



General Assembly

Distr.: General
29 October 2025

Original: English

Human Rights Council Sixtieth session

Summary record (partial)* of the 46th meeting

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Wednesday, 8 October 2025, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Lauber (Switzerland)

Contents

Agenda item 10: Technical assistance and capacity-building (*continued*)

Agenda item 1: Organizational and procedural matters (*continued*)

Closure of the session

* No summary record was prepared for the rest of the meeting.

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 10: Technical assistance and capacity-building (continued)

([A/HRC/60/L.33/Rev.1](#) and [A/HRC/60/L.37](#) as orally revised)

Draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.33/Rev.1](#): Technical assistance and capacity-building in the field of human rights in the Central African Republic

1. **Mr. Boateng** (Ghana), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the main sponsors, namely the Group of African States, said that the Council's yearly adoption of resolutions on technical assistance and capacity-building in the field of human rights in the Central African Republic illustrated an ongoing commitment to support that country in its efforts to consolidate peace, achieve national reconciliation and promote human rights. The Group welcomed the signing in N'Djamena of the 19 April 2025 agreement between the Government of the Central African Republic and the armed groups Retour, réclamation et réhabilitation and Unité pour la paix en Centrafrique, as well as institutional reforms aimed at strengthening electoral governance and the National Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms Commission. The Group of African States furthermore welcomed the Government's continued cooperation with United Nations mechanisms and the move towards a gradual easing of the mandate of Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic, in recognition of the progress made. The Group encouraged the Central African Republic to submit its candidacy for membership of the Human Rights Council and hoped that the Council would adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

2. **The President** announced that five States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which had programme budget implications amounting to \$473,000, of which \$454,200 was already included in the programme budget. He invited the State concerned by the draft resolution to make a statement.

3. **Mr. N'Gben Mokoue** (Observer for the Central African Republic) said that the draft resolution was an acknowledgement of the tangible progress that his Government had made in the areas of peacebuilding, national reconciliation and human rights. Notable achievements included the signing of the 19 April 2025 agreement between the Government and the armed groups Retour, réclamation et réhabilitation and Unité pour la paix en Centrafrique; the strengthening of national institutions, including the reform of the National Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms Commission to bring it into line with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles); the adoption of a law on the promotion and protection of human rights defenders; and the gradual operationalization of the National Observatory for Gender Parity. His Government continued to work, with the support of its international partners and the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic (MINUSCA), towards ensuring that the elections scheduled for December 2025 were inclusive, free and transparent.

4. His Government was deeply grateful to the outgoing Independent Expert for his steadfast commitment, relevant analyses and sound recommendations. It also welcomed the exemplary cooperation with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and the Council's continued support of his country's efforts to strengthen democratic governance, justice and national cohesion, and to maintain an environment that fostered respect for human rights and sustainable development. He hoped that the Council would adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

5. *Draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.33/Rev.1](#) was adopted.*

Draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.37](#), as orally revised: Technical assistance and capacity-building in the field of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

6. **Mr. Empole Losoko Efambe** (Democratic Republic of the Congo), introducing the draft resolution, as orally revised, said that, in addition to highlighting the progress made by his Government in areas such as justice sector reform and promotion of the rights of persons with disabilities, the text reiterated the continued need for technical assistance and

capacity-building in key areas such as forensic expertise, transitional justice, the protection of human rights in the extractive industries and the fulfilment of the right to development as a means of promoting sustainable and participatory development and conflict prevention. While recognizing the valuable support provided by the team of international experts, his Government preferred that the team's mandate should be terminated and the focus shifted to strengthening the United Nations Joint Human Rights Office in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Duplication of effort would thus be avoided and coordination would be enhanced; those were important objectives in the light of the liquidity crisis facing the United Nations. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

7. **The President** said that the proposed amendments contained in documents [A/HRC/60/L.48](#), [A/HRC/60/L.49](#) and [A/HRC/60/L.50](#) had been submitted by Rwanda but had not been sponsored by any member of the Council. In accordance with rule 72 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.

