resolution 1612 (2005) on children and armed conflict. His Government had been actively engaged in promoting and protecting the human rights of women and children in conflict and post-conflict situations, including by hosting the meeting of the Women and Peace and Security Focal Points Network in Tokyo in February 2025. The draft resolution was aimed at strengthening the protection of the human rights of women and children in such situations and remedies for violations. However, his delegation was concerned to note that there was some overlap between the aims set out in the draft and those of existing Council initiatives. Nevertheless, it recognized the importance of highlighting and strengthening action on the issue. His delegation was also concerned about the interpretation of certain paragraphs under international law. In particular, careful consideration was needed with respect to the paragraphs that dealt with the principles of international humanitarian law and the scope of States' obligations, and the treatment of schools in conflict situations under international humanitarian law. Despite such concerns, his delegation supported the fundamental objectives of the draft resolution and hoped it would be adopted by consensus.

7. **Ms. Cordero Suárez** (Cuba) said that her delegation reiterated its deep concern about the disproportionate impact of armed conflict on women and children. Any form of cruel or inhuman treatment of women and children committed in armed conflict or in occupied territories constituted an international crime, and those responsible must be brought to justice. In that regard, Cuba denounced in the strongest terms the genocide being committed by Israel against the Palestinian people. More than 40,000 children had been killed or injured and more than 17,000 had been separated from their families. Many children had died of hunger and malnutrition. More children than adults had died in the massacre, made possible by the sophisticated weapons provided to Israel by the Government of the United States of America, with the complicit silence of many others. Her delegation supported the invitation in the draft resolution for the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the relevant special procedure mandate holders, commissions of inquiry and treaty bodies to mainstream, within their respective mandates, the need to promote and protect the human rights of women and children in conflict and post-conflict situations. She hoped that the draft would be adopted by consensus.

8. **Ms. Widyaningsih** (Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), said that OIC was deeply concerned about the devastating impact that armed conflicts continued to have on women and children around the world. Regrettably, women and children bore the brunt of conflicts, experiencing violence, displacement and immense suffering. OIC supported the goal of the draft resolution, which was to ensure that States recognized the special needs and rights of women and children in conflict zones and took immediate and concrete measures to protect them from harm, including during occupation, in particular by facilitating the safe passage and delivery of humanitarian aid to civilians. OIC also emphasized the importance of refraining from the use of starvation as a method of warfare and protecting humanitarian personnel, facilities and assets, hospitals, schools and places of worship. Her delegation welcomed the draft resolution's focus on the critical role women played in peacebuilding, conflict prevention and post-conflict reconstruction. The States members of OIC reaffirmed their support for the draft resolution and called for its adoption without a vote.

9. **Mr. Guillermet Fernández** (Costa Rica) said that, while women and children were different rights holders and required tailored measures to meet their needs, both groups were undeniably the ones most disproportionately affected by armed conflict. The draft resolution's aim was to reduce the existing gap in addressing important issues affecting women and children that had often been ignored, primarily by ensuring justice, remedies and reparation for victims and approaches that resulted in restitution, rehabilitation and guarantees of non-repetition. The draft also expressed recognition of the importance of the full, equal, meaningful and safe participation of women in all stages of peace processes. In

relation to the way in which conflict situations affected children, the draft resolution included a call for the best interests of the child and the need for child-friendly justice systems to be taken into account. It was essential for the full range of Council mechanisms to be available to States in order to mainstream a unified approach in their work. His delegation called for the draft resolution to be adopted by consensus.

10. **Mr. Lanwi** (Marshall Islands) said that the protection of civilians was a core principle addressed in the Fourth Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949. Yet in the more than 120 ongoing armed conflicts worldwide, women and children were often the most vulnerable to gross violations of their fundamental rights, which in some instances might amount to international crimes. The destruction of the environment further exacerbated their suffering. The lack of representation and invisibility of women and children in public discourse in the context of armed conflicts and their aftermath compounded their vulnerability and hindered their access to justice and reparation. Women and children were agents of resilient and peaceful societies. The international community had a common responsibility to fully implement international humanitarian law and human rights law, ensure that all civilians, including women and children, were protected and foster credible, lasting peace and justice. His delegation stood ready to support the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus and called on all Council members to do the same.

11. **Mr. Sultanov** (Kyrgyzstan), speaking on behalf of the members of the Organization of Turkic States, said that women and children were among the most vulnerable in times of conflict, facing grave violations of their fundamental rights, including displacement, violence and denial of access to education, healthcare and humanitarian assistance. The draft resolution's focus on the full, equal, meaningful and safe participation of women in peacebuilding, post-conflict reconstruction and decision-making processes was welcome, as was the recognition of the critical importance of protecting schools, hospitals and infrastructure from attack or military use. Empowering women and safeguarding children were essential to sustainable peace, reconciliation and development. The members of the Organization of Turkic States called on all Council members to support the draft resolution and to translate its principles into concrete action on the ground.

12. **Mr. Gallón** (Colombia) said that he welcomed the draft resolution. Colombia had experienced first-hand the devastating impact that armed conflict had on the civilian population. Women and children were disproportionately affected by sexual violence, forced recruitment, denial of the right to education, exploitation, and displacement. Attacks on schools, hospitals and health centres, which had become a regular occurrence, not only violated international law, but also deprived entire communities of essential services, particularly affecting women and children. His delegation welcomed the recognition in the draft resolution that sustainable peace required truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-repetition and that women played an indispensable role in peacebuilding. Women were the source of life, and children embodied innocence and the future. The international community must not be guilty of any refusal or reluctance to protect them.

13. **Mr. Mahabub** (Bangladesh) said that Bangladesh, as a country that had consistently upheld its commitment to protecting and promoting the rights of women and children both nationally and internationally, aligned itself with the draft resolution's focus on accountability, justice and reparation for victims of violations in conflict and post-conflict situations. Bangladesh had long advocated the women and peace and security agenda and the protection of children in armed conflict. The disproportionate and multidimensional impact of conflict on women and children demanded sustained international attention, the meaningful participation of women in peace and security processes and robust mechanisms to prevent and address violations. His delegation underscored the critical importance of ensuring safe, unhindered and sustained humanitarian access to affected populations. Humanitarian operations must always adhere to the principles of neutrality, impartiality and independence.

14. As a host country to one of the largest displaced populations in the world, Bangladesh had seen first-hand the devastating and gendered impact of conflict on women and children. His delegation therefore strongly supported the draft resolution's provisions on strengthened protection capacities on the ground and effective mechanisms for reparation and rehabilitation. The international community shared responsibility for ensuring that women

and children in conflict and post-conflict situations were protected, empowered and given a voice in shaping a future of peace and justice.

15. **Ms. Tsheole** (South Africa) said that children, especially girls, needed special protection, as they were among the most vulnerable members of society. Her delegation was deeply concerned to note that multidimensional conflicts continued to adversely affect the protection of children, who continued to bear the brunt of relentless hostilities and indiscriminate attacks. They were being subjected to starvation as a weapon of war. Her delegation was also concerned about the continued killing and maiming of children by the use of explosive ordnance and by crossfire between parties to conflicts in populated areas, which often led to lifelong disabilities, if not death. South Africa called upon all parties to conflict to facilitate safe, timely and unimpeded humanitarian access and children's access to services, assistance and protection, and to ensure the safety and security of humanitarian personnel and assets. Failure to ensure the protection of children in conflict situations exposed them to further threats. It was the moral obligation of the international community to protect children, and their protection must be its first priority.

