



General Assembly

Distr.: General
23 January 2019

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Twenty-seventh session
Agenda item 1
Organizational and procedural matters


Report of the Human Rights Council on its twenty-seventh session

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

GE.18-20756(E)



* 1 8 2 0 7 5 6 *

Please recycle 



Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Part One: Resolutions, decisions and President's statements adopted by the Human Rights Council at its twenty-seventh session	4
I. Resolutions	4
II. Decisions	5
III. President's statements	6
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. Election of members of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee	8
H. Selection and appointment of mandate holders	9
I. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	10
J. Adoption of the report of the session	10
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	12
A. Update by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights	12
B. Reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General	13
III. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development	14
A. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders	14
B. Panel discussions	20
C. General debate on agenda item 3	26
D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	29
IV. Human rights situations that require the Council's attention	45
A. Interactive dialogue with the independent international commission of inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic	45
B. General debate on agenda item 4	45
C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	46
V. Human rights bodies and mechanisms	48
A. Complaint procedure	48
B. Interactive dialogue with the Advisory Committee	48
C. Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples	48
D. Open-ended intergovernmental working group on a draft United Nations declaration on the right to peace	48
E. General debate on agenda item 5	48

F.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	49
VI.	Universal periodic review	51
A.	Consideration of review outcomes.....	51
B.	General debate on agenda item 6	120
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	121
VII.	Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories	123
A.	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights	123
B.	General debate on agenda item 7	123
VIII.	Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action	124
A.	Annual discussion on the integration of a gender perspective	124
B.	General debate on agenda item 8	125
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	125
IX.	Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action	130
A.	Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders	130
B.	General debate on agenda item 9	130
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	131
X.	Technical assistance and capacity-building.....	132
A.	Interactive dialogue on cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights	132
B.	Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders	132
C.	Panel discussions	135
D.	General debate on agenda item 10.....	135
E.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	136
Annexes		
I.	Attendance.....	139
II.	Agenda	145
III.	Documents issued for the twenty-seventh session	146
IV.	Advisory Committee members elected by the Human Rights Council at its twenty-seventh session and duration of terms of membership	171
V.	Special procedure mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its organizational meeting of 6 November 2014	172

Part One

Resolutions, decisions and President's statements adopted by the Human Rights Council at its twenty-seventh session

I. Resolutions

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
27/1	Enforced or involuntary disappearances	25 September 2014
27/2	The right to development	25 September 2014
27/3	Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence	25 September 2014
27/4	Local government and human rights	25 September 2014
27/5	The safety of journalists	25 September 2014
27/6	Panel discussion on realizing the equal enjoyment of the right to education by every girl	25 September 2014
27/7	The human right to safe drinking water and sanitation	25 September 2014
27/8	Promoting human rights through sport and the Olympic ideal	25 September 2014
27/9	Mandate of the Independent Expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order	25 September 2014
27/10	The use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination	25 September 2014
27/11	Preventable maternal mortality and morbidity and human rights	25 September 2014
27/12	World Programme for Human Rights Education: adoption of the plan of action for the third phase	25 September 2014
27/13	Human rights and indigenous peoples	25 September 2014
27/14	Preventable mortality and morbidity of children under 5 years of age as a human rights concern	25 September 2014
27/15	The right of the child to engage in play and recreational activities	25 September 2014
27/16	The continuing grave deterioration in the human rights and humanitarian situation in the Syrian Arab Republic	25 September 2014
27/17	Promotion of the right to peace	25 September 2014
27/18	National institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights	25 September 2014
27/19	Technical assistance and capacity-building for Yemen in the field of human rights	25 September 2014
27/20	Enhancement of technical cooperation and capacity-building in the field of human rights	25 September 2014
27/21	Human rights and unilateral coercive measures	26 September 2014
27/22	Intensifying global efforts and sharing good practices to effectively eliminate female genital mutilation	26 September 2014

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
27/23	Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the implications for human rights of the environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes	26 September 2014
27/24	Equal participation in political and public affairs	26 September 2014
27/25	Mandate of the Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent	26 September 2014
27/26	National policies and human rights	26 September 2014
27/27	Technical assistance and capacity-building for human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo	26 September 2014
27/28	Technical assistance and capacity-building in the field of human rights in the Central African Republic	26 September 2014
27/29	Technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in the Sudan	26 September 2014
27/30	Effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights: the activities of vulture funds	26 September 2014
27/31	Civil society space	26 September 2014
27/32	Human rights, sexual orientation and gender identity	26 September 2014

II. Decisions

<i>Decision</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
27/101	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Norway	18 September 2014
27/102	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Albania	18 September 2014
27/103	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Democratic Republic of the Congo	18 September 2014
27/104	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Côte d'Ivoire	18 September 2014
27/105	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Portugal	18 September 2014
27/106	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Bhutan	18 September 2014
27/107	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Dominica	19 September 2014
27/108	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Democratic People's Republic of Korea	19 September 2014
27/109	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Brunei Darussalam	19 September 2014
27/110	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Costa Rica	19 September 2014
27/111	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Equatorial Guinea	19 September 2014
27/112	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Ethiopia	19 September 2014
27/113	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Qatar	19 September 2014
27/114	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Nicaragua	19 September 2014

III. President's statements

<i>President's statement</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
PRST/27/1	Twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Convention on the Rights of the Child	26 September 2014
PRST/27/2	Reports of the Advisory Committee	26 September 2014
PRST/27/3	Protection of the human rights of migrants at sea	26 September 2014
PRST/27/4	The Ebola epidemic	26 September 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-seventh session at the United Nations Office at Geneva from 8 to 26 September 2014. The President of the Human Rights 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-seventh session was held on 25 August 2014.
3. The twenty-seventh session consisted of 42 meetings over 14 days.

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 8 September 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted the agenda and programme of work of the twenty-seventh session.
6. At the same meeting, the President stated that, in conformity with Human Rights Council resolution S-22/1, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights would present to the Council an oral update on the human rights situation in Iraq, under agenda item 2.

D. Organization of work

7. At the 1st meeting, on 8 September 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.
8. At the 3rd meeting, on the same day, the President outlined the modalities for the clustered interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders under agenda item 3, introduced on a trial basis for the twenty-seventh session of the Human Rights Council. The total duration of each clustered interactive dialogue would not exceed four hours. Each special procedure mandate holder in a cluster would introduce his or her reports within 15 minutes and respond to questions and make concluding remarks within 15 minutes. As soon as the list of speakers was available following the electronic registration, the secretariat would calculate the estimated time necessary to complete the clustered interactive dialogue with the mandate holders. If the total duration of a given interactive dialogue was estimated to last less than four hours, the speaking time limits would be five minutes for States Members and three minutes for observer States and other observers. However, if it was estimated to be more than four hours, the speaking time limits would be reduced to three minutes for States Members and two minutes for observer States and other observers. If that measure was deemed insufficient to ensure that the total duration did not exceed four hours, the speaking time limit would be further reduced to two minutes for States Members and

two minutes for observer States and other observers, or the total time could be divided equally among all speakers with a minimum of 1.5 minutes per speaker.

9. At the 4th meeting, on 9 September 2014, the President outlined the modalities for panel discussions, which were summarized in the concept notes, and which would be five to seven minutes for the initial presentations by the panellists and 15 minutes for their comments and replies, and two minutes for States Members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.

10. At the 11th meeting, on 12 September 2014, the President outlined the modalities for the individual interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders under agenda items 3 and 10, which would be 15 minutes for the initial presentation by the mandate holder of the report, 3 minutes for States Members of the Human Rights Council, 2 minutes for observer States and other observers, and 15 minutes for the mandate holder's response to questions and his or her concluding remarks.

11. At the 22nd meeting, on 18 September 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, 2 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.

E. Meetings and documentation

12. The Human Rights Council held 42 fully serviced meetings during its twenty-seventh session.

13. The list of the resolutions, decisions and President's statements adopted by the Council are contained in part one of the present report.

F. Visits

14. At the 5th meeting, on 9 September 2014, the Commissioner for Human Rights and Humanitarian Action of Mauritania, Aichetou Mint M'Haiham, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

15. At the 21st meeting, on 17 September 2014, the Vice-Minister of Justice of Paraguay, Ever Martinez, delivered a statement to the Council.

16. At the 29th meeting, on 22 September 2014, the Undersecretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Bahrain, Abdulla Abdullatif Abdulla, delivered a statement to the Council.

G. Election of members of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee

17. At its 42nd meeting, on 26 September 2014, the Human Rights Council elected, pursuant to its resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, seven experts to the Advisory Committee. The Council had before it a note by the Secretary-General (A/HRC/27/17 and Add.1) containing the nomination of candidates for election, in accordance with Council decision 6/102, and the biographical data of the candidates.

18. The candidates were as follows:

<i>Nominating Member State</i>	<i>Expert nominated</i>
African States	
Morocco	Mohamed Bennani
Nigeria	Obiora Okafor
Asia-Pacific States	
Pakistan	Ahmer Bilal Soofi
Republic of Korea	Changrok Soh
Eastern European States	
Romania	Laura Crăciunean
Latin American and Caribbean States	
Guatemala	Anantonia Reyes Prado
Western European and other States	
France	Laurence Boisson de Chazournes

19. The number of candidates for each of the regional groups corresponded to the number of seats available in each of these groups. The practice of holding a secret ballot pursuant to paragraph 70 of Human Rights Council resolution 5/1 was dispensed with and Mohamed Bennani, Obiora Okafor, Ahmer Bilal Soofi, Changrok Soh, Laura Crăciunean, Anantonia Reyes Prado and Laurence Boisson de Chazournes were elected as members of the Advisory Committee by consensus (see annex IV).

H. Selection and appointment of mandate holders

20. At its 42nd meeting, on 26 September 2014, the Human Rights Council decided to postpone its approval of the list of candidates presented by the President of the Human Rights Council for the seven vacancies for special procedure mandate holders (see below) to an organizational meeting of the Council to be held any time before the end of the twentieth session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (from 27 October to 7 November 2014). It was also decided that the term of office of the current mandate holders would be extended until their successors took up their functions.

21. The following special procedure mandate holders were due to be appointed:

- Independent Expert on capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights
- Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Sudan
- Special Rapporteur on the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation
- Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities
- Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent (member from Asia-Pacific States)
- Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent (member from Eastern European States)
- Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances (member from Western European and other States)

22. At its organizational meeting, on 6 November 2014, the Human Rights Council appointed seven special procedure mandate holders in accordance with Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21 and its decision 6/102 (see annex V).

I. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Convention on the Rights of the Child

23. At the 42nd meeting, on 26 September 2014, the President of the Human Rights Council introduced draft President's statement A/HRC/27/L.52.

24. At the same meeting, the representative of Ethiopia, also on behalf of Costa Rica, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland and Thailand, made general comments on the draft President's statement.

25. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft President's statement (PRST/27/1).

Reports of the Advisory Committee

26. At the 42nd meeting, on 26 September 2014, the President of the Human Rights Council introduced draft President's statement A/HRC/27/L.53.

27. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft President's statement (PRST/27/2).

Protection of the human rights of migrants at sea

28. At the 42nd meeting, on 26 September 2014, the President of the Human Rights Council introduced draft President's statement A/HRC/27/L.54.

29. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft President's statement (PRST/27/3).

The Ebola epidemic

30. At the 42nd meeting, on 26 September 2014, the President of the Human Rights Council introduced draft President's statement A/HRC/27/L.55.

31. At the same meeting, the representatives of Cuba, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States) and Sierra Leone made general comments on the draft President's statement.

32. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft President's statement (PRST/27/4).

J. Adoption of the report of the session

33. At the 42nd meeting, on 26 September 2014, the representatives of Australia, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Canada, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Malta, Norway and Switzerland made statements as observer States with regard to the resolutions adopted.

34. At the same meeting, the Vice-President and Rapporteur of the Human Rights Council made a statement in connection with the draft report of the Council on its twenty-seventh session (A/HRC/27/2).

35. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted ad referendum the draft report on the session and entrusted the Rapporteur with its finalization.

36. At the same meeting, an observer for the International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of Amnesty International, Article 19 — International Centre against Censorship, the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, CIVICUS — World Alliance for Citizen Participation, the

Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, Conectas Direitos Humanos, the East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, the Human Rights House Foundation, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues and the International Lesbian and Gay Association) made a statement in connection with the session.

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

38. At the 1st meeting, on 8 September 2014, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement providing an update of the activities of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR).

39. During the ensuing general debate, at the 1st, 2nd and 3rd meetings, on the same day, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czech Republic, Egypt¹ (also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Thailand, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe), Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), France, Gabon, Germany, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)¹ (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Ireland, Italy (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Georgia, Iceland, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Japan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait (on behalf of the Gulf Cooperation Council), Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco (also on behalf of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Namibia, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Philippines, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN));

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Canada, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Georgia, Ghana, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Senegal, Serbia, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Holy See;

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

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence internationale pour le développement, Allied Rainbow Communities International, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Centre for Reproductive Rights, CIVICUS — World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Muslim Women's Union, International Service for Human Rights, Maarj Foundation for Peace and Development, United Nations Watch, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Muslim Congress.

¹ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

40. At the 3rd meeting, on 8 September 2014, the representatives of Algeria, Morocco, the Russian Federation, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Ukraine made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

41. At the same meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Algeria and Morocco made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

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

42. At the 12th meeting, on 12 September 2014, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights presented the thematic reports prepared by OHCHR and the Secretary-General under agenda items 2 and 3.

43. At its 12th meeting, on 12 September 2014, its 14th meeting, on 15 September, and its 16th meeting, on 16 September, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on the thematic reports presented by the Deputy High Commissioner (see paras. 153–156 below).

44. At the 30th meeting, on 22 September 2014, the Deputy High Commissioner presented the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (A/HRC/27/76) (see para. 914 below).

45. At the 38th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the Deputy High Commissioner presented the oral country updates and the country reports of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Secretary-General submitted under agenda items 2 and 10 (A/HRC/27/42, A/HRC/27/43, A/HRC/27/44 and A/HRC/27/74) (see para. 1003 below).

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

Independent Expert on the enjoyment of all human rights by older persons

46. At the 3rd meeting, on 8 September 2014, the Independent Expert on the enjoyment of all human rights by older persons, Rosa Kornfeld-Matte, presented her report (A/HRC/27/46).

47. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 3rd meeting, on the same day, and the 5th meeting, on 9 September 2014, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

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

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belgium, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Malaysia, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Thailand;

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

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

(e) Observers for national human rights institutions: Conseil national des droits de l'homme du Maroc, International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights;

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Friends World Committee for Consultation, HelpAge International, the International Drug Policy Consortium, International Longevity Center Global Alliance, International Network for the Prevention of Elder Abuse.

48. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery, including its causes and its consequences

49. At the 3rd meeting, on 8 September 2014, the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery, including its causes and its consequences, Urmila Bhoola, presented her report and those of her predecessor (A/HRC/27/53 and Add.1–3).

50. At the same meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Ghana, Kazakhstan and Mauritania made statements as the States concerned.

51. Also at the same meeting, the Commission nationale des droits de l'homme de Mauritanie made a statement.

52. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 3rd meeting, on 8 September 2014, and the 5th meeting, on 9 September, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Botswana, Brazil, China, Costa Rica (also on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Cuba, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Morocco,

Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Philippines, Sierra Leone, South Africa, 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, Belgium, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Latvia, Spain, Thailand, Holy See;

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

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

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

(f) Observer for a national human rights institution: Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain (by video message);

(g) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities) (also on behalf of Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, Associazione Points-Coeur, the Company of the Daughters of Charity of Saint Vincent de Paul, Dominicans for Justice and Peace — Order of Preachers, Edmund Rice International Limited, the International Catholic Child Bureau, the International Kolping Society, the International Movement of Apostolate in the Independent Social Milieus, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development — VIDES, International Young Christian Workers, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, Pax Romana (International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs and International Movement of Catholic Students) and the World Movement of Christian Workers), Center for Environmental and Management Studies, International Catholic Child Bureau (also on behalf of the Company of the Daughters of Charity of Saint Vincent de Paul, the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, Franciscans International and the International Movement ATD Fourth World), International Humanist and Ethical Union, Liberation, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale — OCAPROCE Internationale, United Schools International, World Barua Organization.

53. At the 3rd meeting, on 8 September 2014, the representative of Qatar made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

54. At the 5th meeting, on 9 September 2014, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

55. At the 6th meeting, on 9 September 2014, the representatives of China and Japan made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

56. At the same meeting, the representative of Japan made a statement in exercise of a second right of reply.

Special Rapporteur on the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation

57. At the 6th meeting, on 9 September 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation, Catarina de Albuquerque, presented her reports (A/HRC/27/55 and Add.1–3).

58. At the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil and Jordan made statements as the States concerned.

59. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 6th meeting, on the same day, and at the 8th meeting, on 10 September 2014, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Chile, China, Costa Rica (also on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ethiopia, Germany, India, Ireland, Maldives, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Uruguay¹ (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Brazil, Croatia, Egypt,

France, Germany, Maldives, Morocco, Slovenia and Spain), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bangladesh, Barbados, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Iraq, Latvia, Madagascar, Mali, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tuvalu, Uruguay;

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

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

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

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Article 19 — International Centre against Censorship, Association of World Citizens, Defence for Children International, Franciscans International, Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, International Association of Democratic Lawyers, Liberation, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization.

60. At the 6th meeting, on 9 September 2014, and at the 8th meeting, on 10 September, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the implications for human rights of the environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes

61. At the 6th meeting, on 9 September 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the implications for human rights of the environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes, Baskut Tuncat, presented his report (A/HRC/27/54).

62. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 6th meeting, on the same day, and at the 8th meeting, on 10 September 2014, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Chile, China, Costa Rica (also on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), India, Ireland, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Mali, Nigeria, Spain, Uruguay;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Human Rights Now, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

63. At the 6th meeting, on 9 September 2014, and the 8th meeting, on 10 September, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

64. At the 8th meeting, on 10 September 2014, the Chair of 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, Patricia Arias, presented the reports of the Working Group (A/HRC/27/50 and Add.1).

65. At the same meeting, the representative of the Comoros made a statement as the State concerned.

66. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Chair questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Chile, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Switzerland, Ukraine;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Khoei Foundation, Canners International Permanent Committee, World Barua Organization.

67. At the same meeting, the Chair answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Independent Expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order

68. At the 8th meeting, on 10 September 2014, the Independent Expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order, Alfred-Maurice de Zayas, presented his report (A/HRC/27/51).

69. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, 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, China, Cuba, Indonesia, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Iran (Islamic Republic of), Sri Lanka;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Federation of Cuban Women, Indian Council of South America, International Association of Schools of Social Work, International Institute for Peace, International Peace Bureau, Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale — OCAPROCE Internationale, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

70. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence

71. At the 9th meeting, on 10 September 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence, Pablo de Greiff, presented his reports (A/HRC/27/56 and Add.1–2).

72. At the same meeting, the representatives of Spain and Uruguay made statements as the States concerned.

73. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 9th meeting, on the same day, and at the 11th meeting, on 12 September 2014, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Cuba, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Belgium, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Switzerland, Tunisia;

- (c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;
- (d) Observer for the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC);
- (e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales, Colombian Commission of Jurists, Human Rights Now, International Educational Development, Liberation, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

74. At the 9th meeting, on 10 September 2014, and at the 11th meeting, on 12 September, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Working Group on Arbitrary Detention

75. At the 9th meeting, on 10 September 2014, the Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, Mads Andenas, presented the reports of the Working Group (A/HRC/27/47, A/HRC/27/48 and Add.1–5).

76. At the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil, Greece, Hungary and Morocco made statements as the States concerned.

77. Also at the same meeting, Conseil national des droits de l'homme du Maroc and the Greek National Commission for Human Rights made statements.

78. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 9th meeting, on 10 September 2014, and at the 11th meeting, on 12 September, the following made statements and asked the Chair-Rapporteur questions:

- (a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Cuba, France, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Maldives, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

- (b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Bahrain, Belgium, Croatia, Iraq, Latvia, Norway, Switzerland, Tunisia, Ukraine, State of Palestine;

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

- (d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Conectas Direitos Humanos, France libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Human Rights House Foundation, International Muslim Women's Union.

79. At the 11th meeting, on 12 September 2014, the Chair-Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

80. At the 9th meeting, on 10 September 2014, the representative of the Russian Federation made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances

81. At the 11th meeting, on 12 September 2014, the Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, Ariel Dulitzky, presented the reports of the Working Group (A/HRC/27/49 and Add.1–2).

82. At the same meeting, the representative of Spain made a statement as the State concerned.

83. Also at the same meeting, the Ombudsman (Defensor del Pueblo) of Spain made a statement (by video message).

84. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 11th and 12th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Chair-Rapporteur questions:

- (a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Argentina, Chile, China, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean

States), Cuba, France, Ireland, Japan, Montenegro, Morocco, Russian Federation, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Latvia, Nepal, Panama, Rwanda, Serbia, Sri Lanka;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Technical Association, African Technology Development Link, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Asian Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Network, Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, International Service for Human Rights.

85. At the 11th and 12th meetings, on the same day, the Chair-Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

86. Also at the 12th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Bahrain, Burundi, China, Japan and Ukraine made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples

87. At the 19th meeting, on 17 September 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples, Victoria Lucia Tauli-Corpuz, presented her reports and those of the previous mandate holder (A/HRC/27/52 and Add.1-4).

88. At the same meeting, the Chair-Rapporteur of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Albert Deterville, presented the reports of the Expert Mechanism (A/HRC/27/64, A/HRC/27/65, A/HRC/27/66 and A/HRC/27/67) (see para. 312 below).

89. At the 21st meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Canada, Panama and Peru made statements as the States concerned.

90. At the same meeting, the Canadian Human Rights Commission made a statement.

91. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, also at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur and the Chair-Rapporteur of the Expert Mechanism questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Brazil, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica (also on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Denmark² (also on behalf of Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), Estonia, Ireland, Mexico, Morocco, Philippines, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, El Salvador, Iraq, Malaysia, New Zealand, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Ukraine, Holy See;

(c) Observers for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: International Labour Organization (ILO), UNICEF;

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

(e) Observer for a national human rights institution: International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights;

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Foodfirst Information and Action Network, Franciscans International, Indian Council of South America, International Institute for Peace, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (also on behalf of the National Coalition Against Racial Discrimination), Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada (also on behalf of the Indigenous World Association), Minority Rights Group, VIVAT International (also on behalf of Franciscans International), World Environment and Resources Council.

² Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

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

93. Also at the same meeting, the Chair-Rapporteur of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

94. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

B. Panel discussions

Panel discussion on history teaching and memorialization processes

95. At its 4th meeting, on 9 September 2014, the Human Rights Council held, in accordance with its resolution 25/19, a panel discussion on history teaching and memorialization processes.

96. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, Farida Shaheed, made introductory remarks and moderated the discussion for the panel.

97. At the same meeting, the panellists Sami Adwan, Pablo de Greiff, Dubravka Stojanović and Marie Wilson made statements.

98. The ensuing panel discussion was divided into two parts, which were held at the same meeting, on the same day. During the first part, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Austria, China, Estonia, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Ireland, Morocco, Sierra Leone;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Colombia, Lithuania, Uruguay;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Baha'i International Community, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

99. At the end of the first part, the panellists answered questions and made comments, and the video presentation "Acting Together on the World Stage: Performance and the Creative Transformation of Conflict" was screened.

100. The following made statements during the second part:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, France, Indonesia, Italy, Pakistan, Romania, Russian Federation, South Africa, United States of America, Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Israel, Rwanda, Serbia, Turkey;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Hope International, Human Rights Now.

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

Panel discussion on the protection of the human rights of persons deprived of their liberty

102. At the 7th meeting, on 10 September 2014, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 24/12, a panel discussion on the protection of the human rights of persons deprived of their liberty.

103. The Director of the Research and Right to Development Division of OHCHR made an opening statement for the panel. The Chair of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, Mads Andenas, moderated the discussion.

104. At the same meeting, the panellists Piera Barzano, Gertrude Brinek, Mario Coriolano, Taghreed Jaber, Nigel Rodley and Martin Schönteich made statements. The panel discussion was divided into two parts.

105. 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, Burkina Faso, Estonia, France, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Colombia, Portugal, Switzerland;

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS;

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

(e) Observer for a national human rights institution: Office of the Public Defender (Ombudsman) of Georgia;

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Friends World Committee for Consultation, International Catholic Child Bureau, Penal Reform International (also on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales and the International Legal Foundation).

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

107. 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: Algeria, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Denmark, Egypt, Iceland, Iraq, Ukraine, Uruguay;

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

(d) Observer for ICRC;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Association for the Prevention of Torture, Defence for Children International.

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

Panel discussion on the right to privacy in the digital age

109. At the 10th meeting, on 12 September 2014, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council decision 25/117, a panel discussion on the right to privacy in the digital age.

110. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The Associate Professor at Nottingham University, Marko Milanovic, moderated the discussion.

111. At the same meeting, the panellists Sarah Cleveland, Catalina Botero Marino, Yves Nissim and Carly Nyst made statements. The panel discussion was divided 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: Cuba (also on behalf of Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Pakistan, the Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Estonia, Germany (also on behalf of Austria, Brazil, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Norway and Switzerland), India, Indonesia, Ireland, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belgium, Canada, Malaysia;

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: American Civil Liberties Union (also on behalf of Human Rights Watch), Association for Progressive Communications.

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

114. 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: Algeria, China, France, Italy, Romania, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, 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, Ecuador, Netherlands, Slovenia;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Article 19 — International Centre against Censorship, Korea Center for United Nations Human Rights Policy.

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

Panel discussion on the protection of the family and its members

116. At its 13th meeting, on 15 September 2014, the Human Rights Council held, in accordance with Council resolution 26/11, a panel discussion on the protection of the family and its members.

117. The Director of the Research and Right to Development Division of OHCHR made an opening statement for the panel. The Permanent Representative of Sierra Leone to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Yvette Stevens, made introductory remarks and moderated the discussion.

118. At the same meeting, the panellists Aslan Khuseinovich Abashidze, Karen Bogenscheinder, Rosa Inés Floriano Carrera and Zitha Mokomane made statements.

119. The ensuing panel discussion was divided into two parts, which were held at the same meeting, on the same day. During the first part, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Australia² (also on behalf of Guatemala, Mexico, New Zealand and the United States of America), Chile, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Egypt² (also on behalf of Bangladesh, China, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Mauritania, Morocco, Namibia, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Tunisia and Uganda), Finland² (also on behalf of Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation (also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Mauritania, Myanmar, Namibia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates and Zimbabwe), Slovenia² (also on behalf of Austria and Croatia),

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (also on behalf of Australia, Austria, Canada, Colombia, France, Germany, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United States of America and Uruguay), United States of America (also on behalf of Chile, Colombia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay), Uruguay (also on behalf of Argentina, Canada, Ethiopia, Honduras, Italy, Maldives, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Poland, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Zambia);

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

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Allied Rainbow Communities International (on behalf of Amnesty International, Article 19 — International Centre against Censorship, the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission, the International Lesbian and Gay Association and the International Service for Human Rights), Howard Center for Family, Religion and Society, Plan International (on behalf of Defence for Children International, Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant, the International Federation of Social Workers, SOS Kinderdorf International, Save the Children International, Terre des Hommes International Federation and World Vision International).

120. At the end of the first part, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

121. The following made statements during the second part:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Czech Republic, Estonia, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Germany, Iran (Islamic Republic of)² (also on behalf of Egypt and Pakistan), Ireland, Namibia, Norway, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the League of Arab States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Egypt, Qatar, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities) (also on behalf of the Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, the Company of the Daughters of Charity of Saint Vincent de Paul, Edmund Rice International Limited, the International Association of Charities, the International Catholic Child Bureau, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development — VIDES, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, New Humanity, Pax Romana (International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs and International Movement of Catholic Students), and the World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations), Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant.

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

Half-day panel discussion on the rights of indigenous peoples

123. At its 20th meeting, on 17 September 2014, the Human Rights Council held, in accordance with Council resolutions 18/8 and 24/10, a half-day panel discussion on the promotion and protection of the rights of indigenous peoples in natural disaster risk reduction, and prevention and preparedness initiatives.

124. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples, Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, made introductory remarks and moderated the discussion.

125. At the same meeting, the panellists Albert Deterville, Alejandro Maldonado, Giovanni Reyes, Aissatou Oumarou Ibrahim and Margareta Wahlström made statements. The panel discussion was divided into two parts.

126. 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: Congo, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Estonia, Germany, Mexico, Philippines, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Canada, Denmark, El Salvador;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Indian Council of South America, International Association of Schools of Social Work.

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

128. 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: Brazil, Ireland, Morocco, Russian Federation;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Finland;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada.

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

Panel discussion on the role of prevention in the promotion and protection of human rights

130. At its 23rd meeting, on 18 September 2014, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 24/16, a panel discussion on the role of prevention in the promotion and protection of human rights.

131. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The Adviser on Human Rights and Refugees at Quaker United Nations Office, Rachel Brett, moderated the discussion.

132. At the same meeting, the panellists Rita Izsák, Renato Zerbini Ribeiro Leão, Benyam Dawit Mezmur, Sima Samar and Mark Thomson made statements. The panel discussion was divided into two parts.

133. 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: Australia² (also on behalf of Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Ghana, Hungary, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Rwanda, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay), Austria, Estonia, India, Maldives, Morocco, Russian Federation (also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam), Senegal² (on behalf of members and observers of the International Organization of la Francophonie);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Lithuania, Poland, Republic of Moldova;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Technology Development Link, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain.

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

135. 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: Algeria, Cuba, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);
- (b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Slovenia, Sudan, Timor-Leste, Ukraine;
- (c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: Organization of Islamic Cooperation;
- (d) Observer for ICRC;
- (e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Association for Democracy in Africa, United Schools International.

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

Panel discussion on ensuring use of remotely piloted aircraft or armed drones in counter-terrorism and military operations in accordance with international law, including international human rights and humanitarian law

137. At its 28th meeting, on 22 September 2014, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 25/22, a panel discussion on ensuring use of remotely piloted aircraft or armed drones in counter-terrorism and military operations in accordance with international law, including international human rights and humanitarian law.

138. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The Co-Director of the Oxford Institute for Ethics, Law and Armed Conflict at Oxford University, Dapo Akande, moderated the discussion.

139. At the same meeting, the panellists Shahzad Akbar, Alex Conte, Ben Emmerson, Christof Heyns and Pardiss Kebriaei made statements. The panel discussion was divided into two parts.

140. 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: China, Cuba, France, Germany, Ireland, Pakistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);
- (b) Representatives of observer States: Ecuador, Netherlands;
- (c) Observer for ICRC;
- (d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: American Civil Liberties Union, Amnesty International, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence.

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

142. 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: Algeria, Brazil, Chile, Indonesia, Russian Federation, South Africa;
- (b) Representatives of observer States: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Nigeria, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland;
- (c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Open Society Institute, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

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

Panel discussion on accelerating global efforts to end violence against children

144. At the 31st meeting, on 23 September 2014, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 25/10, a panel discussion on accelerating global efforts to end violence against children.

145. The Director of the Research and Right to Development Division of OHCHR made an opening statement for the panel. The Associate Director for Child Protection of the Programme Division at UNICEF, Susan Bissell, moderated the discussion.

146. At the same meeting, the panellists Pavel Astakhov, Jorge Freyre, Laila Khondkar, Benyam Dawit Mezmur, Marta Santos Pais and Fatiha Hadj Salah made statements. The panel discussion was divided into two parts.

147. 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, Burkina Faso, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Philippines (on behalf of ASEAN), Sweden³ (also on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Norway), Timor-Leste³ (also on behalf of Angola, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Portugal and Sao Tome and Principe), United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Croatia, Paraguay, Tunisia;

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

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights;

(e) Observer for a non-governmental organization: Save the Children International (also on behalf of Child Helpline International, Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant, the International Catholic Child Bureau, Myochikai (Arigatou Foundation), SOS Kinderdorf International and Terre des Hommes International Federation).

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

149. 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: Austria, India, Mexico, Montenegro, United Arab Emirates;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lithuania, Spain, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Ukraine;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: British Humanist Association, International Institute for Non-Aligned Studies, World Organization against Torture (also on behalf of Defence for Children International).

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

C. General debate on agenda item 3

151. At the 12th meeting, on 12 September 2014, the Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group on the Right to Development, Tamara Kunanayakam, presented the report of the Working Group on its fifteenth session (A/HRC/27/45).

³ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

152. At the same meeting, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights presented the thematic reports prepared by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Secretary-General.