8. *It was so decided.*

9. **Mr. Simas Magalhães** (Brazil), making a general statement before the decision, said that his Government was deeply concerned about the human rights and humanitarian 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 human rights violations. It affirmed its ongoing commitment to stability through its role in the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. He commended the work of the team of international experts, whose contributions had been instrumental in the monitoring of compliance with human rights obligations in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. His delegation supported the adoption of resolutions under agenda item 10 and hoped that such texts would consistently focus on providing concrete, measurable and sustainable capacity-building projects aimed at securing tangible improvements in human rights.

10. **Ms. Thuadet** (France), making a general statement before the decision, said that her Government was deeply concerned about the humanitarian crisis in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the violence committed by all parties against civilian populations, especially women, children and human rights defenders. The Governments of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and of Rwanda must redouble their efforts to end the fighting and human rights violations. Furthermore, the various parties involved in the conflict must stop all cooperation with armed groups and firmly oppose hate speech, regardless of its source and the victims it targeted. The technical assistance provided by OHCHR, including with regard to the transitional justice policy, would continue to be indispensable for ensuring the policy's effective implementation, inter alia in the area of forensic medicine, which played a vital role in combating impunity. While the termination of the mandate of the team of international experts was regrettable, France welcomed the commitment of the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to continue working with OHCHR and encouraged it to implement all the recommendations made by the team of international experts and the fact-finding mission on the situation in North Kivu and South Kivu Provinces of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

11. **The President** announced that the draft resolution, as orally revised, had programme budget implications amounting to \$7,284,400, whereas \$7,653,300 was already included in the programme budget; the savings of \$368,900 would subsequently be reflected in the budget. He invited the other State concerned by the draft resolution to make a statement.

12. **Ms. Bakuramutsa** (Observer for Rwanda) said that her delegation wished to commend those States that had spoken out against the politicization of the Council. Draft resolutions [A/HRC/60/L.32/Rev.1](#), as orally revised, and [A/HRC/60/L.37](#), as orally revised, failed to hold the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo accountable for the dire human rights and security situation in its territory. The Council had remained silent on

that State's responsibility and instead amplified unfounded accusations that made it complicit in condoning impunity and rewarding political manipulation.

13. Her Government firmly supported the provision of technical assistance and capacity-building under agenda item 10. However, when that mechanism was used to advance petty political narratives or shape biased perceptions, the Council undermined its own credibility and failed the very populations it claimed to protect. The Council had remained silent on the accusatory language in the draft resolution currently under consideration and thus allowed the Democratic Republic of the Congo to use what was supposed to be a technical resolution for purposes of selective justice and misinformation. While the text referred to various provinces and localities, mainly in the eastern part of that country, hotspots in the western part had been purposely omitted. In addition, the draft resolution omitted any mention of the continued spread of genocidal ideology by the Forces démocratiques de libération du Rwanda, which was under United Nations sanctions but was backed by the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and allied militias. Clearly, the Democratic Republic of the Congo had no intention of using the draft resolution to enhance the human rights situation in its territory.

14. Draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.32/Rev.1](#), as orally revised, which had been adopted at the Council's 44th meeting, expressed condemnation of only certain dissident elements of the Wazalendo militia, whereas the current draft resolution rightly condemned the whole of the militia, as her delegation had recommended. The Wazalendo militia was clearly sponsored by the State and was armed by and incorporated into the military chain of command of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

15. Such resolutions achieved nothing, but merely obscured responsibility, blamed situations on foreign forces, brandished unverified statistics and distracted attention from the root causes of the instability in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, to the detriment of the people. Agenda item 10 must remain a technical, neutral tool geared towards concrete results; if used as such, it could truly improve the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

16. *Draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.37](#), as orally revised, was adopted.*

Agenda item 1: Organizational and procedural matters (continued) ([A/HRC/60/2](#) and [A/HRC/60/90/Rev.1](#))

Election of members of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee

17. **The President** drew attention to a note by the Secretary-General on the election of members of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee ([A/HRC/60/90/Rev.1](#)). Since the number of candidates from African States, Asia-Pacific States, Latin American and Caribbean States and Western European and other States was equal to the number of vacancies to be filled from each of those groups, he took it that the Council wished to elect the candidates by acclamation.