16. **Ms. Arrous** (Algeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States, said that she wished to emphasize the vital importance of the draft resolution, at a time when the world was facing an unprecedented number of conflicts with a significant impact on civilians, especially women and children. The draft resolution referred to the need to fulfil obligations under international humanitarian law and international human rights law with regard to the protection of women and children in conflict and post-conflict situations, including situations of occupation. The draft resolution underscored the complementarity between international human rights law and international humanitarian law, especially regarding fundamental rights such as the rights to education, food and health. The violation of those rights, including through attacks on schools and hospitals, obstruction of the work of humanitarian and health workers and the use of starvation as a weapon against civilian populations, constituted war crimes and should be prosecuted and punished accordingly. Her delegation urged Council members to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

17. **Ms. Fuentes Julio** (Chile) said that the draft resolution not only recognized women and girls as victims but also highlighted their active role in peacebuilding, conflict prevention and transitional justice processes, in line with the principles of the women and peace and security agenda. Building lasting peace required not only an end to conflict but also the construction of more inclusive and peaceful societies in which women acted as agents of change, contributing to reconciliation, the prevention of new violence and the restoration of the social fabric. Her Government's feminist foreign policy underscored the importance of incorporating a gender perspective into all stages of peace processes, strengthening the participation of women in decision-making and ensuring the protection of their rights in contexts of crisis and conflict. Her delegation had therefore joined the sponsors of the draft resolution and called on all Council members to adopt it by consensus.

18. **Ms. Day** (Switzerland) said that, shortly before the formal deadline for the submission of draft resolutions, the main sponsors had indicated that paragraph 9 of the draft had been revised to include a decision to hold an interactive dialogue with the Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence at the Council's sixty-third session. However, that option had never been discussed during the informal consultations. The dialogue was to take place following the submission of a report to be prepared by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. That would be the first time in the Council's history that a Special Rapporteur would be asked to answer questions or participate in a dialogue on a report that he or she had not written. Her delegation did not support that request. Furthermore, the current mandate holder had not been consulted prior to the submission of the draft resolution and had not given his consent. In that regard, her delegation would like to point out that special procedure mandate holders were independent experts. In accordance with the Code of Conduct for Special Procedure Mandate Holders of the Human Rights Council, the notion of independence was linked to the status of mandate holders and to their freedom to assess the human rights questions they were called upon to examine under their mandate. Moreover, an interactive dialogue with the Special Rapporteur was already planned for the sixty-third session of the Council. There would thus be two interactive dialogues with the same mandate holder, even though work and

discussions were currently under way on the rationalization and efficiency of the Council. For those reasons, her delegation deeply regretted that the main sponsors of the draft resolution had refused to revise paragraph 9, which was an unfortunate precedent that was not merely procedural.

19. **Mr. Song** Changqing (China) said that his delegation welcomed the Council's focus on the rights of women and children in conflict and post-conflict situations, especially as it marked the thirtieth anniversary of the adoption of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action. It appreciated the recognition in the draft resolution that armed conflict had a disproportionate impact on women and children, the reaffirmation of women's full, equal and meaningful participation in the peace and security agenda and the focus on ensuring adequate and effective remedies and reparation for victims. The text was balanced and objective and would help to promote and protect the rights of women and children in conflict and post-conflict situations. His delegation would therefore join the consensus on the draft resolution.

20. **Mr. Eisa** (Sudan) said that, by adopting the draft resolution, the Council would reaffirm the need to respect the rules of international law and international humanitarian law in countries experiencing war, such as the Sudan. It would also emphasize the importance of protecting vulnerable groups, especially women and children, and all persons under international protection, as well as vital civilian infrastructure such as hospitals and schools. Women and children paid the highest price in conflicts. Furthermore, non-State actors and rebel groups, such as the Rapid Support Forces in the Sudan, had used methods such as the recruitment of child soldiers and sexual violence as a weapon of war. The draft resolution referred to the interdependence of the fundamental pillars of the United Nations, namely peace, human rights and development, which could not be achieved in isolation. His delegation supported the draft resolution and called on Council members to adopt it by consensus.

21. **Mr. Kah** (Gambia) said that his delegation shared the deep concern over the disproportionate impact of armed conflicts on women and children and reaffirmed that their protection, justice and access to remedies were not only legal obligations under international law but also moral imperatives. The Gambia underscored the importance of accountability and reparation for victims of grave violations and the full, equal and meaningful participation of women in peacebuilding and reconstruction processes, which were critical to achieving sustainable peace, reconciliation and national healing. Respect for international humanitarian law and human rights law, together with unimpeded humanitarian access, must remain at the heart of all responses to armed conflict. His delegation expressed its strong support for the draft resolution and called on all States members of the Council to adopt it by consensus as a collective reaffirmation of their commitment to protecting the dignity of women and children everywhere.

22. **Ms. Rasheed** (Maldives) said that, with its emphasis on justice, remedies and reparation, the draft resolution served to reaffirm the international community's collective responsibility to ensure accountability and address the long-term consequences of conflict for women and children. It also reinforced the principle that sustainable peace was inseparable from justice and human rights. Her delegation commended the draft resolution's focus on the need to protect civilian infrastructure and to condemn its use for military purposes. Maldives remained deeply concerned about the continuing attacks on such facilities, including in Gaza, which were clear violations of international humanitarian law. Her delegation welcomed the draft resolution's emphasis on the full, equal, meaningful and safe participation of women in conflict prevention, mediation and post-conflict reconstruction. Maldives remained firmly committed to advancing the rights and protection of women and children everywhere. In that spirit, her delegation was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution.

23. **Ms. Kivuti** (Kenya) said that ensuring justice, remedies and reparation for women and children who were victims of human rights violations was fundamental to preserving human dignity, maintaining peace and promoting sustainable post-conflict recovery. From its own experiences of mediation and peacekeeping at the regional and global levels, Kenya was aware of the devastating impact of armed conflict on women and children and recognized the importance of placing women and children at the heart of the peace and security

architecture. Guided by Security Council resolution 1325 (2000), her Government had developed and implemented successive national action plans on women and peace and security, with the aim of strengthening women's participation in conflict prevention, peacebuilding and post-conflict reconstruction, not as beneficiaries but as equal partners.

24. As a State that had endorsed the Safe Schools Declaration, Kenya remained committed to protecting education during armed conflict and continued to champion the protection of children, teachers and learning spaces. Her delegation therefore supported the renewed call in the draft resolution for the protection of civilian infrastructure and humanitarian workers and wished to reiterate the importance of integrating child protection and women's empowerment into peace agreements and transitional justice processes. It encouraged the members of the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

25. *Draft resolution A/HRC/60/L.28 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/HRC/60/L.38/Rev.1, as orally revised: Sea-level rise and its effects on the full and effective enjoyment of human rights

26. **Mr. Ogando Lora** (Dominican Republic), introducing the draft resolution, as orally revised, on behalf of the main sponsors, namely the Bahamas, Cabo Verde, Cyprus, Ecuador, Maldives, Malta and his own delegation, said that its purpose was to provide a multilateral and human rights-based response to the urgent and ever-growing challenge of sea-level rise. The draft resolution marked the first time that the Council had sought to comprehensively address the impact of sea-level rise on human rights, recognizing that it was not a future or theoretical threat but an existing reality that affected the lives of countless communities around the world. The draft resolution incorporated significant legal advances inspired by recent pronouncements by bodies such as the International Court of Justice, the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights and the International Law Commission that reaffirmed essential principles such as the continuity of statehood, the inviolability of sovereignty and respect for maritime rights and entitlements in accordance with international law, notwithstanding the physical impacts of climate change. The language used was intended to provide the most vulnerable States with legal certainty, predictability and stability. His delegation invited all members of the Council to support the draft resolution.

27. **The President** said that, while no member of the Council had sponsored the proposed amendment contained in document A/HRC/60/L.51, the delegation of the Marshall Islands had requested that it should be considered.