153. At its 12th meeting, on the same day, and at its 14th meeting, on 15 September 2014, and its 16th meeting, on 16 September, 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, Benin, Botswana, Chile, Costa Rica (also on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Cuba, Estonia, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)³ (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Ireland, Italy (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), Japan, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco (also on behalf of Chile, Denmark, Ghana and Indonesia), Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone (also on behalf of Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, the Comoros, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, the Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, the Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, Uruguay, Zambia and Zimbabwe), South Africa, Thailand³ (also on behalf of Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay), United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Angola, Armenia, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Iceland, Iraq, Malaysia, Netherlands, Panama, Republic of Moldova, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Ukraine;

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

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

(e) Observer for the Holy See;

(f) Observer for a national human rights institution: South African Human Rights Commission (also on behalf of the Australian Human Rights Commission, the Canadian Human Rights Commission, Defensor del Pueblo de Bolivia, Defensoría del Pueblo de Colombia, Defensoría del Pueblo de Ecuador, Defensoría del Pueblo of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, the Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain, the German Institute for Human Rights, the Greek National Commission for

Human Rights, the Human Rights Defender of the Republic of Armenia, Instituto Nacional de Derechos Humanos de Chile, the National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia, the National Human Rights Commission of Nepal, the Netherlands Institute of Human Rights, the New Zealand Human Rights Commission, the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission, the Office of the Public Defender (Ombudsman) of Georgia, the Ombudsman of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Procuraduría de los Derechos Humanos de Guatemala, the Scottish Human Rights Commission and the Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights);

(g) 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, Africa culture internationale, African Technical Association, African Technology Development Link, Agence internationale pour le développement, Agir ensemble pour les droits de l'homme, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Article 19 — International Centre against Censorship, Asian Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Network, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of Association Points-Coeur, Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities), Dominicans for Justice and Peace — Order of Preachers, the International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development — VIDES, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco and New Humanity), Auspice Stella, BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, British Humanist Association, Center for Inquiry, Center for Reproductive Rights, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, CIVICUS — World Alliance for Citizen Participation (also on behalf of Article 19 — International Centre against Censorship), Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative (also on behalf of the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development), Conectas Direitos Humanos (also on behalf of Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales and Centro Regional de Derechos Humanos y Justicia de Género), European Centre for Law and Justice, European Union of Public Relations, Franciscans International, Friends World Committee for Consultation, Human Rights Now, Il Cenacolo, Indian Council of South America, International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Catholic Child Bureau, International Educational Development, International Institute for Peace, International Institute for Peace, Justice and Human Rights, International Muslim Women's Union, International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of CIVICUS), Lawyers for Lawyers, Liberal International (World Liberal Union) (also on behalf of the International Network of Liberal Women), Liberation, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Organisation mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale, 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, Soka Gakkai International (also on behalf of the Al-Hakim Foundation, the Asia-Pacific Human Rights Information Center, CIVICUS, the Equitas International Centre for Human Rights Education, the Foundation for GAIA, Human Rights Education Associates, the Institute for Planetary Synthesis, the International Association for Religious Freedom, the International Catholic Child Bureau, the International Federation of University Women, the International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education, Myochikai (Arigatou Foundation), the Planetary Association for Clean Energy, SERVAS International, Soroptimist International, the Sovereign Military Order of the Temple of Jerusalem, the Teresian Association and the United Network of Young Peacebuilders (UNOY Peacebuilders)), United Nations Watch, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization, World Environment and Resources Council, World Evangelical Alliance, World Muslim Congress.

154. At the 14th meeting, on 15 September 2014, the representatives of China, Egypt, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia and Ukraine made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

156. At the 16th meeting, on 16 September 2014, the representatives of Belarus, China and Viet Nam made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Enforced or involuntary disappearances

157. At the 39th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the representative of France introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.1, sponsored by Argentina, France, Japan and Morocco and co-sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Switzerland and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Subsequently, Andorra, Angola, Armenia, Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, Ecuador, Finland, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Lithuania, Maldives, Monaco, New Zealand, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Spain, Sweden, Togo, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

158. At the same meeting, the representative of Argentina 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 Programme Support and Management Services of OHCHR made a statement on the budgetary implications of the draft resolution.

160. At the same meeting, the representatives of India and the Russian Federation made statements in explanation of vote before the vote. The representative of India disassociated the State from the consensus on the ninth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

161. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.1 without a vote (resolution 27/1).

The right to development

162. At the 39th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.3, sponsored by the Islamic Republic of Iran (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries) and co-sponsored by Brazil and China. Subsequently, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), the United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

163. At the same meeting, the representatives of Pakistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments on the draft resolution.

164. 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.

165. At the same meeting, the representatives of France, Italy (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights 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.

166. 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, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Japan, Republic of Korea, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

167. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.3 by 42 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions (resolution 27/2).

168. At the 41st meeting, on 26 September 2014, the representatives of Sierra Leone and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence

169. At the 39th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the representative of Switzerland introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.4, sponsored by Argentina, Austria, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Maldives, Morocco, Peru, Switzerland and Uruguay and co-sponsored by Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, the Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, the United States of America and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Albania, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Honduras, Ireland, Mali, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, the Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Timor-Leste, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

170. At the same meeting, the representative of Switzerland orally revised the draft resolution.

171. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Argentina made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

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 as orally revised.

173. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.4 as orally revised without a vote (resolution 27/3).

Local government and human rights

174. At the 39th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the representative of the Republic of Korea, also on behalf of Chile, Egypt and Romania, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.6, sponsored by Chile, Egypt, the Republic of Korea and Romania and co-sponsored by Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Peru, the Republic of Moldova, Sri Lanka, Thailand and

the United States of America. Subsequently, Angola, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burkina Faso, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Georgia, Honduras, Indonesia, Israel, Maldives, Malta, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Senegal and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

175. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.6 without a vote (resolution 27/4).

The safety of journalists

176. At the 39th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the representative of Austria introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.7, sponsored by Austria, Brazil, France, Greece, Morocco, Qatar and Tunisia and co-sponsored by Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, the Central African Republic, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Yemen and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Armenia, Barbados, Botswana, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Libya, Mali, Malta, Monaco, Panama, the Republic of Korea, Somalia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Ukraine and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

177. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.7 without a vote (resolution 27/5).

Panel discussion on realizing the equal enjoyment of the right to education by every girl

178. At the 39th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the representative of the United Arab Emirates introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.8, sponsored by the United Arab Emirates and co-sponsored by Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Italy, Jordan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Spain, the Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Yemen and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Afghanistan, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chad, the Congo, Ecuador, Haiti, Indonesia, Ireland, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malta, Monaco, Nicaragua, Paraguay, the Philippines, Poland, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Singapore, Switzerland, the United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam joined the sponsors.

179. 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.

180. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.8 without a vote (resolution 27/6).

181. At the 41st meeting, on 26 September 2014, the representative of Japan made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

The human right to safe drinking water and sanitation

182. At the 39th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the representatives of Germany and Spain introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.11/Rev.1, sponsored by Germany and Spain and co-sponsored by Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Uruguay and Yemen. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Benin, Burkina Faso, Chad, Chile, the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Kenya, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Timor-Leste, Togo, Ukraine and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

183. At the same meeting, the representatives of South Africa and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote. The representative of the United States of America disassociated the State from the consensus on the twenty-first preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

184. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.11/Rev.1 without a vote (resolution 27/7).

185. At the 41st meeting, on 26 September 2014, the representatives of Argentina and India made statements in explanation of vote after the vote. In its statement, the representative of India disassociated the State from the consensus on paragraph 9 of the draft resolution.

Promoting human rights through sport and the Olympic ideal

186. At the 39th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the representative of the Russian Federation, also on behalf of Brazil, the Congo, Cyprus, Greece, Japan, Lebanon, Morocco and the Republic of Korea, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.14, sponsored by Brazil, the Congo, Cyprus, Greece, Japan, Lebanon, Morocco, the Republic of Korea and the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Armenia, Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, Nigeria, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, the United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, Ecuador, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Finland, Ireland, Israel, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Malta, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, the Philippines and Tajikistan joined the sponsors.

187. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.14 without a vote (resolution 27/8).

Mandate of the Independent Expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order

188. At the 39th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.16, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Angola, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Lebanon, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Belarus, the Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Namibia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Philippines, Senegal, South Sudan and the United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) joined the sponsors.

189. 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.

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

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

In favour:

Algeria, Argentina, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, 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, 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:

Chile, Costa Rica, Mexico, Peru

192. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.16 by 29 votes to 14, with 4 abstentions (resolution 27/9).

The use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination

193. At the 39th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.17, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ethiopia, Lebanon, Peru, South Africa, the Sudan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Angola, Belarus, Chile, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Senegal, South Sudan, the United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

194. At the same meeting, the representative of Cuba orally revised the draft resolution.

195. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Italy, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

196. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Italy, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as orally revised. 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, 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

Abstaining:

Mexico

197. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.17 as orally revised by 32 votes to 14, with 1 abstention (resolution 27/10).

198. At the 41st meeting, on 26 September 2014, the representative of Argentina made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

199. At the same meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made a statement.

Preventable maternal mortality and morbidity and human rights

200. At the 39th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the representative of Burkina Faso, also on behalf of Colombia and New Zealand, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.19/Rev.1, sponsored by Burkina Faso, Colombia and New Zealand and co-sponsored by Australia, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Switzerland, Turkey, the United States of America and Uruguay. Subsequently, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Germany, Haiti, Honduras, Japan, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Morocco, the Netherlands, Nigeria, the Philippines, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Serbia, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

201. At the same meeting, the representatives of Pakistan, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of member and observer States of the Gulf Cooperation Council) and South Africa made statements in explanation of vote before the vote. The representative of Pakistan disassociated the State from the consensus on paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

202. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.19/Rev.1 without a vote (resolution 27/11).

203. At the 41st meeting, on 26 September 2014, the representative of India made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote, disassociating the State from the consensus on the fourth preambular paragraph and paragraphs 2 and 3 of the draft resolution.

World Programme for Human Rights Education: adoption of the plan of action for the third phase

204. At the 39th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the representative of Costa Rica, also on behalf of Italy, Morocco, the Philippines, Senegal, Slovenia and Switzerland, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.20, sponsored by Costa Rica, Italy, Morocco, the Philippines, Senegal, Slovenia and Switzerland and co-sponsored by Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mali, Mexico, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Spain, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey and Uruguay. Subsequently, Albania, Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, the Czech Republic, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Maldives, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Togo, Uganda, Ukraine and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

205. 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.

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

207. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.20 without a vote (resolution 27/12).

Human rights and indigenous peoples

208. At the 39th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the representative of Mexico, also on behalf of Guatemala, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.22, sponsored by Guatemala and Mexico and co-sponsored by Albania, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, the Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Djibouti, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Spain, Sri Lanka, the United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Cyprus, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Slovenia, Ukraine and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

209. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution.

210. 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.

211. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.22 without a vote (resolution 27/13).

Preventable mortality and morbidity of children under 5 years of age as a human rights concern

212. At the 39th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the representatives of Botswana and Ireland, also on behalf of Austria, Mongolia and Uruguay, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.23, sponsored by Austria, Botswana, Ireland, Mongolia and Uruguay and co-sponsored by Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Belarus, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burkina Faso, Chile, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, the Czech Republic, Ecuador, Honduras, Israel, Libya, Maldives, Mali, Malta, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Timor-Leste, Togo and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

213. At the same meeting, the representative of Pakistan made general comments on the draft resolution.

214. 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.

215. Also at the same meeting, the representative of South Africa made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

216. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.23 without a vote (resolution 27/14).

217. At the 41st meeting, on 26 September 2014, the representatives of India and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote after the vote. The representative of India disassociated the State from the consensus on the sixth preambular paragraph and paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

The right of the child to engage in play and recreational activities

218. At the 39th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the representative of Romania introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.28, sponsored by Brazil, Norway and Romania and co-sponsored by Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, the Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, France, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, Thailand, Tunisia and Turkey. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, Estonia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Oman, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

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

220. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.28 without a vote (resolution 27/15).

221. At the 41st meeting, on 26 September 2014, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Human rights and unilateral coercive measures

222. At the 40th meeting, on 26 September 2014, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.2, sponsored by the Islamic Republic of Iran on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. Subsequently, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States) and the United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) joined the sponsors.

223. At the same meeting, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, orally revised the draft resolution.

224. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America introduced amendment A/HRC/27/L.33 to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.2 as orally revised. Amendment A/HRC/27/L.33 was sponsored by France, Greece, Poland, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Subsequently, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden joined the sponsors.

225. At the same meeting, the representative of Switzerland introduced amendment A/HRC/27/L.44 to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.2 as orally revised. Amendment A/HRC/27/L.44 was sponsored by Denmark, France, Greece, Liechtenstein, Norway, Poland, Romania, Switzerland and the United States of America. Subsequently, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden joined the sponsors.

226. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Cuba, Japan, Pakistan, the United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised and on the amendments.

227. 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 as orally revised. The Chief of the

Programme Support and Management Services of OHCHR made a statement on the budgetary implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

228. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Cuba, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/27/L.33. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Austria, Costa Rica, 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

Against:

Algeria, Argentina, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, 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

Abstaining:

Gabon, Kazakhstan

229. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/27/L.33 by 15 votes to 30, with 2 abstentions.

230. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Cuba, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/27/L.44. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Austria, Costa Rica, 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

Against:

Algeria, Argentina, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, 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

Abstaining:

Gabon, Kazakhstan

231. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/27/L.44 by 15 votes to 30, with 2 abstentions.

232. At the same meeting, the representatives of Italy, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, and of the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

233. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representatives of Italy, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, and 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, Argentina, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, 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

Abstaining:

Costa Rica, Kazakhstan

234. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.2 as orally revised by 31 votes to 14, with 2 abstentions (resolution 27/21 and Corr.1).

Intensifying global efforts and sharing good practices to effectively eliminate female genital mutilation

235. At the 40th meeting, on 26 September 2014, the representatives of Burkina Faso and Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.12, sponsored by Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Slovakia and Thailand. Subsequently, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Honduras, Japan, Latvia, Maldives, Nicaragua, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America 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/27/L.12 without a vote (resolution 27/22).

Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the implications for human rights of the environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes

238. At the 40th meeting, on 26 September 2014, the representatives of Côte d'Ivoire and Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.13, sponsored by Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States). Subsequently, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Maldives, Nicaragua and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

239. At the same meeting, the representatives of Côte d'Ivoire and Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States) orally revised the draft resolution.

240. 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 as orally revised. The Chief of the Programme Support and Management Services of OHCHR made a statement on the budgetary implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

241. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote, disassociating the State from the consensus on the draft resolution as orally revised.

242. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.13 as orally revised without a vote (resolution 27/23).

243. At the 41st meeting, on the same day, the representative of Japan made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Equal participation in political and public affairs

244. At the 40th meeting, on 26 September 2014, the representative of the Czech Republic, also on behalf of Botswana, Indonesia, the Netherlands and Peru, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.29/Rev.1, sponsored by Botswana, the Czech Republic, Indonesia, the Netherlands and Peru and co-sponsored by Albania, Australia, Austria,

Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey and the United States of America. Subsequently, Armenia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Ecuador, Honduras, Japan, Mexico, Panama, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, Serbia, Switzerland, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

245. At the same meeting, the representative of Saudi Arabia made general comments on the draft resolution.

246. 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.

247. At the same meeting, the representatives of Saudi Arabia, South Africa and the United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the States members of the Gulf Cooperation Council) made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote. The representative of the United Arab Emirates, on behalf of the States members of the Gulf Cooperation Council, disassociated the States members of the Gulf Cooperation Council from the consensus on paragraphs 4 (h) and 4 (i) of the draft resolution. The representative of South Africa disassociated the State from the consensus on paragraph 6 of the draft resolution. The representative of Saudi Arabia disassociated the State from the consensus on the second and eighth preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 2 and 4 (c) of the draft resolution.

248. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.29/Rev.1 without a vote (resolution 27/24).

Effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights: the activities of culture funds

249. At the 41st meeting, on 26 September 2014, the representative of Argentina, also on behalf of Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Cuba, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.26, sponsored by Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Cuba, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and co-sponsored by Chile, El Salvador, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Lebanon, Paraguay and Peru. Subsequently, China, Colombia, Ecuador, Honduras, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Nicaragua, Panama, the Philippines and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

250. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Brazil, Cuba, Morocco, Pakistan, the Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments on the draft resolution.

251. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of France, Italy (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Mexico, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

252. 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, 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:

Czech Republic, Germany, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Austria, Estonia, France, Ireland, Italy, Montenegro, Republic of Korea, Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

253. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.26 by 33 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions (resolution 27/30).

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

Civil society space

255. At the 41st meeting, on 26 September 2014, the representatives of Ireland and Tunisia, also on behalf of Chile, Japan and Sierra Leone, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.24, sponsored by Chile, Ireland, Japan, Sierra Leone and Tunisia and co-sponsored by Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Yemen. Subsequently, Albania, Angola, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Honduras, Malta, Mexico, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Ukraine and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

256. At the same meeting, the representative of Ireland, also on behalf of Chile, Japan, Sierra Leone and Tunisia, orally revised the draft resolution. The oral revisions took into consideration amendment A/HRC/27/L.37 to the draft resolution. Consequently, no action was taken on amendment A/HRC/27/L.37.

257. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Cuba, also on behalf of Bahrain, China, Egypt, the Russian Federation, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), introduced amendment A/HRC/27/L.34 to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.24 as orally revised. Amendment A/HRC/27/L.34 was sponsored by Bahrain, China, Cuba, Egypt, the Russian Federation, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

258. At the same meeting, the representative of India introduced amendments A/HRC/27/L.35, also on behalf of Bahrain, China, Cuba, Egypt, the Russian Federation, South Africa, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), and A/HRC/27/L.41 to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.24 as orally revised. Amendment A/HRC/27/L.35 was sponsored by Bahrain, China, Cuba, Egypt, India, the Russian Federation, South Africa, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Amendment A/HRC/27/L.41 was sponsored by Bahrain, China, Cuba, Egypt, India, the Russian Federation, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

259. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced amendments A/HRC/27/L.36, A/HRC/27/L.38, A/HRC/27/L.39 and A/HRC/27/L.40 to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.24 as orally revised. Amendment A/HRC/27/L.36 was sponsored by Bahrain, China, Cuba, Egypt, the Russian Federation, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Amendments A/HRC/27/L.38 and A/HRC/27/L.39 were sponsored by Bahrain, China, Egypt, the Russian Federation, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Amendment A/HRC/27/L.40 was sponsored by Bahrain, China, Cuba, Egypt, India, the Russian Federation, South Africa, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

260. At the same meeting, the representative of China, also on behalf of Bahrain, Cuba, Egypt, the Russian Federation, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian

Republic of), introduced amendment A/HRC/27/L.42 to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.24 as orally revised. Amendment A/HRC/27/L.42 was sponsored by Bahrain, China, Cuba, Egypt, the Russian Federation, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

261. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, also on behalf of Bahrain, China, Cuba, Egypt, the Russian Federation and the United Arab Emirates, introduced amendment A/HRC/27/L.43 to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.24 as orally revised. Amendment A/HRC/27/L.43 was sponsored by Bahrain, China, Cuba, Egypt, the Russian Federation, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

262. At the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Japan, Montenegro, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised and on the amendments.

263. 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 as orally revised.

264. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic and South Africa made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/27/L.34.

265. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/27/L.34. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, China, Congo, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Kuwait, Maldives, Morocco, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, 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

Abstaining:

Gabon, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Namibia, Philippines, Viet Nam

266. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/27/L.34 by 15 votes to 25, with 7 abstentions.

267. At the same meeting, the representative of Austria made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/27/L.35.

268. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/27/L.35. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Brazil, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Maldives, Mexico, 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

Abstaining:

Congo, Gabon, Kazakhstan, Philippines

269. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/27/L.35 by 18 votes to 25, with 4 abstentions.

270. At the same meeting, the representatives of Germany and Montenegro made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/27/L.36.

271. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/27/L.36. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, China, Congo, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait, Morocco, 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, Maldives, Mexico, 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

Abstaining:

Gabon, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Philippines

272. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/27/L.36 by 17 votes to 26, with 4 abstentions.

273. At the same meeting, the representatives of Estonia and France made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/27/L.38.

274. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/27/L.38. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Kenya, Kuwait, Morocco, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, 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, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Peru, Republic of Korea, Romania, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Congo, Gabon, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Philippines

275. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/27/L.38 by 14 votes to 27, with 6 abstentions.

276. At the same meeting, the representatives of Estonia and France made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/27/L.39.

277. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/27/L.39. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Kenya, Kuwait, Morocco, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, 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, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Peru, Republic of Korea,

Romania, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Congo, Gabon, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Philippines

278. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/27/L.39 by 14 votes to 27, with 6 abstentions.

279. At the same meeting, the representatives of Germany and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/27/L.40.

280. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/27/L.40. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait, Morocco, Pakistan, Russian Federation, 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, Maldives, Mexico, 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

Abstaining:

Congo, Gabon, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Philippines

281. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/27/L.40 by 15 votes to 26, with 5 abstentions.⁴

282. At the same meeting, the representative of Costa Rica made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/27/L.41.

283. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/27/L.41. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Brazil, China, Congo, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Morocco, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, 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

Abstaining:

Gabon, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Philippines

284. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/27/L.41 by 19 votes to 24, with 4 abstentions.

285. At the same meeting, the representative of the Czech Republic made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/27/L.42.

⁴ Saudi Arabia did not cast a vote. The representative of Saudi Arabia subsequently stated that the delegation had intended to vote in favour of the amendment.

286. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/27/L.42. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait, Morocco, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Argentina, Austria, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Maldives, Mexico, 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

Abstaining:

Gabon, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Philippines, South Africa

287. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/27/L.42 by 15 votes to 27, with 5 abstentions.

288. At the same meeting, the representatives of Austria and Japan made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/27/L.43.

289. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/27/L.43. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, China, Congo, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Kenya, Kuwait, Morocco, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, 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, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Peru, 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

Abstaining:

Gabon, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Namibia, South Africa

290. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/27/L.43 by 15 votes to 27, with 5 abstentions.

291. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, India, Indonesia, Kuwait (on behalf of the States members of the Gulf Cooperation Council), Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Viet Nam made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on the draft resolution as orally revised. The representative of India disassociated the State from the consensus on the eighth and ninth preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 10, 12 and 14 of the draft resolution as orally revised. The representative of Saudi Arabia disassociated the State from the consensus on paragraphs 2 and 15 of the draft resolution as orally revised. The representative of Kuwait, on behalf of the States members of the Gulf Cooperation Council, disassociated the States members of the Gulf Cooperation Council from the consensus on the sixth preambular paragraph and paragraph 10 of the draft resolution as orally revised. The representative of China disassociated the State from the consensus on the eighth and ninth preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 10 and 12 of the draft resolution as orally revised. The representative of South Africa disassociated the State from the consensus on the draft resolution as orally revised.

292. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.24 as orally revised without a vote (resolution 27/31 and Corr.1).

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

293. At the 16th meeting, on 16 September 2014, the Chair of the independent international commission of inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic, Paolo Sérgio Pinheiro, presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 25/23, the report of the commission (A/HRC/27/60).

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

295. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 16th and 17th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Chair questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Austria, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, China, Cuba, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Maldives, Morocco, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, 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, Bulgaria, Canada, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Greece, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Presse emblème campagne, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

296. At the 17th meeting, on the same day, the Chair answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

B. General debate on agenda item 4

297. At its 17th and 18th meetings, on 16 September 2014, and its 19th meeting, on 17 September, 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, China, Cuba, Czech Republic, France, Germany, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of)⁵ (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Ireland, Italy (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), Japan, Montenegro, Morocco, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

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

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Development Association, African Technical Association, African Technology Development Link,

⁵ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Agence internationale pour le développement, Al-Khoei Foundation, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Article 19 — International Centre against Censorship, Asian Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Network, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Association of World Citizens, Baha'i International Community, British Humanist Association, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, Center for Inquiry, Centre Europe-Tiers Monde — Europe-Third World Centre, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, CIVICUS — World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Colombian Commission of Jurists, Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations (also on behalf of B'nai B'rith), Federation of Cuban Women, France libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Franciscans International, Helios Life Association, Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights Watch, Il Cenacolo, Indian Council of South America, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, International Association of Schools of Social Work, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Institute for Peace, International Institute for Peace, Justice and Human Rights, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, International Muslim Women's Union, Jubilee Campaign, Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, 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, Society for Threatened Peoples, Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of the Environment, Syriac Universal Alliance, United Nations Watch, United Schools International, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Victorious Youths Movement, VIVAT International, Women's Human Rights International Association (also on behalf of International Educational Development), Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, World Barua Organization, World Environment and Resources Council, World Evangelical Alliance (also on behalf of Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities)), World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress.

298. At the 18th meeting, on 16 September 2014, the representatives of Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Japan, Maldives, Morocco, Niger, Saudi Arabia, South Sudan, Thailand, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

299. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Ethiopia and Morocco made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

300. At the 19th meeting, on 17 September 2014, the representatives of China, Cuba, the Russian Federation and the Sudan made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

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

301. At the 39th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the representatives of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, also on behalf of France, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, Qatar, Turkey and the United States of America, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.5/Rev.1, sponsored by France, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, 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, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United Arab Emirates. Subsequently, Andorra, Bahrain,

Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Malta, Norway, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Senegal, Sweden and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

302. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Italy (on behalf of the European Union) and the Russian Federation made general comments on the draft resolution.

303. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

304. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Argentina, Brazil, China, Cuba, Mexico and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

305. 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, 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, Kenya, Namibia, Pakistan, Philippines, South Africa, Viet Nam

306. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.5/Rev.1 by 32 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions (resolution 27/16).

V. Human rights bodies and mechanisms

A. Complaint procedure

307. At its 12th meeting, on 12 September 2014, and its 30th meeting, on 22 September, the Human Rights Council held closed meetings of the complaint procedure.

308. At the 31st meeting, on 23 September 2014, the President of the Human Rights Council made a statement on the outcome of the meetings, stating that the Council had examined, in closed meetings, the situation of human rights in Cameroon, under the complaint procedure established pursuant to Council resolution 5/1. The Council decided to discontinue its consideration of the situation.

B. Interactive dialogue with the Advisory Committee

309. At the 19th meeting, on 17 September 2014, the Chair of the Advisory Committee, Mario Luis Coriolano, presented the reports of the Committee (A/HRC/27/57, A/HRC/27/58, A/HRC/27/59 and A/HRC/27/62).

310. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Chair questions:

- (a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Argentina, China, Costa Rica, Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);
- (b) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;
- (c) Observer for the International Olympic Committee;
- (d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence.

311. At the same meeting, the Chair of the Advisory Committee answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

C. Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

312. At the 19th meeting, on 17 September 2014, the Chair-Rapporteur of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Albert Deterville, presented the reports of the Expert Mechanism (A/HRC/27/64, A/HRC/27/65, A/HRC/27/66 and A/HRC/27/67).

313. At its 21st meeting, on the same day, the Human Rights Council held an interactive dialogue on the human rights of indigenous peoples under agenda items 3 and 5 (see paras. 87–94 above).

D. Open-ended intergovernmental working group on a draft United Nations declaration on the right to peace

314. At the 27th meeting, on 19 September 2014, the Chair-Rapporteur of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on a draft United Nations declaration on the right to peace, Christian Guillermet-Fernández, presented the report of the working group on its second session, held from 30 June to 4 July 2014 (A/HRC/27/63).

E. General debate on agenda item 5

315. At its 27th meeting, on 19 September 2014, and its 29th meeting, on 22 September, 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, Botswana, Costa Rica (also on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Cuba, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Germany, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy (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, Turkey and Ukraine), Latvia⁶ (also on behalf of Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay), Morocco, Pakistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), El Salvador, Hungary, Norway, Sri Lanka, Switzerland;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Khoei Foundation, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Association of World Citizens, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of the Company of the Daughters of Charity of Saint Vincent de Paul, the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development — VIDES, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco and Pax Romana (International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs and International Movement of Catholic Students)), Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, CIVICUS — World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations in Consultative Relationship with the United Nations (also on behalf of the International Alliance of Women, the World Student Christian Federation and the World Young Women's Christian Association), Il Cenacolo, International Buddhist Foundation, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Lesbian and Gay Association, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, International Service for Human Rights, Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Society Studies Centre, United Nations Watch, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace, World Barua Organization, World Muslim Congress.

316. At the 29th meeting, on 22 September 2014, the representative of Malaysia made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

F. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Promotion of the right to peace

317. At the 39th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the representative of Cuba, on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.15/Rev.1, sponsored by Cuba, on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States, and co-sponsored by Angola, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ethiopia, Lebanon, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan and the State of Palestine.

⁶ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Subsequently, Belarus, China, the Congo, Indonesia, Namibia, Senegal, South Sudan, Togo and the United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) joined the sponsors.

318. At the same meeting, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made general comments on the draft resolution.

319. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and of the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

320. At the same meeting, at the request of the representatives of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and 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, 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, Japan, Republic of Korea, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Ireland, Italy, Montenegro, Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

321. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.15/Rev.1 by 33 votes to 9, with 5 abstentions (resolution 27/17).

VI. Universal periodic review

322. 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 nineteenth session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, held from 28 April to 9 May 2014.

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

A. Consideration of review outcomes

324. 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.

Norway

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

(a) The national report submitted by Norway in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/NOR/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/NOR/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/NOR/3).

326. At its 22 meeting, on 18 September 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Norway (see sect. C below).

327. The outcome of the review of Norway comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/27/3), 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/27/3/Add.1).

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

328. The head of the delegation stated that Norway strongly supported the universal periodic review, which provided all States with a unique opportunity to undertake a review of their human rights situation.

329. Throughout the process, the Government of Norway had cooperated transparently with civil society. A draft report had been circulated among civil society actors in Norway and they had been invited to give their views. Their critical assessment and constructive advice on areas where there was disagreement with the Government or where improvement had been deemed to be needed had been of key importance to the process.

330. The universal periodic review had contributed to a strengthened dialogue between civil society and the authorities on a range of human rights related issues.

331. Norway had received 203 recommendations relating to a number of issues, including the establishment of a new national human rights institution, the ratification of international instruments, racism, discrimination and violence against women. It had welcomed all of the recommendations and the relevant authorities had carefully considered each of them. Norway had accepted 150 recommendations. Extensive comments were provided in the addendum, including explanations for why it had not accepted certain recommendations.

332. The delegation of Norway thanked the missions that had contributed to a useful dialogue during the review. The delegation also thanked representatives of civil society for their many and constructive contributions. Civil society had played a crucial role in making the universal periodic review a credible and useful process.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

333. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Norway, 12 delegations made statements.⁷

334. The Islamic Republic of Iran stated that Norway was expected to implement the recommendations it had accepted fully and effectively. It was concerned about the lack of updated data on the use of solitary confinement and on cases of domestic violence, discrimination against and allegations of mistreatment of migrants, persons from migrant backgrounds, asylum seekers and refugees, discrimination against minorities and indigenous peoples, persistent hate speech against minorities, xenophobia and Islamophobic statements. It called upon Norway to address those concerns.

335. Romania congratulated Norway on the successful completion of its second universal periodic review. The importance placed on the preparation of the report, the extensive consultation with stakeholders and the attention paid to all of the recommendations showed a willingness on the part of Norway to uphold the highest human rights standards. It also congratulated Norway on its unwavering commitment to the promotion of human rights at the international level.

336. Sierra Leone stated that the report submitted by Norway reflected a willingness to consider ways to promote and protect human rights further. It commended Norway for having established a national human rights institution that would be effective as of 1 January 2015 and it was also pleased to note that it was a priority of Norway to ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. Sierra Leone pointed out that Norway had not accepted the recommendation on ratifying the optional protocols to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

337. The Sudan thanked Norway for its report, statement and clarifications. The participation of the State in the universal periodic review showed its willingness to have a positive impact on the process. The Sudan thanked Norway for having accepted some of the recommendations it had made.

338. Togo commended Norway for its commitment to universal human rights values. It was pleased to note that Norway had favourably received its recommendation and invited the State to step up efforts to work effectively against racial profiling in all public and private spheres. Togo welcomed the willingness of Norway to continue its full cooperation with the Human Rights Council and its mechanisms.

339. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela thanked Norway for its presentation. It had participated constructively in the review of Norway and made recommendations on having the State increase efforts to combat the ongoing stigmatization and discrimination of ethnic

⁷ 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/27thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

minorities, particularly the Roma and migrants. It hoped that the willingness expressed by the Government of Norway would take the form of tangible actions that would help to improve the human rights situation for those vulnerable groups. It was willing to continue cooperation with the Government of Norway within the framework of the work of the Human Rights Council, so as to make further progress in improving the human rights situation in Norway.