18. *It was so decided.*

19. *Ms. Ameline (France), Mr. Asante (Ghana), Mr. Boudache (Algeria), Mr. De Casas (Argentina), Ms. Nadipour (Islamic Republic of Iran) and Mr. Ren (China) were elected members of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee.*

20. **The President** drew attention to rule 94 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which applied pursuant to paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 60/251, and invited the Council to elect by secret ballot one member from an Eastern European State.

21. *At the invitation of the President, Ms. Fuentes Julio (Chile) and Mr. Empole Losoko Efambe (Democratic Republic of the Congo), Vice-Presidents, acted as tellers.*

22. *A vote was taken by secret ballot.*

Number of ballot papers: 47

Number of valid ballots: 47

23. *Having obtained the largest number of votes, Ms. Fikfak (Slovenia) was elected a member of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee.*

Appointment of special procedure mandate holders

24. **The President** said that, on the basis of the recommendations of the Consultative Group and following broad consultations, he had decided to propose the appointment of the candidate whose name was indicated in the letter circulated to delegations on 22 August 2025. He took it that the Council wished to endorse that candidate and appoint him as a special procedure mandate holder.

25. *It was so decided.*

Report on the sixtieth session

26. **Mr. Empole Losoko Efambe** (Democratic Republic of the Congo), Vice-President and Rapporteur, said that an advance unedited version of the draft report of the Human Rights Council on its sixtieth session ([A/HRC/60/2](#)) had been circulated. The structure of the report reflected the 10 items on the Council's agenda. The secretariat would finalize the report after the session and circulate it for comments. During the session, the Council had held nine general debates and 41 interactive dialogues, including 12 with the participation of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights or the Deputy High Commissioner and 1 with the Under-Secretary-General for Human Rights. It had held 20 dialogues with special procedure mandate holders, 2 with expert mechanisms, 7 with investigative mechanisms and 1 with the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee. The Council had also held five thematic debates, one urgent debate and two closed meetings under its complaint procedure. It had adopted 35 resolutions, one decision and one statement by the President; considered and adopted 14 outcome documents under the universal periodic review process; and appointed one special procedure mandate holder.

27. **The President** said he took it that the Council wished to adopt the report ad referendum on the understanding that it would be finalized with the assistance of the secretariat.

28. *It was so decided.*

29. **The President** said he had been informed by the secretariat that the programme budget implications of all the resolutions and decisions adopted at the current session amounted to \$53,624,000. The amount of \$30,469,400 was already included in the programme budget, which meant that \$23,154,600 would need to be added. He was grateful to OHCHR for providing budget figures during the adoption process, as the transparent sharing of figures allowed delegations to take well-informed decisions. However, the figures that were announced were only an estimate of the programme budget implications and would need to go through the normal budget review and approval by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee. He therefore encouraged delegations in Geneva to follow up with their counterparts in New York to ensure that the Council's decisions received the full budget that they required for implementation. He had suggested that the High Commissioner and the Director-General of the United Nations Office at Geneva should hold a briefing for Council members and observers regarding the impact of the ongoing budget process and the UN80 Initiative on the human rights architecture. Despite the requirement to reduce its meeting time and the fact that some previously mandated activities could not be delivered due to the liquidity crisis, the Council had just approved new activities and renewed old ones, which would require more resources and more meeting time. He and the Council's co-facilitators on efficiency and rationalization had been working with delegations to find solutions to that predicament, which was an urgent priority for the Council. He was grateful for delegations' constructive feedback and participation; however, the Council needed to do more to address the issue.