28. **Mr. Antas** (Observer for Vanuatu), introducing the proposed amendment contained in document A/HRC/60/L.51, said that his delegation had engaged in the negotiations on the draft resolution with a deep sense of purpose, because sea-level rise was an issue that affected the homes, the heritage and the very survival of the people and nation of Vanuatu. His delegation was deeply disappointed that the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Obligations of States in respect of Climate Change*, issued on 23 July 2025, was not adequately reflected in the draft resolution. In its advisory opinion, the Court had clarified that States had binding legal obligations to prevent, reduce and redress the adverse impact of climate change on the enjoyment of human rights. To fulfil those obligations, they must confront the root causes of the crisis, including the continued production and burning of fossil fuels. To discuss sea-level rise without mentioning fossil fuels was to deny reality. Addressing fossil fuels was not a political statement; it was a human rights imperative. His delegation was concerned to note that the main sponsors of the draft resolution had faced extreme pressure from delegations seeking to dilute the wording of the text. For the sake of consensus and out of solidarity with fellow small island developing States and the main sponsors, his delegation had decided to withdraw the proposed amendment. It wished to reiterate, however, that ending dependence on fossil fuels and enforcing States' legal obligations in that regard were essential steps to protect human rights.

29. **The President** said he had been informed that the proposed amendments contained in documents A/HRC/60/L.60 and A/HRC/60/L.61 had also been withdrawn. Eight States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which had programme budget implications amounting to \$919,500.

General statements made before the decision

30. **Ms. Papanikolaou** (Cyprus) said that the unprecedented rise in sea levels around the world, which was accompanied by rising sea temperatures and increasingly severe storm surges and coastal flooding, was having a devastating impact on coastal areas and constituted a serious threat to the full and effective enjoyment of all human rights. Sea-level rise endangered the right to self-determination and the right to life, as well as basic rights such as the rights to food, water, health and housing. It led to forced displacement and increased the risk of conflict, poverty and inequality. Its dire consequences posed a threat to the very existence of some States, especially small island developing States. Her delegation urged the members of the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

31. **Ms. Rasheed** (Maldives) said that her country had been working hard for over three decades to ensure that sea-level rise remained a priority on the global agenda. For small island developing States, sea-level rise was a lived reality. It endangered lives and livelihoods, displaced communities and undermined development. By adopting the draft resolution, the Council would not only recognize that sea-level rise posed a serious threat to the enjoyment of human rights, but would also chart a path forward by calling for urgent, equitable and human rights-based measures to scale up financing for adaptation and strengthen technical assistance and capacity-building. Her delegation urged all members of the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

32. **Mr. Benítez Verson** (Cuba) said that his delegation welcomed the reference in the draft resolution to the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities. It also welcomed the recognition of the impact of sea-level rise on the right to self-determination, as well as the importance of preserving States' sovereignty and enjoyment of maritime rights in accordance with international law. His delegation appreciated the inclusiveness of the text, which drew attention to the disproportionate impact of sea-level rise on vulnerable groups such as women and girls, Indigenous Peoples and persons with disabilities. Developed countries must fulfil their commitments with respect to climate finance, technology transfer and capacity-building. Climate justice required that the countries that had created the problem of climate change should assume their historical responsibility and assist the most vulnerable countries with their adaptation and development efforts. His delegation supported the draft resolution and hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

33. **Mr. Simas Magalhães** (Brazil) said that his delegation was concerned that the wording of the draft resolution, as orally revised, particularly the references to threats in the thirteenth, nineteenth, twenty-first and twenty-third preambular paragraphs and in paragraphs 1 and 4, promoted a security-oriented approach. His delegation had advocated a balanced reflection of guiding principles in the operative part of the text. The recent advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Obligations of States in respect of Climate Change* clarified the relevance of common but differentiated responsibilities for the implementation of climate treaties and the interpretation of customary international law relating to the environment. His delegation believed that the draft resolution should also have reflected the fact that the Paris Agreement and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change were mutually reinforcing, as reaffirmed in the advisory opinion. It also considered that the Council should not use language that fell outside its mandate and had not been agreed upon multilaterally, such as the term "threat multiplier". Forum shopping weakened the organizations that had been established to serve as authorities in their respective areas of competence and undermined the climate change regime at a critical time. In view of those concerns, his delegation felt obliged to dissociate itself from paragraph 4 and considered that the draft resolution did not establish a precedent for future negotiations in the relevant forums on climate change and oceans.

34. **Mr. Lanwi** (Marshall Islands), speaking on behalf of a group of small island countries in the Pacific, said that, for over 35 years, leaders of those countries had worked closely with various partners, including other small island developing States, to better understand and address the impact of sea-level rise. The Council's consideration of its first-ever draft resolution on that subject was a landmark moment and was particularly timely, given that two expert bodies, the International Law Commission Study Group on sea-level rise in relation to international law and the International Court of Justice, had recently issued

documents that provided clear directions on protecting the rights of persons affected by sea-level rise.

35. Climate change was the single greatest threat to the Pacific region, and rapid action to address greenhouse gas emissions was needed to ensure the full enjoyment of human rights. He was pleased to note the recognition, in the draft resolution, of the special circumstances of small island developing States and the challenges posed by sudden-onset coastal hazards. He welcomed the call for States to ensure that climate commitments reflected the highest possible ambition and the recognition of the importance of the continuity of statehood and maritime zones for the fulfilment of States' obligations under human rights treaties. He also welcomed the recognition of the impact of sea-level rise on women and girls, and the request for the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) to increase its technical assistance and capacity-building for States. However, he was disappointed that the draft resolution referred only to the symptoms of sea-level rise without explicitly acknowledging the root causes. He therefore welcomed the efforts led by Vanuatu to draw attention to those causes, with reference to the recent advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, and appreciated the main sponsors' insertion of an additional reference to that opinion in the oral revision of the draft resolution. His delegation was counting on all members of the Council to adopt and implement the text.

36. **Mr. Gunnarsson** (Iceland) said that the acute, existential threat posed by sea-level rise was not solely the concern of low-lying coastal and island communities. The consequences of sea-level rise could be felt across many sectors and must be comprehensively addressed in the appropriate international forums. His delegation supported the draft resolution insofar as it pertained to the enjoyment of human rights but was disappointed that its scope extended beyond the Council's mandate. Specifically, paragraph 2 referred to a legal situation that was comprehensively governed by the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. By issuing an interpretation of the law of the sea, which fell outside its competence, the Council might prejudice the just and adequate resolution of the issue. Consequently, his delegation wished to dissociate itself from paragraph 2 while joining the consensus on the remainder of the draft resolution.

37. **Mr. Kah** (Gambia) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution, which highlighted the profound human rights implications of sea-level rise, particularly for low-lying coastal and small island developing States. For the Gambia, sea-level rise was already a lived reality that posed a threat to farmers' livelihoods and to the rights to life, health, food and sustainable development. There was an urgent need for collective global action to address the root causes of sea-level rise through ambitious mitigation and adaptation measures and sustained international cooperation. At the same time, the global response to climate change must take into account national circumstances, development needs and the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, to ensure a just and inclusive transition for countries still reliant on fossil fuels for their basic energy needs. Technical assistance, capacity-building and access to climate finance were essential to strengthen resilience and protect the human rights of affected populations.