340. Viet Nam expressed its appreciation to Norway for having accepted a large number of recommendations, including the two recommendations Viet Nam had made on discrimination against ethnic minorities and on domestic violence.

341. Algeria welcomed and thanked the delegation of Norway for having participated in the adoption of the report. It was pleased that Norway had accepted 177 of the 203 recommendations, including the two recommendations made by Algeria. It wished Norway success in implementing the recommendations accepted.

342. Angola congratulated Norway on having presented a detailed report. It welcomed the dedication of the State to promoting and protecting human rights and to closely cooperating with human rights mechanisms. Norway had made strides in achieving equality between men and women. Angola thanked Norway for the technical assistance it had provided as part of human rights training and it wished the State success in implementing the recommendations accepted.

343. Botswana commended the Government of Norway for the measures it had taken to address inequality and discrimination. Norway had accepted many of the recommendations, thereby demonstrating its long-standing commitment to human rights at both the national and international levels. Botswana was pleased that the State had accepted the two recommendations it had made and applauded its commitment to the protection of children's rights, and was particularly encouraged by the asylum process with legal safeguards for children.

344. Bulgaria congratulated Norway on the legislative and institutional progress that had been made since the State's first review. It welcomed its decision to establish a new independent national human rights institution and took positive note of the fact that Norway attached great importance to ensuring a rapid asylum process with legal safeguards for children and to providing good living conditions during the process. Bulgaria urged Norway to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography.

345. Côte d'Ivoire warmly welcomed the delegation of Norway and thanked it for the responses and additional information provided. It believed that Norway would do everything in its power to implement the recommendations it had accepted. Côte d'Ivoire commended Norway for the efforts made to ensure equality and the enjoyment of human rights by all citizens. It encouraged the State to continue its cooperation with international mechanisms for the promotion and protection of human rights.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

346. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Norway, six other stakeholders made statements.

347. The European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Association urged Norway to develop a new national action plan to address the continuing challenges faced by lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons, and to allocate resources to train administrators and service providers on sexual orientation and gender identity issues. It called upon Norway to authorize the office of the anti-discrimination ombudsman to award compensation to victims of discrimination, to coordinate national efforts within the Ministry of Justice, the National Police Directorate and the police to tackle hate crime, to include gender identity and gender expression in those provisions of the Penal Code relating to hate crime and hate speech, to provide national standards for adequate care for victims of hate crime and domestic violence, to remove the requirement of sterilization for the changing of legal gender markers, to ensure safe spaces and housing for lesbian, gay,

bisexual, transgender and intersex asylum seekers, and to improve access to health services and hormone treatment for transgender asylum seekers.

348. The World Network of Users and Survivors of Psychiatry stated that disability-based discrimination was an ongoing problem in Norway, and fundamental changes to the law were required, with other measures, to fulfil the obligations set forth in the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. It regretted that Norway had not ratified the Optional Protocol to the Convention, and urged Norway to withdraw its reservations on articles 12 and 14 of the Convention. It encouraged the State to take the action necessary to develop laws and policies to replace the regimes of substitute decision-making by supported decision-making that respected a person's autonomy, will and preferences. It urged Norway to repeal legal provisions authorizing detention on mental health grounds.

349. The International Humanist and Ethical Union commended Norway particularly for its human rights record on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex issues and civil and political liberties. It was concerned about the amendment of 2012 to the Constitution that enshrined the State church system, requiring the head of State to be a church member, and anchoring State values within specific religious heritage. It recommended the revision of the Constitution with the aim of securing equality and non-discrimination. It was also concerned about the attempts of the Government to amend the secondary school subject of religion, philosophies of life and ethics to explicitly incorporate Christianity by name and to ensure that 55 per cent of the course covered Christianity.

350. Save the Children regretted that the Government of Norway had rejected the recommendations relating to the signing and ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure. It was also concerned that the Government had not provided a clear position on those recommendations, and called upon Norway to facilitate access to justice for children by making children's housing services available and accessible to all victimized children up to the age of 18 years. Not all children were referred to those centres, as national regulations limited the right to judicial examination to children below the age of 16 years. Save the Children called upon the Government to ensure that the children's housing services were available to all children regardless of age.

351. Action Canada for Population and Development welcomed the acceptance of a number of recommendations relating to sexuality and gender and looked forward to hearing the results of the public consultation on the proposed amendments to the Penal Code with regard to provisions relating to violence. It urged Norway to widen the definition of rape to include all types of non-consensual sexual activity, to complete regular national surveys on sexual violence in order to increase knowledge and develop effective policies, education and campaigns, to ensure that the police made use of forensic information from sexual assault clinics, and to ensure that national plans of action on forced marriages included reference to rape and sexual violence. Increased training on sexual violence and gender stereotypes was essential for people working with victims of sexual violence.

352. Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik welcomed the State's acceptance of many recommendations, but was disappointed that Norway had rejected the recommendations on ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. Although Norway had a good human rights record, the human rights situation could still be improved.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

353. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, of the 203 recommendations received, 150 recommendations had enjoyed the support of Norway and 53 recommendations had been noted.

354. The delegation of Norway stated that the universal periodic review was an ongoing process and that the implementation phases were crucial. Norway looked forward to following up on the many useful recommendations received.

355. The delegation concluded by thanking all the delegations for having participated in the review. In closing, the delegation emphasized that the promotion and protection of

human rights was a priority for the Government of Norway. Although much had been achieved, Norway still faced some challenges and the Government was continually striving to make improvements. The universal periodic review process provided a unique opportunity to address those challenges and to raise awareness about the importance of strengthening the implementation of the recommendations.

Albania

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

(a) The national report submitted by Albania in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/ALB/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/ALB/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/ALB/3).

357. At its 22nd meeting, on 18 September 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Albania (see sect. C below).

358. The outcome of the review of Albania comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/27/4), 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/27/4/Add.1).

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

359. The delegation of Albania reported that, of the 165 recommendations received, it supported 161 recommendations, partially supported three recommendations (106.6, 106.7 and 106.21) and noted one recommendation (106.22). The Government had carried out a series of activities to promote and protect human rights. Several strategies and action plans had been adopted and implemented. The rule of law and respect for and the protection of human rights remained important objectives of government programmes, including objectives relating to education, health care, gender equality and social inclusion.

360. Albania had extended a standing invitation to all special procedure mandate holders and consequently, two special procedures had visited the country. The Government had pledged to continue working with the special procedures to implement their recommendations.

361. Albania was considering accepting individual complaints procedure under the human rights conventions to which Albania was a party. It had established a working group to evaluate and to make proposals regarding the ratification of the Kampala amendments to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.

362. The protection and promotion of human rights was a priority for the Government, and thus the authorities would continue to fulfil the State's international obligations by implementing human rights relating to legislation and policies, and raising public awareness of human rights and cooperation among stakeholders.

363. Independent institutions such as the People's Advocate and the Commissioner for Protection from Discrimination played significant and proactive roles in promoting and protecting human rights.

364. The amendments to the Penal Code adopted in 2012 and 2013 were in compliance with the relevant provisions of international human rights treaties, with the Law on Protection from Discrimination and with the legal practice of the Constitutional Court. Those amendments had established domestic violence, rape and sexual violence in the

marriage, sexual harassment and psychological violence as separate offences and increased the punishment for those crimes. Furthermore, the amendments made in 2013 to the Criminal Code had introduced a new article on blood feuds, providing for more severe punishment for such crimes.

365. In recent years, Albania had undertaken important reforms to protect the human rights of persons deprived of their liberty and to implement policies regarding the protection of rights of those persons, in line with European standards. In that respect, amendments to the laws on the rights and treatment of prisoners and detainees and on prison police had been initiated in November 2013. The draft law on the rights and treatment of prisoners and detainees covered a wide range of issues, with the aim of improving conditions in prisons, including access to health care, complaint mechanisms and the protection of personal data. Albania was planning a revision of the general regulations for prisons and drafting new internal regulations for each penitentiary institution. The law on granting amnesty had been adopted in April 2014 to reduce overcrowding in prisons, and since its implementation, prison overcrowding had decreased from 29 per cent to 11 per cent.

366. Regarding the strengthening of the judiciary and the fight against corruption, the delegation stated that the adoption of legal amendments had been planned for 2014 in consultation with the Venice Commission of the Council of Europe.

367. The delegation explained that the legal criteria for the recognition of minorities were based on historical considerations and on requirements set by relevant international conventions, including the principle of self-identification. The Greek, Macedonian and Serbo-Montenegrin minorities had the status of national minorities, while the Roma and Aromanian/Vlach minorities were recognized as ethno-linguistic minorities. The distinction drawn between national and ethno-linguistic minorities had no negative or discriminatory effect on the implementation of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities or on protecting the rights of individuals belonging to those two categories of minorities. According to the data from the 2011 census, minorities constituted approximately 1.4 per cent of the total population.

368. Regarding the protection of minorities, the Government was committed to implementing the recommendations made by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe in its 2014 resolution on the implementation of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. In the road map on the fulfilment of the five priorities of the European Commission, adopted in May 2014, several measures had been included with a view to protecting minorities. In that respect, a working group had been established under the auspices of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, involving representatives of State institutions and non-State organizations that would examine the existing legal and policy framework on minorities and prepare proposals on improving national legislation and policies.

369. Albania had ratified 18 international human rights instruments and 41 instruments of the Council of Europe. Its application to become a State Member of the Human Rights Council for the period 2015–2017 was a result of its continuous efforts to build a democratic society based on human rights.

370. Albania would continue to promote human rights within the United Nations system, including through its active engagement in the work of the General Assembly and the Third Committee.

371. With a view to strengthening the international human rights system, Albania had made a number of commitments, including to work on observing the principles of universality and indivisibility of human rights and of impartiality, objectivity and non-selectivity in its endeavours; to uphold the principle of universality of the universal periodic review and to make recommendations in a non-selective manner to all States under review; to ensure the full enjoyment of human rights by all and to protect the human rights of persons belonging to ethnic, linguistic and religious minorities; to support initiatives at the regional and international levels in order to combat intolerance and discrimination based on religion, ethnicity, nationality, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability or any other

grounds; to support initiatives to foster interreligious and intercultural dialogue; and to work on the inclusion of a human rights perspective in the post-2015 development agenda.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

372. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Albania, 13 delegations made statements.

373. Algeria was pleased that Albania had accepted a large number of recommendations, including two recommendations made by Algeria on strengthening the role and resources of human rights institutions and on combating violence against women and children.

374. Angola commended Albania for the progress it had made in the promotion and protection of human rights by adopting a policy to harmonize its laws with international human rights instruments. The implementation of the recommendations accepted would reinforce the State's efforts to improve access to education and health care, to prevent domestic violence and to promote gender equality.

375. Bulgaria commended Albania on the measures it had taken to implement the recommendations made during the first review and for its cooperation with human rights mechanisms. It was pleased with the measures Albania had taken to improve its legal framework, especially the amendments made in 2013 to the Criminal Code in order to address internal human trafficking, to promote the rights of women, to ensure gender equality and to combat domestic violence. It recommended that Albania continue strengthening measures to ensure gender equality, especially in the labour market.

376. China was pleased with the active engagement of Albania in the review and its acceptance of a large number of recommendations. It hoped that the Government would continue to implement effectively the national strategy to achieve gender equality and to reduce gender-based and domestic violence and the national action plan for children, in view of the State's acceptance of a recommendation on issues raised by China. China referred to the progress Albania had made in the protection and promotion of human rights, including the rights of women, children, Roma and other vulnerable groups, and in the improvement of the legal and institutional framework to combat human trafficking and blood feuds.

377. The Council of Europe highlighted the importance of the recommendations made by various bodies of the Council of Europe in three priority areas: the ineffective delivery of justice; discrimination against minorities and the social exclusion of Roma; and corruption, money laundering and organized crime. It welcomed the measures that the Government had already taken to address those priority areas. It commended Albania for having ratified the Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence.

378. Kuwait commended Albania for its continuous efforts to improve its cooperation with the United Nations human rights mechanisms and the protection and promotion of human rights. It was pleased with the legislative reforms that had been made in various areas, including education, health care, anti-corruption and the rights of persons with disabilities.

379. Morocco was pleased that Albania had accepted three recommendations that it had made. It commended Albania for its efforts to harmonize its national legislation with international standards and referred to the legislative amendments in the area of protecting the rights of children, women and persons with disabilities. It referred to the State's cooperation with United Nations bodies and the ratification of new instruments on individual complaints.

380. Nigeria commended Albania for supporting most of the recommendations made during the review. It was pleased with the adoption of strategies and action plans in various areas, including domestic violence, the rights of the child and combating human trafficking. Nigeria commended Albania for its efforts to improve the legal framework relating to protection from discrimination, the rights of the child and of persons with disabilities, and the fight against corruption.

381. Romania commended Albania for the progress it had made since its first periodic review. It pointed out that, despite the fact that Albania had not supported a part of the second recommendation made by Romania (on abolishing any possible legal grounds for differentiated treatment between national and ethno-linguistic minorities), Albania would implement Council of Europe resolution CM/ResCMN(2014)1, which addressed a similar issue and was aimed at eliminating discrimination against the citizens of Albania.

382. Sierra Leone pointed out that Albania had supported a large number of recommendations and considered that some of those recommendations were in the process of implementation, including the recommendations on child labour and trafficking in children made by Sierra Leone. It encouraged Albania to continue to increase the resources necessary for the People's Advocate.

383. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia was pleased that Albania had supported most of the recommendations made during the review. It was confident that the Government would make the efforts necessary to implement the recommendations on the new law on administrative and territorial division in accordance with the provisions of the European Charter of Local Self-Government of the Council of Europe.

384. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela pointed out that Albania had ratified a number of human rights instruments, including the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. It also referred to the State's efforts to improve the legal framework to prevent gender discrimination and domestic violence. It commended Albania for its efforts and the achievements made in implementing the recommendations that the State had accepted during its first review.

385. Viet Nam was pleased that Albania had supported a large number of recommendations, including two made by Viet Nam on further improving its national institutions and human rights infrastructure and on allocating resources to the implementation of current national strategies, programmes and measures.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

386. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Albania, six other stakeholders made statements.

387. The People's Advocate of Albania listed several challenges that the State continued to face, including strengthening the rule of law, harmonizing national legislation with international law, and strengthening the capacity and independence of human rights institutions. Furthermore, it highlighted several areas in which efforts needed to be stepped up, namely preventing child exploitation and child labour, adopting a new law on minorities, addressing the causes of blood feuds, providing victims of the Communist rule with compensation, strengthening mechanisms to address domestic violence, addressing the issue of mandatory medical treatment in prison hospitals, protecting the rights of persons with disabilities, implementing legislation on the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons, and fighting corruption.

388. The European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Association pointed out that Albania had taken steps to improve its legislation in order to protect the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex community from discrimination. It commended the Government for having developed a set of measures against discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. It urged Albania to, inter alia, pay attention to the implementation of the law on protection from discrimination and of the amendments to the Penal Code, to protect lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons from potential hate crimes, to ensure the legal recognition of same-sex partnerships, and to include the concerns of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons in the new strategy for social inclusion.

389. Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII was pleased with the measures that Albania had planned in order to combat the phenomenon of blood feuds. It recommended that the Government, inter alia, initiate a national reconciliation process through transitional justice, establish a coordination council to address the phenomenon of blood feuds, and

conduct public awareness campaigns to promote reconciliation and a culture based on non-violence and respect for human rights.

390. In their joint statement, Save the Children International and World Vision International noted with satisfaction that Albania had accepted recommendations regarding the rights of children. With regard to the implementation of those recommendations, they highlighted the need for sufficient budget allocations to ensure inclusive education, to conduct national awareness-raising campaigns against violence and to ensure the availability of child protection services nationwide. Emergency centres and rehabilitation and reintegration programmes had to be budgeted and embedded in social protection services. Save the Children International and World Vision International were pleased with the Government's willingness to consult with civil society in the universal periodic review process, and looked forward to such cooperation during the follow-up stage of the review.

391. Amnesty International welcomed the State's commitment to integrate the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance into domestic legislation and its acceptance of several recommendations on investigating and punishing abuses by law enforcement officials, ending discrimination against Roma and Egyptian communities, and addressing domestic violence. It regretted, however, that Albania continued to deny Egyptians minority status. Roma and Egyptians continued to live in inadequate housing and to be vulnerable to forced eviction. The implementation of national plans for the integration of Roma remained slow. It concluded that domestic violence was still commonly reported.

392. Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik appreciated the fact that Albania had noted only one recommendation out of a total of 165 recommendations. It welcomed the Government's decision to accept a number of asylum seekers, but was concerned about the health situation of some of them.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

393. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 165 recommendations received, Albania had supported 161 recommendations, provided additional clarification for another three recommendations, indicating which parts had been supported and which parts had been noted, and had noted one recommendation.

394. In conclusion, the delegation of Albania affirmed the State's commitment to implement the recommendations made during the review, while recognizing the challenges ahead. Albania was also committed to strengthening the United Nations human rights system, including by building the capacity of the Human Rights Council to respond to gross human rights violations effectively, strengthening cooperation with the United Nations human rights mechanisms, working towards the further advancement of international human rights norms and standards, improving efforts to promote gender equality, empowering women and promoting the rights of the most vulnerable groups, and strengthening the protection and promotion of the rights of older persons.

Democratic Republic of the Congo

395. The review of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was held on 29 April 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by the Democratic Republic of the Congo in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/COD/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/COD/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/COD/3).

396. At its 22nd meeting, on 18 September 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (see sect. C below).

397. The outcome of the review of the Democratic Republic of the Congo comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/27/5), 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.

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

398. The delegation of the Democratic Republic of the Congo pointed out that the session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review held on 29 April 2014 provided an opportunity for the State to report to the Human Rights Council on the efforts and progress that it had made in the implementation of the recommendations accepted during the first review.

399. Of the 229 recommendations received, the Democratic Republic of the Congo had accepted 190, noted 38 and delayed giving its position on one recommendation, made by Belgium, on ensuring that all persons, including members of the national army, the police and intelligence service, who were suspected of having committed crimes of international law and other grave human rights violations, were brought before the courts in fair trials that did not lead to the death penalty. The Government ensured that people's fundamental rights were protected and that perpetrators of criminal acts were pursued. Given that the death penalty had not been abrogated in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, however, the State was unable to accept the recommendation made by Belgium.

400. Concrete initiatives had been carried out by the Government to implement the recommendations. It had clustered all the recommendations accepted into 25 thematic groups and identified the ministries responsible for implementing each group of recommendations. In addition, the Ministry of Justice and Human Rights had prepared an action plan for their implementation, which would be adopted at a workshop by all the stakeholders concerned, namely representatives of the Government and of civil society, and development partners.

401. Regarding the recommendations on sexual and gender-based violence, the State intended to adopt in August 2014 an action plan to fight sexual violence for the armed forces. The phenomenon of sexual violence had slightly decreased since the end of the war in the eastern part of the country. The Government had called for the continuation of collaboration with the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in particular the "Brigade d'intervention spéciale", in order to totally dismantle all armed groups.

402. The above-mentioned action plan was focused on reducing the violence attributable to the armed forces by strengthening the prevention of and the fight against impunity, and was based on the four pillars of prevention, repression, communication and follow-up/monitoring.

403. The Government continued to implement the action plan, which had been signed in October 2012, to end the recruitment of children associated with the armed forces and the security forces. A ministerial decree of May 2013 required that all members of the armed forces combat the recruitment and use of child soldiers within the armed forces. Thanks to those efforts, the number of children separated from the armed groups had increased from 2,894 in 2013 to 5,609 in 2014. There were no child soldiers in the armed forces; the phenomenon had been linked to the presence of armed groups in the State.

404. With regard to the establishment of a national human rights commission, the delegation pointed out that the institution was not operational because the representatives of civil society had not yet chosen the commissioners.

405. The Government had taken measures to submit its reports to the treaty bodies. The fourth report on the implementation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (CCPR/C/COD/4) had been sent to the Secretary-General.

406. In conclusion, the Democratic Republic of the Congo remained committed to implementing the recommendations from the universal periodic review and all the commitments made under the international instruments that it had ratified.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

407. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, 13 delegations made statements.⁸

408. Angola welcomed the commitment of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to protecting and promoting human rights despite the crisis that the country was enduring. Peace and security were essential for the implementation of the recommendations accepted; Angola welcomed the efforts made by the Democratic Republic of the Congo to achieve effective and lasting peace.

409. Botswana commended the Democratic Republic of the Congo for the measures it had taken to restore peace and stability, which were crucial to the protection and promotion of human rights. It commended the Government for the initiatives that had led to the signing of a number of agreements, including the Peace, Security and Cooperation Framework for the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Region, and the Nairobi Declaration. Botswana welcomed the concrete steps the State had taken to address sexual and gender-based violence. It called upon the international community to extend the technical assistance and capacity necessary to implement the recommendations.

410. Chad was pleased that the Democratic Republic of the Congo had made significant efforts to promote and protect human rights. It thanked the Congolese authorities for having accepted the recommendation that it had made.

411. China was grateful that the Democratic Republic of the Congo had accepted its recommendations. The international community should fully acknowledge the efforts and progress made by the Government in restoring stability, combating sexual violence, protecting the rights of women and children, furthering judiciary reform and ending impunity. It called upon the relevant United Nations bodies to provide the Democratic Republic of the Congo with assistance in implementing the recommendations from the universal periodic review.

412. The Congo congratulated the Democratic Republic of the Congo on the progress it had made since its previous review, namely by adopting legal documents and by taking measures to protect vulnerable people and to prevent violence against women and children. The Congo also welcomed the efforts made to eradicate all forms of discrimination and violence.

413. Côte d'Ivoire thanked the Democratic Republic of the Congo for having accepted the recommendations it had made. It encouraged the Government in its efforts to strengthen legal mechanisms and instruments to promote and protect human rights.

414. Cuba pointed out that the Democratic Republic of the Congo had implemented the recommendations from the first review despite the difficult situation that the State faced and its inability to implement development plans throughout its territory, as shown by, among other things, plans for the construction and rehabilitation of schools, the increase in the resources allocated to education and the adoption of national plans for poverty reduction.

⁸ 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/27thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

415. Djibouti encouraged the Democratic Republic of the Congo in its efforts to promote and protect human rights. It also encouraged the authorities to continue current reforms of the justice and security sectors.

416. Egypt commended the Democratic Republic of the Congo for its support of the recommendations that it had made on the adoption of a social security code, the elimination of the sale of and trafficking in children for sexual exploitation, the fight against maternal and infant mortality, access for women and girls to basic health-care services, and free and compulsory education for all children without discrimination.

417. Ethiopia was pleased to note that the Democratic Republic of the Congo had supported the recommendations it had made. It was encouraged by the Government's commitment to strengthening the capacity of law enforcement organs and by its acceptance of the recommendation on strengthening measures to progressively ensure free primary education. Ethiopia called upon the United Nations human rights mechanisms and special funds and programmes to assist the Democratic Republic of the Congo in implementing the recommendations.

418. Gabon recognized the efforts the Democratic Republic of the Congo had made to promote and protect human rights, and particularly to strengthen the capacities of national human rights institutions. Gabon recommended that the Government continue to take measures to combat sexual violence.

419. The United States of America appreciated the recommendations made by several States calling upon the Democratic Republic of the Congo to increase efforts to address impunity for extrajudicial killings and arbitrary detention. It also welcomed the Government's pledge to increase support for victims of sexual and gender-based violence. The United States welcomed the acceptance of the recommendation on establishing, in conjunction with civil society and the international community, independent and impartial specialized mixed chambers to address human rights violations. It was also encouraged by the fact that the Democratic Republic of the Congo had supported recommendations on allowing for the full freedom of expression and assembly, and urged the Government to implement those recommendations fully.

420. Mali welcomed the State's support for several recommendations on the fight against gender-based violence. Efforts made in that area would strengthen the measures already taken by the Government to implement its 2009 action plan. Mali invited the international community to continue to assist the Democratic Republic of the Congo in implementing the recommendations.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

421. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, 10 other stakeholders made statements.⁸

422. In a joint statement, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco and the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development — VIDES welcomed the acceptance by the Democratic Republic of the Congo of almost all of the recommendations made on the rights of the child. They drew attention, however, to the situation of the most vulnerable children, namely street children, "child witches" and children living in rural and remote areas. They recommended that the Democratic Republic of the Congo accelerate the implementation of Law No. 09/001 of 10 January 2009 on the protection of the child, punish by law adults who accused children of witchcraft, ensure that primary education was free, ensure equal access to the labour market through professional training for the least favoured among young people, and bring perpetrators of violence against children to justice.

423. The World Evangelical Alliance highlighted the practice of rape as a weapon of war. The Government had taken a constructive approach to the universal periodic review. The Alliance was also aware of the substantial security challenges. That, however, could not justify the 40,000 cases of rape, as reported by the State itself. Judicial reform could have been expedited to deal with rape and to promote the rule of law. It also highlighted corruption, which had received, alarmingly, little attention during the universal periodic

review despite the fact that it was rampant in the country. The country was laden with mineral wealth, and the Alliance emphasized that there was a great opportunity for the Government to promote human rights and deal with inequality. It recommended that elections ensure balanced representation in Government.

424. The International Lesbian and Gay Association pointed out that the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender community suffered persecution from the population in general and the police in particular, including arbitrary and illegal imprisonment, intimidation and extortion. Homosexuals were doubly discriminated against in their right to health care, especially with regard to HIV/AIDS. They were stigmatized and not necessarily permitted access to health care. It hoped that the recommendations from the universal periodic review would ensure an improvement in the lives of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

425. The International Catholic Child Bureau underlined its participation, along with that of other partners, in the establishment by the Ministry of Justice and Human Rights of the juvenile justice system and mechanisms. The Government had made an effort to establish secondary courts in Kinshasa, thereby improving the effectiveness of the court in N'djili. However, continued efforts were required in order to ensure that there were judges in juvenile courts and to support the functioning of those courts, the ombudsman committees and social assistants, and to provide non-governmental organizations with financial and logistical support. The International Catholic Child Bureau reported on the poor prison conditions for children detained in Kinshasa, Mbuji-Mayi and Kananga.

426. Franciscans International welcomed the commitment made by the Democratic Republic of the Congo during its review, especially with regard to the reform of security services and the fight against impunity, sexual violence and child labour. It referred to the significant and grave violations of human rights and pointed out that very little attention had been paid to those violations during the State's review. Nonetheless, it welcomed efforts made by the State in the mining sector to ensure traceability, transparency and classification of mining sites. The impact on the living conditions of the population was, however, still insufficient. It recommended that the Democratic Republic of the Congo finalize its revision of the mining code, intensify its efforts to certify and trace minerals and to monitor artisanal mining sites, and consolidate the State's authority throughout the country, especially in the east, to neutralize the armed groups that were still active in some mining sites.

427. Amnesty International welcomed the support by the Democratic Republic of the Congo for the majority of the recommendations made during its review, and called upon the Government to implement them without delay. It welcomed the Government's support for the recommendations on addressing impunity, including its commitment to incorporate the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court into domestic legislation. It was concerned, however, that in May 2014, Parliament had rejected a legislative proposal on the domestication of the Rome Statute. It urged the Government to submit new legislative proposals to Parliament to incorporate the Rome Statute into domestic law and to establish specialized chambers in the Court of Cassation tasked with hearing international crimes committed in the Democratic Republic of the Congo between 1993 and 2003. It was also concerned that current legislation provided for the death penalty. It urged the Government to reconsider its position and to take steps to abolish it. It was disappointed that recommendations on adopting a law on the protection of human rights defenders had been rejected. It urged the Government to reconsider those recommendations and to investigate all alleged violations against human rights defenders, including killings, arbitrary arrests, threats and intimidation, and to bring those responsible to justice.

428. Action Canada for Population and Development commended the Government for its acceptance of recommendations on early marriage, female genital mutilation, young women's education, sexual and gender-based violence, and gender equality. It urged the Government to devote adequate funds to the department responsible for eliminating and addressing sexual violence, and to create and implement a plan to monitor the effective utilization of those funds. It also called upon the Government to increase its efforts to raise awareness about the laws against gender-based violence and the legal instruments available to hold perpetrators accountable. In promoting efforts to ensure gender equality, Action

Canada for Population and Development also urged the Government to decriminalize abortion. Lastly, it was concerned about the lack of attention paid during the review to the discrimination facing individuals with diverse sexual orientations and gender identities and expressions. It urged the Government to reject the proposed bill that would criminalize sexual practices “against nature” and, in doing so, uphold and promote the right of individuals to privacy.

429. United Nations Watch referred to the severe and large-scale sexual and gender-based violence committed in the country. In addition, it was gravely concerned about the lack of progress in combating violence against civil society activists and journalists. It regretted that the Democratic Republic of the Congo had rejected key universal periodic review recommendations in that regard. Human rights activists were frequently subjected to death threats, arbitrary arrest, rape, beatings and in some cases torture, or even killing by government agents or armed groups. The magnitude of systematic sexual violence against citizens in the Democratic Republic of the Congo was deplorable, as was the violence perpetrated against journalists and human rights workers.

430. The Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom reminded the Democratic Republic of the Congo that it had to demonstrate its support for Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) by ensuring women’s representation at all decision-making levels to resolve the conflict, and by bringing that resolution to the attention of all public institutions. Moreover, given that mining activities in the country had proven to have a negative impact on human rights and the rule of law, it encouraged the Government to refrain from developing new mining projects until there was a policy containing measures to protect the population from the negative impact of mining on human rights. It also made recommendations on the limitation of the arms trade and the proliferation of light weapons in the State, as they were direct factors hindering the enjoyment of human rights and facilitating acts of gender-based violence. It reiterated its recommendation by calling upon the Government to ratify the Arms Trade Treaty.

431. In a joint statement, the Norwegian Refugee Council and Refugees International welcomed the observations and recommendations regarding the situation of the human rights of internally displaced persons in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Given the scale of internal displacement in the country, they were disappointed to see that only minimal attention had been paid to the plight of those 2.6 million people. Internally displaced persons in the country often lived in a dire situation: they lacked access to basic services, food, water and shelter. They also faced serious protection concerns. The Norwegian Refugee Council and Refugees International hoped that the recommendation on internally displaced persons would be given priority in the Government’s implementation plan. They commended the Government for having started the ratification process of the African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa, and encouraged the Government to complete the ratification process. They also recommended that it respond to the needs of internally displaced persons and ensure the conditions necessary to allow such persons to find a durable solution to their plight.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

432. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 229 recommendations received, the Democratic Republic of the Congo had supported 190 recommendations and noted 39 recommendations.

433. In its concluding remarks, the delegation thanked the representatives of the States and human rights organizations that had actively participated in the review for their interest in the human rights situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Government remained faithful to its international commitments and to the ideals of peace and the protection of human rights. The Government needed peace and the support of the Human Rights Council to consolidate the efforts and progress necessary to promote human rights.

Côte d'Ivoire

434. The review of Côte d'Ivoire was held on 29 April 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Côte d'Ivoire in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/CIV/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/CIV/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/CIV/3).

435. At its 24th meeting, on 18 September 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Côte d'Ivoire (see sect. C below).

436. The outcome of the review of Côte d'Ivoire comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/27/6), 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/27/6/Add.1).

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

437. The Permanent Representative of Côte d'Ivoire to the United Nations Office at Geneva welcomed the opportunity to address the Human Rights Council and to present the addendum to the report of the Working Group.

438. Referring to the follow-up phase to the first universal periodic review, the delegation referred to its national report (A/HRC/WG.6/19/CIV/1). The document was divided into three main sections, namely the developments in its normative and institutional framework, the monitoring and implementation of recommendations and commitments from its first universal periodic review, and its expectations in terms of capacity-building and technical assistance.

439. Over the course of its second universal periodic review, Côte d'Ivoire had received 186 recommendations, of which it had accepted 178, deferred six and rejected two. The delegation was pleased to have participated in the exercise, which allowed for an assessment of the ability of States Members to comply with the mechanisms established by the United Nations to promote human rights, the measures taken to give them effect and the progress achieved in that area.

440. During its review, Côte d'Ivoire had requested and obtained the consent of the Working Group to postpone its decision on six recommendations. Those recommendations were on accession to international human rights instruments, cooperation with special procedures and the treaty bodies, equality, non-discrimination and the protection of vulnerable persons.

441. During the plenary session, an addendum to the national report containing the response of the Government to those six recommendations had been distributed. Côte d'Ivoire had accepted three of the recommendations and rejected the other three.