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

30. **Ms. Micael** (Observer for Eritrea) said that draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.1/Rev.1](#) on promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka reflected the growing

trend for drafters to include elements they considered relevant without clear guidance or the agreement of the States concerned. Previous resolutions on the same subject had lacked implementation details, leading to the creation of a costly and poorly defined mandate. Her delegation dissociated itself from the text in its entirety.

31. Draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.18](#), entitled “Responding to the human rights and humanitarian crisis caused by the ongoing armed conflict in the Sudan”, was highly politicized. The drafters’ refusal to recognize the Government of the Sudan was unacceptable, as was their portrayal of themselves as arbiters of legitimacy. The independent international fact-finding mission for the Sudan had produced no tangible benefit that contributed to lasting solutions in the country. Again, her delegation dissociated itself from the text as a whole.

32. It was difficult to understand why States whose nationals held the majority of country-specific mandates continued to vote against resolutions on the right to development, including draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.5](#). Those States repeatedly characterized certain developing countries as the worst human rights violators, yet consistently withheld support for efforts to advance the right to development. That approach overlooked the fact that development was an integral component of the broader human rights framework. While those States often argued that the right to development was not a prerequisite for upholding human rights, developing countries had never made that claim; rather, they maintained that Governments bore the primary responsibility for upholding their people’s rights.

33. Regarding draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.20/Rev.1](#) on preventable maternal mortality and morbidity and human rights, her delegation appreciated the main sponsors’ willingness to take its proposals on board by making an oral revision to the twenty-ninth preambular paragraph and had therefore withdrawn the proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/60/L.35](#) in the spirit of consensus. The proposed amendment nonetheless concerned an important issue, namely the serious barriers facing the health systems of many countries, which should be reflected in future resolutions on the same subject.

34. **Mr. Foradori** (Observer for Argentina) said that, although his Government aimed to improve the lives of all women, it wished to convey its reservations about draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.20/Rev.1](#). In particular, terms such as “bodily autonomy”, “comprehensive sexuality education” and “sexual and reproductive health and rights” were not recognized in international human rights treaties. Under Article 38 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, the only sources of public international law were treaties, custom and general principles of law; the Council was thus not empowered to create new rights. The Argentine Government’s commitment to reducing maternal mortality was centred on proven measures such as the provision of high-quality obstetric care, trained health personnel and emergency services. Furthermore, abortion was not an internationally recognized human right. The 1994 amendment of the Constitution of Argentina had enshrined the constitutional status of international human rights treaties, which protected life from the moment of conception.

35. **Ms. Lin** (Observer for Singapore) said that the adoption of draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.12](#) on the question of the death penalty, and the political agenda that it reflected, were regrettable. Her Government’s views on that subject had been described in detail in her delegation’s introduction of its proposed amendments.

36. Regarding draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.31/Rev.1](#) on the human rights implications of drug policy, it was disappointing that a group of States had revived and repackaged a text as a recurring resolution on the subject, even though neither the Council nor OHCHR had a mandate to address drug-related issues, which should be handled by competent expert bodies such as the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. She was concerned that some States were using the Council to reopen technical debates that they had failed to advance in the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. Moreover, the resolution undermined the impartial, objective and evidence-based work that had already been undertaken in Vienna, and was thus contrary to the aims of the UN80 Initiative. While her delegation had engaged with the main sponsors in good faith and recognized the improvements made to the initial draft, the fundamental flaw remained. The resolution sought to portray drug control policies as inherently harmful to human rights; perplexingly, it ignored both the negative impact of drug abuse on the enjoyment of human rights and the positive impact that drug control policies had had on many societies. Such an unbalanced

view ignored the clear purpose of drug control policies, as reflected in the international drug control conventions: to protect the health and welfare of humankind; to safeguard the rights, safety and well-being of individuals, their families and societies; and to address and counter the world drug problem. Singapore remained committed to upholding the integrity of the international drug control framework and would continue to work with like-minded States to resist attempts to undermine it under the guise of promoting human rights.

