



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
20 August 2019

Original: English

---

**Human Rights Council**  
Twenty-sixth session  
10–27 June 2014  
Agenda item 1  
**Organizational and procedural matters**

## **Report of the Human Rights Council on its twenty-sixth session**

*Vice-President and Rapporteur: Kateřina Sequensová (Czech Republic)*

GE.19-14142(E)



\* 1 9 1 4 1 4 2 \*

Please recycle 



## Contents

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
Part One: Resolutions, decisions and President's statements .....	4
I. Resolutions.....	4
II. Decisions .....	5
Part Two: Summary of proceedings.....	7
I. Organizational and procedural matters.....	7
A. Opening and duration of the session.....	7
B. Attendance .....	7
C. Agenda and programme of work .....	7
D. Organization of work.....	7
E. Meetings and documentation .....	8
F. Visits.....	8
G. Selection and appointment of mandate holders .....	8
H. Adoption of the report on the session .....	9
I. Closing ceremony in honour of outgoing United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Navi Pillay .....	9
II. Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General.....	10
A. Update by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights .....	10
B. Reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General.....	11
III. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development.....	12
A. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders .....	12
B. Panel discussions .....	20
C. General debate on agenda item 3 .....	24
D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	25
IV. Human rights situations that require the Council's attention .....	39
A. Interactive dialogue with the independent international commission of inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic.....	39
B. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders .....	39
C. General debate on agenda item 4.....	41
D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	42
V. Human rights bodies and mechanisms .....	45
A. Social Forum.....	45
B. Open-ended intergovernmental working group on the rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas .....	45
C. Forum on Business and Human Rights.....	45
D. General debate on agenda item 5 .....	45
E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	46
VI. Universal periodic review .....	48

A.	Consideration of universal periodic review outcomes .....	48
B.	General debate on agenda item 6 .....	115
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	115
VII.	Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories .....	117
	General debate on agenda item 7 .....	117
VIII.	Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action .....	118
	General debate on agenda item 8 .....	118
IX.	Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action .....	120
A.	Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders .....	120
B.	General debate on agenda item 9 .....	120
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	121
X.	Technical assistance and capacity-building .....	122
A.	Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders .....	122
B.	Panel discussions .....	123
C.	General debate on agenda item 10 .....	123
D.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals .....	124
<b>Annexes</b>		
I.	Attendance .....	127
II.	Agenda .....	132
III.	Documents issued for the twenty-sixth session .....	133
IV.	Special procedure mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its twenty-sixth session .....	154

## Part One

### Resolutions, decisions and President's statements

#### I. Resolutions adopted by the Human Rights Council at its twenty-sixth session

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
26/1	Implementation of the International Decade for People of African Descent: draft programme of activities	18 June 2014
26/2	The question of the death penalty	26 June 2014
26/3	Extreme poverty and human rights	26 June 2014
26/4	Protection of Roma	26 June 2014
26/5	Elimination of discrimination against women	26 June 2014
26/6	Mandate of the Independent Expert on human rights and international solidarity	26 June 2014
26/7	Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers	26 June 2014
26/8	Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children	26 June 2014
26/9	Elaboration of an international legally binding instrument on transnational corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights	26 June 2014
26/10	International Albinism Awareness Day	26 June 2014
26/11	Protection of the family	26 June 2014
26/12	Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions	26 June 2014
26/13	The promotion, protection and enjoyment of human rights on the Internet	26 June 2014
26/14	Human rights and arbitrary deprivation of nationality	26 June 2014
26/15	Accelerating efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women: violence against women as a barrier to women's political and economic empowerment	26 June 2014
26/16	Human rights and the regulation of civilian acquisition, possession and use of firearms	26 June 2014
26/17	The right to education: follow-up to Human Rights Council resolution 8/4	26 June 2014
26/18	The right to everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health: sport and healthy lifestyles as contributing factors	26 June 2014
26/19	Human rights of migrants: mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants	26 June 2014
26/20	Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities	27 June 2014
26/21	Promotion of the right of migrants to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health	27 June 2014

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
26/22	Human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises	27 June 2014
26/23	The continuing grave deterioration in the human rights and humanitarian situation in the Syrian Arab Republic	27 June 2014
26/24	Situation of human rights in Eritrea	27 June 2014
26/25	Situation of human rights in Belarus	27 June 2014
26/26	Promotion and protection of the human rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas	27 June 2014
26/27	Human rights and climate change	27 June 2014
26/28	The Social Forum	27 June 2014
26/29	Contribution of parliaments to the work of the Human Rights Council and its universal periodic review	27 June 2014
26/30	Cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights	27 June 2014
26/31	Technical and capacity-building assistance for South Sudan in the field of human rights	27 June 2014
26/32	Capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights	27 June 2014

## II. Decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council at its twenty-sixth session

<i>Decision</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
26/101	Outcome of the universal periodic review: New Zealand	19 June 2014
26/102	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Afghanistan	19 June 2014
26/103	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Chile	19 June 2014
26/104	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Uruguay	19 June 2014
26/105	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Yemen	19 June 2014
26/106	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Vanuatu	20 June 2014
26/107	Outcome of the universal periodic review: the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	20 June 2014
26/108	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Comoros	20 June 2014
26/109	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Slovakia	20 June 2014
26/110	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Eritrea	20 June 2014
26/111	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Cyprus	20 June 2014
26/112	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Dominican Republic	20 June 2014
26/113	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Viet Nam	20 June 2014
26/114	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Cambodia	26 June 2014

<i>Decision</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
26/115	The negative impact of corruption on the enjoyment of human rights	26 June 2014
26/116	Promotion and protection of human rights in post-disaster and post-conflict situations	27 June 2014

## **Part Two**

### **Summary of proceedings**

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

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

1. The Human Rights Council held its twenty-sixth session at the United Nations Office at Geneva from 10 to 27 June 2014. The President of the Council opened the session.
2. In accordance with rule 8 (b) of the rules of procedure of the Human Rights Council, as contained in part VII of the annex to Council resolution 5/1, the organizational meeting of the twenty-sixth session was held on 26 May 2014.
3. The twenty-sixth session consisted of 40 meetings held over 14 days (see para. 15 below).

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

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

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

5. At its 1st meeting, on 10 June 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted the agenda and programme of work of its twenty-sixth session.

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

6. At the 1st meeting, on 10 June 2014, the President outlined the modalities for the general debates, which would be three minutes for States Members of the Human Rights Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.
7. At the 3rd meeting, on 10 June 2014, the President outlined the modalities for the clustered interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders under agenda item 3, which would be 10 minutes for the initial presentation by the mandate holder of the report, five minutes for the States concerned, if any, and for States Members of the Human Rights Council, three minutes for observer States and other observers and five minutes for concluding remarks by the mandate holder.
8. At the 16th meeting, on 17 June 2014, the President outlined the modalities for the full-day discussion on women's human rights, which would be seven minutes for panellists and two minutes for States Members of the Council, observer States and other observers.
9. At the 17th meeting, on the same day, the President outlined the modalities for the individual interactive dialogue with the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic, which would be 10 minutes for the initial presentation by the Commission of the report, five minutes for the States concerned, if any, three minutes for member States, two minutes for observer States and other observers and five minutes for the Commission's concluding remarks.
10. At the same meeting, the President referred to the note verbale dated 13 June 2014 received from the Permanent Mission of Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States, in which it requested the Human Rights Council to hold an interactive dialogue on the

situation of human rights in South Sudan at its twenty-sixth session. The Council decided to hold an interactive dialogue on the situation of human rights in South Sudan on 24 June 2014.

11. At the 19th meeting, on 18 June 2014, the President outlined the modalities for the individual interactive dialogues with special procedure mandates holders, which would be 10 minutes for the initial presentation by the mandate holder of the report, five minutes for the States concerned, if any, three minutes for member States, two minutes for observer States and other observers and five minutes for the mandate holder's concluding remarks.

12. At the 21st meeting, on 18 June 2014, the President outlined the modalities for the general debates, which would be three minutes for States Members of the Human Rights Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

13. At the 22nd meeting, on 19 June 2014, the President outlined the modalities for the consideration of the outcomes of the universal periodic review under agenda item 6, which would be 20 minutes for the State concerned to present its views; where appropriate, two minutes for the national human rights institution with "A" status of the State concerned; up to 20 minutes for States Members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and United Nations agencies to express their views on the outcome of the review, with varying speaking times according to the number of speakers in accordance with the modalities set out in the appendix to resolution 16/21; and up to 20 minutes for stakeholders to make general comments on the outcome of the review.

14. At the 30th meeting, on 23 June 2014, the President announced that the interactive dialogue on the situation of human rights in South Sudan would not be held owing to logistical difficulties.

## **E. Meetings and documentation**

15. The Human Rights Council held 40 fully serviced meetings during its twenty-sixth session.

16. Any resolutions, decisions and President's statements adopted by the Human Rights Council are contained in part one of the present report.

## **F. Visits**

17. At the 1st meeting, on 10 June 2014, the Minister-Chief of the Secretariat for Human Rights of the Presidency of Brazil, Ideli Salvatti, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

18. At the 10th meeting, on 13 June 2014, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Seychelles, Jean-Paul Adam, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

19. At the 28th meeting, on 23 June 2014, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation of Portugal, Luis Campos Ferreira, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

20. At the 31st meeting, on 24 June 2014, the Commissioner for Human Rights, Humanitarian Action and Relations with Civil Society of Mauritania, Aichetou Mint M'Haiham, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

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

21. At its 40th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the Human Rights Council appointed six special procedure mandate holders in accordance with Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21 and its decision 6/102 (see annex IV).

22. At the same meeting, the President of the Human Rights Council made a statement on the selection and appointment of special procedure mandate holders. The representatives of Brazil, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States) and India also made statements.

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

23. At the 40th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the representatives of Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Canada, Egypt, Eritrea, Georgia, Singapore and Switzerland made statements as observer States with regard to the resolutions adopted by the Human Rights Council.

24. At the same meeting, the representatives of Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Italy (on behalf of the European Union) and Nigeria made statements.

25. Also at the same meeting, the Vice-President and Rapporteur made a statement on the draft report of the session.

26. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted ad referendum the draft report on the session (A/HRC/26/2), and the Council decided to entrust the Rapporteur with its finalization.

27. At the same meeting, the observers for the General Arab Women Federation and the International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of Action Canada for Population and Development, AKAHATÁ – Equipo de trabajo en Sexualidades y Géneros, article 19 – International Centre against Censorship, the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, the Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, the Federation for Women and Family Planning, the Human Rights House Foundation, the International Commission of Jurists, the International Federation for Human Rights, the International Lesbian and Gay Association, the Legal Resources Centre, Proyecto de Derechos Económicos, Sociales y Culturales, A.C., Reporters sans frontières International – Reporters Without Borders International and the World Organisation against Torture) made statements on the session.

28. Also at the same meeting, the President of the Human Rights Council made a closing statement.

## **I. Closing ceremony in honour of the outgoing United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights Navi Pillay**

29. At the 40th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the Acting Director-General of the United Nations Office at Geneva delivered a statement on behalf of the Secretary-General.

30. At the same meeting, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Argentina, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Germany (on behalf of the Group of Western European and Other States), Iran (Islamic Republic of) (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), South Africa;

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

(c) Observer for a non-governmental organization: Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme.

31. Also at the same meeting, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement.

32. At the same meeting, the President of the Human Rights Council made a statement.

## II. Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General

### A. Update by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

33. At the 1st meeting, on 10 June 2014, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement providing an update of the activities of the Office of the High Commissioner.

34. During the ensuing general debate, at the 1st and 2nd meetings, on the same day, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Botswana, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Czech Republic, Egypt<sup>1</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), France, Gabon, Germany, Greece<sup>1</sup> (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Iceland, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), India, Indonesia (also on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)), Iran (Islamic Republic of)<sup>1</sup> (on behalf of the Movement of the Non-Aligned Countries), Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Philippines, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Switzerland<sup>1</sup> (also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Ireland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay), United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Egypt, Georgia, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Libya, Malaysia, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Slovenia, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Uruguay;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence internationale pour le développement, Alsalam Foundation, Amnesty International, Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network (also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association), CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, General Arab Women Federation (also on behalf of the Union of Arab Jurists), International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Muslim Women's Union, International Service for Human Rights, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, Russian Peace Foundation, United Nations Watch, Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, Women's Human Rights International Association (also on behalf of Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples and International Educational Development, Inc.), World Muslim Congress.

35. At the 3rd meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Algeria, Bahrain, Egypt, Morocco, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic and Ukraine made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

<sup>1</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

36. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Morocco, Saudi Arabia and the Syrian Arab Republic made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

37. At the 18th meeting, the representative of Egypt made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

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

38. At the 21st meeting, on 18 June 2014, the Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights presented the thematic reports prepared by the Office of the High Commissioner (OHCHR) and the Secretary-General under agenda items 2 and 3.

39. At the same meeting, and at the 23rd meeting, on 19 June, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on thematic reports presented by the Deputy High Commissioner (see chap. III, sect. C).

40. At the 36th meeting, on 25 June, the Deputy High Commissioner presented the reports prepared by the High Commissioner under agenda items 2 and 10 (see chap. X, sect. C).

### **III. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development**

#### **A. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders**

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

41. At the 3rd meeting, on 10 June 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, Frank La Rue, presented his reports (A/HRC/26/30 and Add.1–3).

42. At the same meeting, the representatives of Italy, Montenegro and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia made statements as the States concerned.

43. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 3rd meeting, on the same day, and at the 5th meeting, on 11 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Austria, Brazil, China, Cuba, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Indonesia, Ireland, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Ecuador, Egypt, Guatemala, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Malaysia, Norway, Pakistan, Poland;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Khoei Foundation, article 19 – International Centre against Censorship (also on behalf of the International Center for Not-for-Profit Law (INCPL) and CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation), Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, British Humanist Association, Conectas Direitos Humanos, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, VIVAT International (also on behalf of Franciscans International).

44. At the 5th meeting, on 11 June, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

45. At the 3rd meeting, on 10 June 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, Maina Kiai, presented his reports (A/HRC/26/29 and Add.1–2).

46. At the same meeting, the representative of Rwanda made a statement as the State concerned.

47. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 3rd meeting, on 10 June, and at the 5th meeting, on 11 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Austria, Brazil, China, Cuba, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), France, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Lithuania, Malaysia, Myanmar, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Slovenia, Switzerland, State of Palestine;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Article 19 – International Centre against Censorship (also on behalf of the International Center for Not-for-Profit Law (INCPL) and CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation), Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Federation (also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association and the International Commission of Jurists), France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Franciscans International, International Humanist and Ethical Union, VIVAT International (also on behalf of Franciscans International).

48. At the 5th meeting, on 11 June, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

49. At the 5th meeting, on 11 June 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, Anand Grover, presented his report (A/HRC/26/31).

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Cuba, Egypt<sup>2</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), France, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Kuwait, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bangladesh, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Malaysia, Paraguay, Qatar, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay;

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: World Health Organization;

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

(e) Observer for a non-governmental organization: Franciscans International (also on behalf of the Sisters of Mercy of the Americas).

51. At the 7th meeting, on 12 June, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

52. At the 5th meeting, on 11 June 2014, the Chair of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises, Michael K. Addo, presented the reports of the Working Group (A/HRC/26/25 and Add.1–5).

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

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

54. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, and at the 6th meeting, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Chair of the Working Group questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Chile, China, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Cuba, Egypt<sup>3</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Kuwait, Morocco, Norway<sup>3</sup> (also on behalf of Argentina, Ghana, India and the Russian Federation), Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Ecuador, Israel, Malaysia, Netherlands, Qatar, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, State of Palestine;

(c) Observer for the Holy See;

(d) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: International Labour Organization (ILO), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF);

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

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, Centre Europe – Tiers Monde – Europe-Third World Centre (also on behalf of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL)), CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Conectas Direitos Humanos (also on behalf of the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development and the Indian Law Resource Centre), Foodfirst Information and Action Network (FIAN), Franciscans International (also on behalf of the Sisters of Mercy of the Americas), International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL), International Commission of Jurists (also on behalf of the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues and Coopération internationale pour le développement et la solidarité (CIDSE) and Franciscans International), International Service for Human Rights, Social Service Agency of the Protestant Church in Germany.

55. At the 7th meeting, on 12 June 2014, the Chair of the Working Group answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

56. At the 7th meeting, on 12 June 2014, the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences, Rashida Manjoo, presented her reports (A/HRC/26/38 and Add.1–3).

57. At the same meeting, the representatives of Azerbaijan, Bangladesh and India made statements as the States concerned.

58. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 7th and 8th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Cuba, Egypt<sup>4</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), France, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein<sup>4</sup> (also on behalf of Austria, Slovenia and Switzerland), Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

<sup>3</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

<sup>4</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Qatar, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay;

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

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

(e) Observer for the Sovereign Military Order of Malta;

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: British Humanist Association, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, Femmes Afrique Solidarité, Franciscans International (also on behalf of the International Movement ATD Fourth World), International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL), Social Service Agency of the Protestant Church in Germany, Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

59. At the 8th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

60. At the 9th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan and the Sudan made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

61. At the same meeting, the representatives of Armenia and Azerbaijan made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

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

62. At the 7th meeting, on 12 June 2014, the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights, Philip Alston, presented the reports of the previous mandate holder (A/HRC/26/28 and Corr.1, and Add.1–3).

63. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mozambique and the Republic of Moldova made statements as the States concerned.

64. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 7th and 8th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, China, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Cuba, Egypt (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), France, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, Namibia, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Belgium, Denmark, Egypt, Eritrea, Malaysia, Norway, Paraguay, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Uruguay;

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

(d) Observer for the Sovereign Military Order of Malta;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network, Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era, Franciscans International (also on behalf of the International Movement ATD Fourth World).

65. At the 8th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

66. At the 9th meeting, on 12 June 2014, the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, Christof Heyns, presented his reports (A/HRC/26/36, Add.1–2).

67. At the same meeting, the representative of Mexico made a statement as the State concerned.

68. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, and at the 10th meeting, on 13 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, China, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Cuba, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), India, Indonesia, Ireland, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Ecuador, Egypt, Iraq, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, State of Palestine;

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

(d) Observer for ICRC;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: American Civil Liberties Union (also on behalf of Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS)), Defence for Children International, International Commission of Jurists (also on behalf of the Human Rights Commission of Pakistan), International Educational Development, Inc., Lawyers for Lawyers, Women's Human Rights International Association, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, World Barua Organization, World Organisation against Torture.

69. At the 10th meeting, on 13 June 2014, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

70. At the 9th meeting, on 12 June 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons, Chaloka Beyani, presented his reports (A/HRC/26/33 and Add.1-4).

71. At the same meeting, the representatives of Georgia, Serbia, South Sudan and Sri Lanka made statements as the States concerned.

72. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting and at the 10th meeting, on 13 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Austria, Chile, China, Cuba, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Indonesia, Ireland, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Egypt, Norway, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Ukraine, State of Palestine;

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

(d) Observer for ICRC;

(e) Observer for the Sovereign Military Order of Malta;

(f) Observer for a national human rights institution: Defensoría del Pueblo de Colombia (by video message);

(g) Observer for a non-governmental organization: BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights.

73. At the 10th meeting, on 13 June, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

74. At the 9th meeting, on 12 June, the representative of Georgia made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

75. At the 12th meeting, on 13 June 2014, the representative of Iraq made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

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

76. At the 10th meeting, on 13 June 2014, the Independent Expert on human rights and international solidarity, Virginia Dandan, presented her reports (A/HRC/26/34 and Add.1).

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

78. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 10th and 11th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Brazil, China, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Cuba, Egypt<sup>5</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Ethiopia (also on behalf of the Group of African States), India, Indonesia, Maldives, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Philippines, Sierra Leone, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Holy See, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Qatar, Spain, Sri Lanka;

(c) Observer for intergovernmental organizations: European Union;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of Edmund Rice International Limited, VIVAT International, the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES International, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities), New Humanity, the International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education and Association Points-Coeur), Indian Council of South America, International Educational Development, Inc.

79. At the 11th meeting, on 13 June, the Independent Expert answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

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

80. At the 10th meeting, on 13 June 2014, the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children, Joy Ngozi Ezeilo, presented her report (A/HRC/26/37 and Add.1–7).

81. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Bahamas, Italy, Morocco and Seychelles made statements as States concerned.

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

83. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 10th and 11th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Austria, Belarus<sup>6</sup> (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, Egypt, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Libya, Nicaragua, Nigeria, the Philippines, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, the United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cuba, Egypt<sup>6</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Ethiopia (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Germany, India, Indonesia, Japan, Maldives, Pakistan (on behalf of the

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

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

Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Ecuador, Egypt, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Uruguay;

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

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Equality and Human Rights Commission (also on behalf of the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission) (by video message);

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, International Catholic Child Bureau, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (also on behalf of the Women's Consortium of Nigeria), Liberation, Union de l'action féminine, World Barua Organization.

84. At the 11th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

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

85. At the 12th meeting, on 13 June 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers, Gabriela Knaul, presented her report (A/HRC/26/32 and Add.1).

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

87. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, and at the 14th meeting, on 16 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, Czech Republic, Egypt<sup>6</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Estonia, France, Indonesia, Ireland, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Egypt, Ghana, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nepal, Portugal, Thailand;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Asian Legal Resource Centre, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, International Commission of Jurists, Lawyers for Lawyers (also on behalf of the Asian Legal Resource Centre).

88. At the 14th meeting, on 16 June, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

89. At the 23rd meeting, on 19 June, the representative of the Russian Federation made a statement in the exercise of the right of reply.

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

90. At the 12th meeting, on 13 June 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants, François Crépeau, presented his reports (A/HRC/26/35 and Add.1).

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

92. Also at the same meeting, the National Human Rights Committee of Qatar made a statement.

93. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, and at the 14th meeting, on 16 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Cuba, Egypt<sup>7</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), France, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Philippines, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Egypt, Ghana, Guatemala, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey;

(c) Observer for the Holy See;

(d) Observer for the Sovereign Military Order of Malta;

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

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: American Civil Liberties Union, Amnesty International, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales, Espace Afrique International, Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland (also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association), Save the Children International, Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

94. At the 12th meeting, on 13 June, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

95. At the 14th meeting, on 16 June 2014, the Chair of the Working Group on the issue of discrimination against women in law and in practice, Frances Raday, presented the reports of the Working Group (A/HRC/26/39 and Add.1–2).

96. At the same meeting, the representatives of Iceland and China made statements as the States concerned.

97. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 14th and 15th meetings, on the same day, and at the 17th meeting, on 17 June, the following made statements and asked the Chair of the Working Group questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Cuba, Estonia, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), France, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Belgium, Colombia, Finland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Lebanon, Malaysia, Niger, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: European Union, International Organization of la Francophonie;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Center for Inquiry, Center for Reproductive Rights, Inc., Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland, Foodfirst Information and Action Network (also on behalf of Friends of the Earth International), Mouvement mondial des mères international.

98. At the 17th meeting, on 17 June, the Chair of the Working Group answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

<sup>7</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

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

99. At the 14th meeting, on 16 June 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the right to education, Kishore Singh, presented his reports (A/HRC/26/27 and Add.1).

100. At the same meeting, the representative of Seychelles made a statement as the State concerned.

101. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 14th and 15th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Brazil, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Cuba, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), France, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Kuwait, Maldives, Mexico, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, United Arab Emirates (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Monaco, Morocco, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Yemen), United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Georgia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lebanon, Malaysia, Portugal, Qatar, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: European Union, International Organization of la Francophonie;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (also on behalf of the International Catholic Child Bureau, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES International, Association Points-Coeur and the Teresian Association), Plan International, Inc., Save the Children International.

102. At the 17th meeting, on 17 June, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

103. At the same meeting, the representative of China made a statement in the exercise of the right of reply.

## **B. Panel discussions**

### **Panel discussion on the safety of journalists**

104. At the 4th meeting, on 11 June 2014, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to its decision 24/116, a panel discussion on the issue of the safety of journalists. The opening statement for the panel was delivered by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. A journalist from Al-Jazeera, Ghida Fakhry, moderated the discussion.

105. At the same meeting, the panellists Gatechew Engida, Dunja Mijatovic, Frank La Rue, Abeer Saady and Frank Smyth made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two parts.

106. During the ensuing panel discussion for the first part, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Austria, Brazil, Egypt<sup>8</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Estonia, Montenegro, Russian Federation (also on behalf of the Collective Security Treaty Organization);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Colombia, Ecuador, Morocco, Tunisia;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Article 19 – International Centre against Censorship, International Federation of Journalists, Presse emblème campagne.

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

108. During the ensuing panel discussion for the second part, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, China, Czech Republic, France, India, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, Pakistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Greece, Lithuania, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Switzerland;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: International Organization of la Francophonie;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, International Humanist and Ethical Union.

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

### **High-level panel discussion on the identification of good practices in combating female genital mutilation**

110. At its 13th meeting, on 16 June 2014, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to its decision 24/117, a high-level panel discussion on the identification of good practices in combating female genital mutilation. The opening statement for the discussion was delivered by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. The Permanent Representative of the Permanent Mission of Togo to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Nakpa Polo, moderated the discussion.

111. At the same meeting, the panellists Chantal Compaoré, Mariame Lamizana, Nafissatou Diop, Hiranthi Wijemanne and Liz Ditchburn made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two parts.

112. During the ensuing panel discussion for the first part, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Austria, Egypt<sup>9</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Gabon, Ireland, Italy, Morocco, Sierra Leone, United States of America;

(b) Representative of an observer State: New Zealand;

(c) Representative for an intergovernmental organization: African Union;

(d) Observer for non-governmental organizations: Center for Inquiry, Plan International, Inc.

<sup>8</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

<sup>9</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

113. During the discussion for the second part, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

- (a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Congo, France, Indonesia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
- (b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Norway, Portugal, Sudan, Switzerland, Togo;
- (c) Representative for an intergovernmental organization: European Union.

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

#### **Annual full-day discussion on women's human rights**

115. On 17 June 2014, at the 16th and 18th meetings, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to its resolution 6/30, the annual full-day discussion, on women's human rights. The discussion was divided between two panels.

116. On 17 June, at the 16th meeting, the Human Rights Council held the first panel discussion with the theme "The impact of gender stereotypes on the recognition and enjoyment of women's human rights". The discussion was divided into two parts, which were held at the same meeting, on the same day.

117. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the discussion. The Executive Director of the White Ribbon Campaign, Todd Minerson, moderated the discussion. At the same meeting, the panellists Simone Cusack, Yetnebersh Nigussie, Dubravka Simonovic and Veronica Undurraga made statements.

118. During the ensuing panel discussion for the first part, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

- (a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Brazil (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese Language Countries), Congo, Egypt<sup>10</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), India, Ireland, Morocco, United States of America;
- (b) Representatives of observer States: Finland (also on behalf of Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), Syrian Arab Republic;
- (c) Observer of an intergovernmental organization: European Union;
- (d) Observer for a national human rights institution: International Coordinating Committee of National Human Rights Institutions;
- (e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Center for Reproductive Rights, Inc., European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Federation (also on behalf of Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland).

119. During the discussion for the second part, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

- (a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Argentina, Brazil, France, Italy, Kuwait, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
- (b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Belarus, Lithuania, Nepal, New Zealand, Switzerland, Thailand;
- (c) Observer for a national human rights institution: Conseil national des droits de l'homme du Maroc;

<sup>10</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, International Humanist and Ethical Union.

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

121. The second panel discussion, held at the 18th meeting, on the same day, had the theme “Women’s human rights and the Sustainable Development Agenda”. The discussion was divided into two parts, which were held at the same meeting, on the same day.

122. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the discussion. The Director of the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, Sarah Cook, made a statement and moderated the discussion. At the same meeting, the panellists Luisa Cabal, Kingsley Kariuki, Saraswathi Menon, Frances Raday and Gita Sen made statements.

123. During the ensuing panel discussion for the first part, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Austria, Canada<sup>11</sup> (on behalf of the members and observers of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Egypt<sup>11</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), India, Italy, Maldives, Montenegro, Sierra Leone;

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

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

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Human Rights Commission of Malaysia;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, International Lesbian and Gay Association (also on behalf of the Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network).

124. During the discussion for the second part, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Chile, Ethiopia, France, Mexico, Netherlands<sup>11</sup> (also on behalf of Belgium, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Slovenia, Spain, Iceland, Italy, Finland, France, Norway, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bulgaria, Israel, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Femmes Afrique Solidarité, General Arab Women Federation.

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

### **Panel discussion on preventing and eliminating child, early and forced marriage**

126. At its 30th meeting, on 23 June 2014, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to its resolution 24/23, a panel discussion on preventing and eliminating child, early and forced marriage, with a particular focus on challenges, achievements, best practices and implementation gaps. The opening statement for the discussion was delivered by the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights. The Permanent Representative of the Permanent Mission of Sierra Leone to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Yvette Stevens, moderated the discussion.

<sup>11</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

127. At the same meeting, the panellists Pooja Badarinath, Kate Gilmore, Soyata Maiga, Violetta Neubauer and Ayman Sadek made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two parts.

128. During the ensuing panel discussion for the first part, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Austria (also on behalf of Croatia and Slovenia), Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Egypt<sup>12</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Maldives, Montenegro;

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

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: UNICEF;

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

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

(f) Observer for non-governmental organizations: Plan International, Inc., Save the Children International.

129. During the discussion for the second part, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Congo, Estonia, France, Italy, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Netherlands, Syrian Arab Republic;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Center for Reproductive Rights, Inc., British Humanist Association, Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

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

### C. General debate on agenda item 3

131. At its 21st meeting, on 18 June 2014, and the 23rd meeting, on 19 June, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on thematic reports under agenda items 2 and 3, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Brazil (also on behalf of Austria, Germany, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Norway and Switzerland), Cuba, Greece<sup>13</sup> (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Armenia, Georgia, Iceland, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), India, Iran (Islamic Republic of)<sup>13</sup> (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Ireland (also on behalf of Australia, Austria, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Kazakhstan, Ireland, Maldives, Mongolia, New Zealand, Paraguay, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Tunisia and Uruguay), Japan, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar<sup>13</sup> (on behalf of ASEAN), Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Singapore<sup>13</sup> (also on behalf of Bahrain, Barbados, Brunei Darussalam, China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen and Zimbabwe), Sudan<sup>13</sup> (on behalf of the Group of African States, the Group

<sup>12</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

<sup>13</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

of Arab States, China, Cuba, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Sri Lanka and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Armenia, Barbados, Kyrgyzstan, Myanmar, Netherlands, Spain, Ukraine;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Advocates for Human Rights, Agence internationale pour le développement, Al-khoei Foundation, Alsalam Foundation, Amnesty International, article 19 – International Centre against Censorship (also on behalf of the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues and the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development), Asian Legal Resource Centre, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, and Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order of Preachers), British Humanist Association, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Center for Inquiry, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Comité international pour le respect et l'application de la Charte africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples (CIRAC), Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches, Conectas Direitos Humanos, European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Federation (also on behalf of Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland and the International Lesbian and Gay Association), General Arab Women Federation, Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant (also on behalf of Plan International Inc.; World Vision International, Defence for Children International, Save the Children International, the International Federation of Social Workers, and Edmund Rice International Limited), Helios Life Association, Human Rights Watch, Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL), International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Educational Development, Inc., International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Muslim Women's Union, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Reporters sans frontières international – Reporters Without Borders International, Society for Threatened Peoples, United Nations Watch, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization (WBO), World Muslim Congress.

132. At the 23rd meeting, on 19 June 2014, the representatives of China, Japan, Nepal and the Republic of Korea made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

133. At the same meeting, the representatives of Japan and the Republic of Korea made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

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

### **The question of the death penalty**

134. At the 37th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the representatives of Belgium, France, Mexico and Switzerland introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.8/Rev.1, sponsored by Belgium, Benin, Costa Rica, France, Mexico, Mongolia, the Republic of Moldova and Switzerland and co-sponsored by Andorra, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Ukraine, the

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay. Subsequently, Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Haiti, Italy, San Marino, Togo and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

135. At the same meeting, the representative of Saudi Arabia introduced amendments A/HRC/26/L.34 and L.35 to draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.8/Rev.1. A/HRC/26/L.34 was sponsored by Bahrain, Brunei Darussalam, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Myanmar, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, the Sudan, Uganda and Viet Nam and co-sponsored by China. Subsequently, Bangladesh, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors. A/HRC/26/L.35 was sponsored by Bahrain, Brunei Darussalam, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Myanmar, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, the Sudan, Uganda and Viet Nam and co-sponsored by China and India. Subsequently, Bangladesh, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors.

136. Also at the same meeting, the representative of China introduced amendment A/HRC/26/L.36 to draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.8/Rev.1. A/HRC/26/L.36 was sponsored by China and co-sponsored by Saudi Arabia and Singapore. Subsequently, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Malaysia, Myanmar, Pakistan, Qatar, the Sudan, Uganda and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors.

137. At the same meeting, the representatives of Botswana, Italy (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council), Montenegro and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia made general comments on the draft resolution and the amendments.

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

139. At the same meeting, the representatives of Germany and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on A/HRC/26/L.34.

140. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/26/L.34. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Botswana, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kuwait, Maldives, Morocco, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Viet Nam

*Against:*

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, Peru, Romania, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Congo, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Philippines, Republic of Korea

141. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/26/L.34 by 17 votes to 23, with 6 abstentions.

142. At the same meeting, the representatives of Benin, Costa Rica and Mexico made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on A/HRC/26/L.35.

143. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representatives of Benin, Mexico and Costa Rica, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/26/L.35. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Botswana, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kuwait, Maldives, Morocco, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam

*Against:*

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, Montenegro, Peru, Romania, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Kazakhstan, Kenya, Namibia, Philippines, Republic of Korea, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

144. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/26/L.35 by 17 votes to 23, with 7 abstentions.

145. At the same meeting, the representatives of France and Sierra Leone made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on A/HRC/26/L.36.

146. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representatives of France and Sierra Leone a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/26/L.36. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Botswana, China, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kuwait, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam

*Against:*

Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining:*

Cuba, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Maldives, Morocco, Republic of Korea, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

147. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/26/L.36 by 12 votes to 26, with 9 abstentions.

148. At the same meeting, the representatives Algeria, Botswana, China, Indonesia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, the United States of America and Viet Nam made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.8/Rev.1.

149. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Botswana a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.8/Rev.1. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

*Against:*

Botswana, China, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kuwait, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

*Abstaining:*

Cuba, Kenya, Maldives, Morocco, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, United States of America, Viet Nam

150. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.8/Rev.1 by 29 votes to 10, with 8 abstentions (resolution 26/2).

151. At the 40th meeting, on the same day, the representative of Japan made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

**Extreme poverty and human rights**

152. At the 37th meeting, on 26 June 2014, the representative of France introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.10, sponsored by Albania, Belgium, Chile, France, Morocco, Peru, the Philippines, Romania and Senegal and co-sponsored by Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Cameroon, Colombia, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Libya, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, the Niger, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, the Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Algeria, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, the Czech Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guinea, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Namibia, Poland, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Thailand, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

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

154. At the same meeting, the representatives of South Africa and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote, in which South Africa disassociated itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

155. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.10 without a vote (resolution 26/3).

**Protection of Roma**

156. At the 37th meeting, on 26 June 2014, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.11, sponsored by the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Argentina, Belarus, Chile, Cuba, Ecuador and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

157. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation orally revised the draft resolution.

158. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of India and Italy, on behalf of the European Union, made general comments on the draft resolution.

159. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution. The Chief of the OHCHR Finance and Budget Section made a statement on the budgetary implications of the draft resolution.

160. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote, in which it disassociated itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

161. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.11, as orally revised, without a vote (resolution 26/4).

### **Elimination of discrimination against women**

162. At the 37th meeting, on 26 June 2014, the representatives of Colombia and Mexico introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.12, sponsored by Colombia and Mexico and co-sponsored by Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Comoros, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Andorra, Argentina, Botswana, Ethiopia, Haiti, Iceland, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Malta, Nicaragua, the Philippines, Poland, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

163. At the same meeting, the representative of Mexico orally revised the draft resolution.

164. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution, as orally revised.

165. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.12, as orally revised, without a vote (resolution 26/5).

### **Mandate of the Independent Expert on human rights and international solidarity**

166. At the 37th meeting, on 26 June 2014, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.16, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Angola, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Indonesia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Botswana, China, Ecuador, Egypt (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Namibia, Nicaragua, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Senegal and Viet Nam joined the sponsors.

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

168. At the same meeting, the representative of Italy, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council, made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

169. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Italy, on behalf of European Union members that are members of the Council, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Argentina, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Austria, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Montenegro, Republic of Korea, Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

170. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.16 by 33 votes to 14 (resolution 26/6).

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

171. At the 37th meeting, on 26 June 2014, the representative of Hungary introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.18, sponsored by Australia, Botswana, Hungary, Maldives, Mexico and Thailand and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Angola, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay. Subsequently, Algeria, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, the Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Guinea, Japan, Mali, Nicaragua, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Senegal and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

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

173. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.18 without a vote (resolution 26/7).

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

174. At the 37th meeting, on 26 June 2014, the representative of Germany introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.19, sponsored by Germany and the Philippines and co-sponsored by Andorra, Angola, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Algeria, Argentina, Belarus, Benin, Botswana, Cabo Verde, the Congo, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Namibia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Poland, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors.

175. At the same meeting, the representative of Germany orally revised the draft resolution.

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

177. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.19, as orally revised, without a vote (resolution 26/8).

### **Elaboration of an international legally binding instrument on transnational corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights**

178. At the 37th meeting, on 26 June 2014, the representatives of Ecuador and South Africa introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.22/Rev.1, sponsored by Ecuador and South Africa and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Algeria, El Salvador, Nicaragua and Senegal joined the sponsors.

179. At the same meeting, the representative of Ecuador orally revised the draft resolution.

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

181. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, India, Ireland, Italy (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council), Japan, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

*In favour:*

Algeria, Benin, Burkina Faso, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Austria, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Montenegro, Republic of Korea, Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Gabon, Kuwait, Maldives, Mexico, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, United Arab Emirates

183. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.22/Rev.1, as orally revised, by 20 votes to 14, with 13 abstentions (resolution 26/9).

184. At the 40th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the representatives of Chile and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

### **International Albinism Awareness Day**

185. At the 38th meeting, on 26 June 2014, the representative of Somalia introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.7, sponsored by Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States) and co-sponsored by Cambodia, Croatia, Greece, Israel, Saudi Arabia and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Indonesia, Ireland, Portugal, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Singapore, Slovenia, Thailand, Turkey and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

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

187. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

188. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.7 without a vote (resolution 26/10).

### **Protection of the family**

189. At the 38th meeting, on 26 June 2014, the representatives of Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt and Sierra Leone introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.20/Rev.1, sponsored by Bangladesh, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, El Salvador, Mauritania, Namibia, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Sierra Leone and Tunisia and co-sponsored by Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Nigeria, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Uganda and Zimbabwe. Subsequently, Belarus, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

190. At the same meeting, the representative of Uruguay introduced amendment A/HRC/26/L.37 to draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.20/Rev.1. A/HRC/26/L.37 was sponsored by Chile, France, Ireland and Uruguay and co-sponsored by Argentina, Austria, Colombia, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Subsequently, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Latvia and Mexico joined the sponsors.

191. Under rule 116 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the representative of the Russian Federation formally moved to adjourn consideration of amendment A/HRC/26/L.37 to draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.20/Rev.1, and requested a vote on the motion.

192. Under the same rule, the Human Rights Council heard two statements in favour of the motion by the representatives of China and Indonesia, and two statements against the motion by the representatives of Argentina and the United States of America.

193. A recorded vote was taken on the motion, which was adopted by 22 votes to 20, with 4 abstentions. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

*Against:*

Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Montenegro, Peru, Republic of Korea, Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Gabon, Maldives, Philippines, Viet Nam

194. At the same meeting, the representative of Saudi Arabia announced that amendment A/HRC/26/L.38 had been withdrawn.

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

196. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Austria (also on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council), France, Germany, India, Ireland, Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Viet Nam made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.20/Rev.1.

197. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Austria, Chile, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Montenegro, Republic of Korea, Romania, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Argentina, Brazil, Costa Rica, Mexico, Peru, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

198. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.20/Rev.1 by 26 votes to 14, with 6 abstentions (resolution 26/11).

199. At the 40th meeting on 27 June 2014, the representatives of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

**Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions**

200. At the 38th meeting, on 26 June 2014, the representative of Sweden introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.23, sponsored by Sweden and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Canada, Costa Rica, Monaco and the Republic of Korea joined the sponsors.

201. At the same meeting, the representative of Saudi Arabia made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote, in which the State disassociated itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

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

203. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.23 without a vote (resolution 26/12).

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

204. At the 38th meeting, on 26 June 2014, the representative of Sweden introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.24, sponsored by Brazil, Nigeria, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey and the United States of America and co-sponsored by Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Angola, El Salvador, Haiti, Kazakhstan, Monaco, Mongolia, Qatar, Switzerland and Timor-Leste joined the sponsors.

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

206. Also at the same meeting, the representative of China introduced an oral amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.24 as orally revised.

207. At the same meeting, the representative of Brazil rejected the amendment to the draft resolution as orally revised.

208. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Argentina, Costa Rica, Estonia, Ireland and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised and the oral amendment.

209. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Brazil and the United States of America a recorded vote was taken on the oral amendment to the draft resolution as orally revised. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, China, Congo, Cuba, Ethiopia, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Namibia, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Peru, Republic of Korea, Romania, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Gabon, India, Indonesia, Philippines

210. The Human Rights Council rejected the oral amendment to the draft resolution as orally revised by 15 votes to 28, with 4 abstentions.

211. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, South Africa and Viet Nam made statements in explanation of vote before the vote, in which South African disassociated itself from the consensus on the draft resolution as orally revised.

212. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.24, as orally revised, without a vote (resolution 26/13).

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

213. At the 38th meeting, on 26 June 2014, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.25, sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Belarus, Cuba, Ecuador, Kazakhstan, Mexico, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Haiti, Morocco, Namibia and Nicaragua joined the sponsors.

214. At the same meeting, the representative of Italy, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council, made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

215. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.25 without a vote (resolution 26/14).

216. At the 40th meeting on 27 June 2014, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

### **Accelerating efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women: violence against women as a barrier to women's political and economic empowerment**

217. At the 38th meeting, on 26 June 2014, the representative of Canada introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.26/Rev.1, sponsored by Canada and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Barbados, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, the Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Djibouti, Fiji, Georgia, Haiti, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Mali, Malta, Myanmar, Namibia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Paraguay, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, Spain, Swaziland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Uganda, Ukraine, Vanuatu and Viet Nam.

218. Subsequently, Algeria, Benin, Burundi, Cuba, Ghana, Greece, Honduras, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Maldives, Mauritius, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Panama, Peru, the Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Thailand, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

219. At the same meeting, the representatives of India, Italy (on behalf of the European Union), Montenegro, South Africa and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution.

220. Also at the same meeting, the representative of France made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

221. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.26/Rev.1 without a vote (resolution 26/15).

#### **Human rights and the regulation of civilian acquisition, possession and use of firearms**

222. At the 38th meeting, on 26 June 2014, the representatives of Ecuador and Peru introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.27, sponsored by Ecuador and Peru and co-sponsored by Chile, Ethiopia, Haiti, Hungary, Ireland, Spain, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Australia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Greece, Kazakhstan, Namibia, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Singapore and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

223. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico, also on behalf of Colombia, and the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

224. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

##### *In favour:*

Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czech Republic, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Germany, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

##### *Abstaining:*

The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United States of America

225. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.27 by 44 votes to none, with three abstentions (resolution 26/16).

226. At the 40th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

#### **The right to education: follow-up to Human Rights Council resolution 8/4**

227. At the 38th meeting, on 26 June 2014, the representative of Portugal introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.28, sponsored by Portugal and co-sponsored by Andorra, Angola, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Norway, Paraguay, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Belarus, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Chile, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, the Czech Republic, Ethiopia, Haiti, Iceland, Indonesia, Japan, Liechtenstein, Malta, Monaco,

Mozambique, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Poland, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Viet Nam and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

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

229. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.28 without a vote (resolution 26/17).

230. At the 40th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

**The right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health: sport and healthy lifestyles as contributing factors**

231. At the 38th meeting, on 26 June 2014, the representative of Brazil, also on behalf of Paraguay, Romania and South Africa, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.29, sponsored by Brazil, Paraguay, Romania and South Africa and co-sponsored by Angola, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Peru, the Russian Federation, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Azerbaijan, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Chad, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Jordan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

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

233. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.29 without a vote (resolution 26/18).

234. At the 40th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

**Human rights of migrants: mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants**

235. At the 38th meeting, on 26 June 2014, the representative of Mexico introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.31, sponsored by Mexico and co-sponsored by Angola, Armenia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Ecuador, El Salvador, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Kyrgyzstan, Paraguay, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Algeria, Argentina, Burkina Faso, Canada, Ethiopia, Georgia, Haiti, Indonesia, Israel, Kazakhstan, Nicaragua, the Niger, the Philippines, Portugal, Thailand and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

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

237. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.31 without a vote (resolution 26/19).

### **Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities**

238. At the 39th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the representative of New Zealand introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.9, sponsored by Mexico and New Zealand and co-sponsored by Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Montenegro, Morocco, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, Spain, the Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, the United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Argentina, Canada, the Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Egypt (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Estonia, Ethiopia, Georgia, Haiti, Iceland, India, Japan, Kenya, Liechtenstein, Malta, Namibia, Nicaragua, the Niger, the Philippines, Poland, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Togo, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

239. At the same meeting, the representative of New Zealand orally revised the draft resolution.

240. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Italy, on behalf of the European Union, and Mexico made general comments on the draft resolution.

241. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution. The Chief of the OHCHR Finance and Budget Section made a statement on the budgetary implications of the draft resolution.

242. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.9, as orally revised, without a vote (resolution 26/20).

### **Promotion of the right of migrants to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health**

243. At the 39th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the representative of Mexico introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.30, sponsored by Mexico and co-sponsored by Angola, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Kyrgyzstan, Paraguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Algeria, Argentina, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Germany, Haiti, Indonesia, Namibia, Nicaragua, the Philippines, Portugal, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Turkey, the United States of America and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

244. At the same meeting, the representative of Mexico orally revised the draft resolution.

245. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution.

246. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.30, as orally revised, without a vote (resolution 26/21).

### **Human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises**

247. At the 39th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the representative of Norway introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.1, sponsored by Argentina, Ghana, Norway and the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Andorra, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Colombia, France, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, India, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Mexico, New Zealand, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey. Subsequently, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Qatar, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukraine and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

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

249. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Argentina, Italy (on behalf of the European Union), the Russian Federation and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution.

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

251. At the same meeting, the representative of South Africa made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

252. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.1, as orally revised, without a vote (resolution 26/22).

253. At the 40th meeting, on the same day, the representative of Chile made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

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

254. At the 40th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the representative of the Philippines, also on behalf of Bangladesh, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.33/Rev.1, sponsored by Bangladesh and the Philippines and co-sponsored by Algeria, Angola, Bhutan, Cuba, El Salvador, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Georgia, Guatemala, Indonesia, Mauritania, Nepal, Nigeria, Seychelles, Singapore, Sri Lanka, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Costa Rica, Egypt (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Haiti, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Maldives, Nicaragua and Peru joined the sponsors.

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

256. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Italy (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council), Maldives, Sierra Leone and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution.

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

258. At the same meeting, the representative of Japan made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

259. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.33/Rev.1, as orally revised, without a vote (resolution 26/27).

260. At the same meeting, the representative of Mexico made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

#### **The negative impact of corruption on the enjoyment of human rights**

261. At the 37th meeting, on 26 June 2014, the representative of Morocco introduced draft decision A/HRC/26/L.5, sponsored by Austria, Indonesia, Morocco and Poland and co-sponsored by Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Guatemala, New Zealand and Sri Lanka. Subsequently, Algeria, Cabo Verde, Israel, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova and Senegal joined the sponsors.

262. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision A/HRC/26/L.5 without a vote (decision 26/115).

## IV. Human rights situations that require the Council's attention

### A. Interactive dialogue with the independent international commission of inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic

263. At the 17th meeting, on 17 June 2014, the Chair of the independent international commission of inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic, Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro, provided an oral update on the findings of the commission, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 25/23.

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

265. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting on the same day, and at the 19th meeting on 18 June, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, China, Cuba, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Canada, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Libya, Liechtenstein, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Slovakia, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Human Rights Watch, International Commission of Jurists, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Presse emblème campagne, Syriac Universal Alliance, Federation Syriaque International, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch.

266. At the 19th meeting, on 18 June, the Chair of the commission of inquiry answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

### B. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders

#### Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea

267. At the 19th meeting, on 18 June 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea, Sheila B. Keetharuth, presented her report (A/HRC/26/45).

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

269. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Austria, Botswana, China, Cuba, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Djibouti, Hungary, Luxembourg, Norway, Sudan, Switzerland;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Human Rights Watch, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, Jubilee Campaign, United Nations Watch.

270. At the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

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

271. At the 19th meeting, on 18 June 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus, Miklós Haraszti, presented his report (A/HRC/26/44).

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

273. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, and at the 20th meeting on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Austria, China, Cuba, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Morocco, Russian Federation (also on behalf of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, Nicaragua, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Turkmenistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian State of) and Zimbabwe), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lithuania, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and the State of Palestine;

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

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

274. At the 20th meeting, on the same day, the representative of Belarus made concluding remarks as the State concerned.

275. Also at the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

#### **Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea**

276. At the 20th meeting, on 18 June 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Marzuki Darusman, presented his report (A/HRC/26/43).

277. At the same meeting, the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea made a statement as the State concerned.

278. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, and at the 21st meeting on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Argentina, Botswana, China, Cuba, Czech Republic, France, Ireland, Japan, Maldives, Republic of Korea, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belarus, Canada, Denmark, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Zimbabwe;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, Jubilee Campaign, United Nations Watch.

279. At the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

### C. General debate on agenda item 4

280. At its 23rd meeting, on 19 June 2014, its 27th meeting, on 20 June and its 28th meeting, on 23 June, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 4, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Austria, Belgium<sup>14</sup> (on behalf of Australia, Canada, the European Union, Montenegro, Norway, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America), China, Cuba, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Greece<sup>14</sup> (on behalf of Albania, the European Union, Iceland, Liechtenstein and Montenegro), Iran (Islamic Republic of)<sup>14</sup> (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Ireland, Japan, Montenegro, Romania, Russian Federation (also on behalf of Algeria, Armenia, Belarus, China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Iraq, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Tajikistan, South Africa and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Canada, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Georgia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Malaysia, Myanmar, Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Agence internationale pour le développement, Al-Hakim Foundation, Al-Khoei Foundation, Alsalam Foundation, Amnesty International, Asian Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Network, Asian Legal Resource Centre (also on behalf of Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada and Franciscans International), Baha'i International Community, B'nai B'rith (also on behalf of the Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations), British Humanist Association, Center for Inquiry, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Espace Afrique International, Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland, Freedom House, General Arab Women Federation, Global Helping to Advance Women and Children, Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights Law Centre, Human Rights Watch, Indian Council of South America, International Association of Democratic Lawyers (also on behalf of Centre Europe – Tiers Monde – Europe-Third World Centre), International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Commission of Jurists, International Educational Development, Inc., International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, International Muslim Women's Union, Liberation, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Presse emblème campagne, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Reporters sans frontières international – Reporters Without Borders International, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization, World Muslim Congress.

281. At the 27th meeting, on 20 June 2014, the representatives of Algeria, Cuba, Egypt, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand,

<sup>14</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zimbabwe made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

282. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the Syrian Arab Republic made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

283. At the 28th meeting, on 23 June 2014, the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Burundi, China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Ethiopia, Japan, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Uzbekistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

## D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

### **The continuing grave deterioration in the human rights and humanitarian situation in the Syrian Arab Republic**

285. At the 39th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the representatives of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.4/Rev.1, sponsored by France, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America and co-sponsored by Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Subsequently, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Mexico, Monaco, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors.

286. At the same meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland orally revised the draft resolution.

287. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Argentina, Brazil and Italy, on behalf of the European Union, made general comments on the draft resolution.

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

289. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, China, Cuba, the Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

290. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the Russian Federation, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as orally revised. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Peru, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Against:*

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

*Abstaining:*

Congo, Ethiopia, India, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Pakistan, Philippines, South Africa, Viet Nam

291. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.4/Rev.1, as orally revised, by 32 votes to 5, with nine abstentions (resolution 26/23).

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

292. At the 39th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the representative of Somalia introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.6, sponsored by Somalia and co-sponsored by France. Subsequently, Austria, Croatia, Djibouti, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Maldives, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

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

294. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Eritrea made a statement as the State concerned.

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

296. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Pakistan, the Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote, in which China, the Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) disassociated themselves from the consensus on the draft resolution.

297. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.6, as orally revised, without a vote (resolution 26/24).

298. At the same meeting, the representatives of Ethiopia and Japan made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

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

299. At the 39th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the representative of Greece, on behalf of the European Union, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.14/Rev.1, sponsored by Greece (on behalf of the European Union) and co-sponsored by Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

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

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

302. At the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil, Cuba, the Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

303. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the Russian Federation, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

#### *In favour:*

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Maldives, Montenegro, Peru, Republic of Korea, Romania, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

#### *Against:*

China, Cuba, India, Kazakhstan, Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Burkina Faso, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates

304. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.14/Rev.1 by 24 votes to 7, with 16 abstentions (resolution 26/25).

## V. Human rights bodies and mechanisms

### A. Social Forum

305. At the 29th meeting, on 23 June 2014, the Permanent Representative of the Permanent Mission of Argentina to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Alberto Pedro D'Alotto, presented the report of the 2014 Social Forum, held from 1 to 3 April 2014, on behalf of the Chair-Rapporteur of the 2014 Social Forum (A/HRC/26/46).

### B. Open-ended intergovernmental working group on the rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas

306. At the 29th meeting, on 23 June 2014, the Chair-Rapporteur of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on a draft United Nations declaration on the rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas, Angélica C. Navarro Llanos, presented the report of the working group on its session, held from 15 to 19 July 2013 (A/HRC/26/48).

### C. Forum on Business and Human Rights

307. At the 29th meeting, on 23 June 2014, the Chief of the Special Procedures Branch of OHCHR presented, on behalf of the Chair-Rapporteur, the report containing a summary of discussions held at the Forum on Business and Human Rights, held from 2 to 4 December 2013 (see A/HRC/26/26).

### D. General debate on agenda item 5

308. At the 29th meeting, on 23 June 2014, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 5, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Brazil (also on behalf of Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Indonesia, Nicaragua, Philippines, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), China, Cuba, El Salvador<sup>15</sup> (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Greece<sup>15</sup> (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iceland, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), Honduras<sup>15</sup> (on behalf of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Lithuania, Maldives, Morocco, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey and Uruguay), India, Indonesia, Ireland, Morocco, Pakistan (also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of));

(b) Representatives of observer States: Ecuador, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, Norway;

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

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

<sup>15</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa Culture International, Asylum Access, Centre Europe – Tiers Monde – Europe-Third World Centre, Foodfirst Information and Action Network, Franciscans International, Indian Council of South America, International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Federation of Rural Adult Catholic Movements, International Muslim Women’s Union, International Service for Human Rights, Liberation, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l’homme, Reporters sans Frontières International – Reporters Without Borders International, Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization, World Muslim Congress.

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

### **Promotion and protection of human rights in post-disaster and post-conflict situations**

309. At the 39th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the representative of Uruguay introduced draft decision A/HRC/26/L.3, sponsored by Uruguay and co-sponsored by El Salvador and Guatemala. Subsequently, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cabo Verde, Chad and Poland joined the sponsors.

310. At the same meeting, the representative of Sierra Leone made general comments on the draft decision.

311. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision A/HRC/26/L.3 without a vote (decision 26/116).

### **Promotion and protection of the human rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas**

312. At the 39th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the representative of Bolivia (Plurinational State of) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.13, sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador and South Africa and co-sponsored by Angola, Benin, Congo, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Sri Lanka, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Argentina, Brazil, the Philippines, Switzerland and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

313. At the same meeting, the representative of Bolivia (Plurinational State of) orally revised the draft resolution.

314. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Cuba, Italy (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council) and South Africa made general comments on the draft resolution.

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

316. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

317. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

*In favour:*

Algeria, Argentina, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against:*

Czech Republic, Republic of Korea, Romania, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Austria, Botswana, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

318. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.13, as orally revised, by 29 votes to 5, with 13 abstentions (resolution 26/26).

**The Social Forum**

319. At the 40th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.17, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Angola, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Saudi Arabia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Argentina, Bangladesh, Cabo Verde, Ecuador, Egypt (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Malaysia, Mauritius, Namibia, Nicaragua, South Africa, Thailand, Uruguay and Viet Nam joined the sponsors.

320. At the same meeting, the representatives of Italy (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council), Japan and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote, in which they disassociated themselves from the consensus on the draft resolution.

321. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.17 without a vote (resolution 26/28).

**The contribution of parliaments to the work of the Human Rights Council and its universal periodic review**

322. At the 40th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the representative of Ecuador introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.21, sponsored by Ecuador, Italy, Maldives, Morocco, Romania and Spain and co-sponsored by Angola, Australia, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Colombia, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Paraguay, the Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, the Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Argentina, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Haiti, Indonesia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, Slovenia, Somalia, Thailand, Ukraine, the United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

323. At the same meeting, the representative of Italy made general comments on the draft resolution.

324. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.21 without a vote (resolution 26/29).

## VI. Universal periodic review

325. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 60/251, Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, Council decision 17/119 and President's statements PRST/8/1 and PRST/9/2 on modalities and practices for the universal periodic review process, the Council considered the outcome of the reviews conducted during the eighteenth session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review held from 27 January to 7 February, 2014.

326. In accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 5/1, the President outlined that all recommendations must be part of the final document of the universal periodic review and accordingly, the State under review should clearly communicate its position on all recommendations by indicating either that it "supported" or that it "noted" the recommendations concerned.

### A. Consideration of the universal periodic review outcomes

327. The section below contains, in accordance with paragraph 4.3 of President's statement 8/1, a summary of the views expressed on the outcome by States under review and by member and observer States of the Human Rights Council, and general comments made by other stakeholders before the adoption of the outcome by the Council in plenary session.

#### New Zealand

328. The review of New Zealand, held on 27 January 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, was based on the following documents:

- (a) The national report submitted by New Zealand in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/NZL/1);
- (b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/NZL/2);
- (c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/NZL/3).

329. At its 22nd meeting, on 19 June 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of New Zealand (see sect. C below).

330. The outcome of the review of New Zealand comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/26/3), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/26/3/Add.1).

#### 1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome

331. New Zealand thanked all States that had participated in the review and welcomed the different perspectives that would be shared with civil society and the New Zealand Human Rights Commission. New Zealand agreed with the opinion emerging from the universal periodic review process that New Zealand had a human rights record of which it could be proud, but that it must continue to do more. The universal periodic review process had been a useful tool for New Zealand to take stock of remaining ongoing challenges.

332. The delegation briefly outlined the process undertaken since its review. Following the review, the Government had met with non-governmental organizations, interested individuals and the New Zealand Human Rights Commission to discuss the review and recommendations. It had also received 11 civil society submissions. That engagement was an opportunity for the Government to understand which recommendations civil society regarded as a priority. New Zealand had also undertaken a comprehensive inter-agency consultation process to consider fully each of the recommendations received. The

recommendations and the responses to them by New Zealand had then been considered at ministerial level by the executive branch. As a result, the formal response presented before the Human Rights Council was the collective response of 24 national government agencies, informed by encouraging participation from civil society groups across New Zealand.

333. New Zealand had found the domestic engagement process to be both important and valuable in preparing for the implementation phase. It had further raised awareness among the New Zealand public and Government, about the universal periodic review process and the recommendations received.

334. New Zealand welcomed all the recommendations made during the review process. It had carefully considered each of them and how to respond. In total, New Zealand had accepted 121 recommendations. It had been unable to accept 34 recommendations.

335. New Zealand had accepted the recommendations that it fully supported and had implemented in practice. It had rejected recommendations for several reasons. In the case of recommendations split across distinct areas, it might accept only one part of that recommendation. For others, New Zealand had accepted the spirit of the recommendation, but could not commit to a specific proposed method of implementation. The responses in the addendum showed the State's reasoning.

336. The recommendations spanned a wide range of human rights issues, but clear themes had emerged. They included family violence, women's and children's rights, addressing inequalities and the ongoing relationship between the Government and the Māori, the indigenous people of New Zealand. All those areas were ones where the State was actively taking steps to address ongoing challenges and remained committed to do more. Many of those issues were, in fact, priority areas identified in the national report and so the recommendations received provided additional impetus for the State to address those challenges.

337. The recommendations would also be a significant basis for the Government's ongoing cooperation with the New Zealand Human Rights Commission, particularly while the Commission developed the second national action plan on human rights. New Zealand understood that the action plan would include specific, measurable and concrete actions to ensure continued respect for its obligations and duties and the universal periodic review recommendations would form an integral part of that.

## **2. Views expressed by member and observer States of the Council on the review outcome**

338. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of New Zealand, 10 delegations made statements.

339. Botswana noted with appreciation the additional information provided and referred to the acknowledgement by New Zealand during the review that women and children suffered from a high rate of domestic violence. Botswana applauded New Zealand on the measures taken, including the enactment of legislation on the sale and supply of alcohol, increasing penalties for domestic violence, implementing the 2009 Action Plan for New Zealand Women and implementation of the recommendations of the Taskforce for Action on Sexual Violence. Botswana was confident that New Zealand, as a diverse and democratic country, would continue in its commitment and desire to improve all human rights for its people. The country's high ranking in terms of human rights, governance and transparency, as shown by various international rating agencies, had not been a source of complacency but had encouraged New Zealand to do more in the promotion and protection of human rights at both national and international levels.

340. Cambodia appreciated that New Zealand had given high importance to and fully cooperated with the Working Group. It welcomed the State's continued efforts to ensure socioeconomic rights for its people through the implementation of its various government programmes. Cambodia was pleased to note that New Zealand had accepted the large majority of recommendations, including the recommendations made by Cambodia concerning the effective implementation of the disability strategy with a view to ensuring the full realization of human rights for persons with disabilities. Cambodia wished New Zealand every success in the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted.

341. Côte d'Ivoire, as a member of the troika for New Zealand, thanked the State for taking into account the recommendations made during the universal periodic review and for the responses provided during the session. Côte d'Ivoire supported the State's commitment to protecting women from violence and to access to education for children from all social strata. It encouraged New Zealand to pursue its fruitful cooperation with international human rights protection mechanisms and wished it every success for the implementation of recommendations made during the review.

342. Mali congratulated New Zealand on the quality of its statement and cooperation with the review mechanism, during the entire process. Mali noted with satisfaction that New Zealand had accepted many recommendations improving the situation of human rights in that country and wished it every success in implementing the recommendations it had accepted.

343. Morocco thanked the delegation for the information shared about the follow-up to recommendations made during the review. Morocco congratulated New Zealand on its programmes and policies, aimed at building a multicultural society based on the principles of tolerance, openness and diversity, as could be seen from the policy on promoting the linguistic rights of minorities and the school programmes dedicated to pluralism and combating racism and xenophobia. Morocco encouraged follow-up on the internal process of reviewing the possibility of ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure. Morocco welcomed the fact that New Zealand had accepted a majority of the recommendations, including that of Morocco to continue targeting support for cultural diversity in all schools. Morocco wished New Zealand every success in implementing the accepted recommendations.

344. Romania expressed appreciation for the way in which New Zealand had conducted its review process and for the Government's inter-agency coordination and its consultations with civil society, both before and after the interactive dialogue. Romania welcomed the fact that New Zealand had accepted most of the recommendations and that it had provided reasons why it had not accepted some of them.

345. Togo welcomed the commitment of New Zealand to the review mechanism and noted with satisfaction the measures taken to implement the recommendations made at its first review, in particular those relating to public services in the areas of education, health and social assistance. Togo wished New Zealand every success in implementing the accepted recommendations from the second cycle.

346. Viet Nam welcomed the seriousness shown by New Zealand in providing detailed feedback on the recommendations received. It appreciated the considerable number of recommendations accepted by New Zealand, including the two made by Viet Nam on enhancing legislation and the legal system and stepping up the implementation of current national plans for addressing challenges and disparities in health, education, employment and gender equality, especially for vulnerable groups of women, children, migrants and ethnic and indigenous groups. Viet Nam agreed that there was still much work to be done but believed that New Zealand with its commitments and determination would make great efforts to further ensure the enjoyment of all human rights for all its people.

347. Algeria congratulated New Zealand on having accepted a large number of recommendations and wished it every success in their implementation. Algeria particularly welcomed the acceptance by New Zealand of recommendations on economic social and cultural rights, particularly in those areas affected by the earthquakes in 2010 and 2011. Natural disasters could constitute an additional challenge in the process of promoting and protecting human rights. Algeria hoped that ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families would be a priority for action by New Zealand in the future.

348. Sierra Leone congratulated New Zealand on its successful completion of the review. The information provided by the State in its addendum to the report of the Working Group demonstrated clearly the commitment of New Zealand to the review process. Care had been taken to give reasons for rejection of recommendations and to indicate that the issues concerned were not closed, as New Zealand would consider the recommendations for possible implementation at a later date. Noting that the rights of indigenous peoples were an

area of concern expressed during the review, Sierra Leone expressed satisfaction at the State's acceptance of all the recommendations relating to indigenous peoples, and noted that the vast majority of recommendations relating to discrimination and violence against women and children had been accepted. It was also pleased to note that the recommendations relating to overseas development assistance (ODA) had been accepted. Sierra Leone appreciated the points made about the level of ODA but wished to urge New Zealand to continue its efforts to reach the 0.7 per cent ratio of ODA to gross national income in the near future.

### 3. General comments made by other stakeholders

349. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of New Zealand, seven other stakeholders made statements.

350. The National Human Rights Commission of New Zealand stated (by video message) that the universal periodic review process had been constructive. It had been notable for the high level of engagement by the Government and civil society. Each of three key steps had been taken in the review of New Zealand. The Commission acknowledged the number of recommendations made and accepted by New Zealand and the fact that the Government had indicated its intention to follow up on issues that had not been reflected in the recommendations, a state of affairs which was very heartening and boded well for the future. The Commission would now work closely with the State, business and civil society in New Zealand to develop and implement a second national plan of action for human rights. That plan would include a set of measurable and concrete actions and outcomes to deliver an improvement in the realization of human rights in New Zealand. It would be prepared at the end of the second review cycle in order to cover the period of the third cycle. The Commission was optimistic that improvements could be achieved prior to the State's next universal periodic review.

351. Amnesty International welcomed the engagement of New Zealand with the universal periodic review and its acceptance of recommendations to incorporate international human rights instruments into its domestic legal framework and to take recommendations by United Nations human rights bodies into account. However, New Zealand still had persistently high levels of inequality in the areas of health, education, employment and income, and over 280,000 children lived in relative poverty without adequate access to high-quality housing, food or medicines. It expressed its deep concern at the Government's rejection of recommendations to provide greater legal protection of economic, social and cultural rights within the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990, and to ratify the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. According to Amnesty International, that stance undermined the Government's commitment to eliminating child poverty, eroded the principle of indivisibility of rights and called into question the leadership role of New Zealand in the protection of all human rights. It welcomed the reference by New Zealand to the Constitutional Advisory Panel's recommendations that further consideration should be given to enhanced protections of economic, social and cultural rights and urged the State under review to commit to continuing that process. While welcoming the promise by New Zealand to draw up a second national action plan on human rights, centred on its universal periodic review commitments, Amnesty International urged the State to use that process to ensure effective and tangible improvement in the promotion and protection of economic, social and cultural rights.

352. Save the Children welcomed the acceptance by New Zealand of recommendations on children's rights, child poverty and the protection of the most vulnerable children through the Vulnerable Children's Bill and Children's Action Plan. Save the Children welcomed the State's acceptance of the recommendations on the protection of the rights of persons with disabilities. It called upon the State to ensure that disabled children, their families and schools were given adequate support and resources to allow disabled children to attend school and to enjoy the right to education like any other child in New Zealand. In that regard, Save the Children drew the State's attention to the need to take those concerns into consideration when updating the New Zealand Disability Strategy in 2015. Save the Children welcomed the State's acceptance of recommendations on the prevention of forced early marriage. Despite the State's assurance that current legislation provided adequate protection, Save the Children recommended that the law, which sanctioned marriage for persons aged 16 subject to parental

consent, be changed because it potentially placed children at risk of forced marriage. Save the Children noted the lack of clarity about the recommendations regarding the signing and ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure. Save the Children, while acknowledging that the State would consider the implications of ratification, called upon New Zealand to follow through and sign the Optional Protocol in order to give children access to the highest level of protection.

353. Action Canada for Population and Development made a joint statement. It commended the acceptance by New Zealand of recommendations to allocate resources to addressing violence against women and to step up efforts to ensure equal access to health services. It welcomed the State's commitment to voluntarily examine recommendations from the National Human Rights Commission and stakeholder submissions during the review process regarding the legalization of abortion. Reform of the abortion law was required in order to increase women's reproductive autonomy and to remove the discrimination and stigma experienced by women seeking an abortion. The New Zealand Abortion Supervisory Committee, the group responsible for oversight of the Contraception, Sterilization and Abortion Act of 1977, had on a number of occasions called for a review of the abortion law, but the Government had refused. Action Canada for Population and Development urged the State under review to provide unhindered access to safe abortion services that met high standards of accessibility, acceptability and affordability, by directing the Law Commission of New Zealand to conduct a full review of the suite of legislation relating to abortion so as to remove abortion from the Crimes Act of 1961 and thus to ensure legal access to abortion in any circumstance, and to address the existing administrative barriers in the Contraception, Sterilisation and Abortion Act. Action Canada for Population and Development provided details of such barriers, including limited access to services in remote areas and an overall shortage of certifying consultants. Lastly, it welcomed the State's commitment to consulting with civil society organizations in examining those recommendations and looked forward to concrete follow-up on the legalization of abortion.

354. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom made a joint statement. It expressed the view that, while the response of New Zealand to the recommendations might seem impressive, with 121 out of 155 accepted, on closer examination the response was not so positive. It was concerned that the State's responses to accepted recommendations were lacking in sincerity and did not always address the point of the recommendation, for example regarding the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The statement that the New Zealand counter-terrorism legislation complied with the legal safeguards enshrined in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights was untrue, since the Human Rights Committee had stated that provisions of the legislation were incompatible with article 14 of the Covenant. It remained deeply concerned at the lack of full protection for human rights under current constitutional arrangements, which was particularly harmful for *hapu* and *iwi* Māori. It reiterated the recommendations made in the context of the universal periodic review and by the treaty bodies and special procedures, and urged New Zealand to begin a process of constitutional change that would give full effect to the Treaty of Waitangi, and to its obligations under the international instruments. It called upon New Zealand to fully implement all accepted recommendations, to reconsider those it had rejected and to develop a transparent action plan to that end.

355. The Lesbian and Gay Federation in Germany made a joint statement by video message. It reported that issues relating to the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex communities remained largely invisible. While expressing disappointment that States had not made recommendations on issues relevant to those communities during the review process, the Federation welcomed the State's declaration that it would follow up on such issues separately as part of its commitment to ongoing engagement with civil society on the universal periodic review process. It recommended that government agencies should start to collect sexual orientation and gender identity data. The Government had been petitioned to address the inadequate supply of publicly funded health services for transgender persons wishing to medically transition. Two of its recommendations were supported by a recent statement by the World Health Organization against forced or coerced sterilization. In the recommendations, it had called for legal prohibition of surgery aimed solely at correcting genital ambiguity in children who were unable to give consent for themselves; and for the removal of any medical requirements for legal gender recognition, including for those

resulting in sterilization. The Federation enquired about the time frame for consultation with the communities concerned on issues raised in the submissions; of the government agencies that would lead that work; and whether the State would address those issues in its national plan of action on human rights.

356. Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik stated that immigration and asylum were some of the important issues confronting New Zealand, which was mainly governed by immigrants. Sudwind, while noting the State's acceptance of some recommendations on the rights of immigrants, including children, referred to the disfavour shown to the recommendation by the Czech Republic not to concede asylum seekers' transfer to detention centres in third countries, which could lead to a critical situation in the life of many asylum seekers. New Zealand should consider the situation of people who had fled their own country and homes and were seeking refuge. The rejection of all recommendations on accession to and signing and ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families showed the lack of will to support immigrants and their families.

#### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

357. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, of the 155 recommendations received, 121 enjoyed the support of New Zealand and the rest had been noted.

358. The delegation thanked all those who had made statements and demonstrated continued interest and engagement in the human rights situation in New Zealand. Some important issues had been raised for New Zealand to focus on in its follow-up. New Zealand would continue to bear in mind the views of all international colleagues in its ongoing human rights work in the country.

359. New Zealand particularly welcomed the opportunity to hear from civil society and the New Zealand Human Rights Commission. Part of the advantage of the universal periodic review for New Zealand continued to be the internal domestic discussion that it generated. The input and engagement of stakeholders within civil society in New Zealand was a key factor in that process, and New Zealand looked forward to it continuing in the next stage. Points raised at the current session of the Human Rights Council would be part of that ongoing discussion.

360. The delegation was not in a position to respond to specific questions at present, but they had been duly noted and would be shared with the capital. It recognized that some of the issues raised by the National Human Rights Commission and non-governmental organizations in their submissions were not reflected in the formal interactive dialogue or the recommendations made: for example, issues around legal abortion and sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex persons. As noted in the addendum to the report of the Working Group, New Zealand intended to follow up on those issues separately as part of its commitment to ongoing engagement with civil society on the universal periodic review and across the full range of human rights issues in New Zealand.

361. The success of the universal periodic review depended on all States committing to it as an ongoing process. Therefore, while the consideration of the report of the Working Group wrapped up the formal proceedings of the Human Rights Council with regard to the second review of New Zealand, domestically the work was just beginning, as New Zealand shifted to the implementation stage. As clearly highlighted, it was implementation that counted.

362. New Zealand announced that, as part of its commitment to ongoing action and engagement during the implementation period, the State had made a voluntary commitment to publish a midterm report on the universal periodic review in 2016.

363. Lastly, the delegation thanked all concerned for their participation in a process that it was sure would help to constantly improve the promotion and protection of human rights in New Zealand.

## Afghanistan

364. The review of Afghanistan, held on 27 January 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Afghanistan in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/AFG/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/AFG/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/AFG/3).

365. At its 22nd meeting, on 19 June 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Afghanistan (see sect. C below).

366. The outcome of the review of Afghanistan comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/26/4), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/26/4/Add.1).

### 1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome

367. The head of the delegation of Afghanistan, Professor Mohammad Qasim Hashimzai, Senior Adviser to the Ministry of Justice, began his intervention by stating that the presidential and provincial elections in Afghanistan had now been held. Through that historic event, the people of Afghanistan and the Government had demonstrated their will and commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights.

368. Afghanistan had supported the universal periodic review mechanism as an important pillar of the Human Rights Council. The second report of Afghanistan, which was a result of a participatory and comprehensive process, had been presented on 27 January 2014. During the interactive dialogue, Afghanistan had received 224 recommendations from delegations. Of those recommendations, 178 were supported by the Government of Afghanistan.

369. The Government had already undertaken a number of activities and would strengthen the already existing initiatives and implementing frameworks. The universal periodic review steering committee had held several follow-up meetings with the technical working group and coordination body to analyse, categorize and raise awareness among the concerned institutions about the recommendations.

370. Furthermore, those recommendations had been shared with the Human Rights Support Unit of the Ministry of Justice, which dealt with the implementation of human rights recommendations. The Unit had taken steps to translate those recommendations into the national languages, categorize and incorporate them into the action plan and share them with relevant sectoral ministries for implementation. Also, a number of awareness-raising workshops had been organized for the focal points of relevant ministries for better implementation of the recommendations, some of which were already being implemented. For instance, the Government had extended an invitation to the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences, who would undertake an official visit to Afghanistan in November 2014.

371. During the review, Afghanistan had pledged to examine the above-mentioned 34 recommendations and provide responses in due time. With that purpose, the Government had established an interministerial committee to review and analyse the recommendations. Considering the importance of the 34 recommendations, the Government had also launched broad discussions with other relevant institutions and civil society organizations to seek their input and ensure a better and more transparent process.

372. Afghanistan accepted 10 recommendations out of the 34 recommendations still pending. Owing to the broadness of the topics, the remaining recommendations were still under discussion and consideration. As a result, of 224 recommendations, the Government had accepted 189 recommendations and rejected 12 recommendations; 23 recommendations were still under discussion and reconsideration, and a response would be provided in due course. In addition to the information included in the report, the head of the delegation wished to elaborate a number of issues in greater depth.

373. Article 398 of the Penal Code did not exonerate the perpetrator of a so-called “honour killing”. Considering the mental state of the perpetrator, the article prescribed a sentence one level lower for the culprit. However, the Penal Code was being reviewed by the relevant committee, which was also assigned to incorporate into national legislation the provisions of the international human rights conventions to which Afghanistan was party.

374. Concerning the protection of human rights defenders, peace activists and female politicians, the Government had assigned three police protection officers for every provincial department. In addition, security forces had been trained to pay particular attention to civil society defenders working on women’s rights at the national and provincial levels. The Government had also decided to assign a number of security officers to protect high-level female politicians and women’s rights activists, had publicly acknowledged the role of women human rights defenders and had condemned violence and discrimination against them.

375. Afghanistan was an Islamic country and the death penalty could be imposed only on rare occasions and for heinous crimes. Decisions of the hierarchy of courts, including the Supreme Court, did not suffice for the imposition of the death penalty. The President seldom used his power to endorse Supreme Court decisions on the death penalty. In practice, he imposed a kind of moratorium on the death penalty, which acted as a deterrent against serious crimes, especially in circumstances of war.

376. Regarding transitional justice, the Government had developed a national action plan for peace, reconciliation and justice in 2005, to document war crimes in Afghanistan. While the documentation process had been finalized, its implementation still remained a challenge, considering the security situation. However, the Government had embarked on a number of side programmes, including the opening of the War Victims Memorial Library and the War Victims for Peace National Museum, and had constructed memorial monuments in various provinces.

377. Torture was prohibited by the Constitution and other laws. Any confession obtained by torture was invalid and perpetrators were punished by law. The Ministry of Interior Affairs had adopted guidelines preventing prison officers from embarking on such action. To oversee the implementation of the principles of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, Afghanistan had assigned a high-level commission to implement relevant programmes to national and provincial levels. A steering committee was preparing the State report of Afghanistan on the status of the implementation of the provisions of the Convention, which would be presented to the Committee against Torture later in 2014.

378. The Constitution guaranteed the free practice of religion by religious minority groups, and the Government provided them with the required support: for example, for the Hindu minority, special places of worship, schools and teaching programmes for Hindu students in mixed schools had been provided. A huge piece of land had been allocated for their religious rituals. Discrimination based on religious or ethnic origin was prohibited in all circumstances.

379. Afghanistan referred to a number of initiatives undertaken and gains in the area of human rights since January 2014. Firstly, as part of its commitment to promoting human rights culture, particularly women’s rights, Afghanistan had completed its second report on the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action in June 2014. The report described notable progress in legislating, policymaking and establishing institutions to protect women’s rights, and the related challenges. Secondly, the work on the report of Afghanistan to the Committee against Torture had started in June 2013 and was scheduled to be completed by the end of 2014. The completed report would provide the Government with a better understanding of the existing situation. Thirdly, the action plan for the implementation of Security Council

resolution 1325 (2000) on women, peace and security had been completed and the implementation phase of the action plan would start soon.

## 2. Views expressed by member and observer States of the Council on the review outcome

380. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Afghanistan, 13 delegations made statements.<sup>16</sup>

381. Malaysia appreciated the open approach demonstrated by Afghanistan in the universal periodic review process, and acknowledged the efforts it had made in the promotion and protection of human rights of, in particular, women and children. Malaysia was pleased with the explanation and clarification provided by the delegation on a number of issues raised by member States during the interactive dialogue, and noted positively the acceptance of a large number of recommendations, including those made by Malaysia. Malaysia recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group.

382. Morocco stated that the participation of a high-level delegation from Afghanistan and its openness in the universal periodic review process demonstrated the commitment to democracy and the rule of law of a country in transition which was facing major challenges in the political, economic and social fields, including challenges relating to security and national reconciliation. Morocco also welcomed the establishment of democratic national institutions, the measures taken in the areas of health, poverty reduction and trafficking in children and those taken to improve the socioeconomic conditions of displaced persons and refugees, in particular with regard to their access to education.

383. Sri Lanka appreciated the constructive engagement of Afghanistan during the session of the Working Group and was pleased to note that its two recommendations enjoyed the State's support. Sri Lanka commended Afghanistan for the progress it had made in combating terrorism and insecurity and in moving towards nation-building and development. Particularly noteworthy were the measures taken to advance the rights of women, especially to increase women's participation, in the prevention of violence and in relief and recovery services. Sri Lanka recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group.

384. The Sudan welcomed the presentation made by the delegation of Afghanistan and the clarifications provided. Afghanistan had accepted a large number of recommendations, although it had expressed reservations on recommendations like the ones on the death penalty and other recommendations containing concepts that did not reflect Afghan culture. The Sudan also drew attention to the commitment demonstrated by Afghanistan on human rights issues.

385. UNICEF was pleased to see that Afghanistan had accepted the recommendations on child marriage made during the session of the Working Group and called upon the State under review to raise the legal age of marriage for girls to 18 years, as a deterrent to child marriage and the negative consequences it has on girls' education, health and well-being. UNICEF was also pleased to note the efforts made to prevent underage recruitment in the armed forces, including the police, and called upon the State to take targeted measures to ensure the application of standards prohibiting and sanctioning recruitment and other grave violations of children rights by all parties to the conflict. UNICEF offered its technical support and looked forward to cooperating with Afghanistan.

386. The United Arab Emirates expressed appreciation for the comprehensive presentation on the measures taken by Afghanistan to give impetus to the national human rights system through the consolidation of a culture of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Despite the challenges Afghanistan was currently facing, progress had recently been made in the consolidation of the rule of law and good governance. Afghanistan was continuing its efforts to make legislative and institutional reforms leading to the realization of equality and social

<sup>16</sup> The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted, if available, on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, at <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/26thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

justice. The United Arab Emirates recommended that the report of the Working Group be adopted.

387. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland welcomed the acceptance by Afghanistan of its recommendation to give the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission the independence and legal authority to hold to account perpetrators of mistreatment of detainees. It hoped that the recommendation for the repeal of article 398 of the Penal Code on honour killings would be implemented in the future. It expressed its concerns with regard to the issues of violence against women, women's access to formal justice and violence against human rights defenders.

388. The United States of America welcomed the acceptance by Afghanistan of recommendations on investigating allegations of human rights violations by members of the Afghan national security forces and on allowing the Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission to operate safely and to carry out its mandate effectively. While noting the acceptance of recommendations calling for the implementation of the law on the elimination of violence against women, the United States of America was disappointed that Afghanistan had not accepted recommendations on ending the criminal prosecution of women who had fled their homes, and encouraged Afghanistan to accept recommendations on expanding cooperation with the special procedures of the Human Rights Council.

389. Uzbekistan thanked the delegation of Afghanistan for the additional information and comments regarding the recommendations made during the review of Afghanistan, and welcomed its constructive participation in the universal periodic review process. Afghanistan had accepted most of the recommendations, including those from Uzbekistan on the improvement of mechanisms for legal assistance and coordination of the activities of national and international organizations. The implementation of measures on the basis of the universal periodic review recommendations would facilitate the strengthening of the national human rights system. Uzbekistan recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group.

390. Cuba acknowledged the efforts made by Afghanistan to promote and protect human rights in difficult security conditions, worsened by foreign occupation and a war that had led to serious consequences linked to terrorism, extremism and drug trafficking. Its two recommendations regarding health, children, young people and the right to education had been accepted by Afghanistan. Cuba recommended that the report of the Working Group be adopted.

391. Viet Nam was pleased to see the engagement of Afghanistan in promoting and protecting human rights and, in particular, in the universal periodic review process. Afghanistan had accepted a large number of recommendations, including the two recommendations made by Viet Nam on the adoption and implementation of the law on social protection and on priority efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goals as soon as possible. Viet Nam recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group.

392. Yemen expressed appreciation for the achievements of Afghanistan in the field of human rights and its efforts to protect and promote human rights, despite the difficulties it was facing. Its acceptance of a high number of recommendations reaffirmed the State's commitment to the protection and realization of civil, economic and social rights. In view of the progress made, Yemen recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group.

393. Algeria noted that Afghanistan had accepted a large number of recommendations, and expressed its best wishes for their implementation. It welcomed the adoption of its recommendation on continuing efforts aimed at the promotion and protection of women's rights, which should be a priority for all countries. Algeria recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

394. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Afghanistan, four other stakeholders made statements.

395. The Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission (by video message) highlighted the progress made by Afghanistan in the rights to education and health care, the promotion of women's rights, freedom of speech, the development of media outlets and the realization of democracy and human rights within a good governance process. Nevertheless, some issues persisted, such as insecurity, poor rule of law, the low quality of education and health services, an unsustainable economy, corruption and nepotism, the criminal economy and the low capacity of the Government to prevent human rights abuses. It called for an increase in women's participation in political and decision-making processes.

396. Human Rights Watch appreciated the fact that Afghanistan had addressed the issue of violence against women and, in particular, had adopted a law on the elimination of violence against women and established the provincial commissions on the elimination of such violence. Nevertheless, it was concerned about shortcomings in the implementation of the law, as few cases were brought before a court. The imprisonment of women for "moral crimes", such as fleeing their homes, should also be stopped. Human Rights Watch recommended that Afghanistan should provide police and prosecutors with adequate resources and technical and political support. Impunity for serious abuses, especially among Afghan officials, remained a major problem in Afghanistan. The Government was also powerless in the face of the abuses perpetrated by the Afghan local police. Afghanistan should end the use of torture and ill-treatment in detention centres. Human Rights Watch recommended that the Government should translate its pledges into action.

397. Amnesty International regretted that Afghanistan had rejected recommendations calling for the abolition of the death penalty, and urged it to declare a moratorium on the death penalty as a first step towards abolishing capital punishment altogether. It welcomed the State's support for recommendations on strengthening women's participation in political and decision-making processes, including the peace process, and on addressing the suffering of victims of armed conflict, including internally displaced persons. The Government should fully implement the law on the elimination of violence against women and address impunity by State and non-State actors. The justice system should be strengthened and corruption rooted out, and the capacity of the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission should be reinforced to enable it to monitor and protect human rights in the country.

398. Action Canada for Population and Development, in a joint statement with International Planned Parenthood Federation, welcomed the willingness of Afghanistan to improve health-care systems and its commitment to eliminating violence against women and girls. It was disappointed that the Government refused to guarantee non-discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, to abolish the practice of prosecuting women for "moral crimes" and to deliver rights-based and stigma-free health services for persons living with HIV and those who injected drugs. It urged Afghanistan to eliminate discrimination against women and girls, promote their participation in education and review the impact of existing legislation on gender equality, and particularly of the Shiite personal law on women.

399. Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik regretted that Afghanistan had rejected all recommendations on a moratorium on the death penalty, a step that would lead to its eventual abolition. Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik believed that, because of their deep cultural and historical connections, Afghanistan and the Islamic Republic of Iran had influenced one another both positively and negatively. Many Afghan citizens were executed in other countries on grounds that did not meet the threshold of serious crime. Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik recommended that Afghanistan should abolish the death penalty and reconsider the recommendations that it ratify a number of optional protocols, such as the ones to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the Convention against Torture and the two optional protocols to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

#### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

400. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, according to the information provided, of the 224 recommendations received, 189 enjoyed the support of Afghanistan and all others had been noted.

401. In his final remarks, the head of the delegation reiterated that the Constitution of Afghanistan and a body of relevant laws fought against torture and worked for its prevention. He also pointed out that it was no longer a crime for a woman to flee her home and that the Government was very engaged in the fight against terrorism. The head of the delegation concluded that the promotion and protection of human rights in Afghanistan required the cooperation and participation of all concerned governmental bodies and civil society institutions and the direct cooperation of the international community, particularly international organizations active in the area of human rights.

### **Chile**

402. The review of Chile, held on 28 January 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Chile in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/CHL/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/CHL/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/CHL/3).

403. At its 22nd meeting, on 19 June 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Chile (see sect. C below).

404. The outcome of the review of Chile comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/26/5), the views of the State concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/26/5/Add.1/Rev.1).

### **1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome**

405. The delegation stressed that, for the Government of Michelle Bachelet, human rights and democracy were the foundations for the actions of the State and would be reflected in the public policies to be adopted and implemented.

406. Chile had participated in the universal periodic review in a spirit of cooperation. Civil society had been consulted and all relevant ministries and services had participated in the preparation of the review and its revision.

407. Those actions also reflected the Government's determination to move forward in accordance with its international obligations and with the changes demanded by Chilean society: a society that was more empowered than before, with more opportunities for participation, and in which the younger generations played a leading role.

408. The Government's commitment was similarly expressed in the number of accepted recommendations, amounting to 180 out of the 185, and in the fact that a large number of recommendations accepted during the first review, in 2009, had already been implemented.

409. The adoption of the report of the second universal periodic review of Chile coincided with the first 100 days of the second administration of President Bachelet, which had achieved at least 90 per cent of the schedule to which it had committed for that period. The Government would follow up on the implementation of the universal periodic review recommendations with the same energy.

410. The new Administration had pledged to ratify all the pending human rights instruments from both the United Nations and the Organization of American States, in accordance with several universal periodic review recommendations it had accepted.

411. The delegation pointed out some recent institutional developments, including the initiative to establish a ministry of indigenous affairs and a council of indigenous peoples,

which would upgrade the hierarchy of the institutional architecture for indigenous issues to the level it deserved. A national council for children had also been established, which would be responsible for guiding new policies and institutional reforms based on a comprehensive respect for the rights of both girls and boys.

412. The new Government had undertaken fundamental reforms, the most emblematic one relating to education. It was driven by civil society, especially students, in accordance with some of the universal periodic review recommendations. The reform sought structural changes at all levels of education so as to ensure equality, social inclusion and the development of the country.

413. The rights of indigenous peoples were a central theme in State policies. The measures taken to overcome all forms of marginalization, racism and discrimination would be the subject of consultations with indigenous peoples, in compliance with the State's obligations under the ILO Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169). In addition, the Government had pledged not to use the Anti-Terrorism Act against members of indigenous peoples. The law was under study with a view revising it to meet international standards.

414. The Government had raised the need to introduce a new agenda item on gender issues. A gender approach would be incorporated into the reforms of the education and electoral systems, the labour policy and the Constitution.

415. Chile had a constant concern regarding violence and discrimination against women, which it had also voiced before the Human Rights Council. The Government was determined to defend and advance the sexual and reproductive rights of all people. Hence, it was noteworthy to mention the initiative to decriminalize abortion under three circumstances: danger to the life of the woman, non-viability of the fetus and pregnancy resulting from rape.

416. For the current stage of the universal periodic review, the new Administration had carefully studied all the recommendations received in the light of its programmes and policies. The exercise had been accompanied and driven largely by an increasingly empowered civil society.

417. For the Government, an empowered citizenship and open dialogue were not only necessary to carry out the reforms it envisaged, but also to follow up on its commitments. The delegation invited civil society to support the Government in the process of implementing the accepted recommendations. It also announced that it would prepare a midterm review report in 2016.

418. In concluding, the delegation reiterated the commitment of Chile to the international system for the promotion and protection of human rights, in particular the Human Rights Council, its mechanisms, special procedures and the treaty bodies.

## **2. Views expressed by member and observer States of the Council on the review outcome**

419. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Chile, eight delegations made statements.

420. Angola welcomed the commitment of Chile to the protection and promotion of human rights, including its accession to several international instruments and its cooperation with Human Rights Council mechanisms. Angola welcomed the State's acceptance of recommendations made by member States, including one made by Angola on intensifying efforts in the fight against discrimination in respect of women and indigenous peoples.

421. Cuba noted the efforts made by the State to modernize and strengthen the institutional human rights infrastructure, highlighting the new legislation adopted for the fight against discrimination and the advances in delivering land to indigenous populations and other policies in benefit of native populations. Cuba had made two recommendations, on improving policies and norms that regulated police force action and on the protection of indigenous populations, the consideration of which would contribute to achieving higher standards of human rights protection.

422. Morocco congratulated Chile on its strong commitment to the values and universal principles of human rights and the strengthening of institutional and normative frameworks, in particular the creation of the National Institute for Human Rights and the adoption of the

law on trafficking in human beings. It also welcomed the State's efforts regarding the rights of persons with disabilities, the elderly, migrants and refugees, as well as the ratification of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. Morocco was pleased that Chile had accepted a large majority of the universal periodic review recommendations, including two made by Morocco inviting the State to encourage training in human rights for officers of the security forces and officials responsible for law enforcement and to strengthen the participation of women in political life.

423. Senegal welcomed the constructive dialogue and the full cooperation of Chile with the universal periodic review process. It took note of the additional information provided, including the addendum to the report of the Working Group, and welcomed the continued commitment of the Chilean authorities to doing more for the promotion, protection and realization of human rights. Senegal hoped that Chile would continue its efforts to implement the recommendations made, with a view to improving the living conditions of its people, especially women and children.

424. UNICEF welcomed the creation of the National Council for Children, which would help to realize the rights of children and adolescents at all levels and coordinate the work of government institutions. The draft law on rights and guarantees for children and adolescents, to be presented to parliament, should enshrine judicial and administrative guarantees, establish responsible institutions, inter-agency coordination, the strengthening of a territorial presence and general obligations for all State bodies, and explicitly prohibit all forms of abuse against children. It appreciated the State's pledge that it would consider setting up an office of an ombudsman for children which, if established, would be responsible for monitoring compliance with the law.

425. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the willingness of the Government of Chile to provide sufficient information allowing for positive interaction on its human rights achievements and challenges. It highlighted the establishment of the National Institute for Human Rights, in accordance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles), and the implementation of a housing policy in favour of the most vulnerable sectors of the population, thereby reducing inequality and promoting social integration. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela recognized the efforts made by the State under review to comply with the recommendations it had accepted during its first review, reaffirming its commitment to the observance of human rights.

426. Viet Nam recognized that Chile had stayed committed to human rights and had made great efforts to protect and promote them since its review. Viet Nam noted with appreciation that Chile had supported its two recommendations on strengthening the rule of law and good governance, including further capacity-building for law enforcement mechanisms and national institutions on human rights, and on continuing current national strategies and programmes for enhancing employment opportunities, social welfare, education and the health-care system, especially for families in rural areas, migrants and indigenous and tribal people.

427. Algeria welcomed the efforts made by Chile at the normative and institutional levels for the promotion and protection of human rights, which had been shown by several actions, such as the presentation of a midterm report, the promotion of the human rights and professional integration of women, the establishment of a human rights body and the creation of the National Institute for Human Rights in accordance with the Paris Principles. It also welcomed the efforts made to promote economic, social and cultural rights and the acceptance of the recommendations made by Algeria.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

428. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Chile, six other stakeholders made statements.

429. According to the National Institute for Human Rights, Chile should ratify the pending international treaties, which would require speeding up the legislative procedure, and that a governmental human rights body, a national plan and greater inclusion in human rights education were needed. With regard to victims of the dictatorship, it would be necessary to

establish a body that constantly assessed pending cases and provided legal and social advice for victims of torture. It drew attention to the delay in the implementation of the national prevention mechanism against torture. Military justice should be limited to military crimes and to military officials, and the anti-terrorist law should be amended. Efforts should be made to ensure that the use of force by the police complied with international standards, and the State should strengthen its action to guarantee equality and non-discrimination.

430. The International Lesbian and Gay Association stated that, although discrimination was decreasing, the State still had obligations towards lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons in a context where cultural homophobia and transphobia caused killings. Measures should be taken to address discrimination effectively. The approved anti-discrimination law did not provide for compensation for victims and only a small number had received favourable judgments. It highlighted the absence of laws on egalitarian marriage and on gender identity and of a comprehensive policy on sexual education or human rights. Some signs of improvement had been seen but it was important to advance together in the construction of policies that were more respectful of diversity and of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons.

431. Amnesty International called upon Chile to ensure truth, justice and reparations for victims of human rights violations committed during the military regime, and their families. It expressed concern about reports of excessive use of force by the police in public protests, in particular in Mapuche indigenous communities; it was important to ensure that national legislation and police protocols were in line with international standards. It also urged Chile to give priority to reforming the military justice system to ensure that human rights violations allegedly committed by the military or the police were tried in civil courts. It welcomed both the rejection by Chile of a recommendation urging respect for the “rights of the human person from the moment of conception to natural death” and the decision by Chile to decriminalize abortion in cases of rape, incest or risk to the woman’s life or health, or when the fetus was not viable.

432. In a joint statement with the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development, International Catholic Child Bureau and Marist International Solidarity Foundation, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco welcomed the acceptance by Chile, in particular of recommendations on improving the juvenile justice system. Act 20.084 (2007) had established a special criminal system but did not provide appropriate legal assistance for child victims, and access to high-quality education was unequal. It recommended, inter alia, the establishment of an ombudsman’s office for children, the removal of all obstacles impeding effective access to justice by children, revision of the 2007 Act to create a more child-friendly juvenile system and the harmonization of the national legal framework with the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

433. Centro Regional de Derechos Humanos y Justicia de Género welcomed the fact that Chile had accepted most of its recommendations on the human rights of women, victims of the dictatorship, indigenous peoples, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons, children, persons with disabilities and migrants. It highlighted the importance of implementing a mechanism for adoption of and follow-up on the recommendations, that should be composed of representatives of all branches of State as well as the human rights institutions that the country needed to expand and strengthen, by implementing the *Defensoría de las Personas* (ombudsman’s office) and the national mechanism for the prevention of torture. It called upon the State to comply with the recommendations it had accepted and to promptly implement a national plan with the broad and effective participation of civil society.

434. Auspice Stella noted the lack of a coherent State policy that would respond to the claims of the Mapuche. The anti-terrorist law had criminalized the struggle of the Mapuche and given the police extraordinary powers, expressed as violence against communities that fought for the restitution of their lands or opposed infrastructure projects that affected the environment. Raids and arbitrary arrests were carried out in violation of court proceedings. Although an anti-discrimination law had been drawn up, it was not being duly implemented because most allegations of criminality against Mapuche, driven by settlers involved in territorial disputes with neighbouring Mapuche, were not properly investigated. While

initiatives to appoint some Mapuche in certain public positions were praiseworthy, they did not solve the underlying problems affecting the Mapuche nation.

#### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

435. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, according to the information provided, of 185 recommendations received, 180 enjoyed the support of Chile, and the rest had been noted.

436. The delegation acknowledged that most speakers had appreciated the fact that Chile had accepted almost all recommendations received during its second review, as well as the efforts to implement the recommendations received at its first review and the measures taken during the first 100 days of the second administration of President Bachelet.

437. In response to some questions raised during the adoption of the report, the State was well aware that there were still some deficits regarding the full implementation of review recommendations. The Government that had taken office in March 2014 expressed its commitment to implementing those recommendations through the legislative, administrative and other means at its disposal, with the active participation and cooperation of civil society organizations and all State institutions.

438. The Government was studying the possibility of establishing a national mechanism for monitoring and implementing universal periodic review recommendations and those made by the treaty bodies. OHCHR was providing support and advice in that process.

439. Several governmental and civil society delegations had referred to the right to education and the situation of girls, boys, young people and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. The Government was working on the adoption of a series of measures leading to a major educational reform that, it was hoped, would address and close some of the gaps still existing in Chile.

440. The delegation concluded its presentation by thanking States and civil society for their statements.

#### **Cambodia**

441. The review of Cambodia, held on 28 January 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Cambodia in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/KHM/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/KHM/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/KHM/3).

442. At its 37th meeting, on 26 June 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Cambodia (see sect. C below).

443. The outcome of the review of Cambodia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/26/16), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/26/16/Add.1).

#### **1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome**

444. The delegation of Cambodia informed the Human Rights Council that, of the 205 recommendations received, Cambodia had accepted 163, noted 38 and rejected four. Its Government considered that, owing to repetitions and overlaps, some of the accepted recommendations could be combined and merged into only 48 recommendations.

445. Cambodia had signed, ratified or acceded to all the core international human treaties. It also noted that Cambodia had collaborated closely with United Nations mechanisms, in particular with the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Cambodia and with OHCHR, through a memorandum of understanding signed in February 2014 for a period of two years. In the first half of 2014, Cambodia had received four official visits, one from the Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights and three from special procedure mandate holders.

446. With regard to prison reform, the delegation noted that, in its previous annual report, OHCHR had noted that the General Department of Prisons had adopted a strategic plan for 2014–2018 that was more compliant with international human rights norms and standards.

447. With regard to the issue of discrimination against women, Cambodia had made an effort to implement the principles of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women by including them in its national policies and plans. In order to prohibit discrimination against women, Cambodia had adopted regulations and measures, inter alia the law on prevention of domestic violence and protection of victims and the law on monogamy.

448. With respect to the rights of the child, the Government had adopted policies, national strategies and action plans which had reduced infant mortality, increased school registration, stopped children from undertaking substantive forms of labour and given them access to education and vocational training, and improved work and child safety standards.

## **2. Views expressed by member and observer States of the Council on the review outcome**

449. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Cambodia, 19 delegations made statements.

450. The Islamic Republic of Iran acknowledged that its recommendations on the child protection, health and social service systems, as well as on the promotion and protection of the rights of persons with disabilities, had been accepted by Cambodia.

451. The Lao People's Democratic Republic welcomed the achievements made by Cambodia in socioeconomic development, including the attainment of five Millennium Development Goal targets before 2015. It also commended the State for the significant improvement made in the implementation of the national plan "Education for All", the adoption of specific regulations to prevent discrimination against women and the action plan to eliminate the worst forms of child labour.

452. Malaysia noted with appreciation the continuous efforts made by Cambodia in the promotion and protection of human rights in various areas, including the strengthening of the legal and judicial systems and the fight against corruption. Cambodia had accepted a large number of recommendations, including those made by Malaysia.

453. Morocco welcomed the political will shown by Cambodia to reform the electoral code in order to consolidate democracy and ensure better conditions for the next elections. It noted with satisfaction the level of cooperation with the Special Rapporteur, who had been able to carry out nine visits to the country. Morocco also supported the commitment of Cambodia to the restoration of an enabling legislative and policy environment conducive to the development and enjoyment of the rule of law and human rights. Lastly, it supported requests for technical assistance for Cambodia.

454. Myanmar was pleased to learn that Cambodia had accepted most of the recommendations, including the two made by Myanmar, on continuing to reduce the poverty rate in rural areas and the wealth gap, and on working on its "Education for All" national plan.

455. The Philippines noted the continued positive engagement of Cambodia with various human rights mechanisms, including the special procedures of the Human Rights Council. It also appreciated the efforts made by Cambodia to improve its domestic institutions and to devise programmes aimed at increasing the protection of the rights of women and children. The Philippines urged Cambodia to continue to cooperate with regional and international partners in combating trafficking in persons.

456. Singapore noted that the large number of recommendations that Cambodia had accepted, including the two made by Singapore, reflected the State's strong commitment and political will to further improve protection of the human rights of its people.

457. Sri Lanka welcomed the progress made by Cambodia towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals, particularly in the fields of gender equality, health services and access to education. It also noted the initiatives taken to achieve the national goals for poverty reduction, food security and socioeconomic development.

458. Thailand welcomed the acceptance by Cambodia of the majority of the recommendations, including its own recommendations on promoting access to education and health services. It stood ready to share experiences with and extend cooperation to Cambodia to implement the recommendations.

459. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland welcomed the acceptance of its recommendation on electoral reform, and urged both Government and opposition to reach a political settlement that set out a clear timetable for electoral reform. While welcoming the action towards improving land rights, it encouraged Cambodia to undertake an urgent review of economic land reform concessions before lifting the current moratorium. Lastly, it urged the Government to ensure that the draft law on cybercrime did not curtail freedom of expression.

460. The United States of America welcomed the acceptance by Cambodia of recommendations relating to key electoral reforms. It noted with deep concern that the Government had not lifted the ban on public demonstrations in Phnom Penh and did not afford its citizens freedom of assembly. Stating that poor labour conditions and lack of respect for freedom of association had continued, the United States of America urged the Government swiftly to implement the recommendations it had accepted on workers' rights and labour standards. It also noted with disappointment that Cambodia did not accept the recommendations regarding the repeal of or amendments to articles of the Penal Code on the defamation or discrediting of judicial decisions.

461. Uzbekistan was pleased that Cambodia had accepted the vast majority of the recommendations, including the ones Uzbekistan had itself made. During the review, it had noted with satisfaction that progress had been made in ensuring gender equality, promoting the right to education and protecting children's rights, and had noted the continuous cooperation of Cambodia with the United Nations human rights mechanisms.

462. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the results of programmes implemented to overcome inequality and social exclusion and fight poverty, including the promotion of transparent, sustainable and effective management in the equitable and fair distribution and use of land. It also acknowledged the substantial progress made by Cambodia in complying with the recommendations accepted during the first cycle of the universal periodic review.

463. Algeria noted with satisfaction the acceptance by Cambodia of a large number of recommendations, including the three that it had itself made on the establishment of an independent human rights institution in conformity with the Paris Principles, the strengthening of measures to fight child labour and exploitation of children, and the continuation of efforts to eliminate all forms of discrimination against women.

464. Brunei Darussalam welcomed the various measures that had been taken, including the policies focused on improving social indicators and those that supported vulnerable groups, including women, children and persons with disabilities. It also appreciated the State's cooperation with United Nations human rights mechanisms and its acceptance of the majority of the recommendations made.

465. China appreciated the commitment of Cambodia to actively implementing the recommendations, and was grateful that Cambodia had accepted the recommendations that China had made. It also hoped that the international community would continue to assist Cambodia in promoting economic and social development and in providing better conditions for the enjoyment of human rights by the people of Cambodia.

466. Cuba noted with satisfaction that Cambodia had ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. It was grateful that Cambodia had accepted the recommendations that it had made, aimed at ensuring the continuation of measures that would allow the elimination of poverty, access to health and education services and improvement of workplace security and safety standards.

467. India commended Cambodia for the receptive and constructive manner in which it had participated in the universal periodic review, and noted that it had accepted most of the recommendations. India believed that Cambodia would continue its efforts to implement the accepted recommendations in the coming years.

468. Indonesia appreciated the intentions of Cambodia in including recommendations in its national plan of action for human rights and its acceptance of the recommendation made by Indonesia on continuing to strengthen its national institutional capacity in promoting and protecting human rights, including the process of establishment of a national human rights institution in accordance with the Paris Principles. It was also appreciative of the acceptance of its recommendation to finalize and implement the new draft of a national plan for the period 2013–2018 to eliminate the worst forms of child labour.

### 3. General comments made by other stakeholders

469. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Cambodia, eight other stakeholders made statements.

470. The Asia Forum for Human Rights and Development (Forum-Asia) reiterated its grave concern over the violent crackdown by State security forces against public assemblies, including the use of live ammunition. Instead of launching credible investigations into those violations, the Government had imposed a ban on all public assemblies and had convicted workers and activists. It was also concerned about the draft laws on non-governmental organizations and associations, on cybercrime and on trade unions, which would impose more restrictions on the freedoms of expression, peaceful assembly and association. It urged the Government to shelve all draft laws that did not comply with international human rights standards and norms. The Forum called upon Cambodia to extend a standing invitation to special procedure mandate holders and to set out a comprehensive, measurable and time-bound action plan for the implementation of the universal periodic review recommendations.