442. The recommendations that Côte d'Ivoire had accepted at its second review would be divided between public and partially public institutions potentially responsible for their implementation. At the end of the process, an extensive restitution and awareness campaign to reach out to civil society would be organized. A follow-up committee composed of human rights experts from different ministries would work to monitor its implementation.

443. Since its previous review, Côte d'Ivoire had taken measures to implement the recommendations it had accepted.

444. Côte d'Ivoire had enacted a law on the reform of the Independent Electoral Commission, whose members were appointed by the ruling party, opposition parties and civil society.

445. The State had adopted a communication regarding the recruitment of young women into the national gendarmerie, starting from the 2015/16 academic year. Women would be allocated 10 per cent of the positions available, for both officers and sub-officers.

446. Regarding the continuation of the process of national reconciliation, surveys had been conducted in the field to determine liabilities, in addition to losses suffered by the victims of the electoral crisis. To that end, the commission on dialogue, truth and reconciliation had begun its public hearings.

447. Côte d'Ivoire was grateful for the international community's support and requested States Members to continue to back the Government's efforts in the construction and consolidation of the rule of law. The delegation referred to the Government's intention to produce a midterm review in 2016 on the effective implementation of the recommendations it had received during its second review.

448. The delegation also referred to the delays in submitting reports to the treaty bodies. To cope with that situation, the Government would soon establish an interministerial committee to draft all pending reports. In recent years, Côte d'Ivoire had made a greater effort to cooperate with all United Nations mechanisms, most notably those addressing human rights.

449. Côte d'Ivoire had renewed its engagement with the special procedures; the Government had in fact responded positively to several visit requests made by, *inter alia*, the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons, the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence and 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.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

450. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Côte d'Ivoire, 16 delegations made statements.⁸

451. Cuba highlighted the efforts made by Côte d'Ivoire to implement the recommendations it had accepted during the first universal periodic review, particularly following the situation of instability that the State had endured and the consequences that remained. Cuba thanked Côte d'Ivoire for having accepted its recommendations, which were on strengthening efforts to reduce poverty, and urged the international community to support Côte d'Ivoire in its efforts.

452. Djibouti encouraged Côte d'Ivoire to pursue its efforts to preserve and promote human rights, and called upon the international community to provide Côte d'Ivoire with support in those efforts.

453. Egypt commended Côte d'Ivoire for its support of a large number of recommendations made during the review, including those on strengthening measures to expand women's access to land and to microfinance and microcredit at low interest rates, continuing to ensure in practice the protection of children against sale and trafficking, reducing the rates of maternal mortality and ensuring that toxic waste was treated in an environmentally sound manner. It urged the State to continue its efforts.

454. Equatorial Guinea stated that the efforts of Côte d'Ivoire in implementing the recommendations made during the first review reflected its willingness to improve the human rights situation in the country and to continue the reconciliation process and the social cohesion programme. In 2012 a national human rights commission had been established in conformity with the Paris Principles, and citizens' access to justice, social services and education had improved.

455. Ethiopia was pleased to note that Côte d'Ivoire had accepted the two recommendations it had made. The State had strengthened efforts to achieve peace and development. Ethiopia encouraged Côte d'Ivoire to continue its efforts to fight poverty and unemployment; it indicated that the elaboration of the national development plan reflected the Government's commitment to development.

456. Gabon commended Côte d'Ivoire for having cooperated with international human rights procedures and mechanisms. It recognized that significant progress had been made in implementing certain categories of fundamental rights. While welcoming the progress made by Côte d'Ivoire in the area of national reconciliation, Gabon recommended that it spare no effort to reach lasting and final peace in the country, which would guarantee citizens' full enjoyment of all human rights.

457. Mali was pleased with the exemplary cooperation of Côte d'Ivoire with the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review and other Human Rights Council mechanisms. It congratulated Côte d'Ivoire on having accepted almost all of the recommendations. It was pleased to see the progress Côte d'Ivoire had made in the areas of national reconciliation, democratic governance and improving the human rights situation. Mali also welcomed the achievements of the Government in strengthening peace and security in the country.

458. Morocco welcomed the acceptance by Côte d'Ivoire of a large number of recommendations. It was pleased that the State planned to establish an interministerial body to coordinate preparation of its national development plan, an initiative that revealed the State's determination to make progress in that area. It also welcomed the interaction of Côte d'Ivoire with the special procedures, and its achievements in transitional justice.

459. The Niger was pleased with the progress made by Côte d'Ivoire, particularly in the areas of national reconciliation, the strengthening of the judicial system and reconstructing the country through the implementation of the national development plan. Those actions had had a positive impact on the political and security situation in the country and on the well-being of its people. The Niger also referred to the Government's initiatives to fight sexual violence against women and girls.

460. Nigeria commended Côte d'Ivoire for its continued engagement with OHCHR and the universal periodic review process. It encouraged the State to continue to harmonize its national laws with international human rights law and to establish government bodies to promote and protect human rights. Nigeria commended Côte d'Ivoire for its accession to several international instruments, including the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness and the optional protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child and to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. It urged the State to continue its efforts to protect and promote the human rights of its people.

461. Sierra Leone commended Côte d'Ivoire for having accepted a large number of recommendations and its readiness to advance human rights in the country. Sierra Leone was pleased to note that Côte d'Ivoire had taken into consideration its recommendations, in particular its recommendations on adopting a comprehensive law on trafficking in persons, on ensuring the national human rights commission was in compliance with the Paris Principles and on submitting its outstanding reports to the treaty bodies concerned.

462. South Africa commended Côte d'Ivoire on its efforts to improve the human rights situation of its people and on the fulfilment of its international obligations through national and sectoral policies. It welcomed the adoption of the national development plan and the conformity of the national human rights commission with the Paris Principles. South Africa commended the acceptance by Côte d'Ivoire of more than 170 recommendations and its determination to implement them. It referred to the State's seven priority areas, including violence against women, prison policy and reporting to the treaty bodies.

463. The Sudan welcomed the efforts made by Côte d'Ivoire and its acceptance of nearly all of the recommendations, and wished Côte d'Ivoire success.

464. Togo thanked Côte d'Ivoire for its determination to fulfil its international obligations in the area of human rights. It was pleased that, despite the ongoing post-crisis situation, Côte d'Ivoire had accepted almost all of the recommendations, including those

made by Togo, and invited the authorities to continue efforts to identify the victims of war and to compensate them for any harm.

465. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the reform of the national human rights commission to bring it into line with the Paris Principles. Genuine dialogue and cooperation were fundamental to achieve peace in the country. It encouraged Côte d'Ivoire to continue its social policy to improve the living conditions of its people, especially those of the most vulnerable.

466. Algeria pointed out that Côte d'Ivoire had been making great efforts to achieve national reconciliation and to strengthen its institutions in order to better promote and protect human rights. It had adhered to a number of international instruments, new laws had been adopted to establish the high authority for audiovisual communication, and the national human rights commission had been formed. Côte d'Ivoire had made efforts to strengthen peace, to combat violence against women and to improve prison conditions.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

467. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Côte d'Ivoire, eight other stakeholders made statements.

468. The International Service for Human Rights praised Côte d'Ivoire for having accepted the recommendations made by Djibouti and by Italy on protecting civil society and building its capacities at the national level. Furthermore, the recent enactment of the law protecting human rights defenders was an encouraging sign that the State was willing to preserve and widen its democratic space. It encouraged Côte d'Ivoire to play a positive role in regional and international human rights mechanisms. It regretted, however, the State's rejection of a recommendation made by the Netherlands on measures to prevent discrimination based on gender or sexual orientation. It urged Côte d'Ivoire to cooperate fully with the newly elected independent expert and to speed up its replies to communications sent by special procedure mandate holders.

469. The World Organization against Torture welcomed the State's ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. It also praised the State for having reviewed its Penal Code in order to include torture as a crime and for having submitted its initial report to the Committee against Torture. The World Organization against Torture and its partner were gravely concerned, however, about the serious and persistent violations of human rights in Côte d'Ivoire, which included the practice of torture, noting that reparations for victims were virtually non-existent. They regretted the lack of effective measures for implementing the Convention against Torture, especially in view of the upcoming elections and the mounting tensions.

470. The International Catholic Child Bureau welcomed the ratification by Côte d'Ivoire of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The Council of Ministers, however, had not yet adopted the 2014–2016 action plan in favour of persons with disabilities. It recommended that schools with Braille educational facilities be established. Furthermore, the precarious situation of domestic workers, especially young girls, was of great concern. It therefore recommended that the State ratify the ILO Domestic Workers Convention (No. 189). Recommendations had also been made on improving the conditions of children in conflict with the law. It referred to a 2012 report according to which young girls and boys had been detained together in prisons, and that, in 2013 in a prison in Abidjan, minors had been placed in adult cells as a punishment.

471. Franciscans International praised Côte d'Ivoire for having accepted the recommendations on facilitating the issuance of birth certificates and for having taken steps towards simplifying that process, even though challenges in that regard remained. It acknowledged that, despite the efforts made by Côte d'Ivoire to favour under a special regime the registration of children born during the crisis, the rate of registration remained unsatisfactory. It recommended that the Government take effective measures to facilitate the issuance of birth certificates without any cost to its population, and organize awareness-raising campaigns on the importance of parents registering their children as soon as they are born.

472. Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale (OCAPROCE Internationale) congratulated Côte d'Ivoire on its national action plan on combating domestic sexual violence and discrimination against women, and for providing mothers and children with free medical care. It pointed out, however, that, despite recent efforts, the legislative framework on the protection of women was still in its early stages, given the persistence of harmful practices. It recommended that Côte d'Ivoire facilitate the access of women victims of violence to courts and tribunals, and take affirmative action to increase the overall participation of women in society. It stressed the need to prosecute perpetrators of sexual violence. Lastly, it recommended that separate areas be allocated in detention facilities to children, women and men.

473. CIVICUS welcomed the State's adoption of a number of recommendations that would create a more enabling environment for civil society and would ensure that the fundamental rights of all citizens were respected and protected. However, despite the commitments made by the State during its review, the Government had also taken steps to limit civil society space and the freedom of expression and of the media at the national level. CIVICUS was concerned about the death of two journalists and the arrest and detention of others for publishing reports criticizing government actions. It urged the Government to take all the measures necessary to implement the recommendations it had accepted on preventing the harassment of journalists and civil society activists.

474. The International Federation for Human Rights praised Côte d'Ivoire for having accepted the vast majority of the recommendations it had received over the course of its review. It referred to the steps Côte d'Ivoire had taken to combat impunity. It welcomed the establishment of a special unit for inquiries and investigations into the post-electoral crisis that had led to more than 3,000 deaths, despite the hindrances that remained. It recommended that cooperation be strengthened between the commission on dialogue, truth and reconciliation and the judiciary. Lastly, the International Federation for Human Rights and its partners regretted that Côte d'Ivoire had rejected recommendations regarding sexual orientation, and therefore appealed to the authorities to guarantee the principle of non-discrimination for all citizens, referring to an attack on a lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender association in 2014.

475. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme praised Côte d'Ivoire for its efforts in the socioeconomic and political spheres to overcome the crisis that had divided and paralysed it. However, it was concerned that gender violence, including female genital mutilation, persisted and that overcrowding and poor conditions in prisons remained serious issues. It stressed that children continued to be exploited and were victims of violence, especially in rural areas. It was also concerned about the recent departure of several political parties, and highlighted the dysfunctional judiciary system. It encouraged the Government to strengthen its cooperation with the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council and urged the authorities to engage in an inclusive social and political dialogue with civil society in order to accelerate the national reconciliation process.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

476. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 186 recommendations received, Côte d'Ivoire had supported 181 recommendations and noted five.

477. The head of the delegation thanked the participants for their support and constructive contributions to its review. Referring to the statement made by the Minister for Justice during the session of the Working Group in April 2014, the delegation emphasized that Côte d'Ivoire remained convinced that human rights were essential to rebuilding the nation and were the foundation of development.

478. The support of the international community, and in particular that of the United Nations agencies, had assisted the State in finding a solution to the crisis it faced. The Government of Côte d'Ivoire was aware of the challenges ahead, and would make every effort to overcome them successfully.

479. Lastly, the head of the delegation called upon all parties to engage with the people and Government of Côte d'Ivoire in order to assist the State in fulfilling its commitments

during the follow-up process, so as to allow Côte d'Ivoire to remain in its legitimate place in the international community. It also thanked the Human Rights Council for its engagement, as well as its material and technical support, which had assisted the State in finding a solution to the post-electoral conflict.

Portugal

480. The review of Portugal was held on 30 April 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Portugal in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/PRT/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/PRT/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/PRT/3).

481. At its 24th meeting, on 18 September 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Portugal (see sect. C below).

482. The outcome of the review of Portugal comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/27/7), 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/27/7/Add.1).

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

483. The Permanent Representative of Portugal to the United Nations Office at Geneva thanked the other delegations, civil society and the Office of the Ombudsman (*Provedor de Justiça*) for their contributions to the review. Expressing himself in Portuguese, he stated that he hoped that that language would in future become an official language of the United Nations.

484. The strong commitment of Portugal to the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms was enshrined in its Constitution and was a government priority, both nationally and in its external actions. Achieving universal respect for all human rights was a major priority. Portugal was proud to be the first country in Europe, and probably in the world, to have abolished the death penalty, more than 150 years earlier. The State's candidacy to be a member of the Human Rights Council for the period 2015–2017 was built upon its firm commitment to the universal achievement of human rights.

485. From the outset, Portugal had supported the universal periodic review as an important mechanism to promote and protect human rights through open dialogue between States. The State's implementation of the wide range of recommendations it had received at its first review in 2009 had contributed to the improvement of the human rights situation in the country.

486. Portugal believed that its record in promoting and protecting human rights had been widely acknowledged by the Human Rights Council during its second review, and it thanked the 74 delegations that had actively participated in the review, the members of the troika and the secretariat for their work.

487. The Government had welcomed and carefully examined the 151 recommendations it had received. It had immediately accepted 67 recommendations, but had been unable to accept five. The positions on the remaining 79 recommendations were presented in the addendum to the report of the Working Group. Of the 151 recommendations made, Portugal had accepted 139; 117 of them corresponded to national priorities and measures that were already being implemented. It was grateful for the remaining 22 recommendations; their implementation would certainly contribute to the full achievement

of human rights in Portugal. There were only 12 recommendations that Portugal had been unable to accept.

488. Portugal had been thoroughly engaged in its preparations for its second review and would be equally committed to implementing the resulting recommendations. That task would be developed in the framework of the national human rights committee, an interministerial coordination body that also involved representatives from civil society in its work. That body had been created in 2010, specifically following a commitment made by Portugal during its first review.

489. Since the first review, Portugal had had to implement a severe financial adjustment programme, under which it had been required to take harsh austerity measures that had had an undeniable social and economic impact. Numerous delegations had drawn attention to the need to assess the human rights impact of such policies, which had already been one of the State's priorities. As stated during the interactive dialogue, Portugal had taken several measures to mitigate the social impact of the crisis. The positive results that had arisen from the social emergency programme created in 2011 were a good example.

490. Portugal was determined to ensure that no one, and particularly the most vulnerable persons, could be prevented from enjoying their human rights within the standards defined by the United Nations. With that objective in mind, it had prioritized the full and effective integration of Roma communities and the implementation of a national strategy that had been adopted in 2013 for that purpose. Another example was the "Choices" programme, which was to promote the social inclusion of children, young persons at risk, the children of migrants and other minorities.

491. Portugal had accepted several recommendations on the prevention of and fight against domestic and gender violence, which was also one of the main human rights priorities of the Government. The delegation referred to some of the measures that had been taken in that area, which included those relating to the elimination of female genital mutilation.

492. Portugal emphasized that the issues covered by the recommendations it had been unable to accept nevertheless deserved great attention. The protection of migrant workers and members of their families was a good example, given that Portugal had a long history of immigration and emigration. Its national policies on the integration of migrant communities had gained wide international recognition. No State member of the European Union was a party to the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Their Families; Portugal, however, granted a degree of protection to migrant communities that went beyond the provisions of the Convention, such as providing migrants in an irregular situation with access to education and health services.

493. Portugal favoured a sectoral approach rather than a single national action plan for human rights; the State had plans in various areas that covered all those that would be envisaged in a single action plan. The full implementation of the measures contained in those plans was a priority.

494. The creation in 2010 of the national human rights committee had strengthened coordination and coherence in the implementation of the State's human rights obligations, together with a comprehensive annual programme and the active participation of civil society.

495. Portugal attached great importance to the fight against discrimination in all its forms, which was reflected in its policies and its legislation. The State prohibited all forms of discrimination based on sexual orientation. Civil marriage between persons of the same sex had become possible through a law adopted in 2010.

496. The delegation highlighted the role of the Office of the Ombudsman as an independent body, which had been enshrined in national legislation and the Constitution for almost 40 years. Besides assessing complaints relating to the acts or omissions of the public administration and making recommendations, it also acted on its own initiative. The competences of the institution had been strengthened in 2013, when it became an independent national institution for monitoring the application of treaties and international conventions with regard to human rights. It had been accredited with A status, according to

the Paris Principles, since 1999. The Government considered its role to be of great importance, and closely collaborated with it while respecting its independent status.

497. In the coming period, Portugal would engage in implementing the 139 recommendations it had accepted, aware that no State had a perfect record and that only the effort of every State would allow for the effective achievement of human rights for all. It was a firm believer in the added value of the universal periodic review mechanism, its principles and its objectives.

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

498. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Portugal, 15 delegations made statements.

499. The Council of Europe congratulated Portugal on its successful review, and reiterated the recommendations made by its monitoring bodies. It drew attention to three priority areas: social exclusion and discrimination against Roma; the excessive length of judicial proceedings; and poor conditions of detention, in particular overcrowding. It welcomed the measures that the Government had already taken to address those areas, and congratulated Portugal on having ratified the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence.

500. Egypt was encouraged by the State's efforts to combat racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, to eliminate violence against women, and to promote social and economic rights. It encouraged Portugal to share its best practices with the Human Rights Council. It welcomed the acceptance by Portugal of all its recommendations on harmonizing national laws with the State's obligations under the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, drafting an action plan for people of African descent and providing protection for the family as the natural unit of society.

501. India thanked Portugal for its responses in the addendum and in its statement, and commended its receptive and constructive engagement with the universal periodic review mechanism. It was encouraged by the State's acceptance of 67 recommendations immediately after the review, and its subsequent acceptance of 72 more. It appreciated the State's acceptance of its three recommendations relating to the Roma community and the issue of trafficking for the purposes of labour exploitation, especially trafficking in children. Portugal had gained much from its participation and would continue its efforts to implement the recommendations in coming years.

502. The Islamic Republic of Iran thanked the delegation for its statement, and had high expectations that the recommendations accepted would be implemented. It urged Portugal to increase its efforts to address the issues of racism and discrimination against immigrants and foreigners, particularly Roma and persons of African descent, in access to education, health care, employment and housing; racism and manifestations of xenophobia; detention conditions, the ill-treatment of detainees and prison overcrowding; poor health conditions in prisons, high mortality rates and drug abuse by detainees; and domestic violence and the high rate of women's mortality as a result of domestic violence. It called for those issues to be addressed in a comprehensive manner.

503. Morocco referred to the importance that Portugal placed on protecting human rights, particularly the rights of migrants and to protecting them from discrimination and violence, and to the importance it placed on intercultural dialogue. It also referred to the efforts the State made to integrate migrants, as shown in the guarantees of access to education for migrants, including those in an irregular situation. Morocco congratulated Portugal on its excellent interaction with the universal periodic review mechanism and its acceptance of the recommendations made by Morocco and almost all of the other recommendations.

504. Nigeria was encouraged by the policies of Portugal to mitigate the hardships experienced by irregular migrants, including the provision of access to education for their children. It urged Portugal to introduce policies to prevent racial discrimination. It also called upon Portugal to accede to the international conventions that it had yet to ratify, to

incorporate the international conventions into national statutes, and to continue to promote and protect human rights. Nigeria endorsed the outcome of the State's universal periodic review.

505. Qatar was grateful for the State's presentation and the clarifications on the recommendations. It referred to some of the measures that had been adopted to develop and promote human rights, and commended Portugal for its close cooperation with the Human Rights Council on meeting its international human rights obligations. Portugal had accepted most of the recommendations made, including the two made by Qatar, which attested to its commitment to upholding human rights.

506. Romania congratulated Portugal on its cooperation; its attitude demonstrated a genuine commitment to human rights. Portugal had distinguished itself in its promotion of economic, social and cultural rights. Romania appreciated the State's commitment to promoting human rights both nationally and internationally.

507. Sierra Leone commended Portugal for its cooperation with the universal periodic review mechanism, and referred to the goodwill it had shown by having accepted the recommendations and by working on their implementation. It emphasized that Portugal had considered the recommendations made by Sierra Leone favourably, and it commended the State's achievements.

508. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela appreciated the State's acceptance of recommendations on themes of common concern, such as education, mechanisms for combating racism and discrimination against migrants and ethnic minorities, and measures to assist women victims of domestic and gender-based violence. Despite the great challenges posed by the economic crisis, Portugal had initiated measures to promote education for children, young people and older women who lacked resources. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela appreciated the State's open cooperation with the universal periodic review, which had resulted in productive dialogue and the acceptance of the majority of the recommendations made.

509. Viet Nam thanked Portugal for the additional information it had provided and for its renewed engagement to meet its international human rights obligations, despite the economic difficulties that it had faced. Portugal had accepted the recommendations it had made, and it wished the State success in implementing the recommendations accepted.

510. Algeria welcomed the acceptance by Portugal of most of the recommendations, including its own recommendation on strengthening measures, particularly preventive measures, to combat all forms of racial discrimination and measures to increase equality for vulnerable groups, particularly through the use of positive actions. It regretted that Portugal had not looked favourably upon its recommendation on acceding to the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. Algeria wished Portugal success in the implementation of the recommendations accepted.

511. Angola encouraged Portugal to continue its policies on the protection and promotion of human rights, particularly those relating to the integration of migrants and other foreigners residing in Portugal, and to make all possible efforts to ensure effective access to justice for citizens. It congratulated Portugal on its acceptance of almost all of the recommendations it had received, including those made by Angola, which demonstrated the willingness of the authorities to deepen cooperation with the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council. It welcomed the fruitful cooperation between the Council and Portugal in the field of human rights.

512. Bulgaria welcomed the efforts made by Portugal to implement the recommendations from its first review. It was pleased that, in accordance with the recommendation made by Bulgaria at the first review, Portugal had continued to collect specific data and to use standardized reporting methods concerning victims of domestic violence, and that combating violence against women and domestic violence remained a priority. It referred to the ongoing implementation of the action plan on the latter issue, and the full implementation of the action plan against human trafficking. It also welcomed the ongoing reforms to the judicial system.

513. Côte d'Ivoire thanked Portugal for the attention it had given to the recommendations made and for the endorsement of the recommendations made by Côte d'Ivoire. It was also grateful for the additional information provided during the meeting. It expressed its support for Portugal in its efforts to ensure equality and the enjoyment of equality for all citizens on its territory, and to strengthen legal mechanisms and related measures. It encouraged Portugal to continue its cooperation with the international mechanisms for the protection of human rights.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

514. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Portugal, four other stakeholders made statements.

515. The Office of the Ombudsman pointed out that the State's acceptance of 139 recommendations reflected its commitment to respecting fundamental rights. It was concerned about and attentive to the impacts of the economic crisis and the austerity measures adopted by the Government, particularly for persons exposed to increased risks of exclusion, but recognized the Government's efforts to mitigate the impacts. The current challenges demanded special attention and innovative methods in order to achieve a fair and equal society. It expressed its commitment to work alongside the international community in protecting and promoting human rights.

516. The European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Association welcomed the commitment made by Portugal to fight discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons. Despite important legislative and policy advances, those persons were still subject to violence and discrimination in several fields. It welcomed the recommendation made by Brazil in the report of the Working Group, and encouraged Portugal to reconsider its position on that recommendation. It had made recommendations relating to the need for comprehensive anti-discrimination legislation, including laws to explicitly prohibit gender identity as grounds for discrimination, the creation of public services mandated to address discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity, the collection of data in those fields, and amending the system for the registration of criminal complaints of hate crimes to include motivation. It encouraged Portugal to continue anti-discrimination policies, including relevant training for public officials.

517. Amnesty International was concerned that the austerity measures had had a negative impact on the enjoyment of economic and social rights, particularly by the most vulnerable groups in society. It welcomed the State's support for the recommendations on mitigating that impact, and called upon the Government to carry out a human rights assessment of its economic recovery plans and policies. Amnesty International urged swift action with regard to the recommendations on addressing overcrowding and improving prison conditions, and on carrying out prompt and thorough investigations into all allegations of the excessive use of force and ill-treatment by police and prison guards. It also welcomed the support for recommendations relating to combating discrimination, and called for the establishment of a national data gathering system to assess the extent of discrimination, and a revision of the Criminal Code to prohibit hate crimes. It was disappointed that Portugal had rejected a recommendation on allowing the adoption of children by same-sex couples, and called upon the State to reconsider its position.

518. Action Canada for Population and Development congratulated Portugal on its acceptance of recommendations concerning migrants and domestic violence, but was disappointed that it had not accepted the recommendation on co-adoption by same-sex couples. It urged Portugal to remove the obstacles and eliminate discriminatory practices that prevented lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender individuals from achieving the full and equal enjoyment of their rights, and to approve the bill that would allow them to co-adopt. It also called upon Portugal to approve the law on prohibiting discrimination against persons based on their HIV status, and to address concerns about women living with HIV in health priorities and plans relating to achieving equality. The comprehensive sexuality education curriculum should be aligned with a strategy to reach all children, and laws should be adopted to legalize sex work, in a manner similar to the measure taken in 2000, which reduced HIV transmission among drug users by half. Specific regulations pertaining to sex workers' labour rights should be integrated into the Labour Code.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

519. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 151 recommendations received, Portugal supported 139 recommendations and noted the remainder.

520. Portugal was grateful for the comments received and had taken due note of all of them. It particularly appreciated the participation of civil society and of the Office of the Ombudsman. Portugal was committed to the follow-up to the 139 recommendations in an ongoing process over the following four years. The follow-up would be done as part of the work of the national human rights committee and in close cooperation with civil society. In 2016, it intended to submit an interim report on the results achieved. It was convinced that the overall outcome would be positive.

521. In conclusion, it hoped that, thanks to open and cooperative dialogue and the cooperation of civil society, United Nations agencies and other international bodies, the universal periodic review would continue to play a key role in the achievement of universal human rights for all.

Bhutan

522. The review of Bhutan was held on 30 April 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Bhutan in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/BTN/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/BTN/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/BTN/3).

523. At its 24th meeting, on 18 September 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Bhutan (see sect. C below).

524. The outcome of the review of Bhutan comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/27/8), 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/27/8/Add.1).

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

525. Bhutan thanked all the delegations for their participation in its review and offered its congratulations to the newly appointed United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.

526. Bhutan had received 163 recommendations, of which it had accepted 103 during the session of the Working Group. It had considered the remaining 60 recommendations. After consultations, four additional recommendations had been accepted and two partially accepted. Bhutan clarified that that did not mean that the other recommendations had been rejected: many of the important recommendations received were already being implemented or had been addressed sufficiently in some form or another. In its addendum to the report of the Working Group, Bhutan had provided explanations for each of the 60 remaining recommendations.

527. Bhutan pointed out that a large number of recommendations had been on considering accession to the core international human rights instruments. The Government was fully aware of the importance of that issue. It intended to expand gradually the range of its international human rights commitments in the future, with due regard to the financial

and resource implications, including the reporting burden, and the need to amend legislation and practices.

528. Bhutan stated that, in order to give meaningful effect to any international obligations, it must first build the necessary legal, political and social institutions, and to develop the State's human resources and capacities before assuming those obligations. In the meantime, the multi-sectoral task force established by the Government would continue to undertake its study of the relevant international instruments in order to consider the feasibility of their ratification.

529. With regard to human rights mechanisms, including mandate holders, Bhutan remained committed to constructive engagement with the human rights mechanisms of the United Nations. Bhutan had received and would continue to receive the visits of special procedures and other mandate holders of the Human Rights Council, taking into account its capacity, national priorities and the need for adequate preparations for such visits. Bhutan emphasized that, in keeping with its commitments, it had recently welcomed a helpful and successful visit of the Special Rapporteur on the right to education.

530. Bhutan looked forward to fruitful engagement and remained open to further cooperation and collaboration with the international community in collective pursuit of the promotion and protection of human rights.

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

531. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Bhutan, 15 delegations made statements.⁹

532. Singapore appreciated the constructive participation of Bhutan in the universal periodic review process. The State's detailed update on its human rights policies and the high level of the representation of the delegation reaffirmed its commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights. Singapore was pleased with the positive response of Bhutan to the recommendations it had received and emphasized in particular that Bhutan had accepted the two recommendations made by Singapore.

533. Sri Lanka appreciated the constructive engagement of Bhutan with the universal periodic review and that it had accepted two recommendations made by Sri Lanka. It commended Bhutan for its progress in having achieved most of the Millennium Development Goals, particularly in the areas of education and poverty reduction. Bhutan had made important progress in strengthening the legal framework for the rights of women and children and it recognized the efforts made to place environmental conservation at the core of the State's development strategy, which contributed to sustainable development.

534. The Sudan thanked Bhutan for its presentation and for the explanations it had provided. It appreciated the efforts made by Bhutan in its cooperation with the universal periodic review and for considering the recommendations it had received. The Sudan thanked the State for having accepted the recommendations it had made. It recommended the adoption of the outcome document on Bhutan.

535. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the responses given by Bhutan during the review, which highlighted its commitment to human rights. It welcomed the State's social policies guaranteeing the right of citizens to free health services, from primary to tertiary care. The implementation of the five-year plan had yielded excellent results in combating poverty, which had been reduced from 23 per cent in 2007 to 12 per cent in 2012. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela recognized the notable progress made by Bhutan in implementing the recommendations it had accepted during its first universal periodic review.

⁹ 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/27thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

536. Viet Nam commended the progress made by Bhutan in promoting and protecting the human rights of its people since its previous review. It referred to the important achievements made, particularly in the areas of health, education, social welfare, poverty reduction and improving the national legal framework, as reflected in its five-year plan and pro-poor policies. It appreciated the State's acceptance of 103 recommendations, two of which had been made by Viet Nam.

537. Afghanistan commended Bhutan for its constructive participation in the universal periodic review process and was pleased to note that Bhutan had supported the two recommendations it had made. As a fellow State member of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation, Afghanistan welcomed the State's progress and commitment to respect, promote and protect human rights. It appreciated the steps it had taken to implement the universal periodic review recommendations.

538. Algeria congratulated Bhutan on having accepted most of the recommendations made during the review, including recommendations made by Algeria on continuing to take measures to improve conditions of access to education for all without discrimination and access to health services. Algeria regretted that Bhutan had not considered favourably its recommendation concerning the ratification of international instruments on human rights. In that regard, Algeria encouraged Bhutan to ratify the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

539. Brunei Darussalam appreciated the continued commitment of Bhutan to protect and promote constitutionally recognized fundamental rights and freedoms. It was encouraged by the State's efforts to ensure quality education, to build a skilled workforce and to promote entrepreneurship for young people. It welcomed the support of Bhutan for the recommendations Brunei Darussalam had made on those matters.

540. Cambodia welcomed the continued efforts made by Bhutan to ensure the socioeconomic rights of its people through the implementation of its governmental programmes and commitments, including those to uphold the rule of law and to strengthen democracy. Cambodia was pleased to note that the State had accepted the majority of the recommendations, including two made by Cambodia, on encouraging the greater political participation of women and on furthering efforts to reduce poverty, particularly in rural areas.

541. China welcomed the constructive engagement of Bhutan in the review and its positive feedback on the recommendations it had received. It thanked Bhutan for having accepted its recommendations on continuing to adopt effective measures to promote youth employment and to reduce poverty for the achievement of balanced and inclusive growth. China wished Bhutan much success in advancing human rights.

542. Cuba thanked Bhutan for the additional information it had provided for its universal periodic review. Bhutan had accepted a large number of recommendations during the review, which illustrated its commitment to the promotion and protection of all human rights of its citizens. Cuba thanked Bhutan for having accepted the recommendation it had made on implementing a more concrete social protection system through the initiatives that it had set out in its national report.

543. Ethiopia commended Bhutan for having accepted a significant number of recommendations, including those made by Ethiopia. It welcomed the State's strengthened legislative framework and poverty reduction programmes and encouraged Ethiopia to develop appropriate normative mechanisms to further strengthen women's empowerment. It called upon the United Nations human rights mechanisms, special funds and programmes to provide Bhutan with the technical and capacity-building assistance it requested.