37. **Mr. Ustinov** (Observer for the Russian Federation) said that his Government categorically rejected the unfounded and politically motivated draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.23](#) on the situation of human rights in the Russian Federation and the mandate of the corresponding Special Rapporteur, as well as draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.16](#) on cooperation with Georgia. The Russian Federation stood against the abuse of human rights issues to push through biased resolutions such as those on Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Burundi and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

38. The Russian Federation opposed the addition of climate-related issues to the Council agenda and thus rejected draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.38/Rev.1](#), on sea-level rise, in its entirety. His delegation continued to interpret references to human rights defenders in accordance with the Declaration on Human Rights Defenders. It distanced itself from the references to the Pact for the Future and the Global Digital Compact, as there was no consensus on those instruments. It assumed that Indigenous Peoples' participation in relevant meetings of the Council, as provided for in draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.24/Rev.1](#), would be organized in a manner consistent with the institution-building package set forth in Council resolution 5/1. The Russian Federation categorically rejected attempts to broaden the interpretation of rights and the international obligations of States or to use terms that did not enjoy the support of all States Members of the United Nations. References in resolutions to general comments of treaty bodies did not imply that all delegations agreed with their content. It was unfortunate that the sponsors of a number of resolutions had not found the courage to reflect the issue of the negative impact of unilateral measures on the realization of human rights, especially among the most vulnerable sectors of the population.

39. **Ms. Atteya** (Observer for Egypt), welcoming the adoption by consensus of draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.29/Rev.1](#), entitled "From rhetoric to reality: a global call for concrete action against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance", said that reparatory justice was central to combating racism and racial discrimination. It was necessary to ensure that resolutions adopted under agenda item 10 were consensus-based and technical and were not politicized. In respect of draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.12](#) on the question of the death penalty, her Government underscored its sovereign right to develop its own legal system in accordance with its international obligations. Regarding draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.25](#), entitled "Cooperation with the United Nations, its representatives and mechanisms in the field of human rights", the Government reaffirmed its commitment to cooperating with United Nations mechanisms and emphasized their responsibility for verifying the credibility of allegations.

40. In respect of draft resolution [A/HRC/L.20/Rev.1](#), her delegation dissociated itself from the language that the proposed amendments contained in documents [A/HRC/60/L.40](#), [A/HRC/60/L.41](#) and [A/HRC/60/L.42](#) were meant to address, and underscored that the references to safe abortion in the draft resolution would be interpreted in line with national law. Regarding draft resolution [A/HRC/L.31/Rev.1](#), Egypt welcomed the reference to the negative impact of the world drug problem and reaffirmed that drug control policies must be in line with States' obligations under the three international drug control conventions.

41. Concerning draft resolution [A/HRC/L.38/Rev.1](#), Egypt dissociated itself from any references to statehood, such as the one in paragraph 2, that went beyond the definition of statehood established in international law, and stressed that its reading of paragraph 6 was fully consistent with the obligations set out under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Paris Agreement. Her delegation also dissociated itself from concepts and references that did not enjoy consensus and had no clear definition in international human rights law. The work of the Council must be guided by respect for and adherence to its founding principles. While non-governmental organizations played a valuable role in promoting human rights, her delegation remained concerned about instances

in which their privileges were misused to politicize discussions or spread inaccurate information.

42. **Mr. Necmioğlu** (Observer for Türkiye) said that, during the negotiations on draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.38/Rev.1](#), his delegation had pointed out that Türkiye was not a Party to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and had expressed disagreement with the view that the Convention had a universal and unified character. The Convention was not the only legal framework that regulated activities in the oceans and seas. Other States had raised similar concerns and objections over the years. While Türkiye appreciated international efforts to establish a regime of the seas that was based on the principle of equity and was acceptable to all States, the Convention did not provide sufficient safeguards for particular geographical situations and, as a consequence, did not take into consideration conflicting interests and sensitivities stemming from special circumstances. Moreover, the Convention did not allow States to make reservations to its articles. Türkiye therefore dissociated itself from the references to the Convention in the resolution. Its participation in the negotiations could not be construed as a change in its legal position.