471. Human Rights Watch stated that the efforts made by the ruling party to impose acceptance of the results of the 2013 national elections, which it claimed had returned it to power, albeit with a reduced parliamentary majority, had plunged Cambodia into a human rights crisis. During the universal periodic review, a clear message had been sent to the Government of Cambodia to end its brutal crackdown and engage in serious reforms. Despite the ruling party's acceptance of several recommendations for legal and judicial reforms, it had pushed through legislation on the judiciary that would strengthen State control over it. Human Rights Watch remained gravely concerned that draft laws on cyberspace, civil society and trade unions threatened to restrict, rather than guarantee, the exercise of fundamental human rights. The State security forces had not been prosecuted for using unnecessary, excessive or lethal force against protesters.

472. Amnesty International urged the Cambodian authorities to lift all restrictions on peaceful assembly, to end the ban imposed on that fundamental freedom, to facilitate rather than restrict the exercise of the right to peaceful assembly, and to establish clear legal or regulatory guidance for policing demonstrations, particularly on the use of firearms. Amnesty International was concerned that the authorities had not held security forces accountable for the use of excessive force against protesters, including the killing of at least four people and the disappearance of a 16-year-old boy. It urged the Government to hold broad and public consultations with civil society on three laws key to maintaining the independence of the judiciary, as those laws in their present form undermined, rather than guaranteed, judicial independence.

473. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland and the International Lesbian and Gay Association called upon the Government of Cambodia to implement the recommendations it had accepted in order to continue to fight

discrimination against children from marginalized and vulnerable groups, to eradicate gender-based stereotypes and to take measures aimed at amending or eliminating patriarchal attitudes and stereotypes against women. Stating that lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons in Cambodia were subject to discrimination, abuse and violence, both organizations called upon the authorities to, inter alia, repeal laws that criminalized sexual orientation and gender identity and expression, and establish national level mechanisms and review existing human rights instruments and programmes to include the protection of equal rights of all people, regardless of their sexual orientation.

474. Action Canada for Population and Development commended Cambodia for accepting recommendations on the elimination of stereotypes, providing people with HIV with free treatment, further developing the health sector, and for providing sexual and reproductive health information. It encouraged the Government to implement a nationwide, rights-based, scientifically accurate, comprehensive sexuality education curriculum that was accessible for young people. Action Canada for Population and Development was concerned with the lack of attention paid in the universal periodic review process to discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity and expression. It called upon the Cambodian authorities to amend the Constitution to include specific reference to sexual orientation and gender identity and expression as grounds for prohibiting discrimination, and to amend the 1997 labour law to prohibit discrimination in the workplace.

475. CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation stated that, despite the explicit commitment it had made during the universal periodic review, Cambodia had taken steps to limit the space accorded to civil society and human rights defenders at the national level. It urged the Government of Cambodia to take the measures necessary to implement the recommendations it had accepted on preventing harassment of human rights defenders, journalists and non-governmental organizations. Concerned about the debilitating effects of the proposed law on associations and non-governmental organizations, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation urged the authorities to consult with independent civil society groups to ensure that the law conformed to international best practice governing freedom of association. It was also alarmed by the increasingly repressive and hostile attitude to peaceful protests and by the failure to prosecute security officials who had used excessive and deadly force. Lastly, it called upon the Government to implement fully the recommendations it had accepted on protecting workers exercising their rights, and on ensuring that the security forces complied with the United Nations Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials.

476. While commending the acceptance by Cambodia of several recommendations concerning the right to education and the ill-treatment and sexual exploitation of children, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development (VIDES International) and Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco noted that further efforts were required to guarantee children's rights fully. A large number of children with disabilities were still excluded from the education system. They also observed that human rights education was not included in school curricula or teacher training. The two organizations noted with concern that sexual or domestic violence affected about 70 per cent of children. They called upon Cambodia to, inter alia, promote and support inclusive education for children with disabilities, implement relevant review recommendations on including human rights education in school curricula and teacher training; increase human rights awareness through national campaigns; and fight against the sale and sexual exploitation of children.

477. The International Federation for Human Rights called upon the Government of Cambodia to implement the recommendations it had accepted on the freedoms of expression and information, as they required political will, not financial resources. The gap between the obligations of Cambodia and the reality of human rights on the ground was widening. Human rights defenders, trade unionists and community activists faced harassment, threats and intimidation. The International Federation for Human Rights called upon the Cambodian authorities to investigate the disappearance of the 16-year-old boy who had been missing since January 2014. It also called upon the Government to revoke the illegal ban on public assemblies in Phnom Penh, and to conduct public consultations on the drafts of trade union and cybercrime laws, and for a review of the three basic laws on the judiciary.

#### 4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

478. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, according to the information provided, of 205 recommendations received 163 enjoyed the support of Cambodia, while 42 had been noted.

479. In its closing remarks, the delegation of Cambodia highlighted the fact that a number of the issues raised during the current session had been addressed in its national report, the report of the Working Group and the statement made by the delegation in January 2014. All the comments and concerns expressed would be conveyed to the relevant institutions for action.

480. Despite the achievements made by Cambodia in the field of human rights, challenges still remained. The Government was committed to implementing realistic measures and the rule of law to ensure the full enjoyment of human rights in the country.

481. Cambodia would continue its close cooperation with the United Nations human rights mechanisms, in particular the special procedures. The Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Cambodia had just finished his fact-finding mission, with very satisfactory results.

482. Cambodia would continue its efforts in the area of gender equality in collaboration with partners and stakeholders, particularly in such critical areas as access to higher education, representation in politics, and decision-making and participation in the formal economy.

483. Cambodia was committed to reforming the legal system and strengthening capacity-building in and the independence of the courts. The Government was continuing to improve the quality of life of all Cambodians, as seen also in the socioeconomic environment and the creation of new jobs.

484. In conclusion, the universal periodic review process had been very beneficial for Cambodia, as it had not only provided the Government with the opportunity to evaluate progress, achievements and shortcomings in terms of human rights, but had also enabled it to continue to take measures and adopt policies to improve further the existing human rights framework.

#### Uruguay

485. The review of Uruguay, held on 29 January 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Uruguay in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/URY/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/URY/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/URY/3).

486. At its 24th meeting, on 19 June 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Uruguay (see sect. C below).

487. The outcome of the review of Uruguay comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/26/7), the views of the State concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/26/7/Add.1).

#### 1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome

488. In its opening remarks, Uruguay reiterated its commitment to the international human rights protection system, in particular the universal periodic review mechanism.

489. That commitment was reflected in the decision made by Uruguay to accept all the recommendations made during the review. With the exception of one recommendation, Uruguay had accepted all the recommendations made during both its reviews. In addition, it had submitted a midterm progress report and, during its second review, it had made 44 voluntary commitments on key human rights issues.

490. The delegation wished to update the Human Rights Council on two major activities that Uruguay had undertaken that were directly linked with its review.

491. With regard to the dissemination of the outcome of the universal periodic review, a public event had been held on 8 May 2014 at the Human Rights Secretariat of the Presidency of the Republic. The event had been attended by a large number of State authorities and representatives, as well as by representatives of the United Nations agencies in the country, civil society and the media. Other dissemination activities had also been organized by civil society organizations, such as the one organized by Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung Uruguay on 17 June 2014, which had been attended by national authorities and several civil society organizations.

492. The delegation also highlighted actions aimed at the establishment of the inter-institutional commission that had a mandate to coordinate the follow-up to recommendations made at the universal periodic review and by other human rights bodies, including the special procedures of the Human Rights Council. The commission, which would have the support of OHCHR, was an initiative for institutional strengthening aimed at ensuring the State's compliance with its international human rights obligations.

493. Since its second review in January 2014, Uruguay had appeared before the Committee on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and the Committee against Torture. During both presentations, Uruguay had had the opportunity of following up on various topics that had been raised during its review.

494. With regard to the national human rights plan and the fight against all forms of discrimination, an initial assessment had been completed with the support of OHCHR. At present, the Government was analysing information from consultations with civil society, with a view to completing a first draft of the plan at the earliest possible date, so that it could be further discussed with relevant actors.

495. Regarding the reform of the penitentiary system, and as announced by Uruguay during its review and before the Committee against Torture, it was actively pursuing its intended goal of ending overcrowding in prisons, with construction scheduled during 2014, (plus further future construction that would provide a surplus of prison capacity. New impetus would be given to the parliamentary debate regarding the Penal Code and the Penal Procedures Code. The delegation recalled that, since 2003, Uruguay had had a specific institution – the office of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Prison System – that monitored conditions in the penitentiary system. The Commissioner had a legal mandate to conduct visits to prisons for adults with a view to monitoring compliance with international and national standards.

496. With regard to the situation of children in conflict with the law, the Government had recently discussed the matter of administrative and judicial cases relating to allegations of ill-treatment in detention centres for minors administered by the Adolescent Criminal Responsibility System, when Uruguay was being examined by the Committee against Torture. The Adolescent Criminal Responsibility System had indeed decided to bring those allegations before the justice system and to suspend the officials concerned from their functions.

497. Regarding the recommendation that it should not lower the age of criminal responsibility, Uruguay recalled that, in response to a popular initiative, a referendum on that issue would be held in October 2014. The Government had expressed its disagreement on the issue.

498. The national human rights institution, created in 2012, had also been monitoring the conditions of children deprived of their liberty in its role as the national mechanism for the prevention of torture, with the support of UNICEF.

499. Uruguay recalled that it had ratified all protocols to the human rights treaties that related to individual communications, except the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure, which was currently under consideration by parliament.

500. Progress made in eliminating domestic violence had also been reported to the Committee against Torture, in particular as it related to recent action. That action included the use under a court order of electronic devices to monitor the whereabouts of perpetrators to ensure the protection of victims; improvements in the registration of cases of domestic violence; an increase of the capacity of shelters; and the adoption of standards for compensation for the children of victims in cases of murder.

501. The priority of the Government continued, however, to be the fight against poverty and extreme poverty. Affirmative action and economic support had been introduced to alleviate the socioeconomic exclusion of trans persons, one of the most vulnerable populations.

502. With regard to the laws on sexual and reproductive health of 2008, complemented by legislation on voluntary interruption of pregnancy adopted in 2012, measures had been taken to make those services available at all levels. Since 2008, there had been no deaths due to unsafe abortion.

503. On the issue of trafficking in persons, earlier in 2014 Uruguay had sent information on its follow-up to the recommendations made by the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children, following the mandate holder's visit to the country in 2010.

504. The Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence had visited Uruguay in October 2013. The report on his country visit would be submitted to the Human Rights Council during its twenty-seventh session. For ethical and legal reasons, the Government of Uruguay was committed to continued progress in the search for truth and justice. Uruguay would comply fully with its international obligations in that area.

505. Regarding the recommendation on voting by Uruguayans living abroad, an issue also addressed by the Committee on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, the Government of Uruguay maintained its position of support for the realization of that right. The issue was being considered by a bicameral commission of the parliament, which hoped to reach a political consensus.

506. With regard to an accepted recommendation on mining activities, on 5 June 2014, Uruguay had deposited the instrument of ratification of the ILO Safety and Health in Mines Convention, 1995 (No. 176).

507. To conclude, the delegation recalled that it had made a commitment to submit a midterm progress report in due course.

## **2. Views expressed by member and observer States of the Council on the review outcome**

508. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Uruguay, 11 delegations made statements.

509. Togo welcomed the fact that Uruguay had accepted most recommendations, including those made by Togo. It invited Uruguay to intensify its efforts to reduce poverty and to allocate the financial resources necessary for the full development of children and their families.

510. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the cooperation of Uruguay with the universal periodic review mechanism, which reflected its commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights. It highlighted the State's efforts to eradicate extreme poverty and to consolidate social policies within the framework of the National Strategy for Children and Adolescents; progress had been made to ensure the accreditation of the national human rights institution in conformity with the Paris Principles.

511. Viet Nam noted with satisfaction that Uruguay had continued to show great commitment to and further engagement with the universal periodic review process, recalling that a high percentage of recommendations had been accepted by the State. It was pleased to see that the recommendations made by Viet Nam had also been accepted, especially those on implementing the pledges and commitments made by Uruguay, and on strengthening cooperation with regional and United Nations human rights mechanisms for further mainstreaming of human rights treaties ratified into domestic legislation and the work of human rights institutions.

512. Yemen appreciated the success achieved and the efforts made by Uruguay in the promotion and protection of human rights. The State's acceptance of a large number of recommendations reaffirmed its commitment to human rights, whether civil, cultural, economic, political or social rights. Yemen applauded the progress made by Uruguay in that regard.

513. Algeria thanked the delegation of Uruguay for the additional information provided. It made reference to the legislative and institutional reforms undertaken, and highlighted the commitment of Uruguay to promoting and protecting economic, social and cultural rights. It praised Uruguay for having accepted the recommendations Algeria had made, and recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group.

514. Angola welcomed the information in the report describing the progress made by Uruguay in the promotion and protection of human rights since its first review, in particular with regard to the strengthening of institutions, the improvement in social indicators in the areas of education and health and the reduction in extreme poverty. It congratulated Uruguay on the recommendations it had accepted.

515. Botswana commended Uruguay for the positive spirit in which it had engaged with the Working Group during its review. The number of recommendations accepted by Uruguay was testimony to its commitment to the universal periodic review process and the promotion and protection of human rights. Botswana applauded Uruguay for its efforts to improve human rights policies, norms and institutions, including policies aimed at improving health, education and equality and the measures taken to eliminate racial discrimination and trafficking in persons. Botswana appreciated the State's continued interest in the promotion and protection of children's rights.

516. Côte d'Ivoire thanked Uruguay for the attention it had paid to the recommendations received during its review and the responses it had provided. Côte d'Ivoire expressed its support for the efforts being made by Uruguay and encouraged it to continue its cooperation with the international human rights mechanisms.

517. Cuba commended Uruguay for its National Strategy for Children and Adolescents and the positive work of the National Gender Council, in particular with regard to the draft law to promote equality of rights and opportunities for women and men. Cuba highlighted the achievements made in combating poverty, educational programmes and the introduction of indicators to assess the realization of economic, social and cultural rights.

518. Mali congratulated Uruguay on its efforts and achievements in the promotion and protection of human rights, as well as its cooperation with the mechanisms and procedures of the Human Rights Council. Mali encouraged Uruguay to pursue and strengthen efforts to ensure the well-being of its population.

519. Morocco congratulated Uruguay on the implementation of an institutional legislative framework to promote the respect of democracy and the rule of law. It welcomed the establishment of a national human rights institution, the implementation of the National Strategy for Children and Adolescents and the national plan of action for the elimination of sexual exploitation against children. It welcomed the State's efforts to reduce the number of children living on the streets, the fight against poverty and violence and the measures taken to address conditions in detention.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

520. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Uruguay, four other stakeholders made statements.

521. The World Organisation against Torture noted that Uruguay had made progress in affirming human rights. Alongside the improvement in its economy, it had seen a reduction in unemployment and poverty. There remained some issues of concern, such as the high concentration of poverty among children under the age of 6 years. Children also continued to be criminalized. It was urgent to establish a mechanism to investigate torture and ill-treatment and to ensure that those that denounced torture were not victims of reprisals.

522. Amnesty International welcomed the State's acceptance of a range of recommendations, and its rejection of a recommendation on protecting a very narrow concept of "family", which would have been incompatible with both national law and international human rights standards. It reiterated its call upon Uruguay to overcome the obstacles to ensuring justice, truth and reparation for the victims of past crimes, urged it to address overcrowding and poor conditions of detention in prisons, while taking specific measures to support women prisoners, and to ensure that the national preventive mechanism established in accordance with the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture had the necessary autonomy, funds and resources to carry out its mandate. It was concerned about the lack of a just outcome to the investigation conducted into recent killings of transsexual women in Uruguay.

523. Action Canada for Population and Development welcomed the State's acceptance of the recommendations aimed at ensuring the prevention of, investigation into and accountability for homophobia and transphobia, and remedies for victims. It reiterated the recommendation that Uruguay incorporate a sexual orientation and gender identity perspective into police procedures and investigation. Widespread transphobia and unresolved murders against transgender persons should be addressed and anti-discrimination commissions should be authorized to impose penalties on perpetrators or call for conciliation with victims.

524. Franciscans International welcomed the renewed commitments by Uruguay in the areas of trafficking of persons, abuse and exploitation of children and adolescents and poverty among children. It was pleased that Uruguay had accepted specific recommendations on the rights of persons with disabilities. It highlighted the State's acceptance of a recommendation on the development of a sustainable mining strategy.

#### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

525. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, according to the information provided, of 188 recommendations received, 187 recommendations enjoyed the support of Uruguay. The remaining recommendation had been noted.

526. Uruguay thanked the delegations and organizations that had taken the floor for their comments and recommendations.

527. Uruguay had taken note of additional comments made, in particular by civil society organizations, with reference to some issues already addressed by Uruguay during its opening remarks, such as the human rights of children in conflict with the law and decisions relating to the actions of the Adolescent Criminal Responsibility System. Uruguay was committed to addressing the concerns of victims as a priority. With regard to the prison system, Uruguay had made a commitment to eliminate overcrowding in prisons and had a very detailed workplan to achieve that end.

528. Uruguay would submit written additional information to the Committee against Torture in May 2015, and would be appearing before the Committee on the Rights of the Child in 2015. Uruguay would thus have the opportunity to report on progress made in the implementation of the recommendations.

529. To conclude, Uruguay reiterated its commitment to the universal periodic review process, an exercise that had, and would continue to, allow the State to assess its own actions to protect human rights.

## Yemen

530. The review of Yemen, held on 29 January 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Yemen in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/YEM/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/YEM/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/YEM/3).

531. At its 24th meeting, on 19 June 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Yemen (see sect. C below).

532. The outcome of the review of Yemen comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/26/8), the views of the State concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group.

### 1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome

533. The head of the delegation of Yemen thanked the Working Group and commended the member States for their contribution to the adoption of the outcome of its review. Yemen looked forward to a constructive and substantive dialogue to improve its cooperation with the Human Rights Council.

534. The delegation welcomed the valuable recommendations made by the delegates during the review of its report. Yemen appreciated the direct and indirect support provided by the international community for its efforts to promote and protect human rights.

535. Yemen recalled its accomplishments during the transitional period in the field of human rights, in accordance with its international obligations, despite the implementation challenges facing the country. The delegation assured the Human Rights Council that the Government, in cooperation with civil society organizations and the international community, placed the highest priority on the implementation of and follow-up to all recommendations made by relevant human rights bodies, particularly by the States sponsoring a political settlement in Yemen.

536. A draft law establishing an independent commission for human rights in conformity with the Paris Principles was currently being considered for adoption by the House of Representatives. The Government had submitted a proposal to parliament on the minimum age of marriage. The House of Representatives was currently discussing draft legislation on trafficking in persons, forced disappearances and the State's accession to the Convention against Torture and the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.

537. The delegation emphasized the importance of the road map laid out by the All-Inclusive National Dialogue Conference. Despite the challenges, the conference had been successful in incorporating human rights and freedoms into its outcome document.

538. The new Constitution of Yemen was based on good governance, the rule of law, the promotion of democracy and the promotion and protection of human rights. It was a political and social contract that would be based on the principles of partnership, sharing of power and wealth and equality.

539. The new Constitution provided for the advancement and empowerment of women in public and political life. New laws, policies, public programmes and plans also contributed to that goal. It also provided for the protection of all civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights for all social groups.

540. The Government, in collaboration with civil society, had drafted two strategies: a national strategy for human rights, and an anti-trafficking strategy. A national observatory to monitor violations of the rights of the child was being established. Transparency and the fight against corruption were also among the priorities set by the Government.

541. The candidates for the independent commission of inquiry on the events of 2011 would soon be nominated and announced, and the transitional justice law would be enacted. Even before that, committees had been set up to address land issues and the arbitrary dismissals in the south in the aftermath of the 1994 war, as well as the apologies issued to the people of the south and Saada for the violations committed in those areas, all of which were indeed part of transitional justice measures. Funds had been allocated to compensate the families of the martyrs and the wounded. Military and security reforms were under way. The draft law on transitional justice would be considered by the Government in line with the results of the national dialogue. Remedy and reconciliation committees would be set up.

542. Yemen had received 191 recommendations during the review; it had immediately accepted 166 of them, and had decided to examine the remaining 25 recommendations and to provide its responses to the Human Rights Council at the current session. Various challenges, however, had hindered the completion of the examination process.

543. The delegation listed its priorities and the challenges and obstacles requiring the Government's attention, namely, the implementation of the outcomes of the All-Inclusive National Dialogue Conference, aimed at establishing a new federal State with a new constitution and a new election law, the establishment of local governments and the adoption of a package of measures regulating the mandate and responsibilities of those governments; maintaining security and stability in the country and combating terrorism by reducing tensions, and combating armed groups that have sabotaged power grids and gas and oil pipelines; supplying fuel, electricity and education, health and social-care services to the population; and meeting the emergency humanitarian needs of internally displaced people, refugees and illegal immigrants.

544. As a result of those challenges, the Government could not hold the necessary consultations with all stakeholders to address the recommendations. The delegation was aware that some of the recommendations could have been accepted, and that others would have to be examined in the light of the State's legal, religious and social obligations and its available resources. By the time of its next review, the State would have addressed those recommendations either partially or totally, and would report on the progress made in its national report.

545. In the meantime, Yemen had noted the 25 recommendations, and would consider them positively with the aim of furthering human rights.

546. The delegation thanked all stakeholders for their positive contribution and expressed appreciation for the support of friendly and brotherly countries, international organizations and OHCHR in the difficult conditions that Yemen was enduring.

## **2. Views expressed by member and observer States of the Council on the review outcome**

547. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Yemen, 13 delegations made statements.<sup>17</sup>

548. Saudi Arabia had listened attentively to the viewpoint of Yemen, which reflected a spirit of cooperation with the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council. It noted with satisfaction the achievements of Yemen in improving and strengthening the human rights situation in the country, in spite of the difficult security situation in its war on terrorism, and its efforts to establish security and stability to ensure the safety of its people. Saudi Arabia fully understood the circumstances that prevented Yemen from examining the rest of the recommendations, which confirmed that Yemen was committed to the protection of human rights and to the relevant international conventions to which it had acceded, despite its

<sup>17</sup> The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted, if available, on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, at <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/26thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

difficult circumstances. Saudi Arabia urged Yemen continue to make every effort to promote and protect human rights at all levels.

549. Senegal welcomed the constructive cooperation and dialogue of Yemen during its review. It took note of the additional information provided by Yemen. It noted with satisfaction the determination of the Yemeni authorities to pursue initiatives and positive action to promote human rights and to ensure their full enjoyment, as provided for in the recommendations that had been accepted. Senegal encouraged Yemen to pursue its action to improve living conditions and living standards for persons with disabilities, women and children. It wished Yemen every success in implementing the recommendations.

550. The State of Palestine welcomed the clarifications on the latest developments in the situation in Yemen since its second national report and on the recommendations provided in the report of the Working Group, which reflected a spirit of cooperation with Human Rights Council mechanisms. It commended the Government for its efforts to protect and promote human rights through the support and development of the national human rights system at the institutional and legislative levels, in spite of the difficulties the State faced. It noted the consultations with all stakeholders in examining the recommendations, and thanked Yemen for accepting the recommendations it had made.

551. The Sudan commended Yemen for having accepted immediately some 90 per cent of the large number of recommendations it had received. It appreciated the acceptance of its two recommendations, on reconciliation and strengthening efforts to combat poverty and unemployment in cooperation with regional and international organizations. The Sudan understood the State's reservations on some recommendations, as Yemen had the right to choose its own legal system and to preserve the security and stability of its society, and to apply the death penalty for serious crimes that adversely affected the security and stability of society. The Sudan wished Yemen successful progress in implementing the accepted recommendations.

552. UNICEF acknowledged the progress made by Yemen in fulfilling the rights of children, and specifically applauded the outcome document of the All-Inclusive National Dialogue Conference. It welcomed the recent signing by the State of an action plan with the United Nations to end and prevent the recruitment of children by the Yemeni armed forces. UNICEF stood ready to support the Yemeni authorities, and called upon the international community to do likewise. UNICEF urged the State to ensure that its new Constitution reflected the guarantee of child rights in education, health and child protection. It called upon Yemen to ensure health and nutrition services for every child and mother.

553. The United Arab Emirates commended Yemen for its willingness to implement the recommendations it had accepted. It noted the positive measures taken by the State to promote the human rights framework at the national level, especially with regard to economic, social and cultural rights aiming to achieve sustainable development and social justice. The United Arab Emirates expected Yemen to strengthen its reform efforts to achieve national security and stability. It encouraged Yemen to continue the implementation of the procedures and measures it had adopted, with the cooperation of OHCHR.

554. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland welcomed the draft legislation on safer motherhood and the rights of the child; the signing by the State of a United-Nations-sponsored action plan to end the recruitment of children in armed conflict; and its endorsement of the statement of action issued after the Global Summit to End Sexual Violence in Conflict, held in London in June 2014. It remained concerned about the execution of juvenile offenders, and urged Yemen to determine accurately the ages of all defendants. It also urged the Government to abolish the death penalty and to look into claims of torture of migrants. The recommendations made at the All-Inclusive National Dialogue Conference should be enshrined in the new Constitution and duly enforced.

555. The United States of America welcomed the State's acceptance of the recommendations on strengthening women's and girls' rights and the abolition of early marriage. It was encouraged by the commitment of Yemen to the eradication of harmful traditional practices, including female genital mutilation. It was pleased that the State had accepted its recommendation to strengthen the rule of law through political transition by, inter alia, ensuring greater effectiveness and transparency in the judicial system. It noted the

State's acceptance of recommendations calling for an end to the use of children in the armed forces, and the recent positive steps taken towards eliminating the use of child soldiers. It looked forward to assisting Yemen in implementing those recommendations.

556. Egypt commended the State for its positive cooperation with the human rights mechanisms, especially the universal periodic review, as shown by its acceptance of the majority of the recommendations made. Egypt welcomed the efforts Yemen had made to improve the national institutional framework for human rights and to promote the rights of women, children and persons with disabilities, taking into consideration the challenges facing Yemen, such as terrorism, economic capacity and limited financial resources. Egypt encouraged Yemen to continue in its positive approach towards human rights issues through consultation with civil society, especially while implementing the review recommendations.

557. Algeria commended Yemen for its positive interaction with the universal periodic review process through its acceptance of 166 recommendations. Algeria noted with appreciation the acceptance of the two recommendations made by Algeria on continuing efforts to achieve national reconciliation and restoring security to promote human rights, and on strengthening the status of women in society by increasing their representation in parliament.

558. Bahrain noted the views of Yemen on the recommendations and observations made in the report, which reflected its interest in cooperating with the United Nations human rights mechanism, especially by accepting various recommendations, including those made by Bahrain. Yemen had always fulfilled its obligations within the United Nations human rights mechanisms and would continue its international consultations and positive cooperation on human rights issues.

559. China hoped that Yemen would step up efforts to reduce poverty and provide people with basic social security. Yemen had accelerated its political transition, strengthened the legal system in the field of human rights, safeguarded the rights of women and children and vulnerable groups and increased employment opportunities for young people: China welcomed those human rights achievements. It hoped that the international community would help Yemen to promote its economic and social development, to make tangible improvements in the security situation and to create conditions conducive to the enjoyment of human rights by the people.

560. Cuba recognized the commitment of Yemen to the promotion and protection of human rights. It noted with satisfaction the reforms of the judicial system, which aimed to achieve stability in political, economy and security matters, strengthen the rule of law and combat corruption. It welcomed the State's acceptance of the recommendations made by Cuba on strengthening the democratic system, and called upon Yemen to continue its efforts to guarantee economic, social and cultural rights, in particular in the areas of health and education.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

561. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Yemen, nine other stakeholders made statements.

562. Human Rights Watch drew attention to the lack of effective accountability processes to address past human rights violations and the numerous attacks on journalists, particularly those who tried to expose corruption. It also highlighted the use of landmines in 2011, in violation of the State's obligations. It welcomed the State's acceptance of the recommendations on ratifying the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and establishing a commission of inquiry to examine the violations committed during 2011, but was concerned that the members of the investigation committee had not yet been appointed; it therefore urged the State to do so. Human Rights Watch called upon the parliament of Yemen to pass as a matter of urgency a transitional justice law meeting international standards, and to enact the draft bill establishing a national human rights institution in conformity with the Paris Principles. It also hoped that the law on the minimum age of marriage and the personal status law would be amended promptly, and called upon the Cabinet to pass the child rights bill.

563. Amnesty International urged Yemen to implement the recommendations that it had accepted immediately, particularly those on ratifying the Rome Statute, the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture. Despite the challenges faced by Yemen, Amnesty International was concerned about the ongoing violations and abuses targeting civilians in the armed conflict. It was likewise concerned about the State's failure to uphold justice and to hold perpetrators accountable, a state of affairs which might encourage impunity, particularly given the failure to investigate the massacre of dozens of peaceful mourners on 27 December 2013, allegedly by the 33rd armoured brigade of the Yemeni army. It called for all law enforcement officials to receive human rights training. Amnesty International urged the repeal of the immunity law of 2012 and called for the establishment of an independent commission of inquiry into the human rights violations of 2011 and the enactment of a transitional justice law. It recalled the holding of unfair trials that had led to death sentences, including for alleged juvenile offenders, and regretted the State's reluctance to declare a moratorium with a view to abolishing the death penalty.

564. Save the Children International welcomed the State's acceptance of the recommendation on setting the minimum age for marriage at 18 years, in accordance with the provisions of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the outcomes of the All-Inclusive National Dialogue Conference. It called for urgent implementation of the recommendation, given that early marriage continued to be a cause of both infant and maternal mortality. It described the impact of early marriage on health and education, and called for measures to prevent early marriage and ensure full compliance with the law. It welcomed the action taken to ban corporal punishment, and the State's acceptance of recommendations on protecting vulnerable groups of children, women and persons with disabilities in the constitutional review.

565. The Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies expressed the fear that the historical opportunity provided by the human rights outcomes of the All-Inclusive National Dialogue Conference to bring peaceful change might be lost. It suggested incorporating accepted recommendations into a clear, time-bound plan as part of the 2014 national human rights strategy. It urged Yemen to establish an independent commission to investigate the violations committed in 2011, and called for justice for victims by means of international investigations if the Government failed to hold to account those who had killed thousands of peaceful demonstrators. An independent national human rights institution should be established, in compliance with the Paris Principles; attacks on journalists and the media should be brought to an end; related laws consistent with international standards should be adopted; and the practice of suppressing freedom of expression and peaceful assemblies and carrying out politically motivated arrests should cease. It also called for an end to the conflict in Saada.

566. United Nations Watch expressed concern about the situation of human rights in Yemen, particularly that of children's rights, given the lack of constitutional protection and the absence of legislation on the minimum age of marriage. Child marriage had been identified as a major factor in malnutrition, domestic violence and female illiteracy, thereby contributing to gender inequality. Girls of 8 and 9 years of age were forced by their parents to marry men many years their senior, leading some brides to commit suicide. A large number of executions had been carried out without any fair trial. Many minors whose ages could not be reliably determined were unlawfully sentenced to death, some having been arrested when they were as young as 13 years of age. That practice continued despite assurances that it had been abolished under the Penal Code.

567. CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation commended Yemen for not rejecting any recommendations. It hoped that that positive attitude would be reflected in national implementation of the recommendations. It recommended that Yemen combat poverty and unemployment, and give priority to economic and social rights in its budget, and review existing economic policies to avoid dependence on oil revenues and allocate more resources to social and economic development. It also suggested that the implementation of national policies should be guaranteed in all respects, including legislation, health and education, giving priority to the fight against illiteracy among girls and aligning the provisions relating to early marriage with the recommendations enshrined in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. It called for the creation

of a suitable work environment for civil society, and for an end to impunity and attacks against journalists and writers.

568. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues welcomed the State's acceptance of recommendations pertaining to the creation of a proper framework for reconciliation and transitional justice, and encouraged it to amend the draft law to guarantee the rights of victims to justice and effective remedies. It was concerned that the members of the independent commission to investigate allegations into human rights violations perpetrated in 2011 had still not been appointed. It hoped that the law on the minimum age for marriage would not be challenged by religious or political groups. It was concerned by the fact that Yemen had not yet ratified the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, and was also concerned by the continued violations committed against journalists and human rights defenders and the restrictions imposed on the work of civil society, and called upon the authorities to put an end to such practices and to investigate those acts.

569. The Organization for Defending Victims of Violence stated that the Houthi minority had been persecuted and victimized by discrimination in all aspects of life and had been excluded from political and economic activities on the pretext of the war on terror by consecutive Governments in Sana'a and their allies over a number of years, particularly over the previous decade. Although all of Yemen had suffered strife and tremendous hardship, the Houthis had to bear the burden of that destruction. It called upon the international community and the Human Rights Council to consider the situation of the Houthis, who were powerless, friendless and helpless. It called upon the State to adhere to its international obligations during the ongoing process of settlement for a peaceful and prosperous Yemen for all Yemenis.

570. Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik welcomed the fact that Yemen had not rejected any recommendation, but regretted that it had postponed taking a position on some recommendations. The military and security budget of Yemen was 3,500 times higher than that for human rights, while the illiteracy rate among women was 70.2 per cent and inequality and discrimination against women were commonplace. It was concerned about sectarian conflicts; in June 2014 alone, there had been 120 casualties in conflicts between the Houthis and troops and members of the Yemeni Islah Party. It urged the Government to continue the process of national reconciliation, to declare a moratorium on the death penalty, to ratify the Rome Statute and the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, and to increase budget allocations to education and health care.

#### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

571. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, according to the information provided, of 191 recommendations received, 166 enjoyed the support of Yemen and the rest had been noted.

572. The delegation of Yemen was grateful for the constructive criticism and advice expressed throughout the universal periodic review process. Although the State was facing a difficult situation, it would take all the comments made into consideration. Yemen was committed to cooperating with all parties, although it faced serious challenges in the implementation of some of the recommendations. The Government would continue to implement recommendations and to further improve the human rights situation in the country.

573. Yemen thanked the Chair of the session, member States, the troika and the secretariat of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review for their efforts.

#### **Vanuatu**

574. The review of Vanuatu, held on 30 January 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Vanuatu in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/VUT/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/VUT/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/VUT/3).

575. At its 25th meeting, on 20 June 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Vanuatu (see sect. C below).

576. The outcome of the review of Vanuatu comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/26/9), the views of the State concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/26/9/Add.1).

#### **1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome**

577. The delegation of Vanuatu presented additional information on its review to the Human Rights Council.

578. The delegation thanked the staff of OHCHR, the Commonwealth Small States Office in Geneva, the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat and the Regional Resource Team of the Pacific Community, which had provided assistance during its second review. It also thanked all the States that had participated in its review and the members of the troika, Algeria, Brazil and Maldives, for its assistance in compiling the recommendations.

579. In the International Year of Small Island Developing States, Vanuatu wished to highlight the importance of participation in international forums, including the Geneva-based human rights mechanisms. It was therefore thankful for the support it had received from the Voluntary Technical Assistance Trust Fund to Support the Participation of Least Developed Countries and Small Island Developing Countries in the Work of the Human Rights Council, which had enabled it to participate in both the review and the current adoption process.

580. Although the universal periodic review process was new and the Government in only its second cycle of reporting, with the assistance of non-governmental organizations it had taken the opportunity provided by the new mechanism to strengthen its commitment to supporting, protecting and promoting the human rights of its citizens.

581. When Vanuatu had received the recommendations, it had indicated that it would require further internal consultations before giving its positions on them. Consultations with appropriate stakeholders had since been held, as had a careful evaluation of each of the 109 recommendations received.

582. A four-year implementation plan to address the accepted recommendations had been completed in order to address the recommendations appropriately. Moreover, to facilitate the work in addressing the recommendations received, they had been classified into thematic areas.