38. **Mr. Ayala Meléndez** (Colombia) said that the draft resolution addressed an urgent, existential issue that called for a coherent, human rights-based collective response. His delegation appreciated the Council's focus on the human rights impact of climate change and recognized that States had a shared responsibility to take measures that demonstrated ambition, solidarity and respect for international law. However, it regretted that two main concerns raised during the consultations had not been addressed. Firstly, the legal framework applicable to the oceans was not limited to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, an instrument to which Colombia was not a Party. Secondly, regarding the needs and responsibilities of developing countries as against those of small island developing States and least developed countries, it was important to use balanced language that was consistent with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and the language agreed upon in Council resolution 58/16, entitled "The human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment: the ocean and human rights". Categories of vulnerability should reflect the diverse realities within the developing world without establishing hierarchies among countries facing common challenges. In addition, it was important to address the structural causes of climate change, especially the preponderant role of fossil fuels, as recognized by

the International Court of Justice in its recent advisory opinion. The Court had noted that that the increase in greenhouse gases was primarily due to human activities, including the burning of fossil fuels and the destruction of carbon sinks, and that the continued use of fossil fuels could constitute an internationally wrongful act. Those facts must be recognized in order to achieve a just, equitable and sustainable energy transition.

39. **Mr. Céspedes Gómez** (Costa Rica) said that, as a country with an extensive coastline, Costa Rica attached great importance to the human rights impact of sea-level rise, which was a complex global phenomenon with numerous consequences that included forced displacement, food insecurity and saltwater intrusion. His delegation welcomed the recognition of the guidance provided by the International Court of Justice in its recent advisory opinion, as well as the call for urgent, equitable, human rights-based mitigation and adaptation measures accompanied by highly concessional finance, in paragraph 7, and the request for increased support and technical assistance from OHCHR, in paragraph 10. His delegation encouraged the members of the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

40. **Mr. Allo** (Czechia) said that his country was committed to playing its part in the protection of oceans and seas. It recognized that sea-level rise disproportionately affected small island developing States, least developed countries and coastal communities, and it acknowledged the urgent need for greater international cooperation to build their adaptive capacities and resilience. Czechia worked with partner countries worldwide to improve disaster preparedness and was a staunch supporter of the Early Warnings for All initiative. His delegation regretted that the wording of the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution was not aligned with article 2 (2) of the Paris Agreement, concerning the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. At the same time, it wished to point out that that principle was only one of the 27 principles laid down in the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development and that singling out just one principle could allow for misleading interpretations. Those comments notwithstanding, his delegation would join the consensus on the draft resolution.

41. **Mr. Alhayen** (Kuwait), speaking on behalf of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf, said that sea-level rise posed a threat to millions of people around the world, especially those living in low-lying coastal areas and small island developing States. Tackling the issue required solidarity and a global approach that was based on international law and that took into account the specific features of the communities affected. The draft resolution was a balanced text that reflected the concerns of the international community, as well as the principles enshrined in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Paris Agreement. His delegation invited the members of the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

42. **Ms. Arrous** (Algeria) said that her delegation welcomed the references in the draft resolution to the need for grant-based resources and highly concessional finance for adaptation and mitigation and for addressing loss and damage in developing countries. Climate finance was central to ensuring climate justice, equity and the right to development. However, her delegation regretted the continued attempts to introduce stigmatizing and prescriptive language on fossil fuels into human rights resolutions, disregarding the bottom-up approach of the Paris Agreement and overlooking both the legitimate energy needs of developing countries and the historical responsibility for climate change. Climate action must uphold the principles of equity, common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, as recognized in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Paris Agreement, and as reflected in the recent advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. Paragraph 6 of the draft resolution should be read in a manner consistent with States' obligations under the Framework Convention and the Paris Agreement and should in no way be construed as creating new obligations in respect of climate change. Moreover, the term "statehood" in paragraph 2 should be understood exclusively as defined in international law. Those concerns aside, her delegation wished to reiterate its full support for a fair, inclusive and rights-based approach to climate change that ensured the fulfilment of existing climate commitments. It was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution.

Statements made in explanation of position before the decision

43. **Mr. Gallón** (Colombia) said that his delegation dissociated itself from the sixth preambular paragraph and paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, which contained references to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, an instrument to which it was not a Party. The international legal framework applicable to the oceans and their resources was based not only on the Convention, but also on other treaties and international law generally. The references to the Convention could not be interpreted as an acceptance by Colombia of obligations under a treaty to which it was not a Party.

44. His delegation also dissociated itself from the twenty-first preambular paragraph of the text as orally revised and paragraph 7. The references they contained to developing countries, small island developing States and least developed countries did not reflect the balanced language of Council resolution 58/16 and could give rise to interpretations that were inconsistent with his Government's principled position on equity and differential treatment among developing countries.

45. His delegation regretted that the structural causes of the ongoing crisis, including the use of fossil fuels, had not been addressed in the draft resolution and hoped that the Council would address those issues in the near future. Colombia would, however, join the consensus on the draft resolution in recognition of the importance of the topic and the value of cooperation at a time of global climate change-related challenges.

46. **Mr. Ishii** (Japan) said that sea-level rise was a matter of profound concern for the international community and especially for island States such as Japan. However, the draft resolution addressed certain issues more properly dealt with in established forums on climate change and even referred to complex legal questions of statehood that fell outside the Council's mandate. By addressing those questions before they were thoroughly considered in the appropriate forums, the Council risked undermining the sound development of international law and hindering constructive debate elsewhere. In that regard, paragraph 2 of the draft resolution linked States' obligation to protect human rights directly with the continuity of statehood. Neither the International Court of Justice nor the International Law Commission had drawn such a conclusion and there was no established legal basis, either under general international law or in the specific context of sea-level rise, for the creation of such an obligation. His delegation considered it inappropriate for a Council resolution to suggest obligations that were unclear and lacked a solid foundation in law and therefore dissociated itself from the consensus on paragraph 2. Furthermore, with regard to paragraph 7, the issue of climate finance should be addressed in the context of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and not in a Council resolution.

47. While the International Court of Justice had recognized, in its recent advisory opinion, that the right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment was essential for the enjoyment of other rights, by placing it alongside established universal human rights, as in the twenty-first preambular paragraph of the text as orally revised and paragraph 1, the Council risked creating the false impression that it was already a binding right under international law. Despite those concerns, given the importance of the issue of sea-level rise, his delegation had decided to join the consensus.

48. *Draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.38/Rev.1](#), as orally revised, was adopted.*

Agenda item 4: Human rights situations that require the Council's attention
(continued) ([A/HRC/60/L.23](#) and [A/HRC/60/L.32/Rev.1](#) as orally revised)

Draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.23](#): Situation of human rights in the Russian Federation

49. **Ms. Schouten** (Kingdom of the Netherlands), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the main sponsors, namely Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and her own delegation, said that the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Russian Federation, in her most recent report ([A/HRC/60/59](#)), had documented a seismic decline in the human rights situation in that country over the previous year. The Russian authorities had pursued a deliberate strategy of wiping out dissent through intensified

ensorship, politically motivated prosecutions and the expansion of repressive legislation. Russia had become the world's third largest jailer of journalists, and torture and ill-treatment remained widespread and systematic. The draft resolution's purpose was to renew the Special Rapporteur's mandate so that she could, independently and impartially, continue to monitor, verify and speak the truth about the human rights situation in Russia.

50. The country concerned had refused to engage with the Council. It had not participated in the interactive dialogue with the Special Rapporteur, where it could have shared its views on her report, or in the two rounds of informal consultations held by the draft resolution's main sponsors, even though it had been provided with the draft before other United Nations Member States. In addition, it did not engage with the Special Rapporteur or other special procedure mandate holders who worked with her. More alarmingly still, it retaliated against those who did cooperate with United Nations human rights mechanisms, as documented in the report of the Secretary-General on cooperation with the United Nations, its representatives and mechanisms in the field of human rights ([A/HRC/60/62](#)).

51. The Council had a duty to address situations of violations of human rights, including gross and systematic violations, as mandated by General Assembly resolution 60/251. She therefore urged all members to support the draft resolution and reaffirm that no State was above scrutiny.

52. **The President** announced that three States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which had programme budget implications amounting to \$869,900, of which \$862,400 was already included in the programme budget.