544. India admired Bhutan for its commitment to democracy and a free press, its achievements in poverty reduction and its holistic approach to development and national happiness. It was encouraged by the State's immediate acceptance of 103 recommendations and its subsequent acceptance of an additional six recommendations out of a total of 163 recommendations received, which included those made by India on increasing women's

participation and on expediting public access to information. India believed that Bhutan had gained much from its participation in the universal periodic review, and wished Bhutan every success in implementing the recommendations it had accepted.

545. Kuwait welcomed the progress and achievements made in Bhutan in promoting and protecting human rights. It applauded the efforts of Bhutan to strengthen democracy in the form of elections organized in 2011 and in 2013. Kuwait referred to the importance Bhutan placed on promoting the role of women in society and on seeking to uphold the rights of the child. Kuwait thanked Bhutan for having accepted the recommendation it had made on continuing the programmes on poverty reduction and maintaining efforts to create a stronger system of social protection.

546. The Lao People's Democratic Republic appreciated the State's acceptance of a large number of recommendations, the steps it had taken to implement them and its efforts to create enabling conditions for its people to exercise their rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of speech, opinion and expression, and the independence of the media. It commended Bhutan for having made significant improvements in the areas of poverty alleviation, youth employment, gender equality, and access to free education and health-care services.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

547. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Bhutan, one other stakeholder made a statement.

548. The Jubilee Campaign welcomed the positive participation of Bhutan in its universal periodic review and, in the spirit of engagement, urged Bhutan to ratify key international human rights treaties, including the two main international covenants. Although Bhutan acknowledged religious diversity in the country and protected the right to freedom of religion and belief in a limited form, there were several areas of legislation and practice that raised concern. The Jubilee Campaign was concerned about overly restrictive measures that compelled others to change their religion, and in that regard called for an amendment to specific provisions in the Constitution, the Penal Code and the Religious Organizations Act. It called upon Bhutan to ensure the equal treatment of all religious communities in the country, in particular by clarifying the eligibility of non-Buddhist and non-Hindu groups to obtain registration under the Religious Organizations Act. It also asked Bhutan to tackle injustices relating to burial rights and to extend an invitation to the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

549. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 163 recommendations received, Bhutan had supported 109 recommendations and noted the remaining 54.

550. Bhutan thanked the delegations and the non-governmental representative for their comments, which it had noted. The delegation reiterated that, in principle, Bhutan had accepted the recommendations made. Bhutan believed that, for any State to be in a position to assume its important obligations, positive results could only be achieved after the necessary legal, political and social institutions and human resources had been put in place. Bhutan had come a long way in terms of socioeconomic development through its holistic and people-centred vision of development.

551. In Bhutan, people had the freedom to embrace and practice the religion of their choice, provided that it was a choice made of their own free will. Although the right to the freedom of religion was guaranteed under article 7 (4) of the Constitution, the majority of the population vulnerable to coercion and "inducement" were also protected by section 463A of the Penal Code.

552. Bhutan reiterated that, as long as a person had been coerced to change religion, the right to the freedom to practice any religion of choice was guaranteed. A number of fundamental rights were guaranteed under the Constitution, including the right to peaceful assembly, the freedom of association, the right to be protected against arbitrary arrest or

detention, the right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty and the right of every person to approach the court in matters relating to the Constitution. If a person felt that his or her rights had been breached, that person had the right to initiate proceedings before the court for the enforcement of his or her rights.

553. Bhutan had made significant progress in advancing national development through the generous support and cooperation of its bilateral and multilateral development partners and would continue to strive for the well-being of its people through its development framework and for the further promotion and protection of all human rights.

Dominica

554. The review of Dominica was held on 1 May 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/DMA/2);

(b) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/DMA/3).

555. At its 25th meeting, on 19 September 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Dominica (see sect. C below).

556. The outcome of the review of Dominica comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/27/9), 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.

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

557. The delegation of Dominica highlighted the State's achievements in education, health care, social services and the protection of the rights of persons with disabilities, and its support for indigenous people, women and older persons. It was committed to human rights and social justice, as enshrined in the Constitution. Any change to the social order or expansion of rights should be driven by its people and reflect their collective will. The people's representatives therefore could not accede to international obligations without the consent of the people. Dominica remained committed to the international obligations that it had accepted, despite the resource constraints, both technical and financial. Training and technical assistance were therefore necessary. Dominica had accepted the offer of assistance from OHCHR and from other States Members, and looked forward to their continued support and cooperation.

558. Regarding the recommendations made during its review, Dominica was in the process of ratifying the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure, the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and the ILO Domestic Workers Convention (No. 189).

559. The Government was considering the establishment of a national human rights institution or office of the ombudsperson in line with the Paris Principles, in order to strengthen legislation and public policies on human rights and to promote human rights education and capacity-building.

560. With regard to cooperation with international mechanisms and bodies, Dominica was seeking technical assistance in order to further advance human rights in the country,

and was making efforts to meet its commitments under the international instruments to which it was a party. In that regard, it would strengthen cooperation with the treaty bodies by requesting technical assistance. It would also request technical assistance from the international community, including from OHCHR, particularly for the preparation of its reports for submission to the human rights mechanisms. It would request OHCHR to make greater efforts to further assist small States in the Caribbean, such as Dominica, to address challenges relating to harmonization with and integration of international obligations into national legislation, and the increasing reporting obligations involved.

561. Concerning equality and non-discrimination, Dominica would strengthen its efforts to fight discrimination to guarantee the physical and mental integrity of the population, continue its work towards eradicating acts of racism and other forms of discrimination and intolerance, and take further steps to protect the rights of persons with disabilities and the rights of women and children, including by strengthening support services.

562. Dominica would continue its efforts to eliminate violence against women and children, including by providing them with a safe environment. It would accelerate the process of adopting the national strategic plan on gender-based violence and ensure that the relevant agencies had the resources and staff necessary to enforce existing domestic violence laws. It would take further measures to address domestic violence and physical child abuse, including by ensuring adequate reporting of child abuse, and respond to child abuse by establishing a comprehensive child protection policy. Dominica would also adopt a comprehensive list of hazardous work prohibited to children and amend its laws to raise the minimum age for employment to at least 15 years, and expressly prohibit the use, procurement or offering of children for pornography.

563. The Government of Dominica would continue to prioritize poverty alleviation in its socioeconomic development and strengthen its social plans and programmes in order to fight poverty, exclusion and social inequality, while paying particular attention to those most vulnerable sectors. To implement those measures it was extremely important to have the support, assistance and cooperation of the international community.

564. In the same vein, Dominica would further strengthen measures to ensure equal access to health services for all, while paying special attention to the needs of children, women and older persons. In cooperation with the World Health Organization, it would continue to improve its national health-care system and ensure access to quality health care for all.

565. Dominica would also maintain its efforts to promote and protect the full enjoyment of the right to education for all, to provide inclusive education for all children, in particular children with disabilities and migrant children, and to strengthen its national cultural policy.

566. Dominica would promote cross-cutting measures to prevent discrimination against persons with disabilities in the education system, including measures to allow persons with disabilities to have safe physical access to education centres and classrooms. In addition, it would strengthen measures to guarantee the full integration of persons with disabilities through an inclusive education plan and take steps to provide inclusive education for all children with disabilities and have specialized centres for assessment and support.

567. The delegation noted the recommendations on the ratification of the second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

568. In conclusion, the delegation stated that the Government of Dominica was grateful to OHCHR for its assistance and to those States Members that had assisted Dominica in providing universal access to education, health care, water and sanitation, housing and social services, especially for indigenous Caribbean people, persons with disabilities and older persons. States such as Dominica that had made commitments under international treaties and conventions were unable to meet their obligations, especially in reporting and monitoring, owing to resource constraints. Training, technical assistance, public education and continuous engagements should be provided where necessary. Dominica called upon all States Members that were in a position to assist to provide support to those States that

were having difficulties meeting their obligations, and to collaborate with OHCHR to that end.

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

569. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Dominica, nine delegations made statements.

570. Morocco welcomed the efforts made by Dominica to improve access to education and to health and social services, and the State's commitment to human rights, social justice and equality. It referred to the constraints faced by Dominica in the implementation of its international obligations and its intention to create an independent national human rights institution in accordance with the Paris Principles.

571. Nigeria was encouraged by the engagement of Dominica with the universal periodic review process and OHCHR, and by its zero tolerance policy with regard to violations of the rights of migrant workers. The steps taken by Dominica to eliminate all forms of discrimination and xenophobia were commendable. Nigeria endorsed the review of Dominica.

572. Sierra Leone acknowledged the need for technical assistance, and the technical and resource constraints Dominica faced. It appreciated the State's acceptance of all of the recommendations made by Sierra Leone. It hoped that the Government of Dominica would be able to integrate the recommendations accepted into its national legislation and to implement them accordingly, and to engage more actively with the treaty bodies.

573. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela pointed out that, since its first review, Dominica had achieved a number of objectives, including the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Optional Protocol thereto, and the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime. It highlighted the efforts made by Dominica in the field of human rights despite the challenges it faced due to climate change and the difficulties created by the crisis of capitalism. It recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group.

574. Algeria congratulated Dominica on having accepted the majority of the recommendations made during its review, and was pleased that the State had accepted its recommendation on strengthening cooperation with the treaty bodies and requesting technical assistance in that regard. Algeria recommended that the report of the Working Group be adopted.

575. Armenia thanked the Government of Dominica for having accepted the two recommendations it had made, particularly the recommendation on accession to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. Armenia looked forward to the implementation of the recommendations.

576. China welcomed the engagement of Dominica in the review and its commitment to implementing the recommendations accepted. It thanked Dominica for having accepted its recommendation on efforts to prioritize poverty alleviation so its people could enjoy their right to development. China understood the difficulty Dominica faced in finding human and financial resources to implement recommendations and its treaty obligations. It called upon the international community to provide Dominica with urgent technical assistance and capacity-building support, in full consultation with the Government.

577. Cuba acknowledged the efforts made by Dominica to implement the recommendations it had received during its first review and its commitment to the review mechanism. It was pleased that the State had adopted national policies on gender equality and women's empowerment and had made improvements in the fields of health-care and education, which was now universal and free of charge. Cuba appreciated the State's acceptance of its recommendations on national cultural policies and the rights of persons living with HIV/AIDS.

578. Jamaica highlighted the acceptance by Dominica of the majority of the recommendations made during its review, including several pertaining to the signing or ratification of various international human rights instruments. That step would substantially increase the State's treaty reporting obligations. Jamaica was encouraged by the support of the Human Rights Council in providing Dominica with technical assistance, and urged the Government of Dominica to pursue all avenues to that end. Its needs and existing resources should be taken into account in the planning of appropriate technical assistance.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

579. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Dominica, three other stakeholders made statements.

580. The International Lesbian and Gay Association was disappointed by the response given by the Government of Dominica to the recommendations on sexual orientation and gender identity, and specifically to those on repealing laws discriminating against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons. The Government had not responded effectively to complaints of human rights abuses against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons, and the International Lesbian and Gay Association made recommendations in that regard, including the recommendation on repealing the "anti-buggery" laws from State legislation.

581. Amnesty International regretted that Dominica had been unable to submit a national report as part of its review and that it had rejected all of the recommendations pertaining to sexual orientation and gender identity and the decriminalization of same-sex sexual intercourse. Amnesty International urged the Government to repeal all legislation discriminating against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons. While taking note of the State moratorium on the death penalty, it was disappointed that its recommendations on abolishing the death penalty had been rejected.

582. Action Canada for Population and Development was concerned about the criminalization of sexual conduct, especially with regard to lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons. The lack of protection rendered them invisible in the eyes of the law, leading to increased stigma and discrimination and making any effort to prevent HIV/AIDS inadequate. During its first review, Dominica had also rejected recommendations on lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons and their rights. Action Canada for Population and Development recommended that Dominica establish a national human rights institution with the capacity to consider individual complaints and carry out a study on the status of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons in the country.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

583. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 116 recommendations received, Dominica had supported 79 recommendations and noted 37.

584. The delegation of Dominica thanked those States Members that had helped it to improve the education and health-care systems and the housing situation. The delegation pointed out that the people of Dominica held no animosity against persons who had same-sex relations, and that stating that Dominica, its State institutions or non-State actors, persecuted and/or discriminated against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons was a serious misrepresentation. Non-governmental organizations should respect the right of people to self-determination, including the right to determine the laws that would govern them. Dominica was deeply concerned about the reiterated attacks that misrepresented the situation of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons in the country.

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

585. The review of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was held on 1 May 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/PRK/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/PRK/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/PRK/3).

586. At its 25th meeting, on 19 September 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (see sect. C below).

587. The outcome of the review of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/27/10), 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/27/10/Add.1).

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

588. The delegation stated that the universal periodic review mechanism was an important impartial and objective means to assess the human rights situation in each State, as it ensured the equal treatment of all States and played a positive role in removing the outdated practice of singling States out.

589. At the nineteenth session, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had had an open and sincere interactive dialogue with many States, through which it had received encouraging comments, and it gave responses to the questions, comments and recommendations it had received.

590. The delegation was grateful to those States that, by making numerous constructive recommendations during the review, had encouraged the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to promote human rights. It also thanked the members of the troika and the secretariat for their contributions to the drafting of the report.

591. Of the 268 recommendations received during the review, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had rejected 83 on the grounds that they seriously distorted reality, slandered the country and were driven by sinister political motivations.

592. The Government delegation had distributed the report for the second review to all of the national institutions and organizations that had participated in the preparation of the State's national report and together they had carefully reviewed the recommendations. The position of the Government on the recommendations was described in the addendum to the report of the Working Group.

593. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea had decided to accept most of the recommendations it had received. That was the result of serious consultations held with the relevant national institutions and reflected the Government's full commitment to respecting the opinions of other States and to making great efforts to promote and protect human rights.

594. Several recommendations were on the enactment of further laws to improve human rights and human rights mechanisms. Such recommendations encouraged the Government in its efforts to protect human rights and coincided with the State's policy of giving priority to the people's needs. As was known, the State adhered to the supreme principle of putting its people at the centre of all considerations.

595. The delegation was convinced that the recommendations would be fully implemented through the strengthening of the domestic legal framework and improvements in the national economy. In practice, the conditions and the environment for the implementation of the recommendations accepted already existed; some were either

currently being implemented or concrete measures would be followed for their implementation in the future.

596. The delegation referred to recommendations on taking further concrete measures in accordance with domestic law for the protection of the rights of vulnerable groups, including children and women. Thanks to the State's policy of "love for the future generation" and sparing nothing for the country's children, who were regarded as the kings of the country, several measures had been taken and a number of facilities had been built to promote their welfare. The Government had also taken measures to ensure that women exercised their full rights in State and social affairs by increasing the advancement of women in government services.

597. The Government would continue to give maximum priority to the promotion of the rights of special groups, including children, women, older persons and persons with disabilities, and to implement the relevant legislation already in place.

598. The Government would give serious consideration and take active measures to implement the recommendations relating to the State's obligations under the international human rights instruments to which it was a party, to accession to instruments to which it was not yet a party and to cooperation with human rights organizations.

599. Although the necessary conditions and circumstances were not yet in place, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had decided to take note of some 50 recommendations with the intention to seek methods for their implementation. Some of those contained elements that did not correspond to the actual situation in the State, such as the recommendation on ensuring the freedom of movement for all citizens and punishing those who returned or were involuntarily returned from abroad. However, the State would take note of those recommendations, paying attention and making continuous efforts to prevent such situations from happening. The Government had noted such recommendations, which were attributable to a lack of understanding, as it respected the views of the States that had made the recommendations, and was hopeful that such misunderstandings would be cleared up.

600. The Government had decided not to accept 10 recommendations, as they went against the State's principled position of opposing the politicization of human rights and contradicted the State's legal system. Most of the recommendations that were unacceptable were based on distorted information provided by hostile forces in order to defame the image of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and ultimately to dismantle its social system. In recent years, hostile forces had deliberately disregarded the reality of the people's enjoyment of their genuine human rights. The delegation referred to a recommendation according to which the Penal Code prohibited people from leaving the country freely, which was a complete distortion of reality.

601. That was also the case of the recommendation on cooperating with the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The Government had a consistent policy of maintaining genuine dialogue and cooperation based on the principle of respect for sovereignty and equality. It rejected the forced adoption of "resolutions" against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea every year and the "special rapporteur", which were the result of politicization, selectivity and double standards in the field of human rights, which the State opposed.

602. The Government deemed cooperation with and technical assistance from international human rights bodies to be useful and was willing to accept cooperation and assistance. However, such action should not be used as a means to interfere in internal affairs.

603. As pointed out during the interactive dialogue, strenuous efforts had been made to achieve international cooperation in the area of human rights. The delegation recalled the efforts made in that regard with OHCHR and the treaty bodies, and its participation in the first and second cycles of the universal periodic review.

604. The State had acceded to the main international human rights instruments and fulfilled its obligations under those treaties. Preparation for the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which had been signed the previous

year, was currently under way and the possibility of signing or acceding to other conventions was being examined.

605. The delegation was pleased to inform the Human Rights Council that, on 9 September 2014, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had signed the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography.

606. That was one of the reasons why some recommendations, such as the one on the ratification of certain international human rights instruments, had been partly accepted.

607. The delegation recalled the many challenges faced by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the suffering endured by the entirety of the Korean people caused by the nearly 70 years of national division imposed by outside forces. Despite those obstacles, it would have ultimate victory and strengthen human rights mechanisms in its own way, meeting demands on basis of the situation of the people. It would also strengthen cooperation and dialogue among States and fulfil its obligations in the field of human rights.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

608. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, 16 delegations made statements.¹⁰

609. The Republic of Korea had taken note of the presentation made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on its review. The Republic of Korea regretted the State's continued refusal to address several important recommendations based on the rights ensured under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and urged the Government to follow up on the recommendations outlined in the report of the commission of inquiry (A/HRC/25/63) and to cooperate fully with human rights mechanisms, including the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. It hoped that the Government would take the measures necessary to resolve the issue of abductees, prisoners of war and separated families.

610. The Russian Federation welcomed the fact that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had undergone its second review and hoped that it would increase its measures to protect and encourage human rights.

611. Singapore was pleased with the participation and constructive engagement of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the universal periodic review. It was also pleased to learn that the Government had accepted the recommendations made by Singapore on continuing to strengthen its domestic legal framework and fulfilling its international human rights obligations, and on continuing its cooperation and dialogue with international organizations to address the economic and social needs of its people.

612. The Sudan welcomed the acceptance by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea of some recommendations, including those the Sudan had made, and acknowledged the Government's cooperation with the universal periodic review process.

613. The Syrian Arab Republic was pleased with the constructive participation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in its second review. It commended the State for having accepted a large number of recommendations, including those the Syrian Arab Republic had made. It encouraged the Government to continue its plans and programmes to improve the standard of living of its people and stressed the need for support from the international community, particularly to alleviate the impact of the economic sanctions imposed on the country.

¹⁰ 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/27thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

614. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia was pleased with the engagement of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the universal periodic review process, noting that it had accepted 113 of the 268 recommendations it had received, including those made by the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. It encouraged the Government to cooperate fully with the special procedures and to declare an immediate moratorium on executions as a first step towards the abolition of the death penalty.

615. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland welcomed the engagement of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea with the universal period review. The commission of inquiry had found that widespread human rights violations, at times amounting to probable crimes against humanity, had been committed. The United Kingdom regretted that the Government had not supported 83 recommendations, particularly those relating to the commission of inquiry and cooperation with the Special Rapporteur. It urged the Government to take concrete steps to implement all of the recommendations.

616. The United States of America acknowledged the action taken by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to accede to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. It was disappointed by the Government's refusal to cooperate with human rights mechanisms, and joined calls for it to dismantle political prison camps and to abandon the use of torture, arbitrary detention, summary executions and forced abortions. It urged the State to work to resolve the issue of abductions and the disappearance of citizens of other States and to cooperate with OHCHR.

617. According to the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, the review had made it clear that only through dialogue and cooperation could challenges and achievements in human rights be examined in an impartial manner rather than through the imposition of mandates against sovereign States, as in the present case, in a pathetic demonstration of politicization, selectivity and double standards. It highlighted the fact that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had a 100 per cent school enrolment rate, that education was universal, obligatory and free of charge, and that health services were also universal and free of charge.

618. Viet Nam welcomed the acceptance by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea of its recommendations. It reaffirmed its willingness to share general experience and to provide assistance when appropriate, and to facilitate genuine dialogue and constructive cooperation between the Democratic Republic of Korea and other relevant parties in addressing humanitarian matters, including the issue of abductions.

619. Algeria congratulated the Government on having accepted many of the recommendations, including those it had made on cooperating with the United Nations and international organizations to confront challenges and obstacles in the area of human rights, and to share good practices with other States in that regard, and on promulgating further laws and regulations on economic, social and cultural rights to improve the legal framework to exercise human rights. It wished the Democratic People's Republic of Korea success in the implementation of the recommendations.

620. Angola congratulated the Government on its acceptance of many of the recommendations that had been made. It welcomed its engagement in the protection of human rights, notably through its collaboration with human rights mechanisms and the progress it had made in protecting the rights of children, women and persons with disabilities. It also referred to progress in the area of health care, and encouraged further action in that regard.

621. Belarus stated that the review had demonstrated the systematic efforts made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to meet its international human rights obligations. It referred to the adoption of laws and the efforts made in the areas of education, health and food security. It welcomed the State's voluntary acceptance of new obligations during its second review, which confirmed its determination to protect human rights. It understood the Government's position with regard to the recommendations it had been unable to accept.

622. China appreciated the commitment of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to implement the recommendations it had accepted. It was grateful that the Government had accepted its recommendations on building sanitation facilities and housing in rural areas, on continuing to promote economic, social and culture development, and on engaging in dialogue and cooperation with human rights mechanisms on the basis of mutual respect and equality. It also called upon the international community to look at the human rights situation in the country objectively, and to assist it wholeheartedly in its economic and social progress.

623. Cuba highlighted the fact that the Government had accepted a large number of recommendations during its second review, including those made by Cuba. Despite the difficulties the State faced, such as political aggression and natural disasters, the Government had made important progress in the field of human rights. It referred to the free and universal health-care system, the eradication of illiteracy and the access to education for all.

624. Estonia welcomed the acceptance of its recommendation. It regretted that the Government had rejected a number of recommendations, including those on abolishing the death penalty, prohibiting the use of torture on detainees, establishing a system to prevent sexual violence against female prisoners, ensuring free access to information, and permitting the establishment of independent newspapers and other social media.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

625. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, six other stakeholders made statements.

626. Amnesty International remained concerned that the Government had refused to accept more than half of the recommendations made. It was also concerned about the outright rejection of the many recommendations on closing political prison camps. It was disappointed by the rejection of the recommendations on allowing victims of its policy of abduction and enforced disappearance of foreign nationals to return to their countries of origin, on cooperating with the Special Rapporteur and on acting on the conclusions reached by the commission of inquiry. It called upon the Government to take immediate measures to end the systematic, widespread and gross human rights violations documented by the commission of inquiry.

627. United Nations Watch was concerned that the Government had rejected many of the most basic recommendations, namely those concerning political prison camps, disappearances, guilt by association and mass starvation. As found by the commission of inquiry, responsibility for those gross and systematic violations reached the highest level of political leadership. It stated that, in a letter sent to the President of Switzerland, 20 survivors of atrocities had called for the immediate freezing of all Swiss bank accounts held by the leadership of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. It encouraged Switzerland to show moral leadership.

628. The Jubilee Campaign was concerned that the freedom of religion or belief was non-existent in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, noting that it had been cited as one of the world's worst States for the persecution of Christians. It strongly urged the Government to implement all of the recommendations made by the commission of inquiry in its report. It called upon the Government to desist from any policy that encouraged forced abortion or the murder of newborn babies and to declare an immediate moratorium on the use of the death penalty. It also urged the Government to respect the rights to freedom of thought, conscience and religion or belief.

629. Human Rights Watch was concerned that the Government continued to deny the existence of political prison camps and had rejected all recommendations on closing them. It was also concerned that it had rejected recommendations on abolishing its guilt by association policy and on abolishing its hereditary and discriminatory class system known as *songbun*. It welcomed the acceptance of recommendations on ensuring that humanitarian agencies had access to people in need, and urged agencies to request such access and to inform the Human Rights Council of their progress. It stated that the universal periodic

review was not suited to respond to mass atrocities and that the Security Council should refer the case to the International Criminal Court.

630. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues pointed out that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had bluntly refused to give consideration to as many as 83 recommendations, disregarding its obligations as a State Member of the United Nations, which included the obligation to cooperate with the universal periodic review mechanism. It emphasized that, in practice, the death penalty was applied on a large scale in the country and that those sentenced to death were systematically denied a fair trial. It also recalled that the crimes committed in the country qualified as crimes against humanity, and urged the Security Council to urgently refer the situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the International Criminal Court.

631. Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik welcomed the Government's acceptance of many of the recommendations, but noted that it had not supported some crucial ones. It was concerned that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was one of only five States that had not ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and recommended that the State immediately accede to the treaty. It was also one of only two States whose Constitution provided for the position of leadership with unlimited authority. It recommended that the State incorporate measures from the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, namely article 25, into its Constitution.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

632. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 268 recommendations received, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had supported 113 recommendations, provided additional clarification on one recommendation, and noted the rest.

633. The delegation was pleased with the constructive dialogue during the second review and the adoption of the outcome. It noted the remarks made by all of the participants, including those by representatives of non-governmental organizations. It was grateful to all for their encouraging and constructive remarks. At the same time, some remarks were regretful as they had been based on misunderstandings, prejudice and distorted information. The delegation was certain that, when States and other stakeholders had a correct understanding of the real situation in the country, any suspicion would be removed once and for all. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea always respected the views of others and attempted to accommodate concerns; for example, it had partly accepted and implemented recommendations that contained both positive and negative elements.

634. The delegation stated that, by participating fully in the two cycles of the universal periodic review, it had gained valuable experience. It was determined to make every effort to promote human rights further. In addition, it would continue to make efforts to have genuine dialogue and cooperation in the field of human rights and to fulfil its obligations with regard to the universal periodic review mechanism.

Brunei Darussalam

635. The review of Brunei Darussalam was held on 2 May 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Brunei Darussalam in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/BRN/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/BRN/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/BRN/3).

636. At its 25th meeting, on 19 September 2014, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Brunei Darussalam (see sect. C below).

637. The outcome of the review of Brunei Darussalam comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/27/11), the views of the State under review, 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/27/11/Add.1).

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

638. Brunei Darussalam continued to place importance on the universal periodic review process as a useful mechanism that provided States with the opportunity to highlight their efforts to improve human rights in their countries.

639. Brunei Darussalam described the process it had undertaken following its review in May 2014.

640. To determine its positions on the recommendations that it had received, a series of extensive inter-agency consultations had been held, involving all the agencies responsible for the implementation process.

641. Brunei Darussalam had accepted 97 out of a total of 189 recommendations, which included those that had already been put into practice or were being implemented. It had partially supported 14 recommendations; that is, it had accepted one part of the recommendation while taking note of the other part. It had not accepted 78 recommendations because they were potentially contrary to the Constitution, the official religion or the national legislation of Brunei Darussalam.

642. With regard to human rights treaties, Brunei Darussalam remained committed to its international obligations, emphasizing that it was a party to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the Convention on the Rights of the Child. In 2012, it had submitted the combined first and second periodic reports to the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW/C/BRN/1-2), which were scheduled to be reviewed by the Committee the following month. In 2013, it had also submitted its combined second and third periodic reports to the Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC/C/BRN/2-3).

643. Brunei Darussalam was making ongoing efforts to consider ratifying in the near future the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict.

644. With regard to lifting its reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the Convention on the Rights of the Child, Brunei Darussalam wished to retain its reservations without prejudice to the generality of both conventions. It had nonetheless withdrawn its reservations to article 20 (1) and (2) of the Convention on the Rights of the Child relating to the protection of a child without a family, and also to article 21 (a) pertaining to the law on adoption.

645. Brunei Darussalam maintained its reservation to article 9 (2) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. However, procedures were available for children of women citizens married to foreign nationals to be accorded Brunei citizenship through an application process, pursuant to section 6 of the Brunei Nationality Act. In view of the fact that Brunei Darussalam had a policy of single nationality, a child of a women citizen may be registered as either a national of Brunei Darussalam or a national of the State of the father.

646. Regarding certain recommendations on promoting and protecting the rights of women, women continued to contribute actively to decision-making processes in Brunei Darussalam. As a result of the Government's long-standing policy on giving girls and women equal access to education, the workforce and national development, women had attained such senior positions as ambassador-at-large, attorney general, deputy minister, member of the legislative council, and chief executive officer in both the public and the

private sector. The efforts made to advance and empower women in contributing to the socioeconomic development of the State would continue.

647. Brunei Darussalam drew the attention of the Human Rights Council to the fact that the rights of women were protected by, inter alia, the Islamic Family Law Act, the Married Women Act and the Women and Girls Protection Act.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

648. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Brunei Darussalam, 17 delegations made statements.¹⁰

649. Sri Lanka pointed out that education and health remained top priorities for the Government of Brunei Darussalam. It commended the State for its significant achievements in education and for providing a comprehensive health-care system. It referred to the inclusion of environmental policies in the government strategies under the national development plan for a healthy environment.

650. Singapore pointed out that Brunei Darussalam had accepted a large number of recommendations, including the two recommendations it had made. As a fellow member of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), it would continue to work closely with Brunei Darussalam to promote the implementation of the ASEAN Human Rights Declaration and other human rights instruments to which ASEAN States members were parties, through various ASEAN human rights bodies, including the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights.

651. The Sudan welcomed the positive engagement and cooperation of Brunei Darussalam with the universal periodic review mechanism and its serious consideration of the recommendations made. The Sudan was also pleased to learn that Brunei Darussalam had accepted the recommendations it had made.

652. Thailand welcomed the State's acceptance of a large number of recommendations, including those made by Thailand on the empowerment of women and on the promotion of the right to education. It stood ready to share its experience and to cooperate with Brunei Darussalam, including within the framework of the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights, to implement the recommendations accepted.

653. The United States of America appreciated the Government's commitment to protecting the rights of children and to women's empowerment and gender equality. It referred to the State's pledge to advance educational opportunities for all citizens. It was concerned that the enactment of the Penal Code Order of 2013 could undermine the State's long-standing international human rights commitments, including those relating to the freedom of religion, expression and association, and the prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment. The United States urged Brunei Darussalam to strengthen respect for internationally recognized labour rights, including the rights of migrant workers, who remained especially vulnerable to forced labour. It also urged Brunei Darussalam to consider ratifying the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

654. According to Uzbekistan, the participation of Brunei Darussalam in the universal periodic review process demonstrated the State's clear intention to meet its international obligations with respect to human rights. Implementing the recommendations made during its second review would allow the State to strengthen its national system of human rights protection.

655. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela was pleased to see that progress had been made during the review period. Brunei Darussalam had done well in achieving most of the health targets of the Millennium Development Goals by improving services, infrastructure and networks for social protection, thereby creating more opportunities for women, children, young people, persons with disabilities and older persons.

656. Viet Nam appreciated the fact that Brunei Darussalam had supported the recommendations it had made on facilitating employment for young people and women and

on providing its citizens with adequate housing. Viet Nam praised the State's contributions to and cooperation with human rights institutions at the regional level, especially through the activities of the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights.

657. Algeria welcomed the acceptance by Brunei Darussalam of the majority of the recommendations, including one made by Algeria on promoting the situation of women in society and ensuring that women participated effectively in the State's decision-making processes. It urged the Government to reconsider its position on its second recommendation, which concerned the ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

658. Bahrain noted with appreciation the efforts made by Brunei Darussalam to continue to protect vulnerable groups. It acknowledged the State's engagement in and successful interactive dialogue on the situation of human rights in the country. It was also pleased with the State's acceptance of the recommendations it had made.

659. Belarus welcomed the significant progress made by Brunei Darussalam in the fields of education, health and women's rights, and in combating human trafficking.

660. Bhutan pointed out that, after further consultations, Brunei Darussalam had accepted 14 additional recommendations, which was a reflection of the Government's dedication to engagement with the international community to promote and protect human rights.

661. Cambodia commended Brunei Darussalam for its commitments and efforts to improve the welfare of its people, especially by addressing core human rights, namely the rights to education, health, food and shelter. It appreciated the State's acceptance of the two recommendations it had made on the effective implementation of the human rights instruments ratified by Brunei Darussalam and on improving accessibility for persons with disabilities to learning and working opportunities.