43. **Ms. Wojnarowicz** (Observer for Canada) said that her Government welcomed the adoption of draft resolutions [A/HRC/60/L.1/Rev.1](#) on promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka and [A/HRC/60/L.24/Rev.1](#) on human rights and Indigenous Peoples. In the latter text, the Council rightly expressed appreciation for the joint report of the co-facilitators and OHCHR on concrete ways to enhance the participation of Indigenous Peoples in the work of the Council. Her delegation welcomed efforts to increase the participation of Indigenous representatives in the Council's annual panel discussion on the rights of Indigenous Peoples.

44. Canada remained committed to reforming and strengthening the multilateral system to achieve an accountable, effective and efficient United Nations that was fit to respond to global challenges. While the current financial situation had exacerbated challenges, it remained imperative that the United Nations should continue to perform its core normative functions, including the protection of human rights. In the context of rationalization, her delegation was grateful to the sponsors of draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.8](#) for merging the mandates of Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children, and Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery.

45. **Mr. Cano Ricciardi** (Observer for Paraguay) said that his Government recognized the urgent challenge of preventing maternal mortality and morbidity. All preventable maternal deaths were a reminder of inequalities in access to quality health services. Paraguay was implementing a plan for the reduction of maternal, fetal and neonatal mortality for the period 2023–2030 and recognized the need to redouble efforts to provide timely and universal obstetric care with a human rights-based approach. Draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.20/Rev.1](#), however, contained sensitive language that was the subject of debate both between States and within societies. The concepts of so-called sexual and reproductive rights, comprehensive sexuality education and bodily autonomy could not be defined or applied in isolation from each country's domestic legal framework, challenges and development priorities. The Constitution of Paraguay protected the right to life from conception, and the country's laws did not provide for the termination of pregnancy, which was a prerogative implicit in the notions of "bodily autonomy" and "reproductive rights". Moreover, under Paraguayan law, comprehensive sexuality education required the balanced participation of the State, society and the family, especially parents, taking account of children's evolving capacities.

46. **Ms. Singh** (Observer for India), referring to draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.12](#) on the question of the death penalty, said that there was no international consensus on capital punishment and its use did not contravene international law. In India, the death penalty was applied only in the rarest of rare cases for exceptionally heinous crimes. Indian law provided for strict procedural safeguards, including a fair trial, the presumption of innocence, the right of defence and review by higher courts. The death penalty could not be imposed on juveniles, pregnant women or persons with mental or intellectual disabilities. The Supreme Court had recognized poverty, socioeconomic conditions and other adversities as mitigating factors. All death sentences required confirmation by a superior court, and the President and state governors held powers of pardon and commutation.

47. **Mr. Karimdoost** (Observer for the Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his Government welcomed the adoption of draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.5](#) on the right to development and encouraged all States to finalize the draft international covenant on that subject. Regarding the new mandate established pursuant to draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.9](#) on the situation of human rights in Afghanistan, his delegation was concerned that the reliance of such country-specific mechanisms on voluntary funding might undermine their independence and impartiality. With respect to draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.31/Rev.1](#), his Government supported the sovereign right of each State to develop policies consistent with national legislation, considering that the discussion on the world drug problem should be conducted within the mandate of the relevant United Nations agencies. Regarding draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.12](#), his delegation dissociated itself from the eleventh, twenty-fourth and twenty-eighth preambular paragraphs, owing to concerns about their content and implications. Respect for State sovereignty was essential in order to maintain a balanced and respectful dialogue on the question of the death penalty.

48. Regarding the draft resolution on sea-level rise, his Government considered that fossil fuels remained an essential component of the development agenda of oil-producing countries; however, it appreciated the reference to the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities. The Islamic Republic of Iran dissociated itself from the controversial terms “comprehensive sexuality education”, “sexual and reproductive health and rights” and “bodily autonomy” in draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.20/Rev.1](#). Lastly, his delegation was of the view that the impact of unilateral coercive measures should have been taken into consideration in draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.19](#) on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health.