General statements made before the voting

53. **Mr. Gómez Martínez** (Spain) said that there had been an escalation in the repression of all forms of dissent in Russia over the previous three years, as documented by the Special Rapporteur. That repression, moreover, crossed borders. Spain condemned in the strongest terms the use by the Russian Federation of transnational repression against political activists, members of the opposition, journalists and media workers, lawyers and human rights defenders. The integrity of the United Nations human rights protection system, including the free and active participation of civil society, must be preserved. Spain condemned the reprisals against persons and groups that cooperated with the United Nations, its representatives and its mechanisms. The mandate of Special Rapporteur remained necessary to ensure accountability. The draft resolution would show that the Council would not waver before powerful States subjected to its fact-based scrutiny.

54. The current meeting was being held 19 years to the day after *Novaya Gazeta* journalist Anna Politkovskaya had been murdered for reporting on human rights violations in the North Caucasus. It was impermissible, in Russia or elsewhere, for the response to freedom of expression to be jail, exile or death. His delegation therefore called on the Council to support the draft resolution.

55. **Ms. Popa** (Romania) said that there had been an alarming deterioration in the human rights situation in the Russian Federation over the previous year. The authorities had intensified their efforts to silence civil society, restrict political opposition and suppress dissent, with women, human rights defenders, members of minorities, political opponents and persons in detention being among those most at risk. Despite reports pointing to the widespread and systematic use of torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, the Russian authorities continued to block independent monitoring.

56. The withdrawal of the Russian Federation from the European Convention for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment eliminated the role in the country of the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and was yet another sign of the Government's broader disengagement from its international human rights commitments. Its refusal to engage with the Special Rapporteur or with the sponsors of the draft resolution during the informal consultations further confirmed its rejection of transparency, accountability and a meaningful commitment to international cooperation. At a time when access to credible information from inside Russia was becoming increasingly limited and independent monitoring was being deliberately obstructed by Russian authorities, the mandate of Special Rapporteur served not

only to keep the international community informed about ongoing human rights violations but also to give a voice to victims and ensure accountability. Her delegation therefore called on all members of the Council to support the draft resolution and extend the mandate of Special Rapporteur.

57. **Ms. Hysi** (Albania) said that, a mere 270 days after Dmitry Muratov, the editor-in-chief of the newspaper *Novaya Gazeta*, had received the Nobel Peace Prize for his courageous fight to safeguard freedom of expression in Russia, his newspaper's licence had been revoked, silencing what many had considered one of the last independent media voices in the country. The incident reflected a broader pattern of steadily increasing repression over the previous decade. Since 2022 alone, Russian authorities had opened 1,259 criminal cases against individuals who had simply expressed their views. Journalists critical of the authorities faced arrest and harsh sentences. The lack of judicial independence and the criminalization of dissent undermined the rule of law and compromised the protection of human rights.

58. By adopting the draft resolution, the Council would call on the Russian authorities to fulfil their obligations and respect fundamental freedoms. It would extend the mandate of Special Rapporteur for another year, thereby ensuring that the Council would continue to receive independent reporting on the situation. The mandate also served as a beacon of hope for Russian civil society, human rights defenders and journalists, as a sign that the international community had not abandoned them. She called on all members of the Council to support the draft resolution.

59. **Mr. Ishii** (Japan) said that universal values such as human rights should be respected in all countries, regardless of culture, traditions or political or economic systems. Japan remained concerned about the deteriorating human rights situation and continued shrinking of civic space in the Russian Federation and reiterated its previous calls on the Russian authorities to comply with all their obligations under international human rights law. Japan remained committed to supporting the implementation of the mandate of Special Rapporteur and hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus. In the event of a vote, his delegation would vote in favour of the text and hoped that other members would do the same.

60. **Ms. Thuaudet** (France) said that the draft resolution would ensure the independent and impartial documentation of the deteriorating situation of fundamental rights and civil liberties in Russia, including with respect to the widespread use of torture against detained Ukrainian soldiers and civilians, the instrumentalization of the judiciary and the campaign of repression being waged by the Russian authorities against any critical voice. At that moment, 50 media professionals, including 29 Ukrainians, were in prison in Russia, according to the most recent report of the Special Rapporteur. The draft resolution was a means of reminding Russian leaders of the international human rights commitments that their country had freely undertaken, which it was bound to respect, just like any other Member of the United Nations. Despite Russian accusations of politicization in the work of the Council and the special procedures, the Council must remain steadfast in championing respect for the rule of law. Her delegation called on all members of the Council to support the adoption of the draft resolution.

61. **The President** said it was his understanding that the State concerned by the draft resolution did not wish to make a statement.

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

62. **Mr. Song** Changqing (China) said that the international community had established the Council for the purpose of promoting and protecting human rights through dialogue and cooperation. The Council's work should be based on the principles of universality, impartiality, objectivity, non-selectivity and non-politicization. Unfortunately, in recent years, politicization and confrontation at the Council had led to increasing interference in States' internal affairs on the pretext of human rights. Rampant double standards were seriously undermining dialogue and cooperation. China had always opposed both the politicization and instrumentalization of human rights issues and the establishment of country-specific mechanisms without the consent of the country concerned. The sponsors of the draft resolution had ignored opposition from the country concerned and had forcibly

pushed for a draft resolution on Russia, even though it would not only waste considerable resources and fail to achieve results, but also severely damage the Council's credibility. His delegation wished to request a vote on the draft resolution. It would vote against it and called on other members to do so as well.

63. **The President** said that Iceland had withdrawn its sponsorship of the draft resolution.

64. **Mr. Gunnarsson** (Iceland) said that his delegation welcomed the focus, in the current iteration of the draft resolution, on the persecution of lawyers. The human rights situation in the Russian Federation remained gravely concerning. Defence lawyers in politically motivated cases faced harassment, disbarment and even prosecution simply for doing their jobs. The erosion of judicial independence had the effect of not only silencing dissent but also undermining the essential work of civil society organizations and human rights defenders. For victims, avenues to justice were nearly closed. Given the lack of effective domestic remedies and the withdrawal of the Russian Federation from the European Court of Human Rights, the mandate of Special Rapporteur was one of the very few remaining mechanisms through which victims could have their voices heard. His delegation strongly supported the extension of the mandate. It would vote in favour of the draft resolution and urged all members to do the same.

65. **Mr. Benítez Verson** (Cuba) said that Cuba reiterated its principled position against selective, biased and interventionist mandates that did not have the consent of the State concerned and were intended to single out certain countries on the pretext of human rights. Such mandates, rather than contributing to the promotion of genuine cooperation and constructive dialogue, only led to greater confrontation and polarization and wasted the Council's limited resources on the preparation of reports that lacked objectivity and impartiality, had no real-world relevance and did not contribute to the promotion and protection of human rights. The extension of the mandate of Special Rapporteur constituted intervention in the internal affairs of the Russian Federation, which his delegation rejected. Cuba would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

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

In favour:

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominican Republic, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait, Malawi, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Qatar, South Africa, Thailand.

67. *Draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.23](#) was adopted by 20 votes to 8, with 18 abstentions.*

Draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.32/Rev.1](#), as orally revised: Situation of human rights in eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo

68. **Mr. Empole Losoko Efambe** (Democratic Republic of the Congo), introducing the draft resolution, as orally revised, said that it followed up on resolution S-37/1, which the Council had adopted on 7 February 2025 at its thirty-seventh special session, in response to the horror and large-scale human rights violations that had followed the January 2025 invasion of the cities of Goma and Bukavu by the Rwandan army and the armed group Alliance Fleuve Congo/Mouvement du 23 mars. By that resolution, the Council had established a fact-finding mission, to operate from February to September 2025, and an independent commission of inquiry, which was to have begun work in September 2025.