662. China was pleased that Brunei Darussalam had accepted its recommendations on implementing the national strategic plan to increase the quality and coverage of education, and on protecting women's rights by providing poor women and women with disabilities with greater assistance. China was hopeful that Brunei Darussalam would succeed in achieving sustainable social and economic development and further progress in human rights.

663. Cuba highlighted the large number of recommendations accepted by the State, including those it had made regarding health, education, nutrition and welfare. The State's commitment to the universal periodic review and to the promotion and protection of the human rights of its people was evident. It encouraged Brunei Darussalam to continue its efforts to protect and promote human rights and to improve the welfare of its people.

664. Djibouti was pleased with the progress made by Brunei Darussalam to ensure the welfare of its people, particularly in the area of economic and social development. Such good practices were a model for other States.

665. India commended Brunei Darussalam on its achievement of the Millennium Development Goals and on the progress it had made in the areas of universal health care and education. It was pleased that Brunei Darussalam had accepted a large number of recommendations, including the one made by India on ratifying the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

666. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Brunei Darussalam, five other stakeholders made statements.

667. The British Humanist Association stated that, despite the acceptance of Brunei Darussalam of the recommendation on harmonizing its legislation with international human rights norms at its first review, it had disregarded that recommendation and had instead implemented the Syariah Penal Code, much of which ran counter to the standards set by international human rights law. It deeply regretted that Brunei Darussalam had rejected a number of recommendations pertaining to the revision or review of the Code, specifically

citing the State's rejection of the recommendation on increasing the age of criminal responsibility, which was currently set at 7 years. The British Humanist Association pointed out that the implementation of the Syariah Penal Code could discriminate against women, and it was particularly concerned about the State's refusal to amend article 375 of the Penal Code, which essentially excused marital rape on the weak excuse that women were already accorded sufficient protection under chapters 190 and 217.

668. The International Humanist and Ethical Union was seriously concerned about the adoption of the Syariah Penal Code, which disregarded, among other things, the right to freedom of religion and belief. The Code could threaten the human rights of all citizens, and those of women and children in particular; for example, women not wearing the hijab could be heavily punished. It added that, if the Government's plans were realized, adulterers would be punished by stoning. Women, including victims of sexual violence and assault, were convicted disproportionately in adultery trials, and marital rape was permitted by the Code. Moreover, it pointed out that the Code deemed children as young as 7 years of age to be criminally responsible with punishment, including life imprisonment and corporal punishment.

669. The Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative was concerned that the implementation of many of the recommendations would not be possible without an extensive review of the human rights implications of the revised Penal Code and a renewed commitment by Brunei Darussalam to United Nations human rights mechanisms through compliance with all the reporting obligations, the issuance of a standing invitation to the special procedures and the ratification of all the core international human rights treaties. It was also concerned that the current restrictions on expression were not compatible with international human rights standards. It therefore urged the Government to review, with a view to repealing, the Newspapers Order, the Sedition Act and the Undesirable Publications Act, all of which restricted journalistic endeavours and the free and frank expression of ideas. Furthermore, it was concerned about the restrictions placed on the right to associate, and stressed the importance of repealing the Societies Order and ensuring an environment conducive to civil society. In that regard, it recommended that Brunei Darussalam accept all the recommendations on the establishment of a national human rights institution. Moreover, it was concerned about the situation of sexual minorities and recommended that Brunei Darussalam accept all the recommendations based on sexual orientation and gender identity, including those on the decriminalization of consensual adult same-sex sexual conduct.

670. Amnesty International pointed out that, in measures that could amount to torture, relatively minor offences such as drinking liquor or theft could be punished by whipping or amputation, and even children could be sentenced to amputations. Judicial caning remained a common punishment for crimes such as theft, the possession of drugs and immigration offences. It was disappointed with the State's decision not to ratify the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. Under the revised Penal Code, conduct such as extramarital sexual relations and consensual sex between persons of the same gender was not only criminalized but punishable by stoning to death. It was also concerned about the fact that the revised Penal Code introduced laws that discriminated against women and girls, such as by punishing abortion with public flogging or out-of-marriage pregnancy with fines or jail terms. Furthermore, despite guarantees of religious freedom in the Constitution, laws and policies restricted that right for Muslims and non-Muslims alike. The revised Penal Code significantly expanded the scope of restrictions and penalties for offences, including by imposing the death penalty for offences such as mocking the Prophet Muhammad and by criminalizing the exposure of Muslim children to the beliefs and practices of any religion other than Islam. Amnesty International urged the Government to bring its new Penal Code into line with international human rights law and standards.

671. Südwind Entwicklungspolitik was disappointed that Brunei Darussalam had not accepted the recommendations on ratifying the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or

Punishment and the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. It pointed out that the adoption of the new Penal Code, which imposed the death penalty for numerous offences, including death by stoning as a specific method of execution for rape, adultery, “sodomy” and extramarital sexual relations, would only increase violence in the country. It also pointed out that Brunei Darussalam was one of those rare States that imposed the death penalty for the crime of apostasy, which was not in line with human rights standards.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

672. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 189 recommendations received, Brunei Darussalam supported 97 recommendations and noted the rest.

673. Brunei Darussalam stated that it remained committed to the promotion and protection of human rights. It emphasized that it would continue to work towards the betterment of human rights and to overcome the challenges ahead.

674. As a member of the international community, Brunei Darussalam appreciated the values of peaceful coexistence, mutual respect and cooperation. It reaffirmed its engagement in regional and international mechanisms to exchange views and experiences towards the promotion and protection of human rights.

675. Brunei Darussalam concluded that, because it was a small State of 400,000 people, it had very limited human resources; hence, it would welcome any capacity-building or other assistance from international organizations.

Costa Rica

676. The review of Costa Rica was held on 5 May 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Costa Rica in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/CRI/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/CRI/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/CRI/3).

677. At its 26th meeting, on 19 September 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Costa Rica (see sect. C below).

678. The outcome of the review of Costa Rica comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/27/12), the views of Costa Rica 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/27/12/Add.1).

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

679. Costa Rica stated that it was a great honour to address the Human Rights Council in the context of the adoption of the report of the Working Group, as it allowed the State to provide additional information on the human rights situation in the country.

680. The universal periodic review mechanism had proven to be a successful opportunity for Costa Rica, as it promoted cooperation and dialogue and guided the formulation of human rights public policies. Its universality ensured the equal treatment of all States, and took into consideration the level of development and characteristics of each one. Costa Rica viewed the exercise as an opportunity to report in a comprehensive manner before the international community on the situation of human rights and to assess its own progress and challenges in meeting its obligations and commitments.

681. Costa Rica was pleased to report that, of a total of 193 recommendations received during its review, it had supported five during the review, and considered them to have already been implemented. Of the 188 recommendations that remained to be examined, Costa Rica supported 173. Of those, it considered six to have already been implemented and four partially supported. Most of the recommendations coincided with decisions and policies that had already been made or implemented by the State even before the review, which demonstrated the Government's commitment.

682. Costa Rica had taken note of the other 15 recommendations, as it believed that it was not currently possible to adopt a position on them.

683. Many recommendations reiterated the same idea, and in general Costa Rica considered them to be encouraging the State to persevere in its ongoing work on the promotion and protection of human rights.

684. Costa Rica wished to report on the recommendations it considered to be fully implemented. Those included the ratification of the ILO Domestic Workers Convention (No. 189), the criminalization of trafficking in the Penal Code (the punishment for which was increased when it referred to trafficking in children), the preparation of the strategic plan for the period 2012–2015 of the national coalition against the smuggling of migrants and trafficking in persons, the formulation of a comprehensive migration policy for the period 2013–2023, and the national action plan for persons with disabilities for the period 2012–2024, which was currently being reviewed and reformulated for the period 2015–2018.

685. In May 2014, Costa Rica had ratified the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; the instrument of ratification was to be deposited by the President of Costa Rica during the sixty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

686. Costa Rica highlighted the progress it had made in establishing the inter-institutional committee on the follow-up to and compliance with international human rights obligations and the permanent entity for consultations with civil society, which it had reported on during its review. With those mechanisms, Costa Rica had been able to develop a dialogue with civil society during the preparation of various reports.

687. Having an adequate legal framework was not sufficient for the protection of the human rights of groups that had been and were still subject to exclusion and social prejudices. For two and a half years, Costa Rica had been engaged in a dialogue with Afrodescendants, indigenous peoples, migrants, refugees and civil society organizations, which allowed for the development of the national policy for a society free from racism, racial discrimination and xenophobia, which had entered into force in 2014.

688. With regard to indigenous peoples, Costa Rica highlighted the commitment of the Presidency to continuing dialogue at the highest level, particularly concerning conflicts relating to land tenure and the security of its inhabitants, and other important issues such as the education, health, housing and social security of indigenous peoples. The delegation also referred to the willingness of the new administration to develop a comprehensive strategy to address the situation of territorial rights of indigenous peoples.

689. With regard to migrant issues, Costa Rica reported on progress made in, inter alia, incorporating a development and human rights approach at both the legislative level and with regard to public policies. It referred to the legislation that had been adopted and the new comprehensive migration policy for the period 2013–2023, which put Costa Rica at the forefront of migration policies in the region, with an inclusive agenda.

690. Costa Rica reported on the progress it had made in the implementation of the law against trafficking in persons, which had been adopted in 2013, the development of regulations and the establishment of the national coalition against the smuggling of migrants and trafficking in persons, and the national fund against trafficking in persons. Those actions were unique in the region.

691. The protection and development of children's rights had been of historic importance for Costa Rica. The delegation reported on the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the

Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure in early 2014, and highlighted the need for States, including Costa Rica, to allocate more resources to allow children to have access to services and a quality education and to enjoy a better life.

692. Gender equality was another fundamental issue for development and democracy. Costa Rica reiterated the commitment of the current administration to its policy of gender equality and the designation of a minister on the condition of women in order to ensure that gender policy remained a cross-cutting issue in all political decisions. Addressing violence against women continued to be a challenge for the State.

693. The delegation also reported on progress and the challenges the State faced in addressing the human rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. In recent years, the State had discussed policies to better guarantee the property rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons, and while the legal options still needed to be discussed, some State institutions had taken positive administrative actions in which civil society played a key role.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

694. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Costa Rica, 15 delegations made statements.

695. Angola recognized the commitment of Costa Rica to protecting and promoting human rights through the ratification of the main international instruments, particularly the optional protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. It welcomed the acceptance by Costa Rica of most of the recommendations made, which reflected the commitment of the State to continue to cooperate with the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council.

696. Bulgaria thanked Costa Rica for the progress it had made in the implementation of a number of recommendations and for meeting several challenges in that regard. It welcomed the efforts made by Costa Rica to protect and promote the human rights of children, and noted positively the implementation of a national policy on children and adolescents. Regarding the recommendations it had made, Bulgaria would follow with interest national activities relating to education for indigenous peoples and investment in infrastructure in indigenous territories.

697. China welcomed the constructive engagement of Costa Rica in the review and appreciated its commitment to protecting and promoting human rights. It thanked the delegation for having accepted its recommendations during the review, which were on continuing the promotion of economic and social development, making the elimination of poverty a priority and further improving people's living standards. It wished Costa Rica well in achieving sustainable economic and social development so that its people could better enjoy all human rights.

698. The Congo welcomed the establishment by Costa Rica of the inter-institutional committee on the follow-up to and compliance with international human rights obligations. The Congo noted with satisfaction the acceptance by Costa Rica of most of the recommendations, particularly those made by the Congo, and its implementation of a recommendation made by the Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples relating to the draft law on the autonomous development of indigenous peoples and land restitution.

699. Côte d'Ivoire thanked Costa Rica for the additional information it had provided and for its careful consideration of the recommendations made, including those by Côte d'Ivoire, and congratulated the State on having accepted 178 of them. Côte d'Ivoire welcomed the progress made in the area of human rights and encouraged Costa Rica to continue its efforts and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms.

700. Cuba referred to the measures taken by Costa Rica to implement the recommendations made during its first review and highlighted the progress it had made in the area of equality and non-discrimination. Cuba thanked Costa Rica for having accepted

most of the recommendations, particularly the one made by Cuba on efforts to ensure better access to education and employment. Cuba wished Costa Rica every success in implementing the recommendations.

701. Djibouti welcomed the commitment of Costa Rica to the promotion and protection of human rights and encouraged the State to continue its efforts, particularly with regard to the rights of vulnerable persons.

702. Morocco noted with satisfaction the progress made by Costa Rica in respecting and implementing its international human rights obligations. Morocco welcomed the State's accession to the International Convention on the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expression. Morocco also welcomed the State's determination and continuous efforts to establish a legal and institutional framework to guarantee the protection and promotion of human rights.

703. The Niger noted the progress made by Costa Rica in protecting and promoting human rights through its cooperation with the treaty bodies and its ongoing efforts to ensure the achievement of the economic, social and cultural rights of the most vulnerable and marginalized sectors of the population. It welcomed in particular the progress that Costa Rica had made in education, which had led to a literacy rate of 97 per cent, and its efforts to provide quality health care.

704. Nigeria referred to the efforts made by Costa Rica to promote and protect human rights, and was encouraged by the policies it had introduced to improve health care and education. It called upon Costa Rica to accede to the international human rights conventions it had yet to ratify, and to strive to incorporate international humanitarian law into its domestic statutes. It also called upon Costa Rica to continue to cooperate with OHCHR and to promote and protect human rights.

705. The Philippines referred to the efforts made by Costa Rica to improve its migration policies and the stronger measures it had taken to combat trafficking in persons, especially women and children. The Philippines was pleased that Costa Rica had accepted its recommendation on considering the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and the ILO Domestic Workers Convention (No. 189). It encouraged Costa Rica to provide the resources necessary to implement universal periodic review recommendations.

706. The Sudan appreciated the feedback it had received from Costa Rica on the recommendations. It welcomed the State's efforts and its cooperation with the universal periodic review. It regretted that Costa Rica had been unable to accept some recommendations made by the Sudan. It wished Costa Rica progress and prosperity in strengthening the rights of its citizens.

707. Togo thanked Costa Rica for the additional information it had provided. It welcomed the State's acceptance of most of the recommendations made during its review, particularly its recommendation calling upon Costa Rica to continue its efforts to combat structured racism and to prosecute perpetrators of racist acts.

708. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela highlighted the efforts made by Costa Rica to improve the conditions of indigenous peoples, persons of African descent, refugees and migrants as part of the national policy against racism, racial discrimination and xenophobia. It also welcomed the policies and programmes developed by the national child welfare agency to address sexual exploitation and abuses against that vulnerable group and to address the issue of teenage pregnancy. It acknowledged the efforts made by Costa Rica to address challenges and to implement the recommendations made during its first review, thereby reaffirming its commitment to human rights.

709. Algeria thanked the delegation for the additional information it had provided. It referred to the acceptance by Costa Rica of most of the recommendations made, which reflected the State's high level of cooperation with the universal periodic review mechanism. In particular, Algeria welcomed the acceptance by Costa Rica of one of the two recommendations made by Algeria, on continuing its efforts to combat violence against

women and children. It wished Costa Rica success in implementing the recommendations and in promoting human rights.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

710. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Costa Rica, four other stakeholders made statements.

711. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit — COC Nederland referred to the prejudices that limited the citizenship of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons. It pointed out that, in Costa Rica, 90 per cent of the population rejected discrimination based on sexual orientation and 70 per cent agreed that lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons should have the same rights and obligations as the rest of the population. One religious belief should not be set above the rights of the population. It thanked the States that had made recommendations relating to the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons.

712. The Center for Reproductive Rights referred to recommendations made to Costa Rica on taking steps to guarantee the full and effective recognition of sexual and reproductive rights, and emphasized the need to decriminalize abortion, particularly in cases of pregnancy resulting from rape or incest. It regretted that Costa Rica had not accepted recommendations made on reproductive health and rights. It urged Costa Rica to amend the current law to legalize abortion in cases of rape and to adopt a health-care protocol to regulate and guarantee access to legal abortion.

713. The International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development — VIDES and Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco welcomed the recommendations on the rights to education and to health, and urged Costa Rica to implement them as soon as possible. They also urged Costa Rica to implement the recommendations on physical or sexual violence against children and women. They recommended that Costa Rica adopt comprehensive programmes to eradicate discrimination against children, particularly the most vulnerable children, so they could enjoy their rights fully, develop policies to guarantee equal access to quality health services and to eradicate corruption, promote campaigns against the use of drugs and sexual education to prevent early pregnancies, and adopt effective measures to eliminate violence against children and women, particularly in schools and at home.

714. Action Canada for Population and Development welcomed the commitment of Costa Rica since its first review to the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. It pointed out that, in recent years, Costa Rica had made major progress in recognizing the identity and gender expression of transgender persons; however, it still had to guarantee access to all identity documents, respecting identity and gender expressions, thus giving transgender persons access to basic rights often denied. It requested Costa Rica to implement comprehensive, specific and inclusive health protocols. It also drew the attention of the Human Rights Council to medical and surgical practices applied to intersex children that could have non-reversible physical, psychological and emotional consequences and on which Costa Rica had not received any recommendations. It therefore recommended that the State adopt and implement protocols for newborn intersex and/or ambiguous-sex babies that were based on international human rights norms.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

715. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 193 recommendations received, Costa Rica had supported 178 recommendations and noted the other 15.

716. Costa Rica thanked all the States that had participated in its review and had contributed comments and recommendations on consolidating its actions and the challenges it faced in addressing human rights issues in the country.

Equatorial Guinea

717. The review of Equatorial Guinea was held on 5 May 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Equatorial Guinea in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/GNQ/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/GNQ/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/GNQ/3).

718. At its 26th meeting, on 19 September 2014, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Equatorial Guinea (see sect. C below).

719. The outcome of the review of Equatorial Guinea comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/27/13 and Corr.1), 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/27/13/Add.1).

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

720. The delegation of Equatorial Guinea began its statement by adding its congratulations to the previous speakers. It also expressed, on behalf of the President of Equatorial Guinea, greetings of peace and solidarity for the promotion and defence of human rights across the world.

721. During its second review, held on 5 May 2014 in Geneva, the Government provided the Human Rights Council with a detailed report on the implementation of the recommendations made during its first review. The delegation reported that, during the second review, a total of 191 recommendations had been made, out of which the Government had accepted 102, left 83 to be examined and rejected six.

722. The Government had tried, and believed it had succeeded in, demonstrating the State's clear commitment to the ideals and values of human rights, the promotion and protection of which were inherent to the equality of all citizens.

723. The delegation was grateful for the acknowledgement of the results achieved and for the recommendations made by various delegations at the session, specifically during the interactive dialogue. All of the recommendations had been carefully analysed to allow the Government to comply with them.

724. That work had enabled the Government, within an interministerial monographic council, to consider all the recommendations to which responses had to be given by the various levels of government. Several of the recommendations were already part of the national action plan.

725. In that context, the delegation reported on the concrete steps that had already been taken to implement and guarantee the application of the main recommendations discussed during the State's second review, which included those listed in the paragraphs below.

726. Regarding the recommendations relating to the death penalty, the Government had passed resolution no. 426 of 13 February 2014 on a temporary moratorium on the application of the death penalty, which came into force on a temporary basis the day of its publication. The Government had recently presented it before Parliament so that, once ratified, it would come into force.

727. Regarding the ratification of the Rome Statute, the State endorsed the declaration of the African Union in that regard.

728. Regarding the creation of an independent national human rights institution, the Government had accepted the recommendation and pointed out that, in 1998, it had created the centre for the promotion of human rights and democracy, which did not fall under any institutional hierarchy. The centre was endowed with its own legal authority, and had the capacity to work within and outside the State in the promotion, protection, dissemination and teaching of human rights and democracy.

729. With regard to the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the Council of Ministers of Equatorial Guinea had already approved the recommendation; a decision had been made and it had been sent to Parliament for ratification.

730. On the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the Government had accepted that instrument and decided to send it to the Deputy Chamber and the Senate. The human rights department attached to the Presidency had reiterated in several seminars to all uniformed officials and judicial, political and decision-making officials that the practices of torture and arbitrary detention should not be tolerated, and that severe sanctions would ensue should they be used. In that regard, the Government had arranged for the International Committee of the Red Cross to have free access to detention centres across the country, decided to check site conditions and the treatment of detainees held, and supported the relevant actions of the Attorney General and the national human rights commission in their periodic inspections of those centres.

731. With regard to the elimination of child labour, the national committee on the rights of the child and the committee to support the children of Equatorial Guinea were responsible for ensuring the rights of children at the national level, with the support of the Government. Equatorial Guinea had accepted the recommendation on the elimination of child labour, and in that regard had created a “children’s parliament” as a forum for free expression where, through an open interactive dialogue, children and adolescents met to discuss the issues affecting them.

732. The Government had accepted the recommendation on the freedom of the press and would consequently review and amend the press and media law to give greater freedom of movement to reporters, and greater expression and press freedom. Professional associations such as the press association of Equatorial Guinea and the association of professional journalists of Equatorial Guinea had been authorized. There were no prohibitions on the publication of any type of information, whether in newspapers or national and international journals, on receiving news from various television channels, or on the functioning of public Internet, intranet or fibre optic services.

733. The delegation had noted the recommendation on the ratification of the United Nations Convention against Corruption. Nevertheless, action had been taken to eradicate corruption: an anti-corruption prosecutor was working in the country, a court of auditors had been created, and Decree No. 42/2007 of 30 July, regulating the participation of civil society in the initiative for transparency and good governance in extractive industries, was now in force.

734. Equatorial Guinea had accepted and approved the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, which the Government had sent to Parliament to proceed with the formalities of accession.

735. The Government had analysed all the other recommendations from the second review, as included in the addendum.

736. On 15 September, President Nguema Mbasogo had awarded the second UNESCO Equatorial Guinea International Prize for Research in Life Sciences. The recipient had been awarded \$100,000 and a gold statuette of an internationally recognized sculptor, the late Leandro Mbomio Nsue of Equatorial Guinea.

737. Lastly, the Government had renewed its readiness to continue to work with the assistance of and in cooperation with OHCHR, and had reaffirmed its commitment to

devote its efforts and capacities to attain a society in which the values of peaceful and democratic coexistence were its human rights.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

738. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Equatorial Guinea, 15 delegations made statements.¹¹

739. Ethiopia commended Equatorial Guinea for its constructive engagement with the Human Rights Council and for having accepted a significant number of recommendations. It thanked the State for having accepted all of its recommendations and called upon United Nations human rights mechanisms, special funds and programmes to provide Equatorial Guinea with technical and capacity-building assistance based on the State's priorities and requests. Ethiopia wished Equatorial Guinea the best in its endeavours to implement the recommendations accepted.

740. Gabon welcomed the total cooperation of Equatorial Guinea with international human rights mechanisms and procedures. It congratulated Equatorial Guinea on the many actions it had taken to establish institutions for the protection and promotion of human rights at the national level, and encouraged the State to continue to strengthen their capacity in terms of human and material resources in order to bring them into line with the Paris Principles. It called upon the international community to support Equatorial Guinea in the implementation of the recommendations.

741. Guinea emphasized the significant progress made by Equatorial Guinea in the area of human rights and particularly its efforts to implement the recommendations made during its previous review. It congratulated the State on its adoption of important legislation to guarantee the representation and participation of women in decision-making bodies, especially in Parliament and other State institutions. It supported the measures taken by Equatorial Guinea to improve the health situation in the country, particularly the measures taken to address child mortality.

742. Morocco welcomed the exemplary collaboration of Equatorial Guinea during the universal periodic review. It supported the reforms undertaken by the authorities to establish a favourable political and legislative environment for the development and enjoyment of human rights. The acceptance by Equatorial Guinea of more than 80 per cent of the recommendations showed its willingness to cooperate with international human rights mechanisms, including the universal periodic review. Morocco was confident that Equatorial Guinea would overcome its remaining human rights challenges.

743. Nigeria urged Equatorial Guinea to continue to incorporate international humanitarian law into its domestic legislation with a view to improving the enjoyment of human rights. It invited the State to prioritize the education and health of its people, and commended it for its contribution to fighting the Ebola pandemic. It noted that Equatorial Guinea had accepted most of the recommendations made and wished it success in their implementation.

744. Sierra Leone commended Equatorial Guinea on the work it had done, and noted with appreciation that the recommendations made by Sierra Leone had enjoyed the support of the State and were already being implemented. While acknowledging that there were challenges ahead in achieving 100 per cent implementation, Sierra Leone continued to applaud the compliance of Equatorial Guinea with the process and wished it success in implementing the recommendations that had been accepted.

745. South Africa welcomed the commitment by Equatorial Guinea to ensuring the achievement of all human rights of its people. It welcomed the efforts made in education and in addressing HIV/AIDS in the context of the Government's national economic and

¹¹ 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/27thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

social development plan “Horizon 2020”. It also underlined the efforts made by the Government to ensure that the national commission on human rights complied with the Paris Principles. South Africa was encouraged by the adoption of Decree No. 426, declaring a temporary moratorium on the use of the death penalty. It encouraged Equatorial Guinea to continue its efforts to promote and protect human rights.

746. The Sudan welcomed the delegation of Equatorial Guinea and appreciated the efforts that the State had made to provide responses to questions and information on the recommendations. It commended the State on its cooperation with the universal periodic review mechanism and expressed gratitude for its acceptance of the recommendations made by the Sudan. It wished Equatorial Guinea every success in the implementation of the recommendations.

747. Togo welcomed the acceptance by Equatorial Guinea of most of the recommendations made during its review, including those made by Togo. It also underlined the progress made by Equatorial Guinea in the achievement of economic and social rights and in promoting the well-being of the population. It invited the international community to provide the State with support in implementing the recommendations.

748. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela appreciated the efforts of Equatorial Guinea to comply with the recommendations made during its review, and for its full and open cooperation with the mechanism. It welcomed the continuity of the free education policy, as established in the national education law, and emphasized that more than 2,000 teachers had been hired for rural and peripheral urban areas in order to increase school enrolment. It reiterated its recognition of the work done by the Government of Equatorial Guinea.

749. Algeria welcomed the legislative and institutional changes that Equatorial Guinea had made to protect and promote human rights. The constitutional reform adopted in 2012 had strengthened the institutional framework to protect human rights through the establishment of the office of the people’s defender. Equatorial Guinea had ratified several human rights instruments and incorporated them into its domestic legislation. Algeria also welcomed the new policies established to ensure advances in the areas of urban planning, housing, electricity, water and sanitation, maternal and child mortality, and health in rural areas.

750. Angola noted that Equatorial Guinea had accepted a number of the recommendations made, including those made by Angola on efforts to increase school enrolment rates and access to schools. It welcomed the willingness of Equatorial Guinea to continue to cooperate with United Nations bodies, particularly by submitting reports to the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, the Committee on the Rights of the Child and the Human Rights Council in the context of the universal periodic review.

751. Armenia thanked Equatorial Guinea for having accepted a number of important recommendations, including those it had made. It welcomed the acceptance of the recommendation on the ratification of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. It believed that the accession of each State to the Convention contributed to the prevention of that odious scourge worldwide.

752. Benin noted with satisfaction the remarkable progress made by Equatorial Guinea in the ratification of several international human rights instruments, and welcomed the decision of the Government to establish a moratorium on the application of the death penalty. It encouraged Equatorial Guinea to accede to other relevant human rights instruments and to strengthen its programmes relating to economic, social and cultural rights. It called upon the international community to support the reforms initiated by Equatorial Guinea in the area of the promotion and protection of all human rights.

753. Botswana commended Equatorial Guinea for the measures it had taken to fight trafficking in children and the recruitment of children as soldiers. It encouraged the Government to finalize the accession to and ratification of the first two optional protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. It also commended Equatorial Guinea for the measures it had taken to reduce child mortality and to improve health-care services, particularly regarding maternal and child mortality. It called upon the international

community to provide Equatorial Guinea with the technical assistance and capacity-building necessary for the achievement of the human rights of its people.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

754. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Equatorial Guinea, four other stakeholders made statements.

755. Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale (OCAPROCE Internationale) congratulated Equatorial Guinea on its ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. It invited the State to redouble its efforts to implement the recommendations made in its previous review. It was concerned about impunity and underscored the need to prosecute criminals, particularly in the context of sexual and domestic violence. It also condemned the many discriminatory practices that favoured some children over others, affecting mostly girls and children born out of wedlock, children from poor families, those with disabilities and those belonging to ethnic minorities. It invited Equatorial Guinea to, inter alia, take effective measures to eradicate those forms of discrimination, to implement a sectoral plan for the promotion of women and gender equality, and to redouble its efforts to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS.

756. Human Rights Watch regretted that the current review had shown that Equatorial Guinea had made no progress since its review in 2009, and that the many and serious concerns described during the current review were the same as those highlighted four years earlier. It was deeply concerned that the Government had not honoured its commitment not to permit torture or arbitrary detention, and reported on several cases. It was concerned that the moratorium on the death penalty had been approved only as a temporary measure, and regretted that, in July, President Nguema Mbasogo had stated that he still supported the death penalty. It underlined the need to monitor the fulfilment by the State of its commitments, and urged OHCHR to assist the Government in launching such a process, ensuring its integrity and independence, and to report regularly on its progress.

757. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme stated that an important part of the recommendations made during the State's first review had not been implemented. Nevertheless, it welcomed the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, the moratorium declared in February 2014 and the law on compensating victims of torture. It remained concerned about cases of arbitrary detention, political violence, impunity for security forces that violated human rights, the restricted freedom for political parties, non-governmental organizations, human rights defenders and opponents, corruption in public administration, the use of torture, and the poor conditions of detention. The incarceration, intimidation and abduction of opponents had to stop. It encouraged Equatorial Guinea to ensure the independence of the judiciary and to issue a standing invitation to all special procedure mandate holders.

758. The African Association of Education for Development stated that Equatorial Guinea had accepted some recommendations but had not implemented them, which made a mockery of the Human Rights Council. It asserted that human rights violations persisted and almost total impunity resulted from control exerted by the executive power over the judicial power; judges were appointed and dismissed by the same executive, while corruption was systematic and generalized. The executive controlled both private and institutional activities, and there was no civil society space, as the few media were under the control of the Government. It called upon the Council to pay special attention to the grave situation in Equatorial Guinea, which had been ongoing for more than 30 years and warranted the appointment of a special procedure and the opening of a permanent OHCHR presence in the country.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

759. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 191 recommendations received, Equatorial Guinea had supported 142 recommendations, noted 37, and provided additional clarification on another 12.

760. Equatorial Guinea reiterated its commitment to cooperate with the various bodies of the Human Rights Council, OHCHR and all people with goodwill who helped to improve the human rights situation in the country.

761. The Government had called for the holding in November of a political dialogue with all political forces, including those based abroad, in the interests of peaceful coexistence.

762. Lastly, the delegation thanked all the States, the Human Rights Council, the secretariat and the troika for their efforts to help the State to improve human rights in Equatorial Guinea.

Ethiopia

763. The review of Ethiopia was held on 6 May 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Ethiopia in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/ETH/1 and Corr.1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/ETH/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/ETH/3).

764. At its 26th meeting, on 19 September 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Ethiopia (see sect. C below).

765. The outcome of the review of Ethiopia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/27/14), 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/27/14/Add.1).

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

766. The delegation of Ethiopia stated that it had accepted 188 recommendations out of 252 recommendations made during the universal periodic review.

767. The delegation stated that the recommendations would be implemented through the interministerial institutional framework established under the national human rights action plan. The Ministry of Justice would play a central role, as mandated by Parliament through the action plan. The process would be further complemented by the active participation of the public and relevant national human rights institutions, such as the Ethiopian human rights commission, the institution of the ombudsman, civil society organizations and other stakeholders.

768. Ethiopia was determined to intensify its efforts to sustain socioeconomic development, capacity-building and awareness-raising at the grass-roots level, to provide law enforcement organs with continuous human rights education, and to strengthen judicial and administrative review mechanisms further.

769. Ethiopia had made progress with its ongoing five-year growth and transformation plan, which was to ensure high-level, broad-based, equitable and participatory growth and the further entrenchment of democracy, good governance and human rights. It had also adopted its first national human rights action plan, for the period 2013–2015, and was committed to building on the achievements and remarkable advances made in meeting many of the Millennium Development Goals.

770. Ethiopia had not been able to accept some of the recommendations as they had been made without a proper understanding of the policy and legal framework and the situation in Ethiopia or owing to a limited capacity or a lack of clarity. The recommendations questioning the content and objectives of the Charities and Societies Proclamation (No.

621/2009) had not been based on an objective assessment. The law and its implementation were to ensure the right to freedom of association as enshrined in the Constitution or the obligations of the State. It had been drafted after extensive public discussions and stakeholder engagement. The law provided a predictable and transparent system for the establishment, registration and regulation of charities and societies, and an environment conducive to the growth of grass-roots, member-based and member-driven civil society groups. It ensured the accountability of all charities and societies while guaranteeing them independence and the due process of law.