49. **Mr. Oravec** (Observer for Hungary) said that his Government was committed to preventing maternal mortality and morbidity and was grateful to the main sponsors of draft resolution [A/HRC/L.20/Rev.1](#) for choosing respectful maternal care as its thematic focus. Abusive practices during pregnancy, childbirth and the postnatal period were unacceptable. The provision of maternal care with dignity, compassion and respect was inseparable from a human rights-based approach. With regard to the twentieth preambular paragraph and paragraph 18, his delegation recalled that the term “sexual and reproductive health and rights” lacked an internationally agreed definition and, therefore, was interpreted and promoted by Hungary in the context of the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development, the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and in line with its national legislation.

50. **Ms. Hermanns** (Observer for the Bahamas) said that her delegation welcomed the adoption of draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.38/Rev.1](#), of which it had been a main sponsor. For the citizens of small island developing States such as the Bahamas, sea-level rise was not a distant threat, but the shrinking of the ground beneath their feet. The adoption of the resolution by consensus therefore marked an important and historic step whereby the Council recognized the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice and affirmed the continuity of statehood and sovereignty and the maintenance of maritime zones as established under international law and reflected in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. It also acknowledged the special circumstances of small island developing States; requested the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee to prepare an in-depth analytical study; and requested OHCHR to provide technical assistance and capacity-building to regions confronting the human rights implications of sea-level rise. The Government of the Bahamas looked forward to working with all States and with OHCHR to address that critical issue and to safeguard the rights, dignity and future of all peoples affected by rising seas.

51. **Ms. Macrory** (Observer for the United Kingdom) said that her Government unequivocally condemned all forms of racism, racial discrimination and xenophobia and was steadfast in its commitment to tackling them. Nevertheless, if the United Kingdom had been a member of the Council, it would have been unable to support draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.29/Rev.1](#). The provisions of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, to which the United Kingdom reaffirmed its commitment, did not alter the established legal principle against the retroactive application of international law in matters of State responsibility. The United Kingdom fully acknowledged the profound and enduring legacy

of historical injustices, including colonialism, slavery and the transatlantic slave trade, and remained committed to constructive engagement and continued dialogue.

52. The United Kingdom commended OHCHR for the support provided to the Democratic Republic of the Congo. However, the references, in both of the resolutions concerning that country, to hate speech and article 20 (2) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights were problematic. The Covenant prohibited incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence. For the sake of accuracy, both resolutions should refer to “incitement to hatred”.

53. **Ms. Matar** (Observer for the United Arab Emirates) said that her Government welcomed the adoption of draft resolutions [A/HRC/60/L.10](#) on the human rights to safe drinking water and sanitation and [A/HRC/60/L.15](#) on the human rights of older persons, both of which were vital for the promotion and protection of human rights. Regarding draft resolution [A/HRC/60/L.18](#) on the Sudan, her delegation noted the references to the efforts of Egypt, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and the United States of America and strongly rejected the false and baseless allegations made by the representative of the State concerned during its adoption. Such remarks constituted a deliberate attempt to avoid legal and moral responsibility for the ongoing civil war. The Government of the United Arab Emirates had unequivocally stated that it had never provided, since the outbreak of the war, any support to the warring parties. The latest reports of the Panel of Experts on the Sudan contained no findings to suggest the involvement of the United Arab Emirates. On the other hand, recent reports made clear that both the Sudanese Armed Forces and the Rapid Support Forces were perpetrating atrocities and war crimes, including sexual and gender-based violence, attacks on civilians and the use of chemical weapons.

The meeting was suspended at 4.25 p.m. and resumed at 4.35 p.m.

Closure of the session

54. After the customary exchange of courtesies, **the President** declared the sixtieth session of the Human Rights Council closed.

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.