69. Given the important role that the independent commission of inquiry would play in establishing the truth and combating impunity, the Council should adopt a resolution

recalling the urgent need to make both the commission and its secretariat operational, preferably by 31 December 2025, as indicated in the draft resolution. As the circumstances that had led to the convening of the Council's special session and the February 2025 resolution had worsened, with some of the crimes being committed in Goma, Bukavu and the surrounding areas amounting to genocide, the draft resolution reiterated the Council's demand for the immediate cessation of support by Rwanda for the armed group and included a call for the unconditional withdrawal of all Rwandan troops from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and for safe, rapid and unimpeded humanitarian access to the Provinces of North Kivu and South Kivu. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

70. **The President** said that the proposed amendments contained in documents [A/HRC/60/L.43](#), [A/HRC/60/L.44](#), [A/HRC/60/L.45](#), [A/HRC/60/L.46](#) and [A/HRC/60/L.47](#) had been submitted by Rwanda but had not been sponsored by any member of the Council. In accordance with rule 72 (3) of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council, which were applicable to the Human Rights Council pursuant to General Assembly resolution 60/251, the Council could take action on a proposal submitted by an observer delegation if it was requested to do so by at least one member of the Council. As no member had made such a request with regard to the proposed amendments, he took it that the Council did not wish to consider them.

71. *It was so decided.*

General statements made before the decision

72. **Ms. Neocleous** (Cyprus), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Union that were members of the Council, said that the European Union condemned in the strongest terms the ongoing human rights violations and abuses being committed in eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo by all parties to the conflict. It stressed the urgent need for thorough investigations, recognition of victims and accountability for all perpetrators. In that regard, it welcomed the efforts by the Democratic Republic of the Congo to advance the operationalization of the commission of inquiry through the draft resolution. It also welcomed the explicit references in the draft to a number of the armed actors involved and the call for all parties to implement the recommendations of the fact-finding mission. It regretted, however, that the Democratic Republic of the Congo had been unable to accommodate its request to include an expression of concern about the use of hate speech by all parties, which fuelled ethnically motivated attacks, and strongly regretted that country's decision to terminate the mandate of the team of experts, given its important contribution to furthering transitional justice and the fight against impunity. The European Union called on all parties to cooperate with and grant access to the future commission of inquiry, whose impartial and independent character must always be respected. The ongoing human rights emergency in eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo warranted the Council's continued attention. The European Union called for the draft resolution to be adopted by consensus.

73. **Mr. Simas Magalhães** (Brazil) said that his Government remained deeply concerned about the human rights situation in eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo. It supported greater engagement by the High Commissioner and other human rights stakeholders to improve that situation and ensure accountability for all human rights violations in the region, where Brazil contributed to peacekeeping through its role in the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The urgency of the situation justified action by the Council. All discussions must be conducted with impartiality, non-selectivity and a focus on dialogue and cooperation among all parties involved in the conflict.

74. **Ms. Day** (Switzerland) said that her Government remained alarmed at the situation in eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo and welcomed the authorities' efforts to keep the situation in their own country on the Council's agenda, and to do so under agenda item 4. The report of the fact-finding mission ([A/HRC/60/80](#)), which had found breaches of international humanitarian law and human rights violations and abuses by all parties to the conflict, provided a solid basis for the future work of the commission of inquiry. Given the gravity of the situation, the commission's mandate was legitimate. However, it should be stressed that, as noted in the report of the fact-finding mission, all parties to the conflict,

meaning all the armed groups identified in the report, must respect international humanitarian law and human rights. Any mechanism tasked with conducting investigations must be able to work independently. Her delegation would therefore have preferred to omit any mention of the secretariat of the future commission from the draft resolution.

75. **Mr. Sultanov** (Kyrgyzstan) said that his Government reaffirmed its support for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of both the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Rwanda. However, respect for human rights and the principle of accountability were equally important. His delegation commended the impartial work of the fact-finding mission and fully supported its balanced findings and recommendations. It also welcomed the mediation efforts of the African Union and the constructive engagement of the United States and Qatar, which had led to the peace agreement of 27 June 2025. Lastly, it stressed the importance of the draft resolution's being balanced, fair and inclusive.

76. **Mr. Al-Mansoori** (Qatar) said that mediation and the peaceful settlement of disputes through dialogue were fundamental elements of the foreign policy of the State of Qatar, which had participated, with the United States, in the mediation during which the Presidents of Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of the Congo had met in Doha on 18 March 2025, after which they had signed their historic agreement in Washington, D.C. on 27 June 2025. Over the many rounds of discussion that had taken place, a spirit of positivity and engagement had been achieved. The State of Qatar called on both parties to carry on their dialogue in a spirit of openness and to refrain from any statements that might undermine the efforts towards lasting peace. His delegation had refrained from commenting on the draft resolution so as not to prejudice the mediation role being played by the Government.

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

78. **Ms. Bakuramutsa** (Observer for Rwanda) said that Rwanda aligned with member States committed to defending the integrity and impartiality of the Council against politicization. The conflict in eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo persisted because its root causes remained unaddressed. The proposals submitted by her delegation to amend the draft resolution had been intended to combat impunity, a goal that would require the Council to condemn the more than 260 armed groups operating in the region and to denounce the support provided by the Democratic Republic of the Congo to militias, particularly the Forces démocratiques de libération du Rwanda, a group that was under United Nations sanctions. That vicious militia comprised remnants of the former Forces armées rwandaises and Interahamwe responsible for the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi and continued to spread hate, violence and genocidal ideology in the region. The draft resolution should also have expressed condemnation of the cooperation of the Democratic Republic of the Congo with the "Wazalendo" militias in their entirety, and not simply elements of them, as stated in the draft as orally revised. The proposed amendments had addressed the protection of children from recruitment by armed groups and the need to combat discrimination by tackling hate speech and incitement. If the Council did not address those issues, it would miss a critical opportunity to promote accountability and human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

79. Her Government rejected the unfounded accusations made against it. Nevertheless, it would continue to engage constructively to ensure that security, accountability and the protection of civilians remained at the heart of any initiative. Her delegation called on the members of the Council to reject politicized approaches and support balanced, fact-based and cooperative engagement.

80. **Mr. Soejono** (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights) said that the draft resolution, as orally revised, if adopted, would entail financial implications. Pending the arrival of a formal statement of those implications, he could inform the Council that the amount of the additional non-recurrent requirements was expected to fall within a range of \$6.2 million to \$6.7 million for the years 2026 and 2027. The additional resource requirements for the draft resolution, as orally revised, would supersede those associated with Council resolution S-37/1. The requirements had not been included in the proposed programme budget for 2026. In accordance with established procedures, they would be brought to the attention of the General Assembly in the annual report of the Secretary-General.

on the revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council during 2025.

81. *Draft resolution A/HRC/60/L.32/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

82. **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.

83. **Mr. Song** Changqing (China), referring to draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.13](#) on the situation of human rights in Burundi, said that his Government commended the Government of Burundi for its positive efforts to maintain national stability and facilitate national reconciliation as well as for its progress in the promotion and protection of human rights. The current peace and stability in Burundi had been hard won. The international community should continue to respect the sovereignty and independence of Burundi and its efforts to address its domestic problems and should play a constructive role in supporting its stability and sustainable development. Regrettably, some States had completely ignored the concerns of the Government and had once again pushed through a resolution to renew the mandate of Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Burundi, thus imposing their own will on the Burundian people, hindering the country's development and stability, and wasting valuable United Nations resources. China had always advocated constructive dialogue and cooperation as the appropriate means to address human rights issues and opposed politicization, double standards, selectivity and confrontation. Western countries should not impose country-specific mechanisms without the consent of the country concerned in order to suppress developing countries on the pretext of human rights. For those reasons, his delegation had voted against draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.13](#).