583. Vanuatu was pleased to report that it had accepted 95 out of the 109 recommendations received, although it had not been able to support 14 of them.

584. The recommendations that the State had accepted included those on the thematic areas of ratification and implementation of international human rights treaties, national human rights mechanisms, prevention programmes in human rights, gender equality, strengthening of the judicial system and law reform, children, the right to information, water and sanitation, health, education, persons with disabilities and the death penalty.

585. The recommendations that had not been supported included those relating to the ratification of international human rights treaties and to education.

586. With regard to the recommendation on acceding to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, Vanuatu was not able to sign the treaty at present, given that it felt that the crimes of genocide and aggression were not currently a serious threat in Vanuatu.

587. While Vanuatu supported the spirit of the recommendations on acceding to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure and the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture, it was not ready to commit itself fully to the optional protocols, since the State's lack of resources and capacity still posed a problem for its full compliance with its current reporting obligations under the human rights conventions that it had already ratified.

588. Vanuatu had not been able to support the recommendations in the thematic area of education, which included references to compulsory education policy and legal measures. Although Vanuatu fully supported the spirit of those recommendations, the term "compulsory" was not included in the current education act. The State would, however, try to ensure proper awareness of the importance of children receiving an education, and to ensure that consultations were carried out thereon at all levels.

589. The newly elected Prime Minister had been quoted on 11 June 2014 as stating that the new Government placed a high priority on education for all the children of Vanuatu. In that context, the years ahead might be promising for the realization of the recommendations and for Vanuatu to be able to address compulsory education in its legislation.

590. On 6 June 2014, as part of its commitment to the promotion of human rights, the newly elected Prime Minister had signed an order for the establishment of the national human rights committee.

591. The functions of the above-mentioned committee would include (a) advising the Government on international human rights treaties; (b) advising the Government on whether Vanuatu should become a State party to an international human rights treaty; and (c) implementing and ensuring that the Government complied with international human rights treaties that Vanuatu had ratified in order to ensure that its human rights laws and policies complied with its international human rights obligations, such as reporting obligations.

592. In addition, the Prime Minister's office, through the Ministry of Justice, was seeking assistance in the establishment of the national human rights commission and was in the process of appointing a coordinator for human rights. The position was to be placed within the Ministry of Justice to assist the national human rights commission in overseeing the implementation of universal periodic review recommendations and the recommendations made by the treaty bodies.

593. In May 2014, the Council of Ministers had approved the State's second and third periodic reports to the Committee on the Rights of the Child, its initial report to the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the fourth and fifth periodic reports to the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women and the recommendations made during the second cycle of the universal periodic review.

594. With regard to the outstanding reports under the Convention against Torture and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Vanuatu intended to complete those reports the following year and that, to that end, it would hold stakeholder consultations in 2014.

595. Vanuatu reported on the implementation plan for its universal periodic review recommendations that had been approved by the Council of Ministers. The recommendations had been divided into priority areas according to thematic areas, the stakeholders responsible had been identified, and each recommendation had been given a time frame. Responsibilities for monitoring progress had also been allocated.

596. A number of recommendations would require national consultations; for example, Vanuatu had accepted the recommendation that it should ratify the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; in order to do so, two national consultations were required. Those were to be conducted with stakeholders and the wider community on the reasons it was important for Vanuatu to ratify the Covenant, and on the associated obligations, benefits and constraints. Vanuatu might decide to seek support for technical and financial assistance in conducting the consultations.

597. Vanuatu hoped that, with a universal periodic review implementation plan approved and in place, it would be able, in four years' time, to take proper stock of data and of what had been accomplished, and effectively report to the Human Rights Council for its third review, and also consider issues that it had not been able to present during the current session.

## 2. Views expressed by member and observer States of the Council on the review outcome

598. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Vanuatu, seven delegations made statements.

599. UNICEF welcomed the steps taken by Vanuatu to meet its obligations under the human rights treaties to which it was party, in particular the treaties relating to the human rights of children, since its report submitted in 2013. It was pleased to learn that the Vanuatu Council of Ministers had endorsed the periodic reports to be submitted to the Committee on the Rights of the Child and the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, and its initial report to be submitted to the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. It congratulated Vanuatu on setting a rapid pace in the Pacific region in the advancement of human rights. It was, however, concerned about the process towards the development of a comprehensive children's law, and encouraged the State to continue the process of incorporating the provisions of the Convention on the Rights of the Child into national legislation. It noted various options that could be considered, such as developing a comprehensive, "stand-alone" children's law, or ensuring that children's rights were systematically incorporated into existing national legislation. It reiterated its support for the Government in addressing gaps and challenges.

600. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela noted that Vanuatu had made great efforts during its review, providing full and open cooperation. It welcomed the replies provided, in particular those regarding action taken by the Department of Women's Affairs intended to guarantee gender equality, such as formulating the "women in government" policy (2011–2015). Vanuatu had successfully completed its second review, thereby demonstrating the work it was carrying out in human rights, in particular for vulnerable groups. It recognized the efforts made by Vanuatu to implement its commitments in the field of human rights, despite the serious limitations faced by the country, in particular the challenge of climate change. It recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group.

601. Viet Nam thanked Vanuatu for updating the Human Rights Council on the human rights situation and its efforts to enhance the enjoyment of human rights for its people. It was encouraged that, despite its difficulties, challenges and limited resources, Vanuatu had made a serious commitment to the universal periodic review and made an effort to implement the recommendations it had accepted, including two made by Viet Nam. It commended Vanuatu for its efforts to strengthen good governance, legislation reform, capacity-building for national human rights mechanisms and its responses to climate change. The Council should therefore adopt the report of the Working Group.

602. Algeria thanked Vanuatu for the additional information presented regarding its second review. It welcomed the fact that Vanuatu had accepted 95 of 109 recommendations received, including those made by Algeria, namely on continuing its efforts to eliminate discriminatory practices against women, particularly regarding the granting of nationality, and on improving the situation of disabled persons and their working conditions.

603. China noted that the delegation of Vanuatu had overcome difficulties in order to participate actively and constructively in the universal periodic review process. It appreciated the State's acceptance of many recommendations, and thanked it for having accepted those made by China, on maintaining its commitment to economic and social development, reducing the development gap between rural and urban areas and protecting people's right to health and the right to development. It hoped that Vanuatu would continue through its laws and action to eliminate discrimination and strengthen its protection of the rights of vulnerable groups, including those of women, children and disabled persons. As a developing country, Vanuatu faced many challenges in its social and economic development and in promoting and protecting human rights; China therefore hoped that the international community would

provide constructive assistance. It recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group.

604. Cuba thanked Vanuatu for the information provided, and welcomed the progress it had made in protecting human rights. It commended Vanuatu for the importance it placed on the universal periodic review mechanism, which was reflected in the efforts it had made to implement the recommendations accepted at its first review. The presentation by Vanuatu during the session of the Working Group had demonstrated its political will to address human rights challenges and the range of plans formulated in a number of fields, such as education, health, women's rights, the rights of persons with disabilities, and access to water. Cuba was pleased that the State had accepted its recommendation on continuing measures to improve the health and education systems in the country. It recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group.

605. New Zealand welcomed the transparent manner in which Vanuatu had explained its position on all the recommendations. It also welcomed the State's commitment to fundamental issues, such as the rights of women and persons with disabilities, through the many recommendations it had accepted. Since the State's review in January 2014, progress could already be seen, in particular the recent establishment of the national human rights committee. It was also interested to hear that Vanuatu had developed a four-year implementation plan. It encouraged the Government to continue its consultative process with civil society and new bodies, such as the national human rights committee, in the implementation of all recommendations. It also appreciated the ongoing dialogue between Vanuatu, OHCHR and the Commonwealth Small States Office in Geneva since the review, and encouraged Vanuatu to continue to work with those bodies and other regional organizations and to draw on their expertise and support. As one of the closest neighbours of Vanuatu, New Zealand welcomed the opportunity to continue discussions with Vanuatu on those important issues. It encouraged Vanuatu to continue its commitment to improving the human rights situation in the implementation phase of the second cycle.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

606. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Vanuatu, two other stakeholders made statements.

607. United Nations Watch stated that Vanuatu resembled a paradise on earth, with its magnificent beaches and the enormous cultural wealth that it had been able to preserve. It acknowledged the State's commitment to strengthening prevention of violence against women. It drew attention to a study carried out by the Vanuatu Women's Centre, according to which 60 per cent of women had suffered from physical or sexual violence committed by their spouse or partner at some point in their lives. The study had also shown that one woman in four had suffered physical violence from persons other than her partner, and that one in three women was a victim of sexual aggression before the age of 15 years and a victim of sexual violence after the age of 15 years. United Nations Watch therefore appreciated the fact that Vanuatu had pledged during its review to working on that issue. It seemed that the country was currently taking the measures necessary to strengthen its institutions, including its judiciary, and to combat gender-based violence, in the context of efforts made at the national level to put an end to all violence. If those improvements were effective and greater respect and equality were given to women and fundamental human rights were respected, then it would be possible to say that Vanuatu had truly become a paradise on earth.

608. In a joint statement with Edmund Rice International and EarthJustice, Franciscans International expressed its appreciation for the State's commitment to addressing the adverse impact of climate change on the full enjoyment of human rights. It commended the efforts made by Vanuatu to implement the recommendations made at its previous review by reducing its greenhouse emissions and establishing a ministry of climate change adaptation. It also welcomed the State's acceptance of the recommendation that Vanuatu should work with the international community to address the problem of the disproportionately negative impact of climate change, especially on women and children, through international cooperation and solidarity. It endorsed the view that climate change posed an immediate and far-reaching threat to peoples and communities around the world, noting that the least developed countries and small island States that had contributed the least to global

greenhouse emissions would be those most affected by global warming, as was the case with Vanuatu. It recommended that the States members of the Human Rights Council take concrete action on climate change by establishing a special procedure on climate change and human rights that would be able to take into consideration the principle of common but differentiated responsibility. It also encouraged Vanuatu, through its National Advisory Board on Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction, to continue to involve different communities in the discussion on mitigation policy by providing a platform for community-level involvement, especially for those who were the most vulnerable to the adverse impact of climate change, in particular women.

#### 4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

609. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, according to the information provided, of 109 recommendations received, 95 enjoyed the support of Vanuatu and 14 had been noted.

610. Vanuatu stated that the protection of the environment for upholding human rights for its citizens would continue to be a challenge as it strove to protect, promote and strengthen democratic institutions to end impunity, violence and discrimination against women and children. The universal periodic review process was still both an educative and a learning process for the Government and its citizens. In accordance with the State's commitment to the promotion of human rights in the country, Vanuatu would positively consider the comments it had received, and they would be reflected in the State's implementation plan.

611. Due consideration was being given by the Human Rights Council to the issue of the contribution of parliaments to its work and its universal periodic review mechanism. Members of parliament were key decision makers in any country, and it was therefore important that they be informed and engaged in the universal periodic review process. Vanuatu was glad to report that, in response to the recommendation received to that effect, it had started to promote that process in Vanuatu.

612. The delegation thanked the member States and other stakeholders that had made comments in response to the second review of Vanuatu.

#### The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

613. The review of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, held on 30 January 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/MKD/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/MKD/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/MKD/3).

614. At its 25th meeting, on 20 June 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (see sect. C below).

615. The outcome of the review of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/26/10), the views of the State concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/26/10/Add.1).

**1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome**

616. The delegation reaffirmed the State's strong commitment to the universal periodic review, which provided an opportunity for self-evaluation that would continue even after the end of the interactive dialogue.

617. In the preceding months, consultations had been undertaken on the recommendations received, and the universal periodic review outcome had also been discussed at the meeting of the intersectoral body for human rights chaired by the Minister of Foreign Affairs. The consultations had shown that most of the recommendations enjoyed full support; a few were accepted in part and just two of them did not enjoy the State's support. Many recommendations reflected established national priorities and undertakings, so most of the recommendations accepted were being implemented, some had already been implemented and only a few were yet to be implemented.

618. With reference to the recommendations on international instruments, that ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance was in preparation, but more time was required for analysis and to harmonize national legislation with its provisions. The Criminal Code had already been harmonized to allow for ratification of the Kampala Amendments to the Rome Statute, and the law on its ratification was expected to be adopted by the end of the year.

619. The recommendations relating to the ombudsman focused on the institution's future accreditation with A status. To that end, a draft law amending the law on the ombudsman, taking into account the recommendations provided by the International Coordinating Committee for National Human Rights Institutions, was expected to be adopted by the end of 2014.

620. Implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement and fostering of good inter-ethnic relations were key government priorities, and much had been achieved in that regard. A comprehensive report on the status of implementation of all policies deriving from the Agreement had been published in 2012. The relevant recommendation (101.8) had been accepted in part, since it included a deadline for action.

621. Many of the recommendations concerning the rights of the Roma were already being implemented in accordance with the strategy for Roma and the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005–2015. The establishment of a national observatory against racism (part of recommendation 101.34) was unnecessary, bearing in mind the existing independent national human rights institutions.

622. On several occasions, the Government had publicly condemned all kinds of hate speech, regardless of the individuals who expressed it or the individuals and groups targeted, and had emphasized the legal consequences of such acts.

623. The law on the prevention of and protection against discrimination had been adopted in 2010. It explicitly prohibited direct or indirect discrimination and contained an open-ended list of prohibited grounds for discrimination, thus making recommendations 101.42 and 101.43 unnecessary. The Commission for Protection against Discrimination had acted upon and confirmed complaints on the grounds of sexual orientation.

624. Recommendations 101.44, 101.45 and 101.46 had been accepted in part and were being implemented through measures to end impunity for violence and intimidation of the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender community and to prevent incidents of violence on the grounds of sexual orientation. The Ministry of Interior was identifying and bringing to justice the perpetrators of incidents relating to lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender activists.

625. All the recommendations concerning gender equality had been supported, and most of them were already being implemented through activities based on the law for equal opportunities, the law for prevention and protection against discrimination, the 2013–2020 strategy, the 2013–2016 national action plan on gender equality and the 2012–2015 strategy on gender-responsive budgeting. In addition, a new law on prevention of and protection against domestic violence was being drafted.

626. The Government was fully committed to reforming the penitentiary system, and the delegation highlighted a few of the many measures being taken. The construction of a new prison had already been finished, and the remaining facilities were to be completed by the end of 2018. A national strategy on the development of the penitentiary system was expected to be adopted by October 2014; the goals included the establishment of more effective mechanisms for tackling inappropriate treatment of detainees and violence between prisoners. Training was being conducted for prison management staff and for trainers. Amendments to the law on the execution of sanctions adopted in March 2014 included stricter requirements for the recruitment of managerial staff and the transfer of health care to public health institutions. In addition, a draft law on probation would reduce the prison population by between 10 per cent and 20 per cent following its implementation.

627. The delegation highlighted the State's strong commitment to reform of the justice system. The separation of powers was enshrined in the Constitution. As an independent body, the Judicial Council provided full independence for the judiciary, prevented political influence and assessed judges' work.

628. Legal remedies were available for the review of indictments and sentences. Access to the European Court of Human Rights was guaranteed, and criminal cases could be reopened on the basis of the final judgments of that court. Since January 2013, all newly appointed first-instance judges had to undergo initial training by the Academy for Judges and Prosecutors. The Academy also provided ongoing training. The system for evaluation of judges was fully established, and the backlog of cases had been reduced.

629. Detention could be ordered only in accordance with the legally prescribed conditions, which included consideration of the gravity of the crime, the possible sentence, the necessity of detention and comprehensive explanations for the decisions made. A new law on criminal procedures had been in force since December 2013, and the expectations arising from its implementation were high.

630. All recommendations relating to freedom of the media and freedom of expression, issues of the utmost importance for the Government, had been accepted. Most of them were already being implemented and some had been implemented. Wide-ranging consultations had been held on the media law and the law on audio and audiovisual media services. International expertise had been provided, and the laws had been adopted in December 2013. Further dialogue had resulted in a number of amendments being adopted in January 2014.

631. The main purpose of the media law was to guarantee freedom of expression. The amendments made it clear that the aim was not to regulate published content, and electronic publications were excluded. The law on audio and audiovisual media services aimed to ensure the development of those services, including independent production, cultural diversity and dialogue between citizens to enhance mutual understanding and tolerance; to protect users, especially minors; to guarantee an independent and accountable public broadcaster; and to provide a regulatory body. Government spending on advertising was to be undertaken in a non-discriminatory, objective and transparent manner. Further details of the amendments had been provided. The Government was committed to an ongoing dialogue with media representatives in order to address outstanding issues, and several recent meetings and their topics were mentioned. Other activities included the publication in the Macedonian language of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights on freedom of expression, and training for judges on defamation issues.

632. The delegation referred those interested to the national report and the country's statements for further information on the remaining recommendations.

## **2. Views expressed by member and observer States of the Council on the review outcome**

633. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, six delegations made statements.

634. Algeria thanked the delegation for the additional information provided, and appreciated the legislative and normative measures that had been taken. They were reflected in the establishment of the commission for protection against discrimination, the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, cooperation with the special

procedures of the Human Rights Council and the submission of reports to the treaty bodies. Algeria had made two recommendations on strengthening policies in favour of the Roma. In calling for the adoption of the report, it appreciated the commitment to human rights of the State under review and wished it success in its implementation of the recommendations it had accepted.

635. Côte d'Ivoire thanked the delegation and noted with satisfaction the continued commitment to human rights of the State under review, as evidenced by the endorsement of the recommendations made during the review. It reiterated its appreciation for the State's ongoing cooperation with the human rights mechanisms of the United Nations, its efforts to strengthen the judicial and penitentiary system and the efforts of the Commission for Protection against Discrimination. While encouraging the State and the numerous efforts it had made to implement the recommendations, it recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group.

636. Morocco thanked the delegation for the additional information provided, and commended the Government for its acceptance of almost all the recommendations made and, in particular, the two recommendations made by Morocco, concerning the strengthening of the national human rights institution and of the judicial system. The information that the delegation had provided and the actions taken by the State since its review were irrefutable proof of its commitment to human rights. Morocco noted the creation of multiple national strategies in the area of women's rights and the prevention of domestic violence, including the gender-sensitive budgeting policy, and was pleased that reform of the justice system was one of the State's priorities.

637. Romania thanked the delegation for its participation and the update of its report. It welcomed the open and transparent manner in which consultations had been conducted during the drafting of the national report. The State's acceptance of most recommendations and the information provided by it on the status of their implementation showed that the State under review was committed to human rights. Romania believed that cooperation with the Human Rights Council and the special procedures would continue in the future. It thanked the delegation and wished the State success in the third cycle of the universal periodic review.

638. UNICEF welcomed the endorsement in 2013 of the law on child protection, which had provided for greater availability of early childhood development services, and recommended paying specific attention to those services in the case of Roma children. In accordance with the recommendations made, it called for further protection of the rights of children with disabilities. It welcomed the entry into force of the law on justice for children, and called for further promotion of cross-sectoral collaboration for the protection of child victims and witnesses. It recommended giving the national child rights commission the necessary capacities to fulfil its responsibilities effectively in policy planning and priority-setting. UNICEF commended the State for the progress made in realizing children's rights, and stressed the need for continuous efforts to reach out to the most disadvantaged children.

639. Viet Nam thanked the delegation for its concise update on the situation of human rights in the country. It appreciated the large number of recommendations that the State had accepted, which showed its commitment to the universal periodic review mechanism. It noted in particular the support for the two recommendations made by Viet Nam, on measures to ensure gender equality, including accession to and effective implementation of international and regional treaties, and on enhancing dialogue with and assistance to vulnerable groups, particularly ethnic minorities. It recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group, and wished the State success in its implementation of the recommendations it had accepted.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

640. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, three other stakeholders made statements.

641. The European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Federation welcomed the report of the Working Group and the readiness of the Government to consider the recommendations. It urged the Government to amend the law on the prevention of and protection against discrimination so that it explicitly extended protection to lesbian, gay,

bisexual and transgender persons; to include in the Criminal Code hate crimes and hate speech based on sexual orientation and gender identity; to use all means available to remove homophobic statements from the public discourse and end impunity for hate crimes directed against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons; to establish permanent programmes for capacity-building in law enforcement agencies and institutions providing health and social services; to remove notions of homosexuality as a disease from textbooks, and to conduct training and awareness-raising on lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender issues for teaching staff and students; and to make use of the resources of non-governmental organizations in the aforementioned activities.

642. United Nations Watch welcomed the constructive cooperation by the State under review with the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council, and its support for a number of important initiatives and resolutions. It was encouraged by the State's commitment to implementing the vast majority of the recommendations, and noted that the most important ones were currently being implemented, including those relating to combating discrimination, trafficking in persons and domestic violence, strengthening judicial independence and protecting children's rights. It hoped that more measures would be taken to enhance the protection and promotion of civil and political rights for all, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. Noting the implementation of measures contained in the report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, it urged further action to ensure freedom of the media. It wished the State success in the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted.

643. The International Planned Parenthood Federation welcomed the recommendations, particularly those on sexual and reproductive rights, on the elimination of all forms of discrimination based on sexual orientation, gender or gender identity, and on strengthening the anti-discrimination law through the explicit prohibition of discrimination on those grounds. It called for the opening of effective investigations into attacks on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex individuals or organizations. It welcomed the acceptance of recommendations on health-care provision for the Roma and on the implementation of the recommendations relating to violence against women made by the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women. It called for measures to strengthen services for the victims of all forms of violence. Welcoming the recently increased budget for antiretroviral drugs, it called for the reliable supply of those drugs under the national health insurance fund. It also urged the State to prioritize the protection of women's health and the sexual and reproductive health of drug users, sex workers and persons with disabilities, the introduction of comprehensive sexuality education, and improved access to modern contraception.

#### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

644. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, according to the information provided, of 104 recommendations received, 96 enjoyed the support of the State under review and the rest had been noted.

645. The delegation thanked member States and stakeholders for their contributions, and assured them that all comments had been noted and would be given consideration during the follow-up period. It also thanked the President and the secretariat of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review for their support, and the troika for its remarkable dedication. It reiterated the State's commitment to the universal periodic review process, and hoped that it had demonstrated progress since the first cycle, while bearing in mind the challenges it faced.

#### **Comoros**

646. The review of Comoros, held on 31 January 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, was based on the following documents:

- (a) The national report submitted by Comoros in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/COM/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/COM/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/COM/3).

647. At its 25th meeting, on 20 June 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Comoros (see sect. C below).

648. The outcome of the review of Comoros comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/26/11), the views of the State concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/26/11/Add.1).

#### **1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome**

649. During its review, the delegation of Comoros had accepted 111 recommendations, requested the postponement of 13 recommendations and rejected eight recommendations, in addition to one of the 13 recommendations postponed, making a total of nine recommendations rejected.

650. Comoros was pleased to announce that of the 13 postponed recommendations, 12 had been accepted. In other words, only one recommendation had been rejected.

651. The Government of Comoros, faithful to its strategy of effective integration of human rights into all public policies, and motivated by the constant desire to preserve the dignity and integrity of the human person, would step up its efforts to achieve enduring respect for and fulfilment of human rights.

652. Comoros greatly appreciated the support and understanding of all those involved in the universal periodic review, and the assistance of other human rights mechanisms of the United Nations.

653. Comoros was particularly sensitive to the efforts of its partners and friends for the successful transition of the universal periodic review, and urged them to stand by Comoros during its implementation of the recommendations it had accepted.

654. The evident political commitment of the Government of Comoros in favour of human rights should be supported by strong partnerships at all levels and in all sectors.

655. The delegation of Comoros had, among other mandates, the mission to continue to advocate for effective support for improved infrastructure and an improved capacity to serve the cause of human rights. To that end, it appealed to all partners to provide effective, monitored and regular cooperation.

656. The Government of Comoros had welcomed with satisfaction the mission conducted in May by the Working Group on the use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination. The Government reaffirmed its continuing determination to cooperate with the special procedures and the treaty bodies.

657. Conscious of the need to ensure a better life for all citizens in freedom, dignity and mutual respect, Comoros had to take into account all the specificities of the national cultural context which, to a great extent, ensured social cohesion. That explained the main reasons behind the State's position on certain recommendations.

658. Of 13 recommendations that had been postponed, the State had rejected one, made by Mexico, in which it called upon Comoros to take measures to ensure the respect of freedom of religion, and to end all types of reprisals against those who converted from Islam.

659. The 12 recommendations that the State had accepted were on ratifying or acceding to international human rights instruments to which Comoros was not yet a party (112.1); continuing to adopt a positive perspective towards accession to international human rights

treaties to which Comoros had not yet acceded (112.2); revising the various legal systems in use, Islamic, civil and customary, to ensure that their treatment of women was uniform and in line with the provisions of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (112.3); adopting legislation explicitly prohibiting the corporal punishment of children in all settings, including the home (112.4); prohibiting, by law, all forms of violence against children, including corporal punishment, and establishing a minimum legal age for marriage (112.5); continuing measures aimed at ensuring that all births of children were registered, particularly by reviewing the legislation to ensure that all children born in the territory could acquire that nationality, and avoiding cases of statelessness (112.6); undertaking a thorough assessment of the issue of trafficking in persons, and taking adequate measures, including enactment of adequate legislation, to combat the practice, as recommended by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (112.7); strengthening the institutional framework for the protection of children's rights by setting up welcome centres and socioprofessional training (112.8); taking the necessary measures to prohibit the use of corporal punishment against children (112.9); ratifying the international human rights treaties to which it was not yet party, and cooperating with OHCHR, treaty bodies and the special procedures (112.10); reviewing the judicial system in order to ensure that the provisions of civil law, Islamic law and customary law conformed to the provisions of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (112.11); and continuing its efforts to promote religious freedom, and continue to broaden the space for interfaith dialogue (112.12).

660. In conclusion, in addition to 111 other recommendations already accepted, the adoption of 12 of the 13 recommendations that had been deferred during the adoption of the report of the Working Group brought the total to 123 recommendations accepted.

661. Comoros would do everything in its power to achieve the objectives laid down in those recommendations, which formed the basis for its national report in view of its next review in 2018. In order to achieve the objectives, the Government reiterated its request for support from the international community. That support would allow it to maintain the achievements of the State in terms of preservation, respect and realization of human rights.

## **2. Views expressed by member and observer States of the Council on the review outcome**

662. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Comoros, 13 delegations made statements.

663. Yemen expressed its appreciation for the efforts that Comoros had made in human rights. It welcomed the work done by the State to promote and protect human rights despite the challenges and difficulties it faced. The State's acceptance of a large number of recommendations reflected its commitment and determination to advance in the promotion and protection of all human rights. Yemen welcomed the progress that had been made by Comoros.

664. Algeria welcomed the State's constructive commitment, as reflected in its acceptance of 123 recommendations. Algeria particularly welcomed the acceptance of its own two recommendations, on improving access by women in rural areas to justice and activities that allowed them and their families to improve their living standards, and on improving the quality of health services and education for the population, particularly for children. Algeria wished Comoros every success in implementing the recommendations it had accepted.

665. Botswana noted with appreciation the additional information provided at the current meeting, and thanked the delegation for accepting the recommendation made by Botswana on trafficking. Botswana commended Comoros for the efforts it had made in the promotion and protection of human rights. The State's acceptance of many recommendations during its review demonstrated its cooperation and commitment to the universal periodic review mechanism. As a developing country, Comoros faced many political and economic challenges, but had remained steadfast in its quest to improve the human rights of the Comorian people. Botswana encouraged the international community to do more in terms of international cooperation to improve the situation of human rights in Comoros.

666. China commended Comoros for its constructive and active participation in the second round of the universal periodic review and its acceptance of the majority of the

recommendations. China appreciated the State's acceptance of the recommendation made by China, and hoped that the Government would continue to implement its anti-poverty strategy, enhance the rights of vulnerable groups and endeavour to bring about sustainable social and economic development. China congratulated Comoros on its achievements in the protection and promotion of human rights, including the rights of women, children and people with disabilities, and called upon the international community to continue to provide the State with constructive assistance.

667. Cuba thanked Comoros for the information provided regarding the recommendations made during the session of the Working Group. Cuba recognized the efforts made by the State to tackle the challenges in promoting human rights, as revealed by the information provided by the Government about measures to reduce maternal and infant mortality, the establishment of new health structures, the improvement of education facilities and the measures taken to eliminate child labour, among others. Cuba welcomed the fact that its two recommendations had been accepted by the State, on measures to improve people's access to health and education in order to improve the standards of living of its citizens.

668. Mali commended Comoros for the efforts it had made to improve the promotion and protection of human rights. The measures the State had taken included the adoption of welcome and significant political reforms including the establishment in 2012 of a national human rights policy, which reflected its commitment to addressing the challenges posed in the area of human rights. Mali encouraged Comoros to sustain the momentum it had created, reflected in the implementation of the 52 recommendations accepted at its first review and the acceptance of almost all of the recommendations made during the current review. Mali called upon the international community to support the State in its efforts to uphold its commitments.

669. Morocco welcomed the exemplary cooperation of Comoros in the universal periodic review mechanism, which reflected its irreversible determination to pursue human rights, democracy and the rule of law. Morocco would follow the political and legislative measures being taken to that end. It also welcomed the operationalization of the national human rights commission to bring it into conformity with the Paris Principles. Morocco encouraged donors to provide human, technical and financial support for the commission. In accepting almost all of the recommendations received, Comoros was one of the States that best demonstrated its cooperation with human rights mechanisms, including the universal periodic review. Morocco congratulated Comoros on its education policy and efforts to eliminate poverty.

670. Qatar praised the valuable clarification and responses provided by Comoros. In that respect, Qatar noted the State's positive engagement with the review mechanism and its cooperation with the Human Rights Council to meet its international obligations and pledges in the area of human rights, as shown by its acceptance of 123 recommendations, including those made by Qatar. Qatar valued the fact that Comoros had sought the support of partners in the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted in order to promote respect for human rights at all levels and in all sectors.

671. Senegal commended Comoros for its full cooperation with the universal periodic review mechanism during the presentation of its national report. It took note of the additional information provided by the State in the addendum to the report of the Working Group. Senegal noted with satisfaction that 12 of the 13 recommendations that had been postponed had now received the support of Comoros, including the one made by Senegal on strengthening the institutional framework for the protection of human rights by setting up welcome centres and socioprofessional training centres. Moreover, Senegal welcomed the determination of the authorities to continue to promote and protect human rights and the call for the international community to assist Comoros in implementing the recommendations accepted during its review.

672. Togo welcomed the progress made by Comoros since its first review, particularly in the fields of health, education and women's rights. Togo noted with satisfaction that Comoros had agreed to implement virtually all of the recommendations made, including the one made by Togo on moving forward more rapidly towards the adoption of a new Criminal Code providing for the abolition of the death penalty. Togo called upon the international

community to support Comoros in its efforts to implement the recommendations it had accepted.

673. The United Arab Emirates appreciated the positive steps that had been taken by Comoros to implement the recommendations made at its first review, in addition to the pledges that had been voluntarily made by Comoros. The United Arab Emirates valued the State's constructive and responsible approach in the preparation and the submission of its report in order to strengthen the rule of law and good governance in the public interest. The United Arab Emirates hoped that the States Members of the Human Rights Council and OHCHR would pay great attention to the aspirations of Comoros to strengthen human rights and its capacity in that regard, and to provide the State with technical assistance. In particular, Comoros was willing to cooperate with various institutions of the United Nations working in the field of human rights.

674. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the information provided by the State during its second universal periodic review. It drew attention to the 2009 constitutional report, the preamble of which upheld the universal values of human rights, which formed the basis of the national human rights policy introduced in 2012. It also welcomed the State's efforts to comply with its human rights commitments, and encouraged it to continue to booster its social policy with a view to improving the living standards of its people. To that end, it should request support and solidarity from the community of nations.

675. Angola commended Comoros for its final report. It welcomed the efforts made by Comoros to promote and protect human rights and the fact that it had accepted almost all the recommendations, which showed the determination of the authorities to continue the State's cooperation with the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

676. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Comoros, one other stakeholder made a statement.

677. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme welcomed the adoption by the authorities of the national human rights policy in 2012 and the incorporation into legislation of international human rights standards to which Comoro was a party, despite its limited human and financial resources. Despite the progress that had been made by the State in the implementation of the recommendations made in the first cycle, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme remained concerned by the continued violation of the rights of those in detention, including the lack of food and other problems of detention. Although the authors of the coup d'état had been prosecuted, it invited the State to take action against corruption in the judiciary and in other circles. It urged Comoros to take appropriate and necessary measures to guarantee respect for freedom of religion and worship. Finally, it encouraged Comoros to promote education in human rights throughout the country, in particular in Qur'anic schools.

### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

678. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, according to the information provided, of 132 recommendations received, 123 enjoyed the support of Comoros and the rest had been noted.

679. The delegation of Comoros expressed its appreciation for the close and fruitful international cooperation that had led to the adoption of its national report.

680. Comoros had taken note of the observations and recommendations made and would do everything in its power to implement all the recommendations it had accepted. It appreciated the interest shown by delegations and organizations during its review.

#### **Slovakia**

681. The review of Slovakia, held on 3 February 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Slovakia in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/SVK/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/SVK/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/SVK/3).

682. At its 26th meeting, on 20 June 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Slovakia (see sect. C below).

683. The outcome of the review of Slovakia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/26/12), the views of the State concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/26/12/Add.1).

#### **1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome**

684. The delegation noted with appreciation the active participation of States and the open and constructive atmosphere during the interactive dialogue on the review of Slovakia, and the contribution made by non-governmental organizations to the review process. The first-hand information submitted by non-governmental organizations on the human rights situation and their expertise had constituted a valuable input to the review process. Slovakia reiterated its firm commitment to the universal periodic review mechanism, which had proved to be an effective tool contributing to the promotion and protection of human rights. Slovakia fully subscribed to the voluntary commitments declared in a joint statement issued by 47 States in March 2013 in order to maintain the credibility and effectiveness of the mechanism.

685. During the interactive dialogue, Slovakia had received 146 recommendations. After a thorough examination by the relevant authorities, the Government had accepted 133 of those recommendations. Some of them were already being implemented, while others would be addressed through existing or future strategies and programmes.

686. After careful consideration, Slovakia had decided not to support seven of the recommendations. The Government had partially accepted six recommendations, meaning that those recommendations were supported in principle; the Government supported the ideas and reasoning behind them, but it was not in a position to accept them fully.

687. The delegation referred the Human Rights Council to its written response regarding its position on the implementation of the recommendations, which had been grouped thematically. It also addressed the State's position on some specific recommendations.

688. Slovakia was committed to further strengthening the protection of human rights. To that end, the first national strategy for the promotion and protection of human rights had been developed and would be submitted for the approval of the Government by the end of June 2014.

689. Slovakia was also committed to improving national human rights standards by assuming new international obligations. However, it did not accept the recommendations on ratifying those international treaties on which it had already expressed a negative position in its national report, such as the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. Similarly, Slovakia was not in a position to ratify the ILO Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169) or the Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189), for the reasons provided in its written response to those recommendations.

690. With regard to the recommendation calling for the ratification of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, the Convention had been approved by the Government in May 2014 and forwarded to the parliament, and was subject to final ratification by the President.

691. The situation on the access of Roma to education, employment, housing and health care had been addressed in a number of recommendations. Improving the situation of Roma was a long-term priority of the Government. Slovakia recognized the need for a comprehensive approach to the process of Roma integration, and would therefore continue to implement existing programmes and strategies with a view to achieving tangible progress in that field. The focus would remain on the implementation of the strategy for integration of Roma to 2020, as the main reference document for national policies.

692. Slovakia had accepted all recommendations relating to Roma, with the exception of the recommendation on establishing an independent mechanism to investigate complaints related to discrimination and segregation within the educational system. The national legal and institutional framework provided sufficient guarantees to ensure respect for equal treatment and protection against discrimination and segregation in education.

693. Another recommendation calling for the adoption of measures to enable children to remain within the school system did not enjoy the support of the Government. No child could be exempted from compulsory school attendance, given that compulsory education was guaranteed by law and its proper realization was ensured through the required mechanisms.