771. The requirement under the Proclamation for charities and societies to use 70 per cent of resources mobilized for operations and not more than 30 per cent for administrative purposes had enabled them to promote the interests of their members and to use a substantial amount of the resources they had mobilized to attain their objectives.

772. The requirement for charities and societies working on political issues to raise 90 per cent of their funds from local resources did not affect the charities and societies working in the areas of development and humanitarian issues. Ethiopia had also signed bilateral agreements with some charities and societies based on the exception provided under article 3 of the Proclamation, which enabled them to participate in those activities. Ethiopia had established a consultative forum composed of relevant government organs and charities and societies to assess the implementation of the Proclamation.

773. There were 3,078 charities and societies operating in Ethiopia. It was thus clear that the recommendations on reviewing, amending or repealing the law were misplaced and would derail the proper functioning of the system designed for the establishment, registration and operation of charities and societies.

774. Similarly, the recommendations relating to the Anti-Terrorism Proclamation (No. 652/2009) was not acceptable. The law was to fight terrorism in all its forms and manifestations. Terrorism was a threat to the national security of Ethiopia. The Proclamation ensured the protection of the rights to life, peace and security of Ethiopians, in accordance with the Constitution, the State's human rights obligations and Security Council resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1373 (2001).

775. The Proclamation was not used to target political opposition. The Government should not be asked to release people convicted of terrorist acts or to interfere with court proceedings. For those reasons, it had rejected the recommendations on amending, reviewing or repealing the Proclamation and recommendations on releasing persons imprisoned for committing or attempting to commit terrorist acts.

776. The Freedom of the Mass Media and Access to Information Proclamation (No. 590/2008) was to guarantee the freedom of expression and of the mass media, to nurture the indispensable role of free, independent and diverse mass media in building a democratic system, and to make the mass media accountable for their activities. In accordance with the Constitution and the State's human rights obligations, it prohibited any form of censorship.

777. Ethiopia had established a national task force, chaired by the institution of the ombudsman and composed of relevant government offices, to oversee the effective implementation of the Proclamation. The Proclamation had enabled people to advocate their views, either in support of or critical of government policies and measures taken, without fear. It had also allowed the freedom of expression to flourish further. For that reason, Ethiopia had not accepted the recommendations on amending or repealing the Proclamation.

778. Ethiopia would consider extending invitations to the special procedures of the Human Rights Council on a case-by-case basis.

779. Ethiopia would continue to work closely with civil society organizations, grass-roots associations and professional associations to implement the recommendations it had accepted. The Government would redouble its efforts to ensure the implementation of the constitutionally guaranteed rights and fundamental freedoms of all Ethiopians. It would continue to pursue its policy of active cooperation with the Human Rights Council and its mechanisms, and also further strengthen its engagement with OHCHR in Geneva and the East African Regional Office in Addis Ababa.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

780. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Ethiopia, 13 delegations made statements.¹¹

781. Indonesia commended Ethiopia for its significant progress in the promotion and protection of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights sustained by the rule of law and the open political process. It also welcomed the ongoing process of the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. Indonesia was appreciative that Ethiopia had accepted its recommendation on the right to education.

782. The Lao People's Democratic Republic appreciated the fact that Ethiopia had accepted a large number of recommendations and had taken the steps necessary for their implementation. It drew attention to the increase in the freedoms of expression, of the mass media and of religion. It welcomed the progress made in gender equality, access to free primary education for all citizens, health-care services, the promotion of the rights of women and children, and fighting human trafficking and poverty alleviation.

783. Malaysia commended the progress made by Ethiopia in establishing a national human rights commission and in adopting a national human rights action plan. It also lauded the priority Ethiopia had given to the areas of health, education and the empowerment of women. It was pleased to note that Ethiopia had accepted its recommendation on increasing the participation of women in the political process.

784. Mali welcomed the renewed commitment of Ethiopia to close cooperation with human rights mechanisms, illustrated by its acceptance of a large number of recommendations. It congratulated Ethiopia on the progress it had made in realizing economic, social and cultural rights, achieved through several legislative and institutional reforms, including the adoption of the national human rights action plan and the national programme for good governance.

785. Morocco welcomed the efforts made by Ethiopia in economic development and in the implementation of its five-year growth and transformation plan. It congratulated Ethiopia on its commitment to eradicating poverty and to achieving the Millennium Development Goals. It emphasized the importance of the national human rights action plan for the period 2013–2015 in the implementation of the recommendations.

786. The Niger highlighted the efforts made by Ethiopia to promote and protect human rights through national strategies and policies. The platform for the economic development and political transformations provided in the growth and transformation plan for the period 2010–2015 had resulted in considerable economic growth over the previous 10 years, and a share of the benefits of that growth would help to raise living standards and strengthen economic, social and cultural rights.

787. Nigeria was pleased that Ethiopia had accepted all of its recommendations. It commended the State on the measures and strategies it had employed to fight such harmful traditional practices as female genital mutilation and early and forced marriage. It appreciated the efforts made to pursue a rights-based approach to development, and welcomed the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the optional protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict and on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography.

788. The Philippines welcomed the willingness of Ethiopia to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, and noted with appreciation that the process had already been initiated. It commended Ethiopia for the steps it had taken to advance the rights of Ethiopian nationals abroad, and for having established a national task force. It was willing to work more closely with Ethiopia in order to promote and protect the rights of migrant workers in a crisis situation.

789. Romania congratulated Ethiopia on its achievements and its willingness to cooperate further with the international community in the promotion and protection of human rights. Although there were still challenges to overcome, Romania hoped that Ethiopia would continue to address the concerns expressed during the interactive dialogue.

790. Sierra Leone appreciated the willingness of Ethiopia to consider implementing many of the recommendations made, including all of those made by Sierra Leone. It commended Ethiopia for having implemented the recommendations accepted at its first review, including those on the ratification of the optional protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Ethiopia had invested in infrastructure and in the social and economic development of its people.

791. South Africa appreciated the role that Ethiopia played within the framework of the Human Rights Council, including by serving in the capacity of coordinator for the African Group. The quality of life of Ethiopians continued to improve, and progress had been made towards the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. It was encouraged by the large number of recommendations that Ethiopia had accepted, including those made by South Africa.

792. Sri Lanka was pleased to note that the recommendations it had made were among those that had been accepted by Ethiopia, which had made considerable progress in addressing poverty and was on track to achieve the relevant Millennium Development Goals. It commended Ethiopia for its efforts to ensure food security, education and health-care facilities. It noted with appreciation that Ethiopia had introduced strategies to promote gender equality in all sectors.

793. The Sudan congratulated Ethiopia on the efforts it had made. It appreciated the role played by Ethiopia and its cooperation with the universal periodic review mechanism. It also emphasized the efforts made by Ethiopia to eradicate poverty and to promote women's rights. It was pleased that Ethiopia had accepted the recommendations that it had made.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

794. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Ethiopia, eight other stakeholders made statements.

795. Article 19 — International Centre against Censorship stated that the Anti-Terrorism Proclamation had been used to prosecute 22 journalists and bloggers. The Proclamation defined “terrorism” so broadly that it encompassed any exercise of legitimate dissent that the Government wished to crush. The “Zone 9” bloggers, together with three journalists, were the most recent victims. Guaranteeing the freedom of expression required substantial reforms to the Criminal Code and to the Freedom of the Mass Media and Access to Information Proclamation. There was no independence or pluralism of the media. The Ethiopia Broadcasting Authority had been appointed by and was financially dependent on the Government. The law required printed media to be licensed, and blocking websites was routine. Article 19 was profoundly disappointed by the State's rejection of the recommendation by Mexico on eliminating all obstacles to the development of non-governmental organizations. Ethiopia was a State Member of the Human Rights Council, and its rejection of a recommendation on issuing a standing invitation to all special procedures of the Council should be condemned and seen as emblematic of the State's disdain for accountability for human rights violations.

796. The East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project stated that Ethiopia had accepted the recommendation made by Australia on implementing fully its own Constitution, which included the freedom of association, expression and assembly for non-governmental organizations; however, just the previous day, a group of United Nations human rights experts had urged Ethiopia to stop misusing anti-terrorism legislation to curb the freedoms of expression and association. Since April, nine journalists, including six members of the “Zone 9” blogging collective, had been jailed on untenable charges that referred to collaboration with international human rights groups. Ethiopia had rejected the recommendation made by Mexico on eliminating obstacles to the development of non-governmental organizations and the recommendation made by Spain on issuing a permanent invitation to the special procedures, and had also failed to respond to an

individual request from the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association. The Human Rights Council was under a moral obligation to exert pressure on Ethiopia to change course. It was incumbent upon the Council and all its States Members to plan to take urgent action at its forthcoming twenty-ninth session.

797. Amnesty International was deeply concerned that Ethiopia had rejected more than 20 key recommendations on the freedom of expression and association, particularly the recommendations on amending the Anti-Terrorism Proclamation and removing restrictions on funding for non-governmental organizations. Journalists and bloggers who had been arrested just days before the universal periodic review of Ethiopia had since been charged with terrorism offences. Four opposition party members had been arrested in July on charges of terrorism, and in August the publishers of six magazines and newspapers had been reported to be facing similar charges. While welcoming the statement made by Ethiopia on its “zero tolerance” for torture, Amnesty International was concerned by its rejection of recommendations on the investigation and prosecution of all alleged cases of torture and on the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. It continued to receive frequent reports of the use of torture on, and other ill-treatment of, perceived dissenters, political opposition and suspected supporters of armed insurgent groups, including in the Oromia region. It urged Ethiopia to demonstrate its commitment to strengthening cooperation with the special procedures by inviting the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment to visit the State. The refusal by Ethiopia to ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance was also deeply concerning.

798. United Nations Watch was disturbed to learn that Ethiopia had rejected many important recommendations. There had been numerous reports of journalists having been falsely charged with terrorism offences, and many legislative and financial restrictions on the activities of non-governmental organizations had been put in place. It was also concerned by the fact that Ethiopia had rejected recommendations on decriminalizing homosexuality, which was punishable by up to 15 years of imprisonment. The State had a responsibility to end all restrictions on an individual’s sexual orientation and gender identity. Ethiopia had rejected recommendations relating to torture, which contradicted its declarations about having zero tolerance for torture. There had been allegations that political detainees had been subjected to torture at detention centres in Addis Ababa. If the Government was serious in its commitment to end torture, its proclamations should be matched with concrete measures. Since Ethiopia had rejected the most meaningful recommendation, there was no alternative but for the Human Rights Council to establish a special procedure to monitor the alarming situation of human rights in the country.

799. Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale (OCAPROCE Internationale) congratulated Ethiopia on its constructive participation in the universal periodic review and its ratification of the optional protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict and on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography. It also welcomed the initiatives taken by Ethiopia to emancipate women and to eradicate harmful practices and discrimination against women and violence against children. It encouraged Ethiopia to establish programmes to combat violence against women and to continue its efforts to protect the rights of unaccompanied minors, separated children and refugees. It was, however, seriously concerned by the prevalence of female genital mutilation, early marriage, domestic violence and sexual and physical violence against women. Very few women sought assistance outside the family because they feared the consequences of doing so. It urged Ethiopia to look into that matter and to create more shelters for women victims of violence.

800. CIVICUS — World Alliance for Citizen Participation was deeply concerned that the recent unprecedented clampdown by Ethiopia on all forms of dissent would severely undermine the prospect of the holding of free and fair elections, scheduled for 2015. While relying on international funding to supplement 50 to 60 per cent of its national budget, Ethiopia had criminalized most foreign funding for human rights groups, thereby precipitating the near complete cessation of independent human rights monitoring in the

country. It was deeply alarming that Ethiopia had explicitly refused to implement the universal periodic review recommendations made by nearly 15 States to create an enabling environment for civil society. Moreover, with nearly 20 journalists and bloggers in prison and hundreds of others in exile, Ethiopia maintained one of the most debilitating environments for the freedom of expression. The terrorism charges levelled against seven members of the “Zone 9” bloggers and three journalists in July 2014 made a mockery of the commitments of Ethiopia under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. In addition, in a joint statement issued the day before, six special procedure mandate holders had called upon Ethiopia to stop misusing anti-terrorism legislation. It was essential that the Human Rights Council take concerted action to address the rapidly deteriorating situation in the country at its twenty-eighth session.

801. Human Rights Watch welcomed the commitment of Ethiopia to rights-based development, its efforts to increase respect for the rights of women, children, persons with disabilities and migrant workers, and its long-standing support for refugees. However, the number of journalists, activists and opposition members arbitrarily detained on spurious terrorism charges continued to rise, and the number of independent media had declined, as media workers fled the threat of arbitrary detention. Regrettably, Ethiopia had rejected recommendations on amending the Charities and Societies Proclamation and the Anti-Terrorism Proclamation, which six special procedure mandate holders had also pointed out the day before. The revision of that legislation was urgently needed in order for the independent media and non-governmental organizations to operate in a meaningful way in advance of the 2015 elections. Ethiopia should consider inviting the special procedures and ratifying the Rome Statute, the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and other important treaties. As a State Member of the Human Rights Council, Ethiopia was expected to uphold the highest standards in the promotion and protection of human rights.

802. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l’homme welcomed the achievement of the socioeconomic goals that had led to improvements in infrastructure in the areas of education, health, housing and technology. It was satisfied to note that the efforts made by Ethiopia had ensured that women’s rights were genuinely respected. It congratulated Ethiopia on the welcome it had extended to refugees. Nevertheless, it deplored the deterioration in the freedom of expression and of the press. It was vital that the authorities create the conditions necessary to end the monopoly and control of the press. It therefore called upon Ethiopia to respect the rights to freedom of expression and of association, which were vital for reinvigorating social and political dialogue for the emergence of genuine democracy. It strongly encouraged Ethiopia to bring its anti-terrorism strategies into line with international standards. It also called for the immediate and unconditional release of all journalists unjustly detained. It encouraged Ethiopia to intensify efforts to eradicate female genital mutilation once and for all.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

803. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 252 recommendations received, Ethiopia had supported 188 recommendations and noted the rest.

804. The delegation of Ethiopia was grateful to all States and non-governmental organizations for their continued support and engagement. Ethiopia valued their comments and criticisms, although some of the language used by the non-governmental organizations had been deplorable. Engagement should be based on factual assessments and the proper use of terminology. Ethiopia was committed to further strengthening the freedom of peaceful assembly in accordance with its Constitution and its obligations. The Constitution guaranteed the right to demonstrate together with others, peacefully and unarmed. The restrictions had been made in the interest of the public, were in line with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and should not be construed as narrowing space.

805. The allegations made in relation to the Charities and Societies Proclamation, the Anti-Terrorism Proclamation, the Mass Media and Access to Information Proclamation and the government measures against the opposition were unfounded. Ethiopia was firmly

committed to further strengthening the freedoms of expression and peaceful assembly and to zero tolerance of the use of torture.

806. Ethiopia had registered a high level of growth in the previous 10 years owing to its development-centred national policies, the participation of the people and the engagement of civil society. It attached great importance to seeking a political culture of change of power based on the holding of regular, free, fair and transparent elections conducted by a competent, independent and impartial electoral board. The right of Ethiopians to exercise self-determination without any discrimination through their representatives, elected in direct and free elections, was constitutionally guaranteed. National elections would be held in 2015. The State had an electoral law and an institutional system that would comply with international standards. The electoral systems allowed political parties with different views to participate in elections and to introduce their objectives to the electorate in a peaceful and legal manner, which allowed Ethiopians to elect their representatives on the basis of informed decisions.

807. In conclusion, the Government of Ethiopia was firmly committed to increasing and consolidating the rule of law, peace, security and development in the country.

Qatar

808. The review of Qatar was held on 7 May 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Qatar in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/QAT/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/QAT/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/QAT/3).

809. At its 27th meeting, on 19 September 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Qatar (see sect. C below).

810. The outcome of the review of Qatar comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/27/15), 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/27/15/Add.1).

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

811. The head of the delegation stated that expressed the appreciation of Qatar to the secretariat and the Working Group for their cooperation, professionalism and contribution to the preparation of the State's second report. The universal periodic review mechanism provided a valuable opportunity to help States to strengthen the implementation of their obligations under international human rights law. The delegation emphasized the fruitful interaction between States during the review process, which had also contributed to strengthening cooperation among stakeholders, taking advantage of the expertise and experiences of other States. The process helped to create the platform necessary to achieve the objectives of the Human Rights Council.

812. Qatar was always keen to participate actively in the universal periodic review, as it believed in the importance of cooperating with international and regional mechanisms to promote and protect human rights and to support the advancement of human rights protection nationally and internationally. The efforts made by Qatar to protect human rights stemmed from its Constitution, in which that cause was considered a strategic choice. It also constituted the backbone of the State's comprehensive policy of constitutional, economic, social and cultural reform. That interest had been reflected in the development

and strengthening of human rights infrastructure at the legislative, institutional and awareness-raising levels, and emphasized in the comprehensive vision of development (Qatar National Vision 2030) and in the Qatar national development strategy for the period 2011–2016.

813. The issue of human rights was also reflected in the State's foreign policy and had led to the prompt provision of humanitarian assistance to people affected by disasters globally. Within the framework of the Qatar Development Fund, human rights were one of the most important pillars of the State's international assistance initiatives and of its development programmes in various areas. Qatar also played a role in mediation efforts to resolve many conflicts, based on the belief that peace and stability were a basic foundation for the enjoyment of human rights.

814. The efforts made by Qatar in recent years and its human rights achievements had been boosted by its determination to overcome all difficulties, to build capacities and to benefit from international experience and expertise. In that regard, it relied heavily on cooperation and dialogue with various Human Rights Council mechanisms. In fact, Qatar would be submitting its candidature for re-election to the Human Rights Council for the period 2015–2017.

815. The delegation referred to the useful experience that had led to an active dialogue on human rights during the preparation of the national report for its review, both with governmental bodies and civil society. It had also raised awareness about the promotion and protection of human rights and had led to an effective dialogue between governmental bodies and other stakeholders.

816. Qatar had received with great interest all the recommendations and observations made during the interactive dialogue in May 2014 and reviewed them carefully. At the time, it had accepted many of those recommendations, and taken note of 84 recommendations for further analysis and consultation with the authorities concerned. Since then, Qatar had classified the recommendations and consulted extensively with various governmental bodies and stakeholders.

817. Consequently, it had been determined that several of the recommendations had already been implemented or were in the process of implementation, and were consistent with the State's objectives and strategies currently at the legislative and executive stages. Regrettably, Qatar had not been able to accept some of the recommendations in full as they were either incompatible with the provisions of Islamic law, and with the Constitution and laws or, in other cases, because they touched upon issues concerning national identity.

818. Some recommendations called for the State's immediate accession to several international conventions, and Qatar had the political will to accede to many of them. However, some temporary difficulties currently prevented the State from doing so. Needless to say, national legislative bodies were under pressure following accession within a short period of time in recent years to many international and regional conventions; there were shortages in technical capacities and human resources, which were still being developed. Nevertheless, Qatar was considering acceding to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. To overcome some of those temporary obstacles, it would continue its efforts to strengthen its capacities through technical cooperation with human rights mechanisms and to take advantage of the activities and programmes of the United Nations Human Rights Training and Documentation Centre for South-West Asia and the Arab Region in Doha.

819. Qatar intended to implement extensive reforms in response to a number of recommendations on the promotion and protection of the rights of expatriate workers. It was considering a new draft law based on employment contracts instead of the Kafala sponsorship system. The new draft law would also abolish the current exit permit system and increase the sanctions imposed on employers who confiscated passports.

820. Qatar reiterated its standing invitation to special procedure mandate holders as part of its determination to improve the human rights situation and its constructive cooperation with human rights mechanisms.

821. Qatar believed that the process of following up on the recommendations accepted was as important as the preparation of its report and its review by the Working Group. The national committee that had prepared the national report would continue its work as the implementing mechanism.

822. Qatar welcomed the comments and statements made by States and stakeholders during the session and looked forward to working with them to achieve common goals and to contribute actively to advancing the work of the Working Group and the Human Rights Council.

823. Lastly, the head of the delegation reiterated the State's sincere thanks to all those who had participated in the review and expressed appreciation to all the States that had made recommendations.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

824. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Qatar, 15 delegations made statements.¹²

825. Uzbekistan commended Qatar for the comprehensive information and comments on the recommendations. It was satisfied with the State's serious approach and constructive participation in the review and that it had accepted the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Uzbekistan on combating trafficking and on taking measures to improve the education system. The effective implementation of the recommendations would help to strengthen and develop the protection of human rights in Qatar.

826. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the legislative and other measures taken by the Government to consolidate the framework of social development that drove the State forward. It welcomed in particular the measures taken to increase the life expectancy of the population.

827. Viet Nam was pleased that Qatar had accepted a large number of recommendations, including two that Viet Nam had made. It encouraged Qatar to promote social tolerance and to continue its efforts to improve the quality of life of its entire population, particularly vulnerable groups such as women, children, older persons, persons with disabilities, immigrants and expatriate workers.

828. Yemen commended Qatar for the progress it had made in the area of human rights and referred to its efforts to improve the situation of human rights. It also referred to the acceptance by Qatar of many of the recommendations and the State's activities in that regard, in addition to what it provided in development support. Those actions confirmed its commitment to and progress in the promotion and protection of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights.

829. Algeria thanked Qatar for its comprehensive presentation and explanations relating to the recommendations it had considered, and congratulated the State on its efforts and achievements in the promotion and protection of human rights. It commended Qatar for its positive cooperation with the universal periodic review and for having accepted the majority of the recommendations. It particularly appreciated the acceptance of the two recommendations made by Algeria, on the promotion and protection of the status of women and on taking measures to improve and protect expatriate workers.

830. Belarus thanked Qatar for its comments on the recommendations and welcomed the significant efforts made by the Government to implement the recommendations made at its first review. It was pleased with the readiness of Qatar to comply with its international obligations in the field of human rights and to strengthen its national potential in that area. Belarus wished Qatar success in the implementation of the recommendations.

¹² 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/27thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

831. Brunei Darussalam appreciated the cooperation of Qatar with United Nations human rights mechanisms. It was pleased to note the acceptance by the State of more than half of the recommendations, including those made by Brunei Darussalam. It commended the State for its implementation of various legal and policy frameworks and the establishment of several institutions in its efforts to improve the lives of vulnerable groups, such as women, children, older persons and persons with disabilities.

832. China thanked Qatar for its commitment to implementing the recommendations accepted at the current cycle, and congratulated it on having implemented the recommendations accepted at its first review. China was grateful that Qatar had accepted its recommendations on promoting gender equality, helping women to play a greater role in economic and social development, continuing to improve the social security system and providing support for vulnerable groups, such as older persons and persons with disabilities. China wished Qatar every success in implementing Qatar National Vision 2030 and the national development strategy for the period 2011–2016, and in the promotion of human rights.

833. Côte d'Ivoire thanked Qatar for the additional information provided at the meeting, for the attention paid to the recommendations during the course of the present review and for its acceptance of a number of recommendations, including those made by Côte d'Ivoire. It referred to the efforts made by Qatar to ensure equality and the enjoyment of human rights, and encouraged Qatar to continue its efforts to ensure gender equality. It wished Qatar success in implementing the recommendations.

834. Cuba commended Qatar for its work on the economic and social development of its population and in improving the living conditions of children with disabilities, and for its leadership in providing States of the South with development assistance. It thanked Qatar for having accepted the recommendation made by Cuba on continuing to implement the objectives of the Qatar National Vision 2030 programme.

835. Djibouti once again encouraged Qatar to continue its efforts to protect and promote human rights. It was pleased to note the recent creation of a foundation for the promotion and protection of the rights of children. The achievements made by Qatar in terms of social and economic rights should be welcomed.

836. The Islamic Republic of Iran welcomed the decision made by Qatar to support its recommendations, to continue efforts in the field of legislative and institutional developments, and to continue its work to promote and protect the rights of women and children.

837. Kuwait referred to the efforts made by Qatar to promote and protect human rights. Those efforts should be praised, as they were reflected in the various human rights initiatives described in the State's second national report. It referred to the political will and the supportive environment to promote and protect human rights, and the methodology used in the follow-up measures for the recommendations since its review in April 2014. By having immediately accepted 84 recommendations, followed by another 52, Qatar had demonstrated its will to achieve the objectives of the Human Rights Council. Kuwait appreciated the acceptance of its two recommendations, on cooperating with OHCHR and on continuing its humanitarian and developmental role.

838. Jordan had paid close attention to the observations made by Qatar regarding the recommendations, and noted that it had accepted the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Jordan, which reflected the strong commitment of Qatar to the promotion and protection of all human rights. It commended the State for its efforts in strengthening economic, social and cultural rights, particularly the rights of women and children.

839. Lebanon commended Qatar for its efforts to conclude its second review. It had carefully read the addendum presented and was pleased that Qatar had accepted the majority of the recommendations, particularly those made by Lebanon on continuing its efforts to amend national laws to ensure they conformed with the recommendations made by the treaty bodies, and on taking action to empower women and to combat female stereotypes.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

840. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Qatar, 11 other stakeholders made statements.¹²

841. The National Human Rights Committee of Qatar welcomed all of the recommendations relating to its area of work, including those urging Qatar to continue its efforts to improve national mechanisms for the protection and promotion of human rights, to raise awareness and to improve training for public service and law enforcement officers, and those relating to legislation and human rights institutional development. It referred to the 28 recommendations on women's rights, adding that it had also made recommendations on strengthening women's rights, which they aspired to achieve before 2017, particularly those on granting the nationality of the mother to her children. It acknowledged the obstacles to the protection of workers' rights despite the efforts of the State, and aspired to abolish the sponsorship system. It thanked the Government for its cooperation with international human rights mechanisms, particularly for issuing a standing invitation to special procedure mandate holders.

842. The Indian Council of South America agreed with the report of the Working Group, in which it referred to the medium-term perspective adopted by Qatar, including through the Qatar National Vision 2030 programme. It also encouraged Qatar to debate and to reform the Kafala system, in view of the projects relating to the FIFA World Cup. It was necessary to continue to work to eliminate discrimination against women and girls in accordance with the obligations under the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, and it would be productive for the State to accede to the human rights treaties listed by the Working Group in its report. Qatar should also actively support the right to self-determination in the work of both the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly. It agreed with the States that had called upon Qatar to declare a moratorium on the death penalty.

843. The International Humanist and Ethical Union remained concerned about the restrictions on the freedom of religion and belief in Qatar, despite the amendment to the Constitution. It supported the appeal by France for greater religious freedom; as an example of the restrictions on the freedom of expression, it referred to the case of Mohammed al-Ajami, who had been imprisoned for 15 years for publishing a poem. It pointed out that the death penalty had still not been abolished, and it was concerned about the general conditions for women, as the law deepened discrimination against women; for example, the law did not consider marital rape to be a crime. It called upon Qatar to accept the recommendations made on those subjects, to ratify the Covenant, and to establish a mechanism relating to reparations for its citizens and to reforming the Criminal Code.

844. The Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies was dismayed by the refusal of Qatar to accept recommendations calling for the respect of freedom of expression, assembly and association. It referred to reports submitted by stakeholders for the universal periodic review in which the authoritarian control in Qatar, with repressive laws enforced by a judiciary that lacked independence, had been highlighted. Any criticism of the ruling family by, for example, journalists, poets or human rights defenders, was met with severe punishment. The cybercrime law imposed heavy fines and long prison sentences on those who published "false" news through any means. It believed that the State's unwillingness to begin a process to address grave human rights violations or to increase its commitment to international human rights norms should be addressed by the Human Rights Council and its special procedures and States Members. It recommended that Qatar acknowledge and address those issues.

845. Amnesty International was concerned that foreign migrant workers continued to be exploited and abused by their employers. In addition, domestic workers had no legal protection of labour rights. There existed an extremely unequal power relationship between employers and workers through the sponsorship system. It urged Qatar to abolish the exit permit requirement. It was concerned that women continued to face barriers to exercising their human rights in law, in policy and in practice. It welcomed the acceptance by Qatar of recommendations on criminalizing violence against women and those relating to violence against domestic workers, but was concerned that there was no law criminalizing domestic

violence or any acknowledgement of the problem of violence against domestic workers in the home. It was also concerned that the freedom of expression remained strictly controlled and that individuals faced lengthy prison sentences solely for peacefully exercising that right. It called for the immediate and unconditional release of Mohammad al-Ajami. It urged Qatar to amend the newly enacted cybercrime law as it could further restrict the freedom of expression.

846. The International Association of Schools of Social Work supported the recommendation on strengthening women's capacities, empowering women to participate in political and economic life, and ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. It also supported the recommendation on the prohibition of advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constituted incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence in the national legislation regulating the media and religious institutions, and on ensuring the implementation of the Rabat Plan of Action. It recommended that Qatar accede to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, endorse the guiding principles to eradicate extreme poverty, and host an international dialogue on the death penalty and invoke a *de jure* moratorium with a view to abolishing it.

847. United Nations Watch asked whether the cause of human rights supported or objected to the adoption of the report on Qatar. It quoted the comments made by other States, and pointed out that no fewer than 78 out of the 84 statements in the report had praised the human rights record of Qatar, which amounted to over 90 per cent of all States. For United Nations Watch, the truth was the opposite. The 1.4 million migrant workers in Qatar objected to the report because they were dying at a rate of one person per day owing to the inhuman conditions they faced while building the infrastructure for the 2022 World Cup in Qatar. Women, journalists, aid workers, Israelis and Palestinians also objected to the report. For all of those reasons, it wished to be clear: the victims of human rights abuses around the world objected to the adoption of the report.

848. The Organization for Defending Victims of Violence highlighted two problems in the way Qatar was increasing its power and influence in the region: the conditions of migrant workers, and its approach to terrorist groups. It was concerned about the living conditions of workers and the Kafala sponsorship system, in addition to the lack of freedom of association, the lack of the right to form unions, the confiscation of passports, and harmful working and housing conditions. It called for the tracking of the financial backing of terrorist groups, as Western States could do so and knew where the financial backing came from and how it was done. It called upon Qatar to create a reliable mechanism to stop any form of backing of terrorist groups, particularly those in Iraq, whether the support came from private citizens or institutions or any other source.

849. A joint statement was made by the Victorious Youths Movement and Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la Région des Grands Lacs, in which they welcomed the adoption of the Qatar National Vision 2030 programme, the strengthening of the fight against all forms of discrimination against women and the promotion of the rights of migrant workers. They noted with satisfaction the changes made to incorporate the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment into the Penal Code, the adoption of a law against trafficking, the creation of a national commission on health and labour security, and legislation to protect migrant workers. They recommended that the Human Rights Council continue its technical cooperation and called upon Qatar to continue to fulfil its commitments in all areas of human rights.

850. Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale (OCAPROCE Internationale) encouraged Qatar to continue its efforts to ensure the education of women and children, and in particular to ensure greater independence for women and the rights of children. It welcomed the progress that Qatar had made in promoting gender equality and the liberation of women, although much remained to be done. It was deeply concerned by the high rate, at 28 per cent, of women who were victims of domestic violence, and asked Qatar to establish legal systems to ensure the protection of victims. It encouraged Qatar to ratify the International Covenant on

Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and to realize relevant rights for women and children.

851. Africa culture internationale stated that the promotion and protection of human rights by Qatar was a strategic choice underpinning the general development policy embodied in Qatar National Vision 2030, which provided for constitutional, economic, social and cultural reform. That programme was focused on important areas of human rights, such as education, health, the environment, workers' rights, and the empowerment of women and children. It noted with satisfaction the national development strategy for the period 2011–2016 and commended Qatar for having developed the rule of law within a short period of time, with institutions to protect the rights and ensure the dignity of all. It acknowledged the efficiency of the Government in dealing with all problems and in its human development for the promotion of democracy. It appreciated the development assistance that Qatar provided for developing States throughout the world.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

852. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 183 recommendations received, Qatar had supported 145 recommendations and noted the remainder.

853. In conclusion, Qatar thanked all States Members and stakeholders for their statements and comments on the report, and assured them that all of their comments and observations would be taken into consideration. It renewed its commitment to strengthening its cooperation with United Nations human rights mechanisms and to continuing to support the Human Rights Council fully in working towards its objectives.

854. Lastly, the delegation thanked all States, the Human Rights Council and its President, and the secretariat for their efforts.

Nicaragua

855. The review of Nicaragua was held on 7 May 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Nicaragua in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/NIC/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/NIC/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/19/NIC/3).

856. At its 27th meeting, on 19 September 2014, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Nicaragua (see sect. C below).