Agenda item 5: Human rights bodies and mechanisms (A/HRC/60/L.25)

Draft resolution A/HRC/60/L.25: Cooperation with the United Nations, its representatives and mechanisms in the field of human rights

84. **Ms. Havasi** (Observer for Hungary), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the main sponsors, namely Fiji, Ghana, Ireland, Uruguay and her own delegation, said that those States remained deeply concerned that intimidation and reprisals against those who engaged with the United Nations human rights system were continuing across all regions. Such acts violated human rights and fundamental freedoms, impeded the Council's ability to discharge its mandate effectively and were an attack against the very essence of the United Nations system. Regrettably, new tendencies had emerged, including an increase in cross-border reprisals and self-censorship and the misuse of counter-terrorism and national security laws and regulations on civil society. The current iteration of the text reflected those developments, building on the findings of the most recent report of the Secretary-General on the topic ([A/HRC/60/62](#)). It also expressed appreciation of the Secretary-General's commitment to making the prevention of and response to reprisals central to United Nations action, including through sustained political will, to ensure that concerted action was taken to protect the meaningful and safe engagement of all those who cooperated with the United Nations human rights system.

85. **Ms. Benítez Lima** (Observer for Uruguay), continuing the introduction of the draft resolution, said that States had a shared responsibility to prevent and address acts of intimidation and reprisals, ensure accountability and create a safe environment for all those who engaged or wished to engage with the United Nations system. The main sponsors had held transparent, open and inclusive informal consultations, as well as bilateral discussions with interested delegations, to ensure that the final text was strong, balanced and reflective of the complex and evolving nature of reprisals. The constructive engagement of delegations and civil society actors showed that the subject matter continued to be a priority for many. On behalf of the main sponsors, she called on all members of the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

86. **The President** said that 16 States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which had no programme budget implications.

General statements made before the decision

87. **Ms. Kivuti** (Kenya) said that her delegation welcomed the draft resolution and commended the Council for its continued vigilance in addressing acts of intimidation and reprisals and for strengthening safeguards for those on the front line defending human dignity. Cooperation with the United Nations architecture and mechanisms was embedded in her country's national ethos and constitutional vision. Kenya was proud to host the United Nations Office at Nairobi, the only United Nations headquarters in the global South. The recent establishment of an OHCHR multi-country office in Nairobi was further testament to the central role played by Kenya as a partner in advancing human rights, sustainable development and peaceful coexistence across the continent. Kenya condemned all acts of retaliation and was committed to building strong partnerships that protected those who stood up for human dignity. However, cooperation must work in both directions. While States must provide safe environments free from intimidation and reprisals, rights holders and actors must engage responsibly with credible information, upholding the values of transparency and constructive dialogue.

88. **Ms. Cordero Suárez** (Cuba) said that her Government opposed all acts of intimidation against organizations or individuals that legitimately cooperated with the United Nations, its representatives and mechanisms in the field of human rights. It condemned the harassment of and unilateral sanctions imposed against the Special Rapporteur on the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on the enjoyment of human rights and the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967, which constituted unacceptable acts of retaliation for the work they did in fulfilment of their mandates and in defence of the Charter of the United Nations and international law. Her delegation welcomed the fact that the draft resolution expressed concern about those worrying developments. The Secretary-General's reports on the topic at hand should be objective, non-politicized and based on credible and verifiable sources. However, in recent years, the reports had focused solely on alleged cases in developing countries, despite the many well-known examples of harassment, threats and reprisals taking place in developed countries against social movements, youth leaders, migrants and people of African descent who cooperated with the United Nations system. There had been frequent instances of harassment, repression and restrictions of the rights of university students and people who protested in the streets to demand an end to their Governments' complicity in the genocide being committed by Israel against the Palestinian people. The Cuban delegation rejected any abuse of human rights mechanisms for purposes beyond the mandate of the Council and contrary to the principles of the Charter. It supported the draft resolution and hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

89. **Ms. Neocleous** (Cyprus), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Union that were members of the Council, said that the European Union resolutely supported the right of everyone, individually and in association with others, to access and cooperate freely with the United Nations and its mechanisms. Yet reports of intimidation and reprisals persisted across all regions. The European Union strongly condemned all such acts, online and offline, by State and non-State actors, since they weakened the ability of both individuals and civil society to contribute meaningfully to United Nations processes. It further condemned the targeting of human rights mechanisms and the deterrent effect of such targeting on those who sought to cooperate with the United Nations. The European Union appreciated the references in the draft resolution to the increasingly transnational nature of reprisals and the chilling effect that the fear of retaliation had on individuals and organizations. Many victims of reprisals requested anonymity during documentation or refrained from reporting altogether. The true number of reprisals cases was therefore likely to be much higher than indicated in the Secretary General's annual report. Underreporting hampered efforts to ensure accountability and to step up prevention efforts. The European Union supported the draft resolution and called on all members of the Council to join the consensus on its adoption.

90. **Ms. Fuentes Julio** (Chile) said that various reports of the High Commissioner and special procedures documented persistent patterns of reprisals and intimidation against those who cooperated with the United Nations, including threats, smear campaigns, judicial harassment and administrative restrictions. Attempts to silence victims, defenders and

witnesses weakened accountability and hindered the Council's capacity to fulfil its mandate. Chile therefore reiterated its categorical condemnation of all forms of retaliation or intimidation by State or non-State actors and its full support for the efforts of the Secretary-General, the High Commissioner and the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights to prevent and address such cases. Her delegation called on the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus, thus reaffirming that stakeholders could cooperate meaningfully with the human rights system only if they were effectively protected.

91. **Ms. Tsheole** (South Africa) said that the draft resolution under consideration was an important one for her country, which owed its freedom to the human rights defenders and civil society actors who, together with supportive Member States, had exposed the tyranny of apartheid to the world at the United Nations. They had successfully managed to mobilize the international community to fight what had ultimately been decried as a crime against humanity. Many South Africans had paid the ultimate price for cooperating with the United Nations and had been subjected to extrajudicial execution. South Africa would therefore always defend the right of unhindered access to and communication with the United Nations. It was concerned about the intimidation and reprisals against individuals and groups for cooperating with the United Nations, including the unique challenges faced by those in situations of armed conflict or under foreign occupation, and the fact that the very mechanisms with which individuals and groups were meant to cooperate were themselves subjected to intimidation and reprisals. That was particularly true for those seeking to draw attention to the genocide in Gaza, including the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967. The imposition of sanctions undermined the integrity of the United Nations human rights system. Her Government concurred with the High Commissioner that attacks against international institutions and their personnel must cease, as recognized in the draft resolution.

92. **Mr. Oike** (Japan) said that his Government recognized that contributions and engagement by civil society actors were crucial to the promotion and protection of human rights in both national and international contexts, including in the Council. It was deeply concerned to note that, as highlighted in the report of the Secretary-General, civil society actors cooperating with the United Nations faced increasing obstacles and harassment, which prevented them from operating freely. His delegation welcomed the strengthened language in both the preambular and operative parts of the current text, which accurately reflected the evolving nature of reprisals, including the misuse of legislation, transnational repression, digital surveillance and gender-based harassment. It also welcomed the emphasis on prevention, accountability and the sharing of good practices by States and United Nations actors. States bore the primary responsibility for preventing and investigating acts of intimidation or reprisals and holding perpetrators to account, and continued constructive dialogue and transparency on those issues should be encouraged. Japan was firmly committed to protecting civic space so that civil society actors could cooperate freely with the United Nations. With that in mind, his delegation hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

93. **Ms. Schouten** (Kingdom of the Netherlands) said that support for human rights defenders and civil society was a long-standing priority of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, as they played a vital role in informing and shaping United Nations decisions, enhancing accountability and promoting inclusive dialogue, all of which were essential for the effectiveness of the Organization. Reports of intimidation and reprisals remained a serious concern in all regions. Such acts undermined human rights and fundamental freedoms, considerably impeded the Council's ability to fulfil its mandate effectively and struck at the very foundations and proper functioning of the United Nations system. Her Government strongly condemned the unacceptable and unjustifiable practice of reprisals and recognized the collective responsibility to take action to respond to those acts. Her delegation therefore urged all Council members to join the consensus on the draft resolution.