694. Slovakia recognized the importance of improving the participation of Roma in public life. However, it was not in a position to accept the recommendation regarding the participation of the Roma minority in parliament because of the political system stipulated by the Constitution. The institution of the parliament was based on civic principles, which implied that any affiliation with a national or ethnic minority could be declared only by the free decision of the individual. In order to achieve better results in that area, Slovakia would support the engagement of Roma in civil society and in elected bodies through existing programmes and strategies.

695. The State had a firm commitment to fighting racism, extremism and other forms of intolerance. Slovakia had taken note of the recommendation on prohibiting by law the activities of extremist organizations; it supported that recommendation in principle.

696. Regarding the recommendation on protecting the right to life from conception to natural death, Slovakia accepted the recommendation without the wording “from conception”, given that the Constitutional Court did not interpret the constitutional right to life as an absolute right effective from conception.

697. Vulnerable groups such as women, children, persons with disabilities, migrants and refugees enjoyed special protection. The Government would pursue national policies to address their special needs. It would likewise continue to ensure full and effective protection of the rights of persons belonging to national minorities.

698. The Government of Slovakia had a firm commitment to cooperating with the Human Rights Council and its mechanisms. It considered the universal periodic review an ongoing process that did not end with the adoption of the outcome report. The Government had therefore undertaken a voluntary commitment to present a midterm report on progress made in the implementation of recommendations made.

## **2. Views expressed by member and observer States of the Council on the review outcome**

699. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Slovakia, eight delegations made statements.

700. Algeria noted with appreciation that Slovakia had accepted a large number of recommendations, in particular those made by Algeria on the reaccreditation of the Slovak National Centre for Human Rights in conformity with the Paris Principles. With regard to the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, Algeria hoped that the rights of migrants would be one of the priorities of the Government.

701. Belarus noted with appreciation that Slovakia had accepted a large number of recommendations, including those made by Belarus regarding the prevention of extremism and torture, and combating human trafficking. With respect to the accepted recommendations on eliminating racial discrimination and intolerance, Belarus hoped that Slovakia would

adopt effective measures to combat hate speech in the media. It noted with regret that Slovakia had rejected a recommendation regarding the activities of extremist organizations. Belarus expressed concern that Slovakia had rejected a number of recommendations on access by Roma children to education, the adoption of a special strategy on that issue and strengthening efforts to eliminate discrimination in education.

702. Côte d'Ivoire noted with appreciation the acceptance of a large number of recommendations by Slovakia. In particular, it noted with appreciation the administrative and institutional reforms undertaken to guarantee the rule of law. Côte d'Ivoire encouraged Slovakia to continue its efforts to implement those recommendations.

703. Cuba thanked Slovakia for having accepted two recommendations made by Cuba, on combating racism, xenophobia and discrimination and on the right to work. It commended Slovakia for its achievements in the implementation of the recommendations made at its first review, and was confident that Slovakia would effectively implement the recommendations of the second cycle that it had now accepted.

704. Morocco commended Slovakia for its active engagement with the universal periodic review, which it had demonstrated by its acceptance of a large number of recommendations. Morocco noted with appreciation the fact that Slovakia had accepted the recommendation made by Morocco to ensure that the Slovak National Centre for Human Rights complied with the Paris Principles. Morocco welcomed the reforms to strengthen the institutional framework for the promotion and protection of human rights. It encouraged Slovakia to strengthen its efforts to improve the situation of Roma and to provide human rights education.

705. Romania noted that Slovakia had established a comprehensive institutional and legal framework to ensure the implementation of human rights standards. The ratification of several international human rights instruments also demonstrated the State's commitment to uphold those standards.

706. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela regretted that Slovakia had not accepted the recommendation that it had made on fighting stigmatization of and discrimination against ethnic minorities, particularly Roma and migrants. Slovakia had not given due consideration to the recommendation on full independence of the Judicial Council and the independence of the judiciary. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela expressed its commitment to continue to work with Slovakia in the context of the Human Rights Council to ensure respect for human rights.

707. Viet Nam noted with appreciation that Slovakia had accepted the majority of recommendations made. It also welcomed the State's commitment to implementing those recommendations.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

708. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Slovakia, one other stakeholder made a statement.

709. The Centre for Reproductive Rights welcomed the commitment of Slovakia to adopting a national programme on reproductive health and ensuring access to high-quality sexuality education. It urged Slovakia to ensure that the programme was comprehensive and supported by sufficient financial and human resources and that it provided mandatory sexuality education. The Centre for Reproductive Rights noted with regret that Slovakia did not consider subsidization of hormonal contraceptives to be a component of the right to the highest attainable standard of health; it was concerned about the legislative ban on coverage of contraceptives by public health insurance. It encouraged the State to develop laws and policies that guaranteed access to affordable and acceptable reproductive health services for all women.

### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

710. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, according to the information provided, of 146 recommendations received, 133 enjoyed the support of Slovakia, and the rest had been noted.

711. In conclusion, Slovakia assured the Human Rights Council that all additional questions raised by delegations during the discussion on the adoption of the outcome of its review had been duly noted and would be examined carefully by the Government.

### **Eritrea**

712. The review of Eritrea, held on 3 February 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Eritrea in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/ERI/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/ERI/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/ERI/3).

713. At its 26th meeting, on 20 June 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Eritrea (see sect. C below).

714. The outcome of the review of Eritrea comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/26/13), the views of the State concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/26/13/Add.1).

## **1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome**

715. The universal periodic review was the most effective tool at the disposal of the Human Rights Council to promote engagement, dialogue and cooperation to advance the protection and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Hence, Eritrea objected strongly both in principle and in practice to politically motivated country-specific Council resolutions, as they were counterproductive.

716. After careful study, Eritrea had decided to accept 92 of the 200 recommendations made. The validity, relevance, practicality and timing of the recommendations had been predicated on a meticulous appraisal of the prevailing institutional, human and organizational capacity in Eritrea, and the associated challenges of implementation, including the situation influencing the security and development of the country. On the basis of that approach, a broad range of recommendations covering economic, social, cultural, civic and political rights had been considered and accepted. The State's decision to ratify international legal instruments, such as the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the ILO Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182) was consistent with the recommendations received. Further efforts to assess other recommendations in the future were also being considered.

717. The recommendation on implementing Security Council resolution 2023 (2011), in which the Council had condemned the use by Eritrea of a "diaspora tax" to destabilize the Horn of Africa region, had not been recognized, as it was inconsistent with the institution-building package. Eritrea was not duty bound to accept such abusive recommendations. The delegation urged the President of the Human Rights Council to have the recommendation deleted.

718. The various recommendations on economic, social and cultural rights which acknowledged the tangible achievements made and the challenges faced had been overwhelming. Eritrea had pledged to broaden and upgrade social services further, including

in remote and difficult-to-reach areas. It was committed to continuing its efforts to eradicate poverty and ensure an adequate standard of living.

719. Eritrea supported the constructive recommendations in the areas of civil and political rights. Eritrea valued the rights of all women, children, disabled persons and other disadvantaged groups, and pledged to realize them. Furthermore, it had reaffirmed its commitment to continuing its efforts to strengthen democratic institutions. The President of Eritrea had announced that a new constitution was being drafted to chart out the political road map for the future governmental structure in Eritrea, based on the lessons learned over the past two decades as a nation. The constitution-making process would be participatory, with the judicial system being an integral part of the process.

720. Some of the recommendations that had not been accepted contained certain aspects that had already been accepted, and others that were not acceptable. However, following established practice, the recommendation could not be divided.

721. The recommendations on compulsory military training for children, lifting the state of emergency and “fear of repatriation to Eritrea” required further clarification, as they were based on countless assumptions that did not reflect the reality in the country. The notion of “conscripting of children into the military” had been raised solely as an attack on the national service system. In Eritrea, children were not recruited into the military.

722. The delegation totally rejected the characterization of Eritrea as an “emergency State” with a pre-constitutional Government. That characterization, together with the myth of a failed State, only reflected the mindset of all those who wished ill to the country. There had been threats that violated the right of the Eritrean people to live in peace. Eritrea had always focused on development without compromising national security, with all organs of the State functioning systematically and with peace and stability as distinctive features of society.

723. The migration of Eritreans had been sensationalized through the use of manipulated statistical data. Thousands of nationals from neighbouring countries had sought asylum in Eritrea. The overwhelming majority of those leaving Eritrea were attracted by the promise of a better standard of living, a common trend by no means peculiar to Eritrea. The biggest problem was the concerted effort to lure the younger generation to an “easy” life in Western countries. Many had settled in their new areas of naturalization and contributed to the growth of those societies, but they still had a very strong bond with their country of origin and their people; in fact, they returned to Eritrea to visit their families.

724. Hence, Eritreans living abroad were accorded by law the same rights and opportunities as those given to other citizens, and thus fulfilled their legal obligations to the nation while actively participating in national development. Nevertheless, some member States and even the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea had wrongly indicated that there was a “fear of repatriation” to Eritrea.

725. The universal periodic review served to intensify internal coordination, continuous dialogue and collective follow-up among all stakeholders. Eritrea was committed to strengthening the implementation of the recommendations within its means and capabilities; increasing efforts aimed at enhancing human rights awareness; accelerating and elevating its engagement with the Human Rights Council, OHCHR and other United Nations bodies; consolidating partnerships with member States at the bilateral level to advance human rights causes and ideals; and intensifying efforts to explore the opportunities for using thematic mandates and other mechanisms on a case-by-case basis as a way of strengthening the implementation of recommendations.

726. Country-specific resolutions did not promote dialogue. The role played by the Special Rapporteur over the past two years had been counterproductive. The delegation urged member States to discontinue the resolutions and the mandate of the Special Rapporteur, as progress could only be achieved by strengthening dialogue, engagement and cooperation on the basis of the report submitted by Eritrea and the recommendations it had accepted. It reiterated its call to address the continued occupation of sovereign Eritrean territories, which was in violation of international law and the human rights of the Eritrean people.

## 2. Views expressed by member and observer States of the Council on the review outcome

727. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Eritrea, 11 delegations made statements.

728. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela recognized the efforts made by Eritrea to set up and invest in social policies and programmes aimed at promoting the fair distribution of wealth and the enjoyment of fundamental rights by its people, particularly with regard to health, food security, and access to water and sanitation. It welcomed the provision of free compulsory basic education. It paid tribute to the efforts the Government had made to fulfil its human rights commitments, despite the limitations it had suffered as a result of the capitalist economic crisis. It urged Eritrea to strengthen its social policies further in order to improve the living conditions of its people, with the required technical assistance and support.

729. Algeria noted that Eritrea had accepted the majority of recommendations, particularly those regarding the establishment of a national human rights institution in conformity with the Paris Principles. It hoped that the matter would be addressed by the State's new Constitution. Algeria welcomed the acceptance of its recommendation relating to the Millennium Development Goals.

730. Botswana was encouraged by the measures taken by Eritrea to improve the rights of children. The State's progress in achieving three Millennium Development Goals was notable. Botswana expressed concern that there were considerable shortcomings in civil and political rights. Cooperation with the special procedures was yet to be achieved. It encouraged Eritrea to take all measures necessary to ensure fuller enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms by its population.

731. China welcomed the State's constructive engagement and appreciated its commitment to active implementation of the accepted recommendations. China thanked Eritrea for accepting its recommendations, and hoped that the Government would continue to strive to eliminate poverty, to raise people's living standards, to realize the Millennium Development Goals, to promote gender equality and to protect the rights of women and girls in practice. China understood that Eritrea, as a developing country, was facing many difficulties and challenges. China hoped that the international community would provide constructive help for Eritrea, in full consultation with the Government.

732. Cuba recalled that it had commended Eritrea for the work it had done to improve the situation of economic, social and cultural rights, particularly the rights to food, health and education. It recognized the positive reforms in basic education, the prohibition of child labour and a return to education for children in conflict with the law. Cuba thanked the State for accepting its two recommendations and urged Eritrea to implement the recommendations it had accepted.

733. Egypt commended Eritrea for its commitment to the universal periodic review. It thanked the delegation for the clarifications provided and expressed appreciation for the spirit of openness it had shown. Eritrea had accepted a number of recommendations, and others were currently being reviewed. Egypt understood the rejection by Eritrea of some of the recommendations, given the sensitive issues they involved. It was important to pay attention to the cultural and social specificities of each country and to move away from any tendency to impose a culturally demanding regime on a country.

734. Estonia welcomed the State's careful study of the recommendations made and its acceptance of a significant number of recommendations. However, Eritrea had not accepted several important recommendations. Estonia remained deeply concerned by the serious and persistent human rights violations. It urged Eritrea to take all steps necessary to implement the accepted recommendations in full. Estonia invited Eritrea to allow independent actors to assess the progress it had made towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals and to verify whether government policies were in line with the State's obligations under international human rights law.

735. The Sudan took note of the clarifications made and the fact that Eritrea had studied all of the recommendations and accepted the majority of them. It also took note of the State's acceptance of the recommendations that the Sudan had made, particularly those relating to

the rights of women. The Sudan encouraged Eritrea to use the accepted recommendations to promote and protect human rights.

736. Togo was pleased to note that Eritrea had agreed to cooperate with human rights mechanisms, particularly with regard to the submission of all reports due to them. It encouraged Eritrea to step up its efforts to ensure full enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights, with a particular focus on programmes and activities which targeted the most disadvantaged groups of the population, such as women and children. Togo called upon the international community to support Eritrea in the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted.

737. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland urged Eritrea to take rapid and practical steps to implement all the universal periodic review recommendations. It was concerned that the human rights record of Eritrea remained poor, and disappointed that Eritrea continued to reject the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea and to deny her access and cooperation. It called upon Eritrea to honour its international human rights obligations and to cooperate fully with the United Nations human rights system.

738. The United States of America encouraged Eritrea to improve its respect for the rights to freedom of expression, assembly, association and religion. It was concerned that national elections remained pending, and called upon Eritrea to allow its citizens to vote in genuine and regular elections. It encouraged Eritrea to facilitate the release of political prisoners. It expressed concern at the conscription of people into national service for indefinite periods; Eritrea should take steps to demobilize those who had completed their mandatory 18 months of service. It encouraged Eritrea to respond positively to the requests made by the special procedures to visit the country.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

739. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Eritrea, nine other stakeholders made statements.

740. Amnesty International stated that Eritrea had rejected recommendations on ending arbitrary detention. It called upon Eritrea to end the use of arbitrary detention, incommunicado detention and detention in secret detention centres. Torture and other forms of ill-treatment were widespread and systematic: it called upon Eritrea to sign and ratify the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. Schoolchildren were required to complete their final year of school in Sawa military camp, effectively entailing the conscription of children into the military.

741. Action Canada for Population and Development, speaking also on behalf of the Sexual Rights Initiative, encouraged Eritrea to undertake public awareness-raising activities with regard to female genital mutilation. It urged Eritrea to introduce comprehensive sexual education curricula in all educational institutions and to establish a multi-stakeholder committee to advocate for the elimination of early and forced marriage, while also meeting the needs of those subjected to child, early or forced marriage. It expressed concern that Eritrea had refused to respect, protect or fulfil the rights of individuals with diverse sexual orientations, gender identities and gender expressions.

742. Meron Estefanos, speaking on behalf of United Nations Watch, reported on her research into the Eritrean refugee crisis. Human traffickers were extorting thousands of dollars from the families of refugees; an estimated 40,000 refugees had been subjected to such extortion. Many of those fleeing the country were young people escaping national service of indefinite duration, or underage children fleeing before they reached the age of conscription. No concrete action had been taken by the Government and there was no indication of a clear strategy to address the issue.

743. CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation stated that, despite the State's acceptance of a number of progressive recommendations, there was little to suggest that its behaviour before the international community would substantively change at the national level. A culture of systematic human rights abuses continued to be sustained with rhetoric. Persistent imprisonment, disappearances and attacks on human rights defenders and

journalists helped to make Eritreans the largest refugee population in the world. CIVICUS called for the establishment of a commission of inquiry on human rights in Eritrea.

744. According to the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, during the interactive dialogue with the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea, the State had referred to its commitment to the universal periodic review process and to the broad range of recommendations it had accepted. However, 15 recommendations relating to the areas covered by the report of the Special Rapporteur had not enjoyed the support of Eritrea. The universal periodic review was not a substitute for other mechanisms of human rights protection.

745. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme stated that there was a lack of sincere cooperation by Eritrea with human rights mechanisms. It had made very little progress in implementing the recommendations it had accepted at its first review. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme remained deeply alarmed by the serious restrictions on freedom of expression, association and religion, extended military service, arbitrary detention, torture, the ill-treatment of prisoners, extrajudicial executions and secret detention centres. It asked the Eritrean authorities to authorize the International Committee of the Red Cross to visit the State's prison facilities, and urged it to promote human rights education.

746. Africa Culture International stated that the human rights situation in Eritrea was mainly political, with people fleeing because of ethnic and tribal problems. To resolve the conflict, the deep-rooted causes had to be targeted. It was time for the people of Africa to take charge of their own fate. The international community was aware of the deplorable situation in the country, but had failed to find a definitive solution. Africa Culture International urged international human rights organizations and State institutions to normalize the situation in Eritrea.

747. The East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project stated that the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea had described in her report indefinite national service, forced labour and migration, arbitrary arrests, incommunicado detention and impunity for the perpetrators; the Government of Eritrea, however, existed in a perpetual state of denial. That very week, on the margins of the Human Rights Council, former child military conscripts had described the horrors of their experience, and yet the Government had rejected recommendations that it should abolish the military conscription of children. Children provided accounts of their detention in shipping containers, and yet the Government rejected recommendations to put an end to torture and cruel treatment. East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project called for the establishment of a commission of inquiry on human rights in Eritrea.

748. The Jubilee Campaign and Release Eritrea stated that Eritrea had arbitrarily denied the right to freedom of worship to churches that it did not recognize. The restrictions had also been extended to recognized churches; for example, the Patriarch of the Orthodox Church had been under house arrest since 2005. Trainee Catholic priests were constantly under pressure to abandon their vocation and to undertake national service, against their will and in conflict with their religious convictions. The Jubilee Campaign and Release Eritrea hoped that the Government would respond positively to all recommendations, and supported the establishment of a commission of inquiry to investigate and document all atrocities.

#### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

749. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, according to the information provided, of 200 recommendations received, Eritrea supported 92 recommendations and had noted the remaining recommendations.

750. The delegation stated that the perceived image of Eritrea was far from the reality. In a very short time, Eritrea had achieved a great deal in many areas. As Eritrea was engaged in a nation-building process, its achievements should be seen in the context of time, space and organization. Although there was still a long way to go, the prevailing circumstances did not imply that there were gross violations of human rights. The people of Eritrea lived in harmony, peace and stability, with a great sense of national unity.

751. The occupation of Eritrean territories was a violation of the right of the Eritrean people to live in peace. The sanctions were a violation of the rights to development and progress. In that context, there were no grounds for the use of terms such as “extrajudicial killings”, “on-the-spot executions” or “reprisals”, which the delegation considered to be offensive. All those issues had been addressed by the State in its report.

752. Eritrea had decided to ratify five conventions. Ratification of the remaining conventions would be considered on a case-by-case basis in the ongoing process of implementation of the universal periodic review recommendations.

753. With regard to assessing progress in achieving the Millennium Development Goals, assessments had been made in reports by the World Health Organization, UNICEF and other United Nations bodies. Eritrea was on track to achieve seven out of eight Millennium Development Goals, which was a reflection of the internal dynamics of development in the country.

754. The delegation reiterated the State’s opposition to country-specific mandates, which it deemed counterproductive. Its experience with the appointment of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea had been negative, with no benefits for the promotion and protection of human rights. Moreover, the Special Rapporteur had not considered the responses by the Government of Eritrea in her report, or the information supplied to her when she had engaged with government officials at various times. That was a violation of article 13 of the code of conduct for special procedure mandate holders (Human Rights Council resolution 5/2).

755. Despite the prevailing security situation, Eritrea had demobilized more than 100,000 military personnel. Demobilization should be predicated on the prevailing security situation in the country.

756. On the issue of human trafficking, Eritrea had requested the Secretary-General to establish an independent investigation into all human trafficking situations where various groups, some acting in the name of human rights, were involved in human trafficking. The delegation asked the Human Rights Council to take note of that issue.

757. Eritrea thanked delegates for their comments. It would continue to consider those recommendations that did not currently enjoy its support.

## Cyprus

758. The review of Cyprus, held on 4 February 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Cyprus in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/CYP/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/CYP/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/CYP/3).

759. At its 26th meeting, on 20 June 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Cyprus (see sect. C below).

760. The outcome of the review of Cyprus comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/26/14), the views of the State concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/26/14/Add.1).

**1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome**

761. Cyprus attached great significance to the universal periodic review process, to which it was fully committed, since it was the only universal mechanism in which all States were reviewed for their human rights record. The second cycle was a valuable opportunity for Cyprus to assess both the implementation of the recommendations of the first cycle and its overall progress in the field of human rights. Cyprus strongly believed that the process was a critical element in its efforts to improve its human rights situation further.

762. In that spirit, the Government of Cyprus had carefully considered the 105 recommendations received during the second cycle of the universal periodic review. It had done so in consultation with the competent authorities, national independent monitoring mechanisms such as the Commissioner for Children's Rights, the ombudsman and other independent institutions, as well as the Commissioner for Humanitarian Affairs. Out of 105 recommendations, Cyprus had accepted 96. More specifically, it had supported 87 recommendations, including four that it had accepted in principle. It had clarified one recommendation and noted 17 recommendations. That figure included three recommendations that had been accepted in principle.

763. Cyprus could not accept recommendations that the Government was not able to commit to implementing at present. For example, Cyprus was not able to accept the recommendations concerning the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, since Cyprus was bound by the official European Union position on the issue of migrant workers. At present, the States members of the European Union were not in a position to sign or ratify the Convention, as its text raised "several difficulties". However, Cyprus had transposed into national law the relevant European *acquis*, promoting the rights of migrants and their families.

764. Cyprus was committed to the promotion and implementation of fundamental human rights instruments and would continue to strengthen its efforts to ensure that policies and legislation for the protection and safeguarding of human rights would be consistent with international standards. Through its internal evaluation process, Cyprus recognized that, despite the progress achieved to date, additional and continuous efforts were required to meet the constantly arising new challenges in the field of human rights. That fact was reflected in the great number of recommendations that the State had accepted.

765. In that regard, the delegation referred to particular groups of recommendations.

766. One of the main priorities of the Government of Cyprus was safeguarding of the rights of migrants. That priority was evident in the series of measures it had taken, and would continue to take, in order to balance migrants' rights with the need for an effective immigration system. A more recent development was the enactment of a new law (L.7(III)/2014), which ratified an agreement on cooperation between Cyprus and the International Organization for Migration.

767. Regarding asylum seekers, Cyprus had, inter alia, taken measures to strengthen its capacity to provide care and housing. For instance, Cyprus was expanding the reception and accommodation centre for applicants for international protection.

768. Cyprus had also increased its efforts to combat human trafficking. It had transposed into national law Directive 2011/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council on Preventing and Combating Trafficking in Human Beings and Protecting its Victims. The rights of child victims would be further protected, since the law contained special provisions to that effect.

769. The fight against discrimination, xenophobia and stereotyping was one of the main priorities of the Government at all levels in, inter alia, education, health care, sport and labour.

770. Regarding gender equality in the workplace, the new national action plan on equality 2014–2017 had now been completed. It prohibited all forms of violence and had introduced a new code on sexual harassment in the public services. Since its universal periodic review, Cyprus had appointed, on 12 March 2014, a commissioner of gender equality, who worked for the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women.

771. Acknowledging the need for immediate reform of operations in prisons, the Government had introduced a far-reaching reform programme. It was based on international human rights standards and norms, and included drastic corrective measures. Prisons were undergoing a considerable restructuring of their leadership and management teams in order to ensure that prison conditions were aligned with the basic principles for the treatment of inmates, including respect for their human rights and dignity.

## 2. Views expressed by member and observer States of the Council on the review outcome

772. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Cyprus, 11 delegations made statements.

773. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the replies made by Cyprus during its review, which testified to the State's commitment to human rights. It noted the implementation of the national action plan on gender equality, which covered such areas as employment, education, decision-making, social rights and the fight against violence and gender stereotypes. It paid tribute to the efforts of Cyprus to comply with the recommendations that it had accepted at its first universal periodic review. Cyprus had the will to achieve those goals, as had been made clear during the review.

774. Viet Nam stated that it was encouraging to see the constructive engagement of Cyprus in the review process, including its acceptance of and commitment to implementing the majority of the recommendations. It also noted with satisfaction that Cyprus had supported the two recommendations made by Viet Nam, on maintaining the current momentum in national action plans and programmes for effectively addressing challenges and disparities in health care, education, employment, gender equality and social welfare, especially for vulnerable groups, such as women, children, the elderly and persons with disabilities; and on intensifying efforts to further raise public awareness and education about human rights, and further strengthen capacity-building for human rights institutions and law enforcement mechanisms.

775. Algeria congratulated Cyprus on accepting the majority of recommendations and welcomed, in particular, the acceptance of its own recommendation, inviting Cyprus to study the measures it considered appropriate to enable the accreditation of the office of the ombudsman as a national human rights institution in conformity with the Paris Principles. Concerning the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, it hoped that the issue would be among the priorities of Cyprus in the future. It wished Cyprus every success in its implementation of the recommendations and the promotion of human rights in general.

776. Armenia appreciated the numerous legislative and administrative measures taken by Cyprus after the first review. It particularly welcomed the commitment of Cyprus to promoting the rights of national minorities, the right to education and the fight against domestic violence and racism. It commended the readiness with which Cyprus had accepted the recommendations during its second review, including the recommendations made by Armenia. It was confident that Cyprus would continue its efforts to improve the human rights situation in the country.

777. China thanked Cyprus for accepting its recommendations, and hoped that the State would take further positive measures to fully promote economic recovery, better protect the economic, social and cultural rights of citizens and further implement measures for the protection of the rights of women, children, persons with disabilities and migrants. It welcomed the reaffirmation by Cyprus of its commitment to the protection of human rights, and wished it further success in that area.

778. Côte d'Ivoire thanked Cyprus for the attention it had paid to the recommendations made during the universal periodic review, as well as the replies provided at the current session. It supported all the measures taken and actions planned by Cyprus for the protection and promotion of human rights throughout its territory. It encouraged Cyprus to continue its cooperation with the mechanisms for the protection and promotion of human rights.

779. The Council of Europe recalled the recommendations made to Cyprus by its various monitoring bodies. It was mainly interested in three priority areas: the conditions of detention

of migrants and rejected asylum seekers (the recommendations made by the Committee for the Prevention of Torture and the Commissioner for Human Rights) and the lack of protection for asylum seekers and migrants; restrictive immigration policies (as recommended by the Commission against Racism and Intolerance); and trafficking in human beings (in accordance with the report of the Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings). It welcomed the measures already taken by Cyprus to address the issues raised by its monitoring bodies, and invited the State to consider acceding to the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence.

780. Cuba appreciated the fact that Cyprus had accepted the recommendation made by Cuba on measures to strengthen the legal system, in accordance with the international human rights treaties to which Cyprus had acceded, particularly those relating to the rights of children and young people. It praised Cyprus for the numerous changes made to legislation and for the ratification of international human rights instruments. It also commended Cyprus for its work to improve the well-being and protection of children.

781. Egypt welcomed the fact that Cyprus had accepted a considerable number of the recommendations, including those made by Egypt. During the review of Cyprus, Egypt had attached particular attention to the situation of economic, social and cultural rights in the country, and the efforts the State had made to promote the rights of migrants and to combat racism and xenophobia. Egypt was conscious of the challenges arising from the current financial and economic crises, and it was certain that Cyprus would continue to adopt the measures and policies that would achieve the desired recovery and, at the same time, preserve its commitment to the realization of economic, social and cultural rights for all citizens.

782. Greece appreciated the detailed answers provided by the State during its review and the efforts it had made at all levels of public administration to implement the recommendations of the first cycle, as well as the constructive spirit in which the State had addressed the recommendations made at the second cycle. Cyprus undeniably had all that was required to promote and protect human rights, such as the rule of law and an independent judiciary, a well-structured apparatus for monitoring human rights and other forms of accountability, and the recognition of vulnerable groups and individuals, including migrants.

783. Morocco applauded the robust and reinvigorated commitment of Cyprus to continuing its efforts to strengthen the promotion and protection of human rights, and the concerted efforts it had made, despite the constraints of the economic crisis. It welcomed, in particular, the importance attached to the protection of the rights of migrants and asylum seekers and to the fight against human trafficking, discrimination and xenophobia through the formulation of specific national plans of action. Morocco also congratulated Cyprus on its positive and constructive interaction with the universal periodic review mechanism, as demonstrated by its support for more than 90 per cent of the recommendations. It thanked Cyprus for having accepted the recommendation that Morocco had made, concerning continuing efforts to strengthen human rights education in school curricula.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

784. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Cyprus, three other stakeholders made statements.

785. Amnesty International was concerned that Cyprus detained irregular migrants without first considering less coercive measures, in breach of international law and domestic legislation. Individuals who could not be deported within a reasonable time often found themselves arbitrarily detained for prolonged periods. It was particularly alarmed by cases of arbitrary detention of asylum seekers and of mothers for immigration purposes, without due consideration of the best interests of the child. It welcomed the recommendations made by States during the review on ensuring respect for the human rights of irregular migrants during deportation procedures, and urged Cyprus to act swiftly on those procedures and to ensure that less restrictive alternatives to detention were always prioritized. It also urged Cyprus to release irregular migrants immediately when their removal from Cyprus could not be assured within a reasonable time. Asylum seekers should be detained for immigration purposes only in exceptional circumstances. Amnesty International welcomed the recommendations made by a number of States regarding the conditions in facilities used to detain immigrants. While

it welcomed the fact that the Nicosia central prison was no longer used for that purpose, it was concerned that detainees in the Menogia pre-removal detention facility were forced to live in cramped conditions and allowed outside the building for only 2.5 hours a day. It called upon Cyprus to ensure that conditions in immigration detention facilities conformed to international human rights standards and that the decision to detain irregular migrants was reviewed periodically by a judicial body on the basis of clear criteria set out in law.

786. United Nations Watch expressed its support for the settlement of the Cyprus problem. A solution to the conflict would greatly advance human rights; Greek and Turkish Cypriots alike could live in peace and prosperity, in accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions. It welcomed the efforts made by Cyprus to promote the equality of women in employment and to combat the root causes of gender equality. It hoped the State could make more consistent efforts to reduce the gender pay gap. In addition, Cyprus had taken measures to curb discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons and other vulnerable groups, including victims of human trafficking. It hoped that those could be followed up with practical professional training for law enforcement officers and by a stricter legal framework.

787. Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik stated that many recommendations focused on the situation of migrants and asylum seekers. Although it welcomed the measures the State had taken and its promises with regard to asylum seekers, the situation of asylum seekers had not changed. The lives of a number of asylum seekers who were on hunger strike were in danger, although they had begun to take liquids in response to an undertaking made by the Minister of the Interior. To prevent harsh attacks on asylum seekers, as had happened on 12 July 2011 at the detention centre in Larnaca, it recommended more human rights training for police forces, detention-centre personnel and all those who came into contact with asylum seekers as part of their job. Cyprus should ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

#### 4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

788. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, according to the information provided, of 105 recommendations received, 87 enjoyed the support of Cyprus, one clarification had been provided and 17 recommendations had been noted.

789. The delegation of Cyprus expressed its appreciation for the comments and suggestions made, which would be forwarded to the relevant Cypriot authorities.

790. Respect for human rights was, and would remain, a major priority for the Government of Cyprus. Despite the economic difficulties that Cyprus was facing and which had spread to all areas and sectors of life, Cyprus was determined to continue its coordinated efforts to enhance, promote and safeguard the human rights of all people in Cyprus. In that respect, the Government had adopted a series of measures to achieve economic stability and to support economic growth in the medium term, and had pledged to improve living standards and to safeguard the human rights of all people living in Cyprus.

791. In conclusion, the delegation expressed its gratitude to the President of the Human Rights Council, the member States that had contributed to the universal periodic review process with their valuable comments and recommendations, and to the members of the troika and the secretariat of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review.

#### **Dominican Republic**

792. The review of the Dominican Republic, held on 5 February 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by the Dominican Republic in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/DOM/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/DOM/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/DOM/3).

793. At its 27th meeting, on 20 June 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the Dominican Republic (see sect. C below).

794. The outcome of the review of the Dominican Republic comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/26/15), the views of the State concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/26/15/Add.1).

**1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome**

795. The delegation of the Dominican Republic drew attention to a number of typographical errors in the numbering of the recommendations listed in paragraphs 4, 5, and 7 of the addendum to the report of the Working Group (A/HRC/26/15/Add.1); where the prefix was 99, it should be understood to refer to paragraph 98 of the report of the Working Group (A/HRC/26/15). In the same way, in paragraph 8 of the addendum, the second explanatory paragraph on forced labour referred to the recommendation in paragraph 98.68 of the report of the Working Group.

796. The Dominican Republic reiterated its support for the universal periodic review, since its emphasis on cooperation and dialogue ensured the equal participation of all States, thereby driving the effective promotion and protection of human rights for all.

797. On that understanding, the Dominican Republic had taken note of all comments and recommendations and would study them in collaboration with the relevant ministries and institutions.

798. The State accepted most of the recommendations and shared their purpose. Most of them had been implemented or were under implementation (84 recommendations); it was currently not possible to ensure compliance with a small group of recommendations (29 recommendations) and therefore it had merely noted them. Only 21 recommendations were inconsistent with constitutional principles and domestic law and did not enjoy the support of the Government.

799. The Dominican Republic was committed to cooperating with the human rights mechanisms of the United Nations system, and particularly with the Human Rights Council, keeping up an open dialogue on those issues on the basis of respect for all States and peoples. The Government of the Dominican Republic had detailed its stance with regard to the recommendations made during the universal periodic review in the addendum to the report of the Working Group (A/HRC/25/15/Add.1).

800. Of the large number of recommendations made, the Dominican Republic had already complied with or was in the process of implementing many of them. Many others were part of its future priorities. It had taken steps to comply with the recommendations that it had noted; however, because of the way in which they had been addressed, immediate compliance could not be ensured.

801. The State took the process of ratification of an international treaty very seriously; many institutions were involved, and time for consultation and assessments of constitutionality were needed to ensure the compatibility of international obligations with national legislation.

802. Of the 21 recommendations that the State did not support, the Government had rejected the recommendation on the establishment of an independent body responsible for investigating alleged police abuses, since various monitoring bodies in its organizational structure already existed to supervise, inspect, monitor, investigate and process all complaints considered abusive acts that were committed by members of the Dominican police and the Ministry of Defence in the performance of their duties. Regarding land and women, the Government had also rejected two other relevant recommendations, since there was no forced

labour by women anywhere in the country, including the sugar plantations. Nor was there a problem with regard to women's access to land, since the law on agrarian reform provided for the distribution of land to women.

803. There was no disparity in access to education between rural and urban areas. The trend in basic education was one of parity between girls and boys; at the middle and higher levels of education, females outnumbered males. The remaining recommendations did not enjoy the support of the Government because they were based on false premises and did not reflect the cooperative and respectful spirit needed for their implementation.

804. The Government had promulgated a new law, No. 169-14, on 23 May 2014, which had been unanimously approved by the National Congress. A special scheme had been set up for persons born within the national territory who were irregularly registered in the Dominican civil registration system for, inter alia, the purposes of naturalization.

805. The legislation was the result of an extensive consultation process and consensus-building with diverse sectors of Dominican society. It was inspired by the same fundamental principles that governed the State, such as human dignity, freedom, equality and the rule of law. It was also a law based on the sovereign exercise of democratic organs of the State in the national interest and in full compliance with the judgments of the Constitutional Court and the Dominican legal system. After making enquiries of various political, business and religious leaders in Dominican society, the Government believed that the final text provided a balanced and responsible answer for two fundamental needs: on the one hand, to safeguard national interests and strict compliance with the law of the Republic; and on the other hand, to guarantee the fundamental rights of all persons residing in the Dominican Republic, especially those born and bred in the country.