857. The outcome of the review of Nicaragua comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/27/16), 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/27/16/Add.1).

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

858. The delegation presented the Government's position on outstanding recommendations (A/HRC/27/16, para. 116) and on some recommendations that it did not support (para. 117). More detailed information on the position of the Government on those recommendations was available in the addendum to the report of the Working Group.

859. Nicaragua noted recommendations 116.1 to 116.8, 116.10 and 116.11, on the ratification of new international instruments, and 116.12, on making efforts to align its

legislation with the obligations emanating from the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. As a sovereign State, Nicaragua did not believe that it was the right time to take on new international commitments, which would result in additional administrative and budgetary burdens for the State. However, it had an extensive legislative framework ensuring the full protection and enjoyment of human rights of all its citizens. Those comments were applicable also to recommendations 117.1 to 117.11.

860. Recommendations 116.9, 116.15 and 116.16 did not enjoy the support of the Government. It did not consider it necessary to employ the definition of torture given in the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment because the national definition of torture had a broader scope, which should be considered a good practice. In January 2012, the Office of the Human Rights Advocate (*Procuraduría para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos*) had been appointed the national preventive mechanism against torture, and the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment had visited Nicaragua in May 2014.

861. The Government accepted recommendations 116.13 and 116.26 on policies to reduce discrimination and to ensure the participation of indigenous and Afrodescendent communities in the decisions relating to their territories. The national human development plan for the period 2012–2016 included a strategy for the development of the Caribbean coast and established an autonomous institutional structure to work on human development in the region.

862. Nicaragua accepted recommendation 116.14 on the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons, as it was in line with the action the Government was taking in that area. For instance, article 204 of the Penal Code, which criminalized homosexuality, had been repealed in 2008. The role of the human right advocate had been established and training workshops on sexual rights and sexual diversity were organized regularly for members of the police academy.

863. The Government supported recommendations 116.17 to 116.19 because in Nicaragua the judiciary was independent. Since 2007, Nicaragua had strengthened its institutional and regulatory framework to ensure the independence of the justice system. In addition, the national council of administration and judicial career was strengthening the system for the selection and appointment of magistrates, judges and public defenders.

864. Nicaragua accepted recommendations 116.20 and 116.21 because the freedom of expression, association, organization and information, and the right to peaceful protest and the plurality of the media were guaranteed in Nicaragua.

865. Nicaragua did not accept recommendation 116.23 in view of the institutional structure that already existed for that purpose. In Nicaragua, there was no persecution or censorship. There were more than 300 radio stations, 20 television stations, 20 printed newspapers, weekly publications and magazines with national coverage.

866. Furthermore, the Penal Code provided for the crime against the freedom of expression and information.

867. Nicaragua noted recommendation 116.22 on the decriminalization of defamation because its national legislation did not criminalize defamation. That was also applicable to recommendation 117.18.

868. Nicaragua accepted recommendation 116.25. The right to education was a priority for the Government; however, a long process was necessary to guarantee that right fully. The Government could not commit to meeting that goal fully and to making a complete transformation immediately. However, it was determined to ensure the rights of persons with disabilities.

869. Recommendation 117.12 did not enjoy the support of the Government because Nicaragua investigated all credible allegations of human rights violations that may have been committed by security forces.

870. Nicaragua did not accept recommendation 117.13 because measures were already being taken and legislation was already in place to protect the rights of such persons. The

Government was aware, however, that its biggest challenge in that area was prison overcrowding. Despite the scarcity of resources, funds had been allocated to expand or to improve infrastructure or to build new prisons.

871. Nicaragua did not support recommendations 117.14 to 117.17; the delegation pointed out that amending law No. 779 and combating violence against women were important issues for the Government. Since 2007, it had promoted the restoration of women's rights as part of its policy against violence through the national human development plan, using the model of shared responsibility. Nicaragua was one of the most advanced States with regard to the participation and empowerment of women, as stated in *The Global Gender Gap Report 2013* of the World Economic Forum, which placed Nicaragua tenth worldwide in terms of gender equality. In the Americas, there was an average of 22.6 per cent of women parliamentarians, while in Nicaragua that proportion had reached 40.2 per cent. In addition, half of the ministers in the country were women.

872. The reform of law No. 779 established mediation only for less serious crimes and was based on the principle of procedural opportunity. Mediation was subject to requirements and conditions, in particular the free will of the victim as verified by the judge. After mediation, the authorities had to ensure the protection of the victim until behavioural changes in the person accused and the absence of risk had been verified.

873. Nicaragua did not accept recommendation 116.24, nor did it accept recommendations 117.19 to 117.31 on reforming the law on abortion. Accepting those recommendations would be contrary to the sovereign will of the people of Nicaragua, who were in favour of the criminalization of abortion, as expressed through a democratic process. The people of Nicaragua considered the right to life of the unborn, that abortion was not a method of birth control and that abortion affected the health of women. The law required that all women undergoing an abortion receive medical assistance, and even more so when the mother's life was in danger.

874. In conclusion, the delegation reiterated the gratitude of the Government to all the States that had participated in the second review of Nicaragua in a constructive spirit and had provided recommendations, showing their interest in the protection of the human rights of the people of Nicaragua.

2. Views expressed by Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council on the review outcome

875. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Nicaragua, 13 delegations made statements.¹²

876. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela referred to the importance the Government of Nicaragua had placed on implementing the recommendations it had accepted. The review showed the efforts and achievements of the Government in guaranteeing the enjoyment of the human rights of its people. Nicaragua had met the goals of the World Food Summit well in advance. The actions of participatory and direct democracy had led to significant progress in reducing poverty and extreme poverty.

877. Viet Nam greatly appreciated the efforts of Nicaragua to promote and protect human rights, despite the numerous difficulties with which it was confronted. It also noted with satisfaction that Nicaragua had agreed to many of the recommendations it had received, including two made by Viet Nam.

878. Algeria referred to the acceptance by Nicaragua of the majority of the recommendations, in particular the three recommendations it had made on improving the quality of education and of health services, allocating additional resources to policies on children, and combating all forms of violence against women and children, which included the strengthening of the legal framework for that purpose.

879. Angola was pleased to see the improvement in the State's cooperation with the mechanisms for the protection and promotion of human rights, namely through the ratification of the main human rights instruments, in particular the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with

Disabilities. It was also pleased that Nicaragua had accepted many of the recommendations it had received, particularly those made by Angola on fighting discrimination against women.

880. Belarus referred to the State's ratification of numerous international legal instruments and its targeted efforts to reduce poverty and social inequality. Those efforts had made it possible for Nicaragua to implement the first Millennium Development Goal ahead of schedule and to move closer to implementing the others. Investments in education and the social sphere showed the Government's determination to increase the development of human rights further.

881. The Plurinational State of Bolivia commended Nicaragua, a member of the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America — Peoples' Trade Treaty, for its achievements in the field of human rights. It stressed that the second review had shown the efforts made and the progress achieved by Nicaragua, particularly in the areas of education, health, access to water and sanitation, and poverty reduction. The acceptance by Nicaragua of the recommendations was another example of the Government's commitment to the achievement of the human rights of its people.

882. China welcomed the acceptance by Nicaragua of most of the recommendations made during the review. It appreciated the efforts made by the Government in its economic recovery and in the protection and promotion of social, cultural, civil and political rights. China was grateful that Nicaragua had accepted the recommendations it had made on poverty reduction and on education. It acknowledged that the State faced many challenges in eliminating poverty, narrowing the wealth gap and strengthening the capacity of public services. It called upon the international community to continue to provide Nicaragua with constructive assistance.

883. Cuba highlighted the commitment of Nicaragua to the universal periodic review and to the promotion and protection of human rights, which was reflected in the large number of recommendations it had accepted. The State's achievements in promoting and protecting the human rights of the Nicaraguan people had been remarkable. It referred to the sustained economic growth, poverty reduction, increased quality of employment, reduction of social inequality, and improvements in the quality of life and the protection of the rights of women and children.

884. Ecuador recognized the efforts made by Nicaragua to participate in the universal periodic review, which was a mechanism that was helpful in effectively promoting and protecting human rights. It welcomed the acceptance by Nicaragua of many recommendations and pointed out that the Government had demonstrated its efforts, achievements and challenges in strengthening women's rights. It congratulated Nicaragua on its commitment to human rights education, particularly of its national police force.

885. The Islamic Republic of Iran commended Nicaragua for its commitment to the promotion of human rights, and particularly its efforts in the areas of economic growth, poverty reduction, increasing quality employment and improving the quality of life of all Nicaraguans. It welcomed the decision by Nicaragua to support the recommendations on continuing its efforts to eradicate extreme poverty, strengthening the right to health and increasing the national budget for education.

886. Malaysia noted positively the continuous efforts made by Nicaragua to promote and protect human rights, particularly in the areas of poverty eradication, economic growth and education, and encouraged Nicaragua to continue those efforts. Malaysia had made recommendations on improving the quality of education and increasing the coverage of secondary and technical education, and on building the capacities of the health and social services sectors. It was pleased to note that Nicaragua had accepted its recommendations.

887. Morocco welcomed the political will of the authorities of Nicaragua to strengthen democracy and the rule of law, to promote economic growth and to fight poverty. It noted the exemplary cooperation of Nicaragua during the review process, which showed its determination to promote human rights, democracy and the rule of law. Morocco supported the efforts that Nicaragua had made to consolidate the situation of human rights in the country.

888. The Russian Federation stated that Nicaragua had accepted most of the recommendations it had received, including those made by the Russian Federation. Nicaragua had achieved significant progress in the field of human rights, particularly in fighting extreme poverty, malnutrition and illiteracy, in ensuring access to drinking water, health services and education, and in protecting the rights of various population groups. It noted with satisfaction that the existing programmes were designed to ensure social protection for vulnerable segments of the population and targeted the State's efforts to ensure personal security, a low crime rate and a favourable climate for free enterprise.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

889. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Nicaragua, seven other stakeholders made statements.

890. Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco and the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development — VIDES welcomed the State's acceptance of the recommendations in favour of the most vulnerable children, but pointed out that children living on the streets, children of migrant parents, indigenous children and children with disabilities suffered from poverty, discrimination, malnutrition and a lack of health services. In addition, access to quality education was poor, especially in rural areas, despite the increase in school attendance rates. Educational disadvantages drastically reduced employment opportunities for young people. They regretted that Nicaragua had not accepted the recommendations on repealing the amendments that weakened law No. 779 on combating violence against women. They recommended that Nicaragua, inter alia, further its efforts to fight poverty and malnutrition and to protect women exposed to physical and sexual violence by reviewing law No. 779.

891. The World Organization against Torture and the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues stated that the institutions that should be a counterweight to the exercise of power failed to fulfil their role because of the undue interference of the president with Congress, the judiciary, electoral processes, the police and the army. It regretted that the constitutional reform approved in January 2014 had established unlimited presidential terms. There was a hostile environment towards the freedom of expression and the work of human rights defenders, which was encouraged by media linked to the presidential family and by statements from senior government officials. The law on violence against women had been weakened by a recent reform and an unconstitutional regulation that altered its spirit and text. Other forms of institutional violence against women remained, such as the criminalization of therapeutic abortion. It urged the Government to implement the recommendations through concrete actions and to comply with its international human rights commitments.

892. Save the Children International welcomed the acceptance by Nicaragua of the recommendation on revising its legislation on violence against women. It urged the Government to provide special protection for women and girls, to guarantee the effective implementation of law No. 779 and to revoke its recent regulation, which was against the spirit of the law, and to reform the Penal Code to guarantee the rights of girls and adolescents who were victims of rape to receive protection and legal and medical attention, including access to therapeutic abortion. It was concerned that Nicaragua did not take a clear position regarding the recommendations on the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure and on ensuring investigations into all allegations of rape, torture or other ill-treatment by law enforcement officials. It considered the signing and ratification of the above-mentioned Optional Protocol to be a priority for Nicaragua, so children could have a reporting alternative at the international level.

893. Franciscans International stated that Nicaragua still had one of the highest rates of unregistered births in the region. There were significant disparities in terms of registration in poor and rural areas and among indigenous and Afrodescendent populations. That issue had not been addressed during the first review of Nicaragua, so the fact that five recommendations on birth registration had been made and accepted was a welcome development. In order to implement those recommendations, Nicaragua should establish a new framework for civil registration in compliance with international standards with regard

to the rights to identity and to freedom from discrimination. It encouraged all stakeholders to remain committed to highlighting and prioritizing the issue of birth registration.

894. Action Canada for Population and Development welcomed the State's acceptance of recommendations on eliminating discrimination against women, improving women's access to education and ensuring women's right to health. It was concerned, however, that Nicaragua had not accepted recommendations made by 13 States on the decriminalization of abortion. Abortion was illegal under all circumstances, even in cases in which the lives of women were in danger, and the rejection of those recommendations perpetuated violence against women and violated their rights to life and health. It therefore requested the Government to review its position on that issue and to implement the relevant recommendations of the treaty bodies and the Human Rights Council.

895. United Nations Watch was deeply concerned with the human rights situation in Nicaragua and referred to the great concern voiced by many stakeholders regarding the widespread violations of the basic human rights of women and detainees. It referred to the criminalization of abortion, the high prevalence of rape and the reversal of legal reforms addressing rampant gender-based violence, such as the regressive amendments to law No. 779. It urged Nicaragua to remain steadfast in protecting those vulnerable to violence. It was alarmed that Nicaragua had rejected recommendations on credible allegations of excessive use of force by the police and the arbitrary abuse of detainees. It urged Nicaragua to conduct immediate investigations into those abuses and to hold perpetrators accountable in accordance with international human rights standards.

896. The Lutheran World Federation pointed out that the State had failed to comply with the ruling of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights in the *YATAMA v. Nicaragua* case, namely to take measures to allow indigenous individuals and communities to participate in elections. In addition, the indigenous peoples of the Caribbean coast continued to face intimidation by non-indigenous persons who usurped their lands and exploited their resources. The Government had announced the implementation of mega-projects such as the interoceanic canal, which mainly affected indigenous territories and had not had the prior and informed consent of the indigenous peoples concerned. As a result, the indigenous peoples of the Caribbean coast subsisted under harsh living conditions that included marginalization and exploitation. It urged the Government to halt and prevent the illegal activities of third parties in indigenous territories, to implement the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169) and to respect the collective rights of indigenous peoples.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

897. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 209 recommendations received, Nicaragua had supported 161 recommendations and noted 48.

898. The delegation of Nicaragua thanked all of the delegations that had participated in the interactive dialogue in a constructive spirit. The Government took the universal periodic review mechanism seriously and would continue to support it. Nicaragua was determined to become an increasingly fraternal State able to guarantee a decent future for all of its citizens.

B. General debate on agenda item 6

899. At its 29th meeting, on 22 September 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: Algeria, China, Cuba, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), India, Italy (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iceland, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), Maldives, Morocco, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (also on behalf of Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland,

France, Georgia, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Maldives, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, the Netherlands, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Iran (Islamic Republic of), Republic of Moldova, Tunisia;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Human Rights Law Centre, International Catholic Child Bureau, International Service for Human Rights, Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, Korea Center for United Nations Human Rights Policy, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Save the Children International, United Nations Watch, UPR Info, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Norway

900. At the 22nd meeting, on 18 September 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 27/101 without a vote.

Albania

901. At the 22nd meeting, on 18 September 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 27/102 without a vote.

Democratic Republic of the Congo

902. At the 22nd meeting, on 18 September 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 27/103 without a vote.

Côte d'Ivoire

903. At the 24th meeting, on 18 September 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 27/104 without a vote.

Portugal

904. At the 24th meeting, on 18 September 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 27/105 without a vote.

Bhutan

905. At the 24th meeting, on 18 September 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 27/106 without a vote.

Dominica

906. At the 25th meeting, on 19 September 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 27/107 without a vote.

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

907. At the 25th meeting, on 19 September 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 27/108 without a vote.

Brunei Darussalam

908. At the 25th meeting, on 19 September 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 27/109 without a vote.

Costa Rica

909. At the 26th meeting, on 19 September 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 27/110 without a vote.

Equatorial Guinea

910. At the 26th meeting, on 19 September 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 27/111 without a vote.

Ethiopia

911. At the 26th meeting, on 19 September 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 27/112 without a vote.

Qatar

912. At the 27th meeting, on 19 September 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 27/113 without a vote.

Nicaragua

913. At the 27th meeting, on 19 September 2014, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 27/114 without a vote.

VII. Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories

A. Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

914. At the 30th meeting, on 22 September 2014, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights presented the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the implementation of Human Rights Council resolution S-21/1 on ensuring respect for international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem (A/HRC/27/76).

B. General debate on agenda item 7

915. At the 30th meeting, on 22 September 2014, and the 32nd meeting, on 23 September 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, Chile, China, Cuba, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)¹³ (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Ireland, Kuwait, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Peru, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(c) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Iceland, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Oman, Qatar, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Uruguay, Yemen;

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Independent Commission for Human Rights of the State of Palestine;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action contre la faim, Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man, Amuta for NGO Responsibility, BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Defence for Children International, Human Rights Now, Human Rights Watch, Ingénieurs du monde, International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Institute for Peace, Justice and Human Rights, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Presse emblème campagne, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, World Jewish Congress.

916. At the 30th meeting, on 22 September 2014, the representatives of Qatar and the Syrian Arab Republic made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

¹³ 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

A. Annual discussion on the integration of a gender perspective

917. At its 15th meeting, on 15 September 2014, the Human Rights Council held, in accordance with Council resolution 6/30, an annual discussion on the integration of a gender perspective.

918. The Director of the Research and Right to Development Division of OHCHR made an opening statement for the panel. Christine Chinkin, professor of international human rights law at the London School of Economics and former member of the United Nations Fact-Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict, moderated the discussion for the panel.

919. At the same meeting, the panellists Bineta Diop, Moez Doraid, Gloria Maira Vargas and Ahmed Shaheed made statements.

920. The ensuing panel discussion was divided into two parts, which were held at the same meeting, on the same day. During the first part, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Austria, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Estonia, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Japan, Montenegro, Norway¹³ (also on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Sweden), United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bangladesh, Canada, Qatar;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, European Union of Public Relations, International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of Amnesty International, the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, the Center for Reproductive Rights, MADRE, Inc. and the World Organization against Torture).

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

922. 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: Algeria, Australia¹³ (also on behalf of New Zealand), Italy, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Bulgaria, Greece, Iraq, Lithuania, Netherlands, Portugal, Rwanda, Slovenia, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey;

(c) Observers for international organizations: Organization of Islamic Cooperation;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

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

B. General debate on agenda item 8

924. At its 32nd meeting, on 23 September 2014, 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, Brazil, Colombia¹³ (also on behalf of Albania, Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burkina Faso, Equatorial Guinea, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Norway, Panama, Switzerland, Timor-Leste and Uruguay), India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Liechtenstein¹³ (also on behalf of Austria, Slovenia and Switzerland), Morocco, United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Netherlands, Sudan;

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

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights;

(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, Allied Rainbow Communities International, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Amuta for NGO Responsibility, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, British Humanist Association, Center for Inquiry, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, Human Life International, Human Rights Law Centre, Indian Council of South America, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Lesbian and Gay Association (also on behalf of Article 19 — International Centre against Censorship and the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues), International Service for Human Rights, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco (also on behalf of the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development — VIDES), Liberation, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale — OCAPROCE Internationale, United Nations Watch, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization.

925. At the same meeting, the representative of Pakistan made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

National institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights

926. At the 39th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the representative of Australia introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.25, sponsored by Australia and co-sponsored by Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Subsequently, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Israel, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Ukraine and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

927. At the same meeting, the representative of Australia orally revised the draft resolution.

928. Also at the same meeting, the representative of India made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

929. At the same meeting, the representative of South Africa made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote, disassociating the State from the consensus on the draft resolution as orally revised.

930. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.25 as orally revised without a vote (resolution 27/18).

Human rights, sexual orientation and gender identity

931. At the 42nd meeting, on 26 September 2014, the representatives of Brazil, Chile, Colombia and Uruguay introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.27/Rev.1, sponsored by Brazil, Chile, Colombia and Uruguay and co-sponsored by Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Subsequently, Japan, Malta, Monaco, Nicaragua, Romania and Serbia joined the sponsors.

932. At the same meeting, the representative of Egypt introduced amendments A/HRC/27/L.45, A/HRC/27/L.46, A/HRC/27/L.47, A/HRC/27/L.48, A/HRC/27/L.49, A/HRC/27/L.50 and A/HRC/27/L.51 to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.27/Rev.1. Amendments A/HRC/27/L.45, A/HRC/27/L.46, A/HRC/27/L.49, A/HRC/27/L.50 and A/HRC/27/L.51 were sponsored by the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Malaysia, Nigeria, South Sudan, the Sudan, Uganda and the United Arab Emirates. Amendments A/HRC/27/L.47 and A/HRC/27/L.48 were sponsored by Djibouti, Egypt, Malaysia, Nigeria, South Sudan, the Sudan, Uganda and the United Arab Emirates.

933. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Italy (on behalf of the European Union), Montenegro and Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the States members of the Gulf Cooperation Council) made general comments on the draft resolution and the amendments.

934. 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.

935. At the same meeting, the representative of Germany made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/27/L.45.

936. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representatives of Brazil and Chile, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/27/L.45. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Burkina Faso, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Gabon, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Morocco, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Botswana, India, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Viet Nam

937. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/27/L.45 by 16 votes to 21, with 7 abstentions.¹⁴

¹⁴ Three delegations did not cast a vote.

938. At the same meeting, the representatives of Montenegro and Romania made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/27/L.46.

939. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representatives of Brazil and Chile, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/27/L.46. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Burkina Faso, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Gabon, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Morocco, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Botswana, India, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Viet Nam

940. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/27/L.46 by 16 votes to 21, with 7 abstentions.¹⁴

941. At the same meeting, the representative of the Czech Republic made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/27/L.47.

942. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representatives of Brazil and Chile, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/27/L.47. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Burkina Faso, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Gabon, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Morocco, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Botswana, India, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Philippines, Sierra Leone

943. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/27/L.47 by 17 votes to 21, with 6 abstentions.¹⁴

944. At the same meeting, the representative of France made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/27/L.48.

945. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representatives of Brazil and Chile, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/27/L.48. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Burkina Faso, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Gabon, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Morocco, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Botswana, India, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Philippines, Sierra Leone

946. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/27/L.48 by 17 votes to 21, with 6 abstentions.¹⁴

947. At the same meeting, the representatives of Costa Rica and Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/27/L.49.

948. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representatives of Brazil and Chile, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/27/L.49. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Burkina Faso, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Gabon, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Morocco, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Botswana, India, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Viet Nam

949. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/27/L.49 by 16 votes to 21, with 7 abstentions.¹⁴

950. At the same meeting, the representative of Estonia made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/27/L.50.

951. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representatives of Brazil and Chile, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/27/L.50. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Burkina Faso, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Gabon, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Morocco, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Botswana, India, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Sierra Leone, Viet Nam

952. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/27/L.50 by 16 votes to 22, with 6 abstentions.¹⁴

953. At the same meeting, the representative of Austria made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/27/L.51.

954. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representatives of Brazil and Chile, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/27/L.51. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Burkina Faso, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Gabon, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Morocco, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

Against:

Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Montenegro, Peru,

Philippines, Republic of Korea, Romania, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Botswana, India, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Sierra Leone, Viet Nam

955. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/27/L.51 by 16 votes to 22, with 6 abstentions.¹⁴

956. At the same meeting, the representatives of Indonesia, Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation that are members of the Human Rights Council) and the Philippines made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on the draft resolution.

957. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation that are members of the Human Rights Council, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Montenegro, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Romania, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Algeria, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Gabon, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait, Maldives, Morocco, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

Abstaining:

Burkina Faso, China, Congo, India, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Sierra Leone

958. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.27/Rev.1 by 25 votes to 14, with 7 abstentions¹⁵ (resolution 27/32).

959. At the same meeting, the representatives of Botswana, Chile (also on behalf of Colombia), China, France, Montenegro, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

¹⁵ One delegation did not cast a vote.

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

Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent

960. At the 33rd meeting, on 23 September 2014, a member of the Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent, Verene Shepherd, presented the reports of the Working Group (A/HRC/27/68 and Add.1).

961. At the same meeting, the representative of Brazil made a statement as the State concerned.

962. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the representative of the Working Group questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, Costa Rica (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Morocco, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Barbados, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Netherlands, Panama;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme, Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit — COC Nederland (also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association), International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations.

963. At the same meeting, the member of the Working Group answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

B. General debate on agenda item 9

964. At its 33rd meeting, on 23 September 2014, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 9, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Argentina, Costa Rica, Cuba, India, Italy (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bangladesh, Barbados, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Sri Lanka;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Advocates for Human Rights, Africa culture internationale, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Center for Inquiry, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme, Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europe, Indian Council of South America, International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Educational Development, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Institute for Peace, Justice and

Human Rights, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, World Barua Organization, World Jewish Congress.

965. At the same meeting, the representative of Lithuania made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Mandate of the Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent

966. At the 40th meeting, on 26 September 2014, the representative of South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.10/Rev.1, sponsored by Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States) and co-sponsored by Cuba, Paraguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Brazil, Chile, Indonesia, Nicaragua, Peru and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

967. At the same meeting, the representatives of Italy (on behalf of the States members of the European Union) and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments on the draft resolution.

968. 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.

969. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote, disassociating the State from the consensus on the draft resolution.

970. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.10/Rev.1 without a vote (resolution 27/25).

X. Technical assistance and capacity-building

A. Interactive dialogue on cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights

971. At the 33rd meeting, on 23 September 2014, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights presented the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the situation of human rights in Ukraine (A/HRC/27/75).

972. At the same meeting, the representative of Ukraine made a statement as the State concerned.

973. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 34th meeting, on 24 September 2014, the following made statements and asked the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Austria, China, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Romania, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America (also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Denmark, Georgia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, European Union;

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Federation of Journalists, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, Minority Rights Group, United Nations Watch.

974. Also at the 34th meeting, on 24 September 2014, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

975. At the 35th meeting, on the same day, the representative of the Russian Federation made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

B. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders

Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Sudan

976. At the 34th meeting, on 24 September 2014, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Sudan, Mashood Baderin, presented his reports (A/HRC/27/69 and Add.1).

977. At the same meeting, the representative of the Sudan made a statement as the State concerned.

978. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 34th and 35th 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, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czech Republic, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), France, Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Kuwait, Montenegro, Morocco, Pakistan, United Arab Emirates (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United

Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (also on behalf of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America), United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Egypt, Eritrea, Mali, Norway, Qatar, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Togo, Yemen;

(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: Al Zubair Charity Foundation (also on behalf of the Eastern Sudan Women Development Organization), East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Society Studies Centre, United Nations Watch, Working Women Association.

979. At the 35th meeting, on the same day, the representative of the Sudan made final remarks as the State concerned.

980. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

981. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Sudan made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Cambodia

982. At the 35th meeting, on 24 September 2014, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Cambodia, Surya Prasad Subedi, presented his reports (A/HRC/27/70 and Add.1).

983. At the same meeting, the representative of Cambodia made a statement as the State concerned.

984. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, also at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, France, Ireland, Japan, Morocco, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, New Zealand, Thailand;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Article 19 — International Centre against Censorship, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network (also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association), Human Rights Now, Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace, World Organisation against Torture.

985. At the same meeting, the representative of Cambodia made final remarks as the State concerned.

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

Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Somalia

987. At the 37th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Somalia, Bahame Nyanduga, presented his report (A/HRC/27/71).

988. At the same meeting, the representative of Somalia made a statement as the State concerned.

989. 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, China, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), France, Ireland, Italy, Morocco, United Arab Emirates (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, Mozambique, Qatar, Yemen;

(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: Amnesty International, Article 19 — International Centre against Censorship, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Human Rights Watch, International Educational Development, International Federation of Journalists.

990. At the same meeting, the representative of Somalia made final remarks as the State concerned.

991. Also at the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic

992. At the 37th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic, Marie-Therese Keita Bocoum, presented an oral update on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic.

993. At the same meeting, the representative of the Central African Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

994. 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, China, Congo (also on behalf of the States members and observers of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Estonia, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), France, Ireland, Morocco, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Belgium, Chad, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mali, Spain, Togo;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Femmes Afrique Solidarité, Human Rights Watch, Servas International.

995. At the same meeting, the representative of the Central African Republic made final remarks as the State concerned.

996. Also at the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

C. Panel discussions

Panel discussion on the situation of human rights in South Sudan

997. At the 36th meeting, on 24 September 2014, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 26/31, a panel discussion on the situation of human rights in South Sudan.

998. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The Permanent Representative of Djibouti to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, Mohamed Siad Doualeh, moderated the discussion for the panel.

999. At the same meeting, the panellists Paulino Wanawilla Unango, Olusegun Obasanjo, Lawrence Korbandy and Ibrahim Wani made statements. The Permanent Representative of Ethiopia to the United Nations Office at Geneva read a statement on behalf of the Chair of the mediation team on South Sudan of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development.

1000. The panel discussion was divided into two parts. During 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: Czech Republic, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Kuwait, Montenegro, Russian Federation, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Togo, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: CIVICUS — World Alliance for Citizen Participation, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Norwegian Refugee Council.

1001. During 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: China, Cuba, Estonia, France, Italy, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Sri Lanka, Sudan;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities), Femmes Afrique Solidarité (also on behalf of the World Young Women's Christian Association).

1002. At the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

D. General debate on agenda item 10

1003. At the 38th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 25/1 and S-22/1, presented oral country updates and introduced the country reports of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Secretary-General submitted under agenda items 2 and 10 (A/HRC/27/42, A/HRC/27/43, A/HRC/27/44 and A/HRC/27/74).

1004. At the same meeting, the representatives of Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Iraq, Sri Lanka and Yemen made statements as the States concerned.

1005. 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, Costa Rica, Cuba, Egypt¹⁶ (also on behalf of Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe and the State of Palestine), France, India, Ireland, Italy (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iceland, Montenegro, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Maldives, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation (also on behalf of Algeria, Armenia, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ecuador, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Tajikistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine), Sierra Leone, Thailand¹⁶ (also on behalf of Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Myanmar, Nicaragua, the Russian Federation, the Sudan, Thailand, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam), United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Canada, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mozambique, Myanmar, Netherlands, Norway, Qatar, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Uzbekistan;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Advocates for Human Rights, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Collectif des femmes africaines du Hainaut, CIVICUS — World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, Human Rights Watch, International Buddhist Foundation, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, Liberation, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Reporters Sans Frontières International — Reporters Without Borders International, Servas International.

1006. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Sri Lanka and Thailand made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Technical assistance and capacity-building for Yemen in the field of human rights

1007. At the 39th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the representatives of the Netherlands and Yemen introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.9/Rev.1, sponsored by the Netherlands and Yemen and co-sponsored by Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritania, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Belgium, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Lithuania, Maldives, Morocco, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovenia, Switzerland and Thailand joined the sponsors.

1008. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.9/Rev.1 without a vote (resolution 27/19).

¹⁶ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Enhancement of technical cooperation and capacity-building in the field of human rights

1009. At the 39th meeting, on 25 September 2014, the representative of Thailand, also on behalf of Brazil, Honduras, Indonesia, Mauritius, Morocco, Norway, Qatar, Singapore and Turkey, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.18/Rev.1, sponsored by Brazil, Honduras, Indonesia, Mauritius, Morocco, Norway, Qatar, Singapore, Thailand and Turkey, and co-sponsored by Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Denmark, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Lebanon, Malaysia, Maldives, Montenegro, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, Sri Lanka, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Yemen. Subsequently, Chile, Cyprus, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), New Zealand, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovenia, Switzerland, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

1010. 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.

1011. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

1012. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.18/Rev.1 without a vote (resolution 27/20).

National policies and human rights

1013. At the 40th meeting, on 26 September 2014, the representatives of Ecuador and Peru introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.21, sponsored by Algeria, Ecuador, Italy, Peru, Romania and Thailand. Subsequently, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States), Georgia, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Arab Emirates (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

1014. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria and Romania made general comments on the draft resolution.

1015. 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.

1016. At the same meeting, the representative of South Africa made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote, disassociating the State from the consensus on paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

1017. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.21 without a vote (resolution 27/26).

Technical assistance and capacity-building for human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

1018. At the 40th meeting, on 26 September 2014, the representatives of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Ethiopia (on behalf of the Group of African States) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.32, sponsored by Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States. Subsequently, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, Lithuania, Maldives, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

1019. At the same meeting, the representative of Italy, on behalf of the European Union, made general comments on the draft resolution.

1020. 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 Programme Support and Management Services of OHCHR made a statement on the budgetary