94. **Ms. Coen Moraga** (Costa Rica) said that the draft resolution under consideration was one of the most important of the session. Multilateral work must be carried out in a safe environment, free from threats and intimidation, where all actors, especially civil society and human rights defenders, could fully exercise their rights to freedom of opinion and expression and freedom of assembly and association. No one should be afraid to cooperate with the

United Nations. Her delegation welcomed the recognition in the draft resolution that special procedure mandate holders appointed by the Council were increasingly targeted in connection with the discharge of their functions and that transnational repression was a matter of concern. That worrying practice had caused fatalities, including among Nicaraguans in Costa Rica. Her Government reaffirmed its unwavering commitment to protecting all persons who cooperated with the United Nations human rights system and called on all States to ensure that cooperation with international mechanisms could be carried out without fear of reprisals, in an environment of respect, transparency and accountability. Her delegation strongly supported the draft resolution and encouraged Council members to adopt it by consensus.

95. **Mr. Gallón** (Colombia) said that the multilateral system could fulfil its mandate only if the voices of victims, human rights defenders and experts could be heard without fear of reprisals. His Government strongly condemned all acts of intimidation, harassment, retaliation or punishment against those who cooperated with the United Nations. Recent cases involving reprisals against actors ranging from Indigenous defenders to Special Rapporteurs were unacceptable examples of how those who spoke out for truth and justice were being silenced. The extension of such reprisals to those who cooperated with other universal or regional accountability bodies established under international law, such as the International Criminal Court, was deeply troubling. Sanctions, threats and attacks against the Court's staff and those who supported its activities not only sought to obstruct justice but also undermined the global fight against impunity. Colombia called on all Member States to respect and protect the work of the mechanisms of the Council, of independent experts and rapporteurs, and of international courts. The credibility of the Council and of the entire international human rights system depended on their collective ability to ensure that no one feared cooperating with the United Nations or with international justice bodies.

96. **Ms. Li Xinda** (China), speaking in explanation of position before the decision, said that her Government opposed reprisals against anyone who cooperated with the United Nations or its representatives and mechanisms. China was a country governed by the rule of law where everyone was equal before the law. Anyone who violated the law using human rights as a pretext must be held to account. Although the main sponsors had incorporated some of her delegation's suggested revisions, the text was still not balanced and did not reflect her delegation's concerns, including about the misuse of United Nations mechanisms to shield criminals from accountability. As a result, her delegation would not join the consensus on the draft resolution.

97. *Draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.25](#) was adopted.*

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 (continued)

Draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.22](#): A world of sports free from racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

98. **Mr. Cozendey** (Brazil), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the main sponsors, namely the Group of African States and his own delegation, said that efforts needed to be stepped up to eliminate persistent racist incidents in sports. It was important to continue to address that critical issue and to follow up on the regional consultations organized by OHCHR earlier in 2025. He hoped that the draft resolution would help to advance international cooperation and further strengthen the international community's collective commitment to combating racism in sports from a human rights perspective. The main sponsors trusted that, as in the case of previous iterations, the text would receive strong support and be adopted by consensus.

99. **The President** announced that 15 States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which had programme budget implications amounting to \$680,100.

General statements made before the decision

100. **Ms. Cordero Suárez** (Cuba) said that Cuba reaffirmed its commitment to a world of sports free from racism, racial discrimination, discrimination based on religion or belief, xenophobia and other related forms of intolerance. It supported and would continue to contribute to the implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. Her delegation agreed that, as highlighted in the draft resolution, sport had the potential to promote values such as respect, dignity, diversity, tolerance, fairness and social inclusion. Cuba rejected the political manipulation of sport, the violation of Olympic values and the theft of sporting talent. It welcomed the request to OHCHR to support, within the framework of its mandate, national efforts to strengthen capacity among States and other actors, including sports professionals, to prevent and respond to racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance in sports. Her delegation supported the draft resolution and called on the Council to adopt it by consensus.

101. **Mr. Dan** (Benin) said that Benin strongly condemned all forms of racism, xenophobia and intolerance in sport, whether on the field, in the stands or online. Sport was a means of bringing people together and creating a space of equality, mutual respect, tolerance, discipline and fraternity among athletes. When racism took hold, as was still too often the case at major national and international sporting events, the spirit of sport was betrayed. As a State that was a Party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and was firmly committed to the full implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, Benin had made respect for human rights a pillar of its sports policy, in particular by ensuring that modules on tolerance and non-discrimination were included in school physical education and sports programmes and by providing appropriate support to sports federations to combat all forms of exclusion, particularly on the basis of origin, religion or gender. For those reasons, his delegation sincerely hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

102. **Mr. Tessema** (Ethiopia) said that Ethiopia reaffirmed its unwavering commitment to the elimination of all forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, including in sport, which was one of the most powerful tools for promoting equality, solidarity and mutual understanding across cultures and communities. Sport must be a safe and inclusive space for all; its transformative power could only be fully realized when it was free from hatred, exclusion and discrimination. His delegation welcomed the draft resolution's comprehensive approach to the topic, particularly its emphasis on ensuring accountability for racially motivated acts in sport, promoting inclusive representation and advancing zero-tolerance policies alongside education and awareness-raising measures to foster a culture of respect, fairness and inclusion. The importance of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action was rightly acknowledged in the draft resolution, as was the role of sport in achieving the goals of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. His delegation strongly supported both the spirit and substance of the draft resolution and called on all Council members to support its adoption by consensus.

103. **Mr. Torrejón Alcoba** (Plurinational State of Bolivia) said Bolivia agreed that sport was a universal language capable of uniting people across borders, creeds and colours. However, it also recognized that racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance were still present in stadiums, sports institutions and the daily lives of many athletes. By adopting the draft resolution, the Council would reaffirm the fundamental principle that everyone had the right to participate in sport without discrimination, in accordance with international human rights values and instruments. It would also invite States to strengthen their public policies, legislation and educational programmes aimed at eradicating all forms of racism in sport by ensuring effective sanctions and promoting accountability. The draft resolution included language recognizing that sport could contribute to the empowerment of women and girls but that they also faced multiple forms of discrimination and violence in sport. His delegation welcomed the proposal that governing bodies and other relevant actors should consider allocating some of the resources generated from profitable sporting events to promote the inclusion and participation of persons who were excluded from sport. His delegation supported the draft resolution and called on the Council to adopt it by consensus.

104. **Ms. Kivuti** (Kenya) said that, as a nation renowned for its excellence in athletics and long-distance running, Kenya welcomed the spirit and substance of the draft resolution. Her country's athletic legacy demonstrated how sport could unite communities, foster equality and serve as a tool for combating discrimination. Kenyan runners, many from historically marginalized or rural areas, exemplified how equal opportunities and talent identification could empower individuals and build national pride, regardless of racial or ethnic origin. Kenya had developed several policy and legal frameworks that addressed discrimination, governance and ethics in athletics and sport, including the Sports Act and the Kenya Academy of Sports safeguarding policy. The draft resolution's inclusion of language recognizing sport as an enabler for the realization of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development was in line with Kenya Vision 2030 and the country's commitment to youth empowerment, education and gender equality through sport.

105. *Draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.22](#) was adopted.*

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.