806. The fact that a large number of people born in the Dominican Republic were not properly registered and therefore had no legal identity reflected an unacceptable institutional weakness. The Government was committed to reversing that state of affairs, through concrete actions such as the recent agreement between the Ministry of Education and the Central Electoral Board, a social protection investment project to develop the "social cabinet", which was mandated to monitor and oversee all social assistance and protection programmes in collaboration with the Central Electorate Board and with the support of the World Bank, and other initiatives for the proper registration of the population that were already under way.

807. The law sought to complement those efforts, providing answers for a very specific population: those born in the Dominican Republic to foreign parents. The parents of the people concerned, most of whom were children, represented more than 100 nationalities, including American, Spanish, British, Japanese and Haitian.

808. Implementation of the mechanisms to be established under the law would provide all people living in the Dominican Republic with the documentation they required, thus allowing them to live their lives more fully.

809. Although everyone subject to the law shared two characteristics – having been born in the Dominican Republic and being children of foreign parents – they should be classified into two distinct groups, according to their current documentation status and situation, with different solutions for each group. The delegation provided the Human Rights Council with a copy of the law in various languages.

## **2. Views expressed by member and observer States of the Council on the review outcome**

810. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Dominican Republic, seven delegations made statements.

811. Morocco welcomed the State's acceptance of almost all the recommendations made, thus confirming its engagement with the universal periodic review mechanism. That acceptance included the two recommendations made by Morocco on combating corruption and on a migration policy respectful of human rights. Morocco reiterated its appreciation to the State for the innovative measures it had taken at the social level, including national strategies and plans of action set up for that purpose. Morocco encouraged the State to strengthen its efforts to provide human rights training for law enforcement officials.

812. Senegal welcomed the State's continued commitment and positive cooperation with the universal period review mechanism. It encouraged the Government to maintain the same momentum in the implementation of the accepted recommendations as it had in the previous cycle.

813. UNICEF noted that maternal and infant mortality remained above the regional average in the Dominican Republic, in spite of the fact that coverage of institutional delivery and prenatal care was almost universal. The causes of maternal and neonatal deaths could be found in the lack of managerial planning in hospitals, the inefficient allocation of human resources and supplies and staff absenteeism. UNICEF recommended that the State promote a national agreement on health and increase its budget allocations to it. It also urged the Ministry of Health to establish mechanisms to investigate and prosecute negligence and malpractice and to become accountable to society.

814. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela stated that the review of the Dominican Republic showed the great efforts made and progress achieved by the Government in the enjoyment of human rights. It stressed the fact that the Government allocated 4 per cent of its gross domestic product (GDP) to education. It reiterated its appreciation to the Government for its achievements in human rights, especially in the field of economic, social and cultural rights, and encouraged it to further consolidate its social plans and programmes to ensure food safety and the welfare of its people.

815. Viet Nam welcomed the achievements of the Dominican Republic in enhancing the enjoyment of fundamental human rights and freedoms for its people. It looked forward to further commitment and efforts by the State under review in considering and implementing all the accepted recommendations. Viet Nam was pleased to see that two recommendations it had made had been accepted, on the acceleration of efforts to implement the Millennium Development Goals on the rights of women and children, and on combating racial discrimination and trafficking in persons.

816. Algeria took note of the acceptance of the majority of the recommendations by the Dominican Republic, which attested to the State's cooperation with the universal periodic review mechanism. Algeria also welcomed the acceptance of the two recommendations it had made, on fighting human trafficking and eliminating social inequalities: two key measures in promoting and protecting human rights in the country.

817. Cuba acknowledged the work undertaken by the Dominican Republic to improve services and infrastructure relating to health, and reiterated its appreciation for the progress made in educational curricula, a key factor in improving the education system. It highlighted the State's efforts to seek better and greater protection for human rights of all Dominican people, and expressed its confidence that the State would implement the accepted recommendations, including the two made by Cuba on the right to health and education.

### **3. General comments made by other stakeholders**

818. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Dominican Republic, eight other stakeholders made statements.

819. The Minority Rights Group was concerned that the Constitutional Court ruling of 2013 had deprived tens of thousands of Dominicans of Haitian descent of their nationality. The people concerned faced multiple complications in obtaining access to schools, hospitals and work. It deeply regretted the fact that the State had not made a strong commitment to abiding by its international human rights obligations. Although a law on citizenship had been passed to mitigate some effects of the ruling, most Dominicans of Haitian descent would have to register as foreigners and reside for an additional two years before being able to apply for naturalization, with no guarantee of success. It urged the State to restore the nationality of all Dominicans of Haitian descent, and with it their basic human rights.

820. Amnesty International welcomed the fact that the Dominican Republic had accepted most of the recommendations aimed at combating human rights violations, and urged their full implementation. Several States had expressed concern about the right to a nationality and the discrimination experienced by Dominicans of foreign descent, in particular those of Haitian descent. The new legislation obliged thousands of people born in the Dominican

Republic to undergo a long and arduous procedure of naturalization, during which they remained stateless and were thus denied a number of basic rights, including the rights to education, employment and health care. It urged the State to reconsider its rejection of recommendations on guaranteeing the right to a nationality and on adopting measures to identify, prevent and reduce statelessness.

821. Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco welcomed the fact that the State had accepted a number of recommendations on the rights of children and women. However, violence was still committed against children by family members, the police or other members of society. Undocumented children were unable to attend high school. It also expressed concern that protection agencies against violence against women were ineffective because they were excessively bureaucratic. Women continued to face discrimination at various levels in daily life. The organization recommended that the State promote programmes to assist children with vulnerabilities, especially street children; combat impunity and eradicate all forms of violence against children; ensure access to secondary education for all children, without discrimination; combat gender violence; develop awareness campaigns against sexism; and encourage women to report abuses.

822. Action Canada for Population and Development regretted that the maternal mortality rate remained high compared with the State's other indicators. Complications relating to unsafe abortion were a major cause of maternal mortality. The Dominican Republic was one of eight countries in the world where abortion was a crime in all circumstances, which greatly complicated the health care of women attending health facilities with incomplete or complicated abortions. The organization was concerned by the rejection of the relevant recommendation, which apparently indicated that the State did not have any intention of amending existing legislation and that abortion would remain a crime, even in cases where the health or life of the woman was in danger. It urged the State to recognize the issue as a critical human rights issue and review the legislation on abortion.

823. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme thanked the Dominican Republic for its efforts to promote and protect women's rights, particularly the adoption of the Constitution of 2010. It acknowledged that the State had adopted a number of laws and regulations on the rights of persons with disabilities, domestic violence and migrant workers' rights and had ratified the Convention against Torture. However, the organization was concerned about discrimination against migrant workers, particularly Dominican nationals of Haitian descent. The Constitutional Court ruling revoking the citizenship of those persons was a particular cause for concern. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme encouraged the State to continue its efforts to fight corruption, and to extend a standing invitation to all the special procedures of the Human Rights Council.

824. The Open Society Institute expressed concern about the damaging consequences of the ruling by the Constitutional Court on the legal status of Dominicans of Haitian descent. Although it was framed as a legal concession, the new law on naturalization would benefit, at most, only 10 per cent of the total number of those affected.

825. Many Dominicans of Haitian descent had been actively prevented from registering births between 1929 and 2007 because of systematic, institutionalized discrimination. The citizenship rights of those individuals and their descendants were thus jeopardized by a historical failure of the State itself. The Open Society Institute urged the State to adhere to its pledges to address racial discrimination, and to ensure fair, transparent, clear and efficient processes for determining nationality.

826. The International Lesbian and Gay Association stated that homosexuality was not criminalized in the Dominican Republic. However, there were no laws or policies protecting lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons against discrimination and violence. The Dominican Congress had ignored all proposals to include sexual orientation and gender identity among the grounds for discrimination set out in various laws; on the contrary, it had taken measures to exclude lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons from exercising their rights as citizens. One example was the definition of marriage and the family in the Constitution of 2010. The lack of social, legal and political recognition of the human rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons was manifested in daily human rights violations, which were almost never prosecuted or penalized by the courts.

827. Friedrich-Ebert Stiftung acknowledged the appointment of an ombudsman, 12 years after the office of the ombudsman had been established. Insecurity was one of the main problems in the country; 4,975 people had died as a result of violence in 2013. Those homicides, categorized as “legal actions”, could be classified as extrajudiciary killings – a non-punishable crime under Dominican law – leaving judges with no other option than to treat the cases as common murder. Enforced disappearances were also not defined as a crime in domestic law. It commended Congress for approving a bill setting up a system to grant citizenship to Dominican-born children of immigrants. It hoped that that step would clear the way for a fair procedure, but regretted that it would force some who were already Dominican nationals to undergo a naturalization process.

#### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

828. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, according to the information provided, of 134 recommendations received, 84 enjoyed the support of the Dominican Republic and 50 had been noted.

829. The delegation of the Dominican Republic thanked States and organizations for their statements and for their acknowledgement of the progress the State had made in advancing human rights. It had taken note of all the concerns raised so they could be transmitted to the capital for future dialogue. The implementation of the mechanisms established as a result of the new law would allow important advances to be made. The conclusions of the exercise had been reached after wide-ranging consultations with the inter-institutional commission for human rights and civil society. The work of implementation would begin immediately, and the Dominican Republic would continue to cooperate and maintain a candid dialogue based on respect for all States and peoples.

#### **Viet Nam**

830. The review of Viet Nam, held on 05 February 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Viet Nam in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/VNM/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/VNM/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/18/VNM/3).

831. At its 27th meeting, on 20 June 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Viet Nam (see sect. C below).

832. The outcome of the review of Viet Nam comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/26/6), the views of the State concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/26/6/Add.1).

#### **1. Views expressed by the State under review on the recommendations and/or conclusions, its voluntary commitments and the outcome**

833. Viet Nam attached great importance to the universal periodic review mechanism and had actively and seriously participated in the process. It considered the review a good opportunity for States to increase awareness of human rights and to strengthen human rights institutions, policies and mechanisms. It appreciated dialogue with all States, international organizations and non-governmental organizations in the interests of the promotion and protection of human rights.

834. Guided by seriousness and transparency, the Government of Viet Nam had briefed all ministries, governmental institutions, representatives of the national and international press

and social, political and professional organizations on the outcomes of the review, immediately after the session of the Working Group in February 2014. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs had also collaborated with the United Nations Development Programme to organize a workshop on the outcomes of the State's review. Several other ministries, agencies, research institutes and national and local media had held discussions on the review results, which had helped to raise the awareness of human rights of all government officials and people even further.

835. Viet Nam had a firm policy of placing people at the centre of national development strategies. The policy had been consistently reflected and updated in judicial and institutional systems and national development policies and programmes, with a view to better promoting and protecting human rights, improving the spiritual and material life of the people, enhancing democracy and promoting equality, social welfare and a State governed by the rule of law. Viet Nam also advocated the strengthening of international dialogue and cooperation on human rights, which provided an opportunity for sharing and learning from experiences and good practices.

836. Viet Nam had established an interministerial working group to review all the comments and recommendations made during its review. The Government had approved a comprehensive report on the recommendations it supported and had entrusted 13 relevant ministries and agencies with implementing them. Viet Nam supported 182 recommendations out of a total of 227, which demonstrated its seriousness, progressiveness, openness and determination in the promotion and protection of human rights.

837. The recommendations supported by Viet Nam included those relating to strengthening policies, measures and resources for the promotion and protection of economic, cultural, social, civil and political rights in line with international standards; achieving all the Millennium Development Goals ahead of 2015; enhancing and improving legal and judicial systems and national mechanisms on human rights; guaranteeing the rights of socially vulnerable groups, especially women, children, persons with disabilities, the elderly and ethnic minorities; improving education about and awareness of human rights; building capacity for law enforcement agencies in a State governed by the rule of law; participating in the implementation of international human rights conventions; observing the obligations laid down in international conventions; and guaranteeing the rights of vulnerable groups.

838. The Government had requested judicial, legislative, social and political organizations to coordinate and collaborate with the executive branch in the implementation of the recommendations relevant to them.

839. Viet Nam was implementing the Constitution of 2013, with the highest priority being given to the implementation of many provisions on human and citizen's rights. Relevant Vietnamese institutions were currently reviewing, amending, supplementing and promulgating legal documents on human rights, fundamental rights and the obligations of citizens in accordance with the Constitution. In May 2014, a standing committee of the National Assembly had endorsed the legislative agenda for the period to 2015, which would include amendments and the formulation of a number of important legal documents, including laws on demonstrations, access to information, freedom of association and referendums.

840. Viet Nam continued to provide sufficient resources for the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals and the implementation of national programmes on social welfare, especially for households in financial difficulties, women, children, elderly persons, ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities and persons in remote and mountainous areas. Due attention had been paid to grass-roots democracy and the participation of social and political organizations and people of all classes in the planning and implementation of important national policies and programmes, particularly on issues of security, peace, stability and development.

841. Viet Nam had successfully hosted the United Nations Day of Vesak, attended by some 3,500 Buddhist representatives and dignitaries from 90 countries and territories and tens of thousands of Buddhist followers and other interested people. It had also hosted a series of regional and international cultural events, including the Hue Festival 2014 and the Viet Nam ethnic minorities' day of culture. Those activities had contributed to spiritual and material

life and increased mutual understanding, exchange and respect for the spiritual and cultural life of other peoples in the region and throughout the world.

842. By the end of 2014, Viet Nam intended to ratify the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Numerous workshops on the two conventions had been held at the national and local levels in order to raise awareness among civil servants and people on the spirit and substance of the two instruments.

## **2. Views expressed by member and observer States of the Council on the review outcome**

843. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Viet Nam, 15 delegations made statements.

844. According to the Islamic Republic of Iran, the State's acceptance of a number of recommendations, including three recommendations made by the Islamic Republic of Iran, reflected its clear commitment to promoting and protecting human rights.

845. The Lao People's Democratic Republic appreciated the fact that Viet Nam had accepted most of the recommendations and had taken steps to implement them. It appreciated the efforts made by the State to create the conditions for all people to exercise their human rights and fundamental freedoms, including freedom of religion and belief. It commended Viet Nam for the important progress made in the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals, including in, inter alia, poverty reduction, social equality, strengthening the rule of law and improving the quality of education.

846. Malaysia commended Viet Nam for the progress it had made in the promotion and protection of the human rights of its people, in particular in the areas of education, social welfare, education, hunger eradication and poverty reduction. Malaysia was pleased to note that its recommendation on enhancing the rule of law in the country had been accepted by Viet Nam.

847. Morocco praised the increased degree of cooperation by Viet Nam with the special procedures, noting that, during the period July 2010 to November 2013, five special procedure mandate holders had visited the country. It welcomed the fact that Viet Nam had devoted the entire second chapter of its revised Constitution to human rights and the duties of citizens, and commended Viet Nam for its achievement of universal primary education. Morocco noted the continued growth in GDP that had allowed Viet Nam to create around 1 million jobs annually. Further, Morocco also praised the State for its socioeconomic dynamism, which had enabled it to achieve the Millennium Development Goals ahead of schedule.

848. Myanmar was pleased to note that Viet Nam had accepted most of the recommendations, including the three made by Myanmar, on providing better guarantees for the rights of vulnerable groups, setting up more human rights education programmes and promoting participation by people in policy formulation and implementation.

849. Pakistan appreciated the fact that Viet Nam had accepted most of the recommendations, including those made by Pakistan. It valued the State's constructive engagement and cooperation with all human rights mechanisms, including the universal periodic review, as shown by the decisions it had taken in fulfilment of its human rights obligations, aimed at strengthening national human rights institutions, eliminating gender-based discrimination, ensuring freedom of expression and opinion and promoting socioeconomic development.

850. The Philippines commended Viet Nam for its success in meeting the Millennium Development Goals, particularly those on poverty alleviation, education and gender equality. It congratulated Viet Nam on its work to accede to more human rights instruments and to align its laws more closely with international standards. It noted measures Viet Nam had taken to protect women and children more effectively from trafficking. It viewed the State's continued engagement with regional and international organizations as a positive sign of its readiness to address all remaining concerns. It valued the support and contributions of Viet Nam to ASEAN, aimed at improving the regional human rights framework.

851. The Russian Federation stated that the second review of Viet Nam had shown the State's determination to take all measures necessary to improve national mechanisms, uphold human rights and actively involve civil society in development and had provided details of its economic, political and social initiatives. The State's acceptance of most of the recommendations reflected its readiness to engage in capacity-building and to uphold human rights.

852. Senegal praised Viet Nam for its renewed engagement in the promotion and protection of human rights. It encouraged Viet Nam to redouble its efforts to implement the recommendations it had accepted in the interests of achieving the full realization of the economic, social and cultural rights of its people.

853. Singapore noted the seriousness and commitment shown by Viet Nam in improving the promotion and protection of the human rights of its people. As a fellow ASEAN country, Singapore looked forward to continuing its cooperation with Viet Nam in strengthening the promotion of human rights in the region through various ASEAN initiatives, such as in the context of the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights.

854. Sri Lanka believed that the recommendations that Viet Nam had accepted would contribute to its efforts to further safeguard human rights in the country. It noted the various measures the State had taken to protect the rights of its people. It was also encouraged by the steps Viet Nam had taken to maintain an environment of peace and stability, sustained economic growth and improved material and cultural life. It noted the early attainment by Viet Nam of the Millennium Development Goals, particularly those on hunger alleviation and poverty reduction, as well as the improvements witnessed in social welfare and the broader access to education and health care.

855. Thailand welcomed the support expressed by Viet Nam for a large number of recommendations. Thailand stood ready to share its experiences with and extend cooperation to Viet Nam to implement the recommendations.

856. UNICEF welcomed a recent decision by the Prime Minister, which directed line ministries to take targeted action to implement the concluding observations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child. It noted the continued and substantial disparities between different groups of children, many of which were due to systematic policy failures. That was especially true of access to high-quality social services, which should be improved by means of equity-oriented and inclusive policies. Freedom of expression and association remained limited, and the rights of children to express their views, to have their views taken into account and to seek redress were still not sufficiently protected. Emphasizing the importance of effective and efficient implementation of government policies for children's rights, UNICEF encouraged the State to improve the allocation of human and financial resources for the implementation of those policies at both the national and subnational levels. It urged Viet Nam to establish an independent mechanism to monitor children's rights.

857. The United States of America welcomed the State's commitment to ratifying the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and its invitation to the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief to visit the country in August 2014. Although it was deeply troubled by the continued application of national security laws to target dissent, it urged Viet Nam to consider the recommendations on revising national security laws. It also urged the State to release all individuals imprisoned merely for exercising their human rights. While noting the statement by Viet Nam that trade union activity was fully guaranteed under current laws, restrictions on independent trade unions persisted, as did the targeting of labour activists. The United States expressed concern about restrictions on access to and use of the Internet, and called for the suspension and repeal of Decree No. 72, which further curbed free speech online. It called upon the State to ensure that individuals of all faiths and backgrounds were free to practice their religion without undue government interference.

858. Uzbekistan stated that the serious and constructive attitude of Viet Nam in the universal periodic review process showed the State's commitment to its international obligations on human rights. Effective implementation of the review recommendations would ensure greater protection of human rights in Viet Nam.

### 3. General comments made by other stakeholders

859. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Viet Nam, 10 other stakeholders made statements.

860. The International Lesbian and Gay Association welcomed the recent position expressed by Viet Nam on protecting the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons. It urged the State to uphold the principle of non-discrimination enshrined in its new Constitution and relevant laws. In particular, it urged Viet Nam to amend the Penal Code to protect transgender men and women with regard to the crime of rape, and to amend the Civil Code to allow people to change their name, gender or legal identification. The new law on marriage and the family did not recognize same-sex unions; the Association therefore urged the State to protect the rights of same-sex couples.

861. Agir ensemble pour les droits de l'homme had continued to receive reports of harassment and threats against civil society actors, including those who collaborated with international human rights mechanisms. Viet Nam had intimidated dozens of bloggers, human rights defenders and civil society activists, and at least five bloggers, online journalists and activists had been arrested and condemned to 15 years in prison under articles of the Penal Code on national security, which were vaguely worded and incompatible with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Viet Nam continued to impose a draconian registration system that criminalized all religious practices other than those approved by the State. It called upon Viet Nam to release all persons detained arbitrarily for peacefully expressing their opinion and beliefs, and to abide by its international legal obligations to respect human rights.

862. Human Rights Watch welcomed the release of a number of people convicted on politically motivated charges for the non-violent exercise of human rights, including Nguyen Huu Cau, Nguyen Tien Trung and Vi Duc Hoi, and the temporary release of Dr. Cu Huy Ha Vu for medical treatment. Despite the State's acceptance of the recommendations on freedom of expression, association, assembly, labour rights and land rights, it continued systematically to violate such rights. The State had imprisoned human rights, land rights and democracy activists. Human Rights Watch urged Viet Nam to release all of them and to put an end to administrative detention without trial and to the imposition of forced labour on drug users and alleged drug users without due process of law. The State had targeted bloggers; on 5 May 2014, it had arrested Ba Sam and Nguyen Thi Minh Thuy and charged them under article 258 of the Penal Code, which provided for up to seven years in prison for "abusing democratic freedoms". It urged Viet Nam to repeal the abusive provisions of the Penal Code and other regulations, or to substantially revise them to bring them into line with international human rights standards.

863. Amnesty International welcomed the early release of several prisoners of conscience in April 2014. However, it expressed deep disappointment about the continued detention of bloggers, political and religious activists, land and labour rights activists, human rights and social justice advocates, merely for peacefully exercising their right to freedom of expression. Some of those detained were in very poor health, which was in some cases exacerbated by harsh prison conditions and other ill-treatment. Those imprisoned after unfair trials, and others in pretrial detention for peacefully exercising their right to freedom of expression and opinion, had been charged under vaguely worded provisions in the national security section of the Penal Code or under article 258 of that law. It urged Viet Nam to revise articles 79, 88 and 258 of the Penal Code to ensure that they complied with its obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and were not used to stifle peaceful expression of views. It also urged Viet Nam to introduce a moratorium on executions as a step towards the abolition of the death penalty.

864. The International Association of Democratic Lawyers noted that the herbicide Agent Orange, used during the Viet Nam war, had left its deadly mark on the national environment, including the destruction of mangrove forests and the long-term contamination of soil. It noted the efforts of Viet Nam to improve the living conditions of the people, and called upon the State to assist those affected by Agent Orange in their fight for justice.

865. The Vietnam Family Planning Association noted the State's important achievements in reducing population growth, maternal mortality and child mortality. It also noted the

improvements witnessed in primary health care and sexual and reproductive health, which had contributed to the State's achievement of the Millennium Development Goals ahead of schedule. It recommended that the State focus more on adolescents and young people in remote areas and young migrants from rural to urban areas, facilitating their access to information, counselling and youth-friendly services in sexual and reproductive health and family planning, advising them on how to avoid unintended pregnancies and on abortion, and on preventing HIV infection.

866. The World Peace Council noted that the Constitution of Viet Nam guaranteed equal rights in all political, economic and social spheres and before the law. The right to petition and complain was respected and protected. The democratic nature and transparency of the State was strengthened by the critiques from the press and other media and feedback from the people. It highlighted the State's efforts on behalf of those affected by Agent Orange.

867. The British Humanist Association stated that the broad legal framework for silencing dissent in Viet Nam was at odds with international human rights law. It cited the example of a man who was reluctant to discuss the human rights situation within the country for fear of being overheard by an alleged secret police force: his fear and self-censorship reflected the total absence of freedom of expression in Viet Nam.

868. The Vietnam Peace and Development Foundation noted the State's continuing efforts in the promotion and protection of the human rights by maintaining peace and stability, improving living conditions and facilitating the exercise of people's rights. The Vietnamese people and their organizations had actively engaged in the recent amendment of the Constitution and in legal reform. It recommended that the Government step up its efforts and allocate more resources to strengthen the enjoyment of human rights and create more favourable conditions for all stakeholders to participate effectively in decision-making processes.

869. United Nations Watch stated that candidates in elections were always pre-selected by the Communist Party. Dissenters and bloggers were harassed and often savagely beaten by thugs on police orders: one in every 18 citizens was working for public security, with the sole aim of monitoring citizens and repressing their human rights. Leaders publicly vowed to crush any attempt to create opposition groups. The Communist Party was determined to maintain dictatorship at all costs and by all means: young people were condemned to 5 or 10 years in prison solely for peacefully expressing their opinion.

#### **4. Concluding remarks of the State under review**

870. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, according to the information provided, of 227 recommendations received, 182 enjoyed the support of Viet Nam and the rest had been noted.

871. The universal periodic review was the most successful mechanism of the Human Rights Council for cooperating and engaging in a genuine dialogue on the basis of equality and respect for national sovereignty. It contributed significantly to the promotion and protection of human rights in every country of the world.

872. Viet Nam would implement the review recommendations and its voluntary pledges as a member of the Human Rights Council. It would continue to conduct a dialogue and share experiences with all States and United Nations entities, including United Nations human rights mechanisms, international organizations and non-governmental organizations, to improve the situation of human rights in Viet Nam.

873. Violations of law must be dealt with in accordance with the law. Viet Nam had provided information on human rights developments in the country during the eighteenth session of the Working Group and in bilateral dialogues with States through other channels. It had also provided timely and adequate responses to the special procedures on similar issues. Viet Nam would continue its practice of dialogue, cooperation and transparency.

## B. General debate on agenda item 6

874. At its 29th meeting, on 23 June 2014, and its 31st meeting, on 24 June 2014, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 6, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Greece<sup>18</sup> (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Morocco (on behalf of members and observers of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Egypt<sup>18</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Russian Federation, China, Ireland, India;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Denmark, Finland, Iraq, Sudan, Togo;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Human Rights Law Centre, UPR Info, Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

## C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

### New Zealand

875. At the 22nd meeting, on 19 June 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 26/101 without a vote.

### Afghanistan

876. At the 22nd meeting, on 19 June 2014 the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 26/102 without a vote.

### Chile

877. At the 22nd meeting, on 19 June 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 26/103 without a vote.

### Uruguay

878. At the 24th meeting, on 19 June 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 26/104 without a vote.

### Yemen

879. At the 24th meeting, on 19 June 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 26/105 without a vote.

### Vanuatu

880. At the 25th meeting, on 20 June 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 26/106 without a vote.

### The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

881. At the 25th meeting, on 20 June 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 26/107 without a vote.

<sup>18</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

**Comoros**

882. At the 25th meeting, on 20 June 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 26/108 without a vote.

**Slovakia**

883. At the 26th meeting, on 20 June 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 26/109 without a vote.

**Eritrea**

884. At the 26th meeting, on 20 June 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 26/110 without a vote.

**Cyprus**

885. At the 26th meeting, on 20 June 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 26/111 without a vote.

**Dominican Republic**

886. At the 27th meeting, on 20 June 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 26/112 without a vote.

**Viet Nam**

887. At the 27th meeting, on 20 June 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 26/113 without a vote.

**Cambodia**

888. At the 34th meeting, on 26 June 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 26/114 without a vote.

## VII. Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories

### General debate on agenda item 7

889. At its 31st meeting, on 24 June 2014, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 7, during which the following made statements:

(a) The representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and the State of Palestine, as the States concerned;

(b) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Brazil (also on behalf of India and South Africa), Chile, China, Cuba, Egypt<sup>19</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)<sup>19</sup> (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Kuwait, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(c) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Oman, Qatar, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, Yemen;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action contre la faim, Al Mezan Centre for Human Rights, Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man, BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches, European Union of Jewish Students, General Arab Women Federation, International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, International Muslim Women's Union, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch.

---

<sup>19</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

## VIII. Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

### General debate on agenda item 8

890. At its 31st meeting, on 24 June 2014, and its 32nd meeting on the same day, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 8, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina (also on behalf of Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico and Uruguay), Cuba, Egypt<sup>20</sup> (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Comoros, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, the Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, the Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe and the State of Palestine.), Greece<sup>20</sup> (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), India, Indonesia, Ireland, Morocco, Pakistan, Russian Federation, United States of America (also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bulgaria, Chile, the Congo, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Italy, Lithuania, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Slovenia, Spain, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Canada, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Netherlands, Sudan;

(c) Observer for the Holy See;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Alsalam Foundation, Amnesty International, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, British Humanist Association, Center for Inquiry, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Comité international pour le respect et l'application de la Charte africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples, Global Helping to Advance Women and Children, Indian Council of South America, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Lesbian and Gay Association (also on behalf of the Association for Women's Rights in Development, Amnesty International, IPAS, the Humanist Institute for Co-operation with Developing Countries, Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Consorcio Boliviano de Juventudes – Casa de la Juventud, the United Nations Association of the United States of America, the Women's Global Network for Reproductive

<sup>20</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

Rights, the International Service for Human Rights, Article 19 – International Centre Against Censorship, Human Rights Watch, the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative and the Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network), International Muslim Women’s Union, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES International (also on behalf of Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco), Liberation, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE International, Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization, World Muslim Congress.

891. At the 32nd meeting on the same day, the representatives of Algeria and Morocco made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

892. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria and Morocco made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

## **IX. Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action**

### **A. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders**

#### **Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance**

893. At the 32nd meeting, on 24 June 2014, the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, Mutuma Ruteere, presented his reports (A/HRC/26/49, A/HRC/26/50 and Add.1–2).

894. At the same meeting, the representative of Mauritania made a statement as the State concerned.

895. Also at the same meeting, the National Human Rights Commission of Mauritania made a statement.

896. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the same meeting, and at the 33rd meeting on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Botswana, Brazil, Cuba, Egypt<sup>21</sup> (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), France, Morocco, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Latvia, Poland, Spain, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, State of Palestine;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, International Lesbian and Gay Association, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, Minority Rights Group.

897. At the 33rd meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

898. At the same meeting, the representatives of Armenia and Azerbaijan made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

899. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Armenia and Azerbaijan made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

### **B. General debate on agenda item 9**

900. At its 21st meeting, on 18 June 2014, the Chair-Rapporteur of the Intergovernmental Working Group on the Effective Implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, Mohamed Siad Douale, presented the report of the Working Group on its twelfth session, held from 7 to 17 April 2014 (A/HRC/26/55).

901. At the same meeting on the same day, the Chief of the Rule of Law, Equality and Non-Discrimination Branch of OHCHR presented the report of the third meeting of the group of independent eminent experts on the implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, held on 4 February 2014 (A/HRC/26/56).

902. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 9, during which the following made statements:

<sup>21</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, China, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Cuba, Greece<sup>22</sup> (on behalf of the European Union and Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), Indonesia, Ireland, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation (also on behalf of Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan), South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belgium, Colombia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, Agence internationale pour le développement, Alsalam Foundation, Association of World Citizens, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Fraternité Notre Dame, Inc., Indian Council of South America, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Educational Development, Inc., International Muslim Women's Union, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Liberation, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Tiye International, United Nations Watch, World Barua Organization, World Muslim Congress.

## C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

### **Implementation of the International Decade for People of African Descent: draft programme of activities**

903. At the 21st meeting, on 18 June 2014, the representative of Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.2, sponsored by Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States. Subsequently, Bangladesh, Colombia, Cuba, Egypt (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Indonesia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

904. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.2 without a vote (resolution 26/1).

<sup>22</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

## X. Technical assistance and capacity-building

### A. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders

#### **Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic**

905. At the 33rd meeting, on 24 June 2014, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic, Marie-Thérèse Keita Bocoum, presented her report (A/HRC/26/53).

906. At the same meeting, the representative of the Central African Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

907. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, also at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Benin, Burkina Faso, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Romania, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Belgium, Chad, Mali, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Togo;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Femmes Afrique Solidarité, Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues.

908. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

909. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Chad made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

#### **Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Côte d'Ivoire**

910. At the 35th meeting, on 25 June 2014, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Côte d'Ivoire, Doudou Diène, presented his report (A/HRC/26/52).

911. At the same meeting, the representative of Côte d'Ivoire made a statement as the State concerned.

912. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, also at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Benin, Burkina Faso, Congo, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), France, Ireland, Maldives, Morocco, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belgium, Chad, Israel, Mali, Mauritania, New Zealand, Niger, Senegal, Sudan, Togo;

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: UNICEF;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: World Organisation against Torture, International Service for Human Rights, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (also on behalf of Human Rights Watch), International Catholic Child Bureau (also on behalf of Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES

International, Franciscans International and Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order of Preachers), Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme.

913. At the same meeting, the representative of Côte d'Ivoire made concluding remarks as the State concerned.

914. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

## **B. Panel discussions**

### **Annual thematic discussion on the enhancement of technical cooperation and capacity-building in the field of human rights**

915. At its 34th meeting, on 25 June 2014, the Human Rights Council held, in accordance with Council resolution 18/18, its annual thematic discussion on the enhancement of technical cooperation and capacity-building in the field of human rights. Pursuant to Council resolution 24/31, the discussion focused on technical cooperation and capacity-building in advancing the rights of persons with disabilities through legal and institutional frameworks, including public-private partnerships. The opening statement for the panel discussion was delivered by the Deputy United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. A member of the Board of Trustees of the Voluntary Fund for Technical Cooperation in the Field of Human Rights, MariClaire Acosta Urquidi, delivered introductory remarks. The Permanent Representative of Thailand to the United Nations in Geneva, Kerkpan Roekchamnon, moderated the discussion for the panel.

916. At the same meeting, the panellists Rosangela Berman Bieler, Ingrid Ihme, Maria Soledad Cisternas Reyes, Wiriya Namsiripongpun and Yannis Vardakastanis made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two parts.

917. During the ensuing panel discussion for the first part, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Cuba, Ireland, Maldives, Morocco, Philippines (on behalf of ASEAN);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Iran (Islamic Republic of), New Zealand, Qatar, Spain, Sri Lanka;

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

(d) Observer for non-governmental organizations: Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

918. During the discussion for the second part, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Austria, Benin, Brazil, Gabon, Indonesia, Italy, Russian Federation, United States of America, Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Ecuador, Finland, Norway, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey;

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: ILO.

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

## **C. General debate on agenda item 10**

920. At the 36th meeting, on 25 June 2014, the Deputy United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 18/18, made a

statement providing an overview of and successes, best practices and challenges in technical assistance and capacity-building efforts provided by OHCHR and relevant United Nations agencies.

921. At the same meeting, the Deputy High Commissioner presented a country-specific report of the High Commissioner submitted under agenda items 2 and 10 (A/HRC/26/23).

922. Also at the same meeting, a member of the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Technical Cooperation in the Field of Human Rights, Mariclaire Acosta Urquidi, presented the report of the Board of Trustees (A/HRC/26/51).

923. At the same meeting, on the same day, the representative of South Sudan made a statement as the State concerned.

924. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 10, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, China, Cuba, France, Greece<sup>23</sup> (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey), India, Ireland, Maldives, Morocco (on behalf of members and observers of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Republic of Korea, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Canada, Central African Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Iraq, Libya, Netherlands, Sudan, Thailand;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation, Amnesty International, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Femmes Afrique Solidarité, General Arab Women Federation (also on behalf of International Educational Development, Inc.), Human Rights Watch, Indian Council of South America, International Commission of Jurists, United Nations Watch.

925. At the 23rd meeting, on 19 June 2014, the representatives of Burundi and Thailand made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

### **Cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights**

926. At the 40th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the representative of Ukraine introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.15/Rev.1, sponsored by Ukraine and co-sponsored by Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Subsequently, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Greece, Italy, Japan and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

927. At the same meeting, the representative of Ukraine orally revised the draft resolution.

928. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Côte d'Ivoire, the Czech Republic, Italy (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council), Mexico and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution.

929. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution. The Chief of the OHCHR Finance and Budget Section made a statement on the budgetary implications of the draft resolution.

<sup>23</sup> Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

930. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Cuba, Indonesia, Kuwait (on behalf of States members of the Gulf Cooperation Council that are members of the Council), Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

*In favour:*

Austria, Benin, Botswana, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Romania, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Against:*

China, Cuba, Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Congo, Ethiopia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Namibia, Pakistan, Peru, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam

932. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.15/Rev.1 by 23 votes to 4, with 19 abstentions (resolution 26/30).

933. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Argentina and Chile made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

**Technical and capacity-building assistance for South Sudan in the field of human rights**

934. At the 40th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the representative of Ethiopia introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.32, sponsored by Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by South Sudan. Subsequently, Botswana, New Zealand, Switzerland and Thailand joined the sponsors.

935. At the same meeting, the representative of Ethiopia orally revised the draft resolution.

936. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Italy and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution.

937. At the same meeting, the representative of South Sudan made a statement as the State concerned.

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

939. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.32, as orally revised, without a vote (resolution 26/31).

**Capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights**

940. At the 40th meeting, on 27 June 2014, the representative of Ethiopia introduced draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.39, sponsored by Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by Belgium, Germany, Italy, Maldives, Monaco, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Thailand and Ukraine. Subsequently, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Indonesia, Luxembourg, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

941. At the same meeting, the representatives of Burkina Faso and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution.

942. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Côte d'Ivoire made a statement as the State concerned.

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

944. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.39 without a vote (resolution 26/32).

## Annex I

### Attendance

#### Members

Algeria	Gabon	Philippines
Argentina	Germany	Republic of Korea
Austria	India	Romania
Benin	Indonesia	Russian Federation
Botswana	Ireland	Saudi Arabia
Brazil	Italy	Sierra Leone
Burkina Faso	Japan	South Africa
Chile	Kazakhstan	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
China	Kenya	United Arab Emirates
Congo	Kuwait	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Costa Rica	Maldives	United States of America
Côte d'Ivoire	Mexico	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
Cuba	Montenegro	Viet Nam
Czech Republic	Morocco	
Estonia	Namibia	
Ethiopia	Pakistan	
France	Peru	

#### States Members of the United Nations represented by observers

Afghanistan	Egypt	Nepal
Albania	El Salvador	Netherlands
Andorra	Eritrea	New Zealand
Angola	Finland	Nicaragua
Armenia	Georgia	Niger
Australia	Greece	Nigeria
Azerbaijan	Guatemala	Norway
Bahrain	Hungary	Oman
Belarus	Iceland	Paraguay
Bangladesh	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Poland
Barbados	Iraq	Portugal
Belgium	Israel	Qatar
Bhutan	Jordan	Republic of Moldova
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Kyrgyzstan	Rwanda
Brunei Darussalam	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Senegal
Bulgaria	Latvia	Serbia
Burundi	Lebanon	Seychelles
Cambodia	Libya	Singapore
Canada	Liechtenstein	Slovakia
Chad	Lithuania	Slovenia
Colombia	Madagascar	South Sudan
Comoros	Malaysia	Spain
Croatia	Mali	Sri Lanka
Cyprus	Malta	Sudan
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	Mauritania	Sweden
Denmark	Monaco	Switzerland
Djibouti	Mozambique	Syrian Arab Republic
Dominican Republic	Myanmar	Tajikistan
Ecuador		Thailand
		Togo
		Tunisia

Turkey	Ukraine	Vanuatu
Turkmenistan	Uruguay	Yemen
Uganda	Uzbekistan	Zimbabwe

### **Non-Member States represented by observers**

Holy See  
State of Palestine

### **United Nations**

Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS	United Nations Development Programme – Viet Nam
United Nations Children’s Fund	United Nations Environment Programme
United Nations Development Programme – Ukraine	United Nations Population Fund
	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women)

### **Specialized agencies and related organizations**

International Labour Office	World Health Organization
International Organization for Migration	World Trade Organization
International Telecommunication Union	

### **Intergovernmental organizations**

African Union	International Olympic Committee
Council of Europe	International Organization of la Francophonie
European Union	Organization of Islamic Cooperation
International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies	

### **Other entities**

International Committee of the Red Cross  
Sovereign Military Order of Malta

### **National human rights institutions, international coordinating committees and regional groups of national institutions**

Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission (by video message)	National Committee for Human Rights – Qatar
Conseil consultative des droits de l’homme du Royaume du Maroc	National Consultative Commission of Human Rights – France
Danish Institute for Human Rights	National Council for Human Rights – Egypt
Defensoría del Pueblo – Colombia (by video message)	National Institute for Human Rights – Chile
Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain (by joint video message)	New Zealand Human Rights Commission (by video message)
International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights	Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission (by joint video message)
	Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights

### **Non-governmental organizations**

- ACT Alliance – Action by Churches Together  
 Action Canada for Population and Development  
 Action contre la faim  
 Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs  
 ActionAid  
 Advocates for Human Rights  
 Africa Culture International  
 African-American Society for Humanitarian Aid and Development  
 African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters  
 African Technical Association  
 Agence Internationale pour le Développement  
 Agir ensemble pour les droits de l'homme  
 Al Mezan Centre for Human Rights  
 Al-Hakim Foundation  
 Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man  
 Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement  
 Al-Khoei Foundation  
 Alsalam Foundation  
 Al-Zubair Charity Foundation  
 American Civil Liberties Union  
 Amis des Etrangers au Togo  
 Amman Center for Human Rights Studies  
 Amnesty International  
 Arab NGO Network for Development  
 Arab Penal Reform Organization  
 Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship  
 Asian Centre for Human Rights  
 Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development  
 Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development (Forum-Asia)  
 Asian Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Network (AITPN)  
 Asian Legal Resource Centre  
 Association des Badinga du Congo - ABADIC  
 Association of World Citizens  
 Association for the Prevention of Torture  
 Association for Progressive Communications  
 Association Points-Cœur  
 Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII  
 Asylum Access  
 Auspice Stella  
 BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Resource Rights  
 Baha'i International Community  
 B'nai B'rith  
 Brahma Kumaris World Spiritual University (BKWSU)  
 British Humanist Association  
 Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies  
 Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network  
 Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities)  
 Center for Reproductive Rights, Inc., The Center for Legal and Social Studies  
 Centre Europe - Tiers Monde – Europe -Third World Centre  
 Centre for Human Rights  
 Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy  
 Center for Inquiry  
 Centre indépendant de recherches et d'initiatives pour le dialogue  
 Centro Regional de Derechos Humanos y Justicia de Género  
 Child Development Foundation  
 Childlink Foundation  
 China NGO Network for International Exchanges (CNIE)  
 CIDSE  
 CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation  
 Colombian Commission of Jurists  
 Comité international pour le respect et l'application de la Charte africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples (CIRAC)  
 Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches  
 Commission to Study the Organization of Peace  
 Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative  
 Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul  
 Conectas Direitos Humanos  
 Congregation of our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd  
 Defence for Children International  
 Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era  
 Development Innovations and Networks  
 Dominicans for Justice and Peace  
 Order of Preachers  
 East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project  
 Edmund Rice International Limited  
 Espace Afrique International  
 European Law Students' Association  
 European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Association  
 European Union of Jewish Students  
 Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit COC Nederland  
 Federation of Environmental and Ecological Diversity for Agricultural Revampment and Human Rights

Femmes Afrique Solidarité  
 Foodfirst Information and Action  
 Network  
 Foundation for GAIA  
 Foundation for International Relations  
 and Development Studies  
 France Libertés: Fondation Danielle  
 Mitterrand  
 Franciscans International  
 Fraternité Notre Dame  
 Freedom House  
 Friedrich Ebert Foundation  
 Friends of the Earth International  
 Friends World Committee for Consultation  
 (Quakers)  
 General Arab Women Federation  
 Geneva for Human Rights – Global  
 Training  
 Geneva Infant Feeding Association  
 Geneva International Model United  
 Nations (GIMUN)  
 Global Helping to Advance Women and  
 Children  
 Groupe des ONG pour la Convention  
 relative aux droits de l'enfant  
 Hawa Society for Women  
 Helios Life Association  
 International Association of Democratic  
 Lawyers  
 International Association of Jewish  
 Lawyers and Jurists  
 International Association for Religious  
 Freedom  
 International Buddhist Relief Organisation  
 International Catholic Child Bureau  
 International Center for Not-for-Profit Law  
 International Commission of Jurists  
 International Educational Development,  
 Inc.  
 International Federation for Human Rights  
 Leagues  
 International Federation of Journalists  
 International Federation of Medical  
 Students' Associations  
 International Federation of Rural Adult  
 Catholic Movements  
 International Fellowship of Reconciliation  
 International Harm Reduction Association  
 International Human Rights Association of  
 American Minorities  
 International Humanist and Ethical Union  
 International Institute for Non-Aligned Studies  
 International Institute for Peace, Justice and  
 Human Rights  
 International Lesbian and Gay Association  
 International Longevity Center Global  
 Alliance, Ltd.  
 International Movement against all Forms  
 of Discrimination and Racism  
 International Muslim Women's Union  
 International Office for Human Rights  
 - Action on Colombia, Oidhaco  
 International Organization for the  
 Elimination of All Forms of Racial  
 Discrimination  
 International Organization for the Right to  
 Education and Freedom of Education  
 International Peace Bureau  
 International Planned Parenthood Federation  
 International Service for Human Rights  
 International Volunteerism Organization  
 for Women, Education and Development  
 International Youth and Student  
 Movement for the United Nations  
 Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice  
 delle Salesiane di Don Bosco  
 Jubilee Campaign  
 Kenya Alliance for the Advancement of  
 Children  
 Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims  
 of Violence  
 Latter-Day Saint Charities  
 Lawyers for Lawyers  
 Le Collectif des Femmes Africaines  
 du Hainaut  
 Lesbian and Gay Federation in Germany  
 (by video message)  
 Liberal International (World Liberal Union)  
 Liberation  
 Maarij Foundation for Peace and  
 Development  
 Make Mothers Matter International  
 Mandat International  
 Medical Care Development International  
 Migrants Rights International  
 Minority Rights Group  
 Modern Advocacy, Humanitarian, Social  
 and Rehabilitation Association  
 Mouvement contre le racisme et pour  
 l'amitié entre les peuples  
 Movement for the Protection of African  
 Child  
 Native Women's Association of Canada  
 New Humanity  
 NGO Coordination post Beijing  
 Switzerland  
 Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational  
 and Transparty  
 Nord-Sud XXI  
 Norwegian Refugee Council  
 ODHIKAR - Coalition for Human Rights  
 Open Society Institute  
 Organisation pour la communication en  
 Afrique et de promotion de la  
 coopération économique internationale  
 (Ocaproce International)

Organisation des Laics Engagés du Sacré-  
 Cœur pour le Développement de  
 Kimbondo  
 Organization for Defending Victims of  
 Violence  
 Oxfam Novib  
 Pax Romana  
 Penal Reform International  
 Plan International, Inc.  
 Presse Emblème Campagne  
 Programme on Women's Economic,  
 Social and Cultural Rights  
 Rencontre africaine pour la défense des  
 droits de l'homme  
 Reporters Sans Frontiers International –  
 Reporters without Borders International  
 Robert F. Kennedy Center for Justice and  
 Human Rights  
 Russian Peace Foundation  
 Save the Children International  
 Schweizerische Arbeitsgemeinschaft der  
 Jugendverbände  
 Shirkat Gah, Women's Resource Centre  
 Social Service Agency of the Protestant  
 Church in Germany  
 Society for Development and Community  
 Empowerment  
 Society for Threatened Peoples  
 Soroptimist International of Europe  
 Sudan Council of Voluntary Agencies  
 Sudanese Women General Union  
 Syriac Universal Alliance  
 Swiss Catholic Lenten Fund  
 Tandem Project  
 Tchad – Agir pour l'Environnement  
 Terre Des Hommes Federation  
 Internationale  
 The Korean Council for the Women  
 Drafted for Military Sexual Slavery  
 by Japan  
 Tides Center  
 Tiye International  
 Union de l'action féminine  
 Union of Arab Jurists  
 United Nations Watch  
 United Towns Agency for North-South  
 Cooperation  
 UPR Info  
 Universal Peace Federation  
 VAAGDHARA  
 Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik  
 Vietnam Family Planning Association  
 Vietnam Peace and Development Foundation  
 Vivat International  
 Vivekananda Sevakendra O-Sishu Uddyan  
 Waterlex  
 Women's Federation for World Peace  
 International  
 Women's Human Rights International  
 Association  
 Women's International League for Peace and  
 Freedom  
 World Barua Organization  
 World Jewish Congress  
 World Muslim Congress  
 World Organisation against Torture  
 World Peace Council  
 World Vision International  
 World Young Women's Christian Association

## Annex II

### Agenda

- Item 1. Organizational and procedural matters
- Item 2. Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General
- Item 3. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development
- Item 4. Human rights situations that require the Council's attention
- Item 5. Human rights bodies and mechanisms
- Item 6. Universal periodic review
- Item 7. Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories
- Item 8. Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action
- Item 9. Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action
- Item 10. Technical assistance and capacity-building

**Annex III***[English, French and Spanish only]***Documents issued for the twenty-sixth session***Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/26/1	1	Annotations to the agenda for the twenty-sixth session of the Human Rights Council: note by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/26/2	1	Report of the Human Rights Council on its twenty-sixth session
A/HRC/26/3	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: New Zealand
A/HRC/26/3/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by State under review
A/HRC/26/4	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Afghanistan
A/HRC/26/4/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by State under review
A/HRC/26/5	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Chile
A/HRC/26/5/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by State under review
A/HRC/26/6	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Viet Nam
A/HRC/26/6/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/26/7	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Uruguay
A/HRC/26/7/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by State under review
A/HRC/26/8	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Yemen
A/HRC/26/9	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Vanuatu
A/HRC/26/9/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/26/10	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/26/10/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/26/11	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Comoros
A/HRC/26/11/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/26/12	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Slovakia
A/HRC/26/12/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/26/13	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Eritrea
A/HRC/26/13/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/26/14	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Cyprus
A/HRC/26/14/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/26/15	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Dominican Republic
A/HRC/26/15/Corr.1	6	Corrigendum
A/HRC/26/15/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/26/16	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Cambodia
A/HRC/26/16/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/26/17- E/CN.6/2014/8	2	Report of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women on the activities of the United Nations Trust Fund in Support of Actions to Eliminate Violence against Women: note by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/26/18	2, 3	Summary of the consultations held on the draft basic principles on the right to effective remedy for victims of trafficking in persons: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/26/19	2, 3	Report on the seminar on the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/26/20	2, 3	Challenges, strategies and developments with regard to the implementation of resolution 21/5 by the United Nations system, including programmes, funds and agencies: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/26/20/Add.1	2, 3	Study on the feasibility of a global fund to enhance the capacity of stakeholders to implement the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights
A/HRC/26/21	3, 4, 7, 9, 10	Communications report of special procedures
A/HRC/26/22	2, 3	Preventing and eliminating child, early and forced marriage: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/26/23	2, 10	Progress in technical assistance and capacity-building for South Sudan in the field of human rights: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/26/24	2, 10	Report on activities undertaken to support efforts by States to promote and protect the rights of persons with disabilities in their national legislation, policies and programmes: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/26/25	3	Report of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises
A/HRC/26/25/Add.1	3	Uptake of the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: findings from a 2013 questionnaire for corporations
A/HRC/26/25/Add.2	3	Report on the First Latin America and Caribbean Regional Forum on Business and Human Rights
A/HRC/26/25/Add.3	3	Report from an Expert Workshop entitled "Business Impacts and Non-judicial Access to Remedy: Emerging Global Experience", held in Toronto in 2013
A/HRC/26/25/Add.4	3	Visit to the United States of America
A/HRC/26/25/Add.5	3	Visit to Ghana
A/HRC/26/26	3, 5	Summary of discussions of the Forum on Business and Human Rights: note by the secretariat
A/HRC/26/27	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to education: assessment of the educational attainment of students and the implementation of the right to education
A/HRC/26/27/Add.1	3	Mission to Seychelles
A/HRC/26/28	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/26/28/Add.1	3	Mission to Mozambique
A/HRC/26/28/Add.2	3	Mission to the Republic of Moldova (8–14 September 2013)
A/HRC/26/28/Add.3	3	Summary of activities of the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights, 2008–2014
A/HRC/26/29	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association
A/HRC/26/29/Add.1	3	Observations on communications transmitted to Governments and replies received
A/HRC/26/29/Add.2	3	Mission to Rwanda
A/HRC/26/29/Add.3	3	Mission to Rwanda: preliminary comments by the Government on the report of the Special Rapporteur
A/HRC/26/30	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression
A/HRC/26/30/Add.1	3	Mission to Montenegro
A/HRC/26/30/Add.2	3	Mission to the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
A/HRC/26/30/Add.3	3	Mission to Italy
A/HRC/26/30/Add.4	3	Mission to Montenegro: comments by the State
A/HRC/26/30/Add.5	3	Mission to the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: comments by the State
A/HRC/26/30/Add.6	3	Mission to Italy: comments by the State
A/HRC/26/31	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health: unhealthy foods, non-communicable diseases and the right to health
A/HRC/26/32	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers
A/HRC/26/32/Add.1	3	Mission to the Russian Federation
A/HRC/26/33	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons
A/HRC/26/33/Corr.1	3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/26/33/Add.1	3	Follow-up mission to Georgia
A/HRC/26/33/Add.2	3	Follow-up mission to Serbia, including Kosovo
A/HRC/26/33/Add.3	3	Mission to South Sudan
A/HRC/26/33/Add.4	3	Mission to Sri Lanka
A/HRC/26/33/Add.5	3	Mission to South Sudan: comments by the State

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/26/33/Add.6	3	Mission to Sri Lanka: comments by the State
A/HRC/26/34	3	Report of the Independent Expert on human rights and international solidarity
A/HRC/26/34/Add.1	3	Preliminary text of a draft declaration on the right of peoples and individuals to international solidarity
A/HRC/26/35	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants: labour exploitation of migrants
A/HRC/26/35/Add.1	3	Mission to Qatar
A/HRC/26/35/Add.2	3	Comments by the State
A/HRC/26/36	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions
A/HRC/26/36/Add.1	3	Mission to Mexico
A/HRC/26/36/Add.2	3	Observations on communications transmitted to Governments and replies received
A/HRC/26/36/Add.3	3	Mission to Mexico: comments by the State
A/HRC/26/37	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children: thematic report
A/HRC/26/37/Add.1	3	Consultative meeting on strengthening partnerships with national rapporteurs on trafficking in persons and equivalent mechanisms
A/HRC/26/37/Add.2	3	Stocktaking exercise on the work of the mandate on its tenth anniversary
A/HRC/26/37/Add.3	3	Visit to Morocco
A/HRC/26/37/Add.4	3	Mission to Italy
A/HRC/26/37/Add.5	3	Mission to Bahamas
A/HRC/26/37/Add.6	3	Mission to Belize
A/HRC/26/37/Add.7	3	Mission to Seychelles
A/HRC/26/37/Add.9	3	Mission to Italy: comments by the State
A/HRC/26/37/Add.10	3	Mission to Bahamas: comments by the State
A/HRC/26/37/Add.11	3	Mission to Belize: comments by the State
A/HRC/26/38	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences
A/HRC/26/38/Add.1	3	Mission to India
A/HRC/26/38/Add.2	3	Mission to Bangladesh (20–29 May 2013)
A/HRC/26/38/Add.3	3	Mission to Azerbaijan
A/HRC/26/38/Add.4	3	Mission to India: comments by the State

*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/26/39	3	Report of the Working Group on the issue of discrimination against women in law and in practice
A/HRC/26/39/Add.1	3	Mission to Iceland
A/HRC/26/39/Add.2	3	Mission to China
A/HRC/26/40	3, 5	Progress report on the research-based report of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee on best practices and main challenges in the promotion and protection of human rights in post-disaster and post-conflict situations: note by the secretariat
A/HRC/26/41	3, 5	Research-based report of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee on the ways and means to enhance international cooperation in the field of human rights
A/HRC/26/42	3, 5	Progress report of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee on the issue of the negative impact of corruption on the enjoyment of human rights
A/HRC/26/43	4	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea
A/HRC/26/43/Corr.1	4	Corrigendum
A/HRC/26/44	4	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus
A/HRC/26/45	4	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea
A/HRC/26/46	5	Report of the 2014 Social Forum (Geneva, 1–3 April 2014)
A/HRC/26/47	5	Open-ended intergovernmental working group on a draft United Nations declaration on the right to peace: note by the secretariat
A/HRC/26/48	5	Report of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on a draft United Nations declaration on the rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas
A/HRC/26/49	9	Report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance
A/HRC/26/49/Add.1	9	Mission to Mauritania
A/HRC/26/49/Add.2	9	Mission en Mauritanie: commentaires du gouvernement sur le rapport du Rapporteur spécial
A/HRC/26/50	9	Report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related

---

*Documents issued in the general series*

---

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		intolerance on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 68/150
A/HRC/26/51	10	Report of the Chairperson of the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Technical Cooperation in the Field of Human Rights
A/HRC/26/52	10	Report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Côte d'Ivoire
A/HRC/26/53	10	Preliminary report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic
A/HRC/26/54	2, 6	Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the operations of the Voluntary Fund for financial and technical assistance in the implementation of the universal periodic review
A/HRC/26/55	9	Report of the Intergovernmental Working Group on the Effective Implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action on its twelfth session: draft programme of activities for the implementation of the International Decade for People of African Descent
A/HRC/26/56	9	Report of the independent eminent experts on the implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action on their third meeting
A/HRC/26/CRP.1	5	Summary of the Human Rights Council panel discussion on the contribution of parliaments to the work of the Human Rights Council and its universal periodic review
A/HRC/26/CRP.2	4	Oral update of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic

---

*Documents issued in the limited series*

---

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/26/L.1	3	Human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises
A/HRC/26/L.2	9	Implementation of the International Decade for People of African Descent: draft programme of activities
A/HRC/26/L.3	5	Promotion and protection of human rights in post-disaster and post-conflict situations
A/HRC/26/L.4/Rev.1	4	The continuing grave deterioration in the human rights and humanitarian situation in the Syrian Arab Republic

*Documents issued in the limited series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/26/L.5	3	The negative impact of corruption on the enjoyment of human rights
A/HRC/26/L.6	4	Situation of human rights in Eritrea
A/HRC/26/L.7	3	International Albinism Awareness Day
A/HRC/26/L.8/Rev.1	3	The question of the death penalty
A/HRC/26/L.9	3	Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities
A/HRC/26/L.10	3	Extreme poverty and human rights
A/HRC/26/L.11	3	Protection of Roma
A/HRC/26/L.12	3	Elimination of discrimination against women
A/HRC/26/L.13	5	Promotion and protection of the human rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas
A/HRC/26/L.14/Rev.1	4	Situation of human rights in Belarus
A/HRC/26/L.15/Rev.1	10	Cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights
A/HRC/26/L.16	3	Mandate of the independent expert on human rights and international solidarity
A/HRC/26/L.17	5	The Social Forum
A/HRC/26/L.18	3	Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers
A/HRC/26/L.19	3	Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children
A/HRC/26/L.20/Rev.1	3	Protection of the Family
A/HRC/26/L.21	5	Contribution of parliaments to the work of Human Rights Council and its universal periodic review
A/HRC/26/L.22/Rev.1	3	Elaboration of an international legally binding instrument on transnational corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights
A/HRC/26/L.23	3	Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions
A/HRC/26/L.24	3	The promotion, protection, and enjoyment of human rights on the internet
A/HRC/26/L.25	3	Human rights and arbitrary deprivation of nationality
A/HRC/26/L.26/Rev.1	3	Accelerating efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women: violence against women as a barrier to women's political and economic empowerment
A/HRC/26/L.27	3	Human rights and the regulation of civilian acquisition, possession and use of firearms
A/HRC/26/L.28	3	The right to education: follow-up to Human Rights Council resolution 8/4

---

*Documents issued in the limited series*

---

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/26/L.29	3	The right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health: sport and healthy lifestyles as contributing factors
A/HRC/26/L.30	3	Promotion of the right of migrants to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health
A/HRC/26/L.31	3	Human rights of migrants: mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants
A/HRC/26/L.32	10	Technical and capacity-building assistance for South Sudan in the field of human rights
A/HRC/26/L.33/Rev.1	3	Human rights and climate change
A/HRC/26/L.34	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.8/Rev.1
A/HRC/26/L.35	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.8/Rev.1
A/HRC/26/L.36	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.8/Rev.1
A/HRC/26/L.37	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.20/Rev.1
A/HRC/26/L.38	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/26/L.20/Rev.1
A/HRC/26/L.39	10	Capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights
A/HRC/26/L.40	1	On prevention of terrorist attacks motivated by intolerance or extremism by terrorists and affiliated groups

---

*Documents issued in the Government series*

---

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/26/G/1	3	Note verbale dated 2 May 2014 from the Permanent Mission of Cuba to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/26/G/2	4	Letter dated 12 May 2014 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/26/G/3	4	Note verbale dated 26 May 2014 from the Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council

---

*Documents issued in the Government series*

---

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/26/G/4	2	Note verbale dated 5 June 2014 from the Permanent Mission of Cyprus to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/26/G/5	4	Letter dated 6 June 2014 from the Permanent Representative of Georgia to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/26/G/6	10	Note verbale dated 23 June 2014 from the Permanent Mission of Ukraine to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/26/G/7	2, 3	Note verbale dated 25 June 2014 from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Singapore to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/26/G/8	3	Note verbale dated 27 June 2014 from the Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/26/G/9	3	Note verbale dated 30 June 2014 from the Permanent Mission of Singapore to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council

---

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

---

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/26/NGO/1	3	Exposé écrit présenté par International Federation of Rural Adult Catholic Movements, organisation non gouvernementale inscrite sur la liste
A/HRC/26/NGO/2	3	Written statement* submitted by the Permanent Assembly for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/3	5	Exposición escrita presentada por la Fundacion Para La Libertad: Askatasun Bidean, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/26/NGO/4	3	Written statement submitted by Reporters Without Borders International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

---

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*


---

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/26/NGO/5	3	Written statement submitted by Reporters Without Borders International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/6	3	Written statement submitted by Reporters Without Borders International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/7	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/8	4	Written statement submitted by Alsalam Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/9	3	Written statement submitted by the Permanent Assembly for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/9/Corr.1	3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/26/NGO/10	3	Exposé écrit présenté conjointement par France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial, Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Educational Development, Inc., Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, organisations non gouvernementales inscrites sur la liste
A/HRC/26/NGO/11	3	Joint written statement submitted by France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Les Amis de la Terre-Togo and Stichting Forest Peoples Programme, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, and International Educational Development, Inc. and Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/26/NGO/12	3	Joint written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, non-governmental organization in general consultative status, France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, the Emmaus International Association, the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Les Amis de la Terre-Togo, the Permanent Assembly for Human Rights and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, and International Educational Development, Inc., a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/26/NGO/13	3	Written statement submitted by France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/26/NGO/14	3	Written statement submitted by Al Khoei Foundation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/15	3	Written statement submitted by Al Khoei Foundation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/16	3	Written statement submitted by Equality Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/17	3	Written statement submitted by Equality Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/18	3	Written statement submitted by Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/26/NGO/19	3	Written statement submitted by Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/26/NGO/20	3	Written statement submitted by the International Educational Development Inc., a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/26/NGO/21	4	Written statement submitted by the Women's Human Rights International Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/22	3	Written statement submitted by asylum Access, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/23	3	Exposé écrit présenté par Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif special
A/HRC/26/NGO/24	3	Written statement submitted by Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/25	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/26	6	Joint written statement submitted by Lawyers for Lawyer, Lawyers Rights Watch Canada, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/27	4	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

---

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*


---

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/26/NGO/28	4	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/29	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/30	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/31	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/32	3	Joint written statement submitted by Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities) and New Humanity, non-governmental organizations in general consultative status, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, Associazione Points-Coeur, the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development: VIDES and Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/33	3	Joint written statement submitted by France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand and the Women's Human Rights International Association, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, and Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples and International Educational Development, Inc., non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/26/NGO/34	3	Written statement submitted by Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/35	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/36	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/37	3	Written statement submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/38	3	Joint written statement submitted by the Europe-Third World Centre (CETIM), a non-

---

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*


---

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		governmental organization in General consultative status, and International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/39	3	Written statement submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/40	3	Written statement submitted by Terre Des Hommes Federation Internationale, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/41	3	Written statement submitted by the Eastern Sudan Women Development Organization, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/42	3	Written statement submitted by the World Federation of Khoja Shi'a Ithna-Asheri Muslim Communities, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/43	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/44	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/45	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/46	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/47	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/48	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/49	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/50	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/51	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/52	4	Written statement submitted by Presse Embleme Campagne, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/26/NGO/53	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/54	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/55	3	Written statement submitted by Presse Embleme Campagne, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/56	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/57	4	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/58	4	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/59	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/60	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/61	7	Joint written statement submitted by the BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights and the Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, and Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/26/NGO/62	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/63	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/64	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/65	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/66	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/67	3	Joint written statement submitted by the New Humanity, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, Organisation Internationale pour le Droit à l'Éducation et la

## Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		Liberté d'Enseignement (OIDE), Apprentissages Sans Frontières (ASF), Association Points- Cœur, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, Dominicans for Justice and Peace (Order of Preachers), the International Catholic Child Bureau (ICCB), the International Federation of University Women (IFUW), Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice (IIMA), the Mothers Legacy Project, the Catholic International Education Office (OIEC) and the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education, Development (VIDES), non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, and Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, a non-governmental organization on the roster.
A/HRC/26/NGO/68	4	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/69	4	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/70	4	Written statement submitted by Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/26/NGO/71	5	Joint written statement submitted by the International Cooperation for Development and Solidarity (CIDSE), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, and Bischöfliches Hilfswerk Misereor e.V. and the Swiss Catholic Lenten Fund, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/72	4	Written statement submitted by Sign of Hope e.V.: Hoffnungszeichen, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/73	3	Written statement submitted by the Social Service Agency of the Protestant Church in Germany, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/74	3	Written statement submitted by the Europe-Third World Centre (CETIM), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/75	3	Joint written statement submitted by the International Catholic Child Bureau, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/76	4	Written statement submitted by Reporters Sans Frontières International: Reporters Without Borders International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

---

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*


---

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/26/NGO/77	3	Written statement submitted by the Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/78	6	Joint written statement submitted by CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, the Arab NGO Network for Development, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/26/NGO/79	7	Joint written statement submitted by the BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status, and Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/26/NGO/80	3	Joint written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, the International Association for Religious Freedom and the International Council of Women / Conseil International des Femmes, non-governmental organizations in general consultative status, International Association of Peace Messenger Cities, Abibimman Foundation, the Abiodun Adebayo Welfare Foundation, the Albert Schweitzer Institute, the American Association of Jurists, Amis des Etrangers au Togo (A.D.E.T.), the Amman Center for Human Rights Studies, the Arab African American Women's Leadership Council Inc., Armenian Constitutional Right-Protective Centre, Association of War-Affected Women, Association pour l'Intégration et le Développement Durable au Burundi, Association Tunisienne des Droits de l'Enfant, Autre Vie, Bangwe et Dialogue, Centre d'accompagnement des alternatives locales de développement, Centro Integrado de Estudos e Programas de Desenvolvimento Sustentável, Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme, Corporación Red Nacional de Mujeres Comunes, Comunitarias, Indígenas y Campesinas de la República de Colombia, Edmund Rice International Limited, Federation
A/HRC/26/NGO/81	3	Written statement submitted by the Liberal International (World Liberal Union), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/82	3	Joint written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, and Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada, the Lawyers for Lawyers, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/83	3	Written statement submitted by France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, a non-

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/84	3	Written statement submitted by the Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europe, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/85	3	Written statement submitted by the People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/86	3	Written statement submitted by Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/87	3	Written statement submitted by the Gazeteciler ve Yazarlar Vakfı, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/88	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/89	3	Written statement submitted by the Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/90	4	Written statement submitted by the Foodfirst Information and Action Network (FIAN), a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/26/NGO/91	3	Exposición escrita presentada por la Permanent Assembly for Human Rights, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/26/NGO/92	3	Written statement submitted by Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/93	3	Exposición conjunta escrita presentada por Centro Europa-Tercer Mundo, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva general, Institute for Policy Studies (IPS), organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial, y Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL), organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva de la lista
A/HRC/26/NGO/94	3	Joint written statement submitted by the Europe-Third World Centre (CETIM) and Franciscans International, non-governmental organizations in General consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/95	3	Written statement submitted by Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/96	3	Written statement submitted by the Europe-Third World Centre (CETIM), a non-governmental organization in General consultative status

---

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*


---

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/26/NGO/97	3	Written statement submitted by Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/98	3	Written statement submitted by Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/99	3	Written statement submitted by Conectas Direitos Humanos, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/100	3	Joint written statement submitted by the Europe-Third World Centre (CETIM), a non-governmental organization in General consultative status, and Environmental Rights Action /Friends of the Earth Nigeria (ERA/FOEN), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/101	6	Written statement submitted by CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/102	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/103	3	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights League of the Horn of Africa
A/HRC/26/NGO/104	3	Written statement submitted by the International Muslim Women's Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/105	4	Joint written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, the Union of Arab Jurists, Arab Organization for Human Rights, General Arab Women Federation, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development: VIDES, Organisation Mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale, Organisation pour la Communication en Afrique et de Promotion de la Coopération Economique Internationale: OCAPROCE Internationale, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Educational Development, Inc., International Human Rights Association of American Minorities (IHRAAM), World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/26/NGO/106	7	Joint written statement submitted by International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in

## Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	Agenda item	
		<p>general consultative status, the Union of Arab Jurists, Arab Organization for Human Rights, General Arab Women Federation, Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development: VIDES, Nord-Sud XXI: North-South XXI, Organisation Mondiale des associations pour l’éducation prénatale, Organisation pour la Communication en Afrique et de Promotion de la Cooperation Economique Internationale: OCAPROCE Internationale, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Educational Development, Inc., International Human Rights Association of American Minorities (IHRAAM), World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster</p>
A/HRC/26/NGO/107	8	<p>Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status</p>
A/HRC/26/NGO/108	3	<p>Joint written statement submitted by the Union of Arab Jurists, Arab Organization for Human Rights, General Arab Women Federation, Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development: VIDES, Nord-Sud XXI: North-South XXI, Organisation Mondiale des associations pour l’éducation prénatale, Organisation pour la Communication en Afrique et de Promotion de la Cooperation Economique Internationale: OCAPROCE Internationale, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Educational Development, Inc., International Human Rights Association of American Minorities (IHRAAM), World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster</p>
A/HRC/26/NGO/109	3	<p>Joint written statement submitted by the Union of Arab Jurists, Arab Organization for Human Rights, General Arab Women Federation, Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development: VIDES, Nord-Sud XXI: North-South XXI, Organisation Mondiale des associations pour l’éducation prénatale, Organisation pour la Communication en Afrique et de Promotion de la Cooperation Economique Internationale: OCAPROCE Internationale, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, Women’s International League for</p>

---

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series*


---

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		Peace and Freedom, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Educational Development, Inc., International Human Rights Association of American Minorities (IHRAAM), World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/26/NGO/110	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/111	6	Written statement submitted by World Peace Council, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/26/NGO/112	3	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/113	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/26/NGO/114	3	Written statement submitted by Geneva Infant Feeding Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

---



---

*Documents issued in the national human rights institutions series*


---

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/26/NI/1	3	Information presented by the Commissioner for Human Rights (Ombudsman) of Azerbaijan: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/26/NI/2	3	Information presented by the Public Defender of Georgia: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/26/NI/3	3	Information presented by the National Human Rights Council of the Kingdom of Morocco: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/26/NI/4	3	Comments by the National Human Rights Commission of Rwanda: note by the Secretariat

---

## **Annex IV**

### **Special procedure mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its twenty-sixth session**

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

David Kaye (United States of America)

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

Danius Puras (Lithuania)

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

Maria Grazia Giammarinaro (Italy)

#### **Special Rapporteur on the implications for human rights of the environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes**

Baskut Tuncak (Turkey)

#### **Working Group on Arbitrary Detention (member from Asia-Pacific States)**

Seong-Phil Hong (Republic of Korea)

#### **Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent (member from African States)**

Sabelo Gumedze (South Africa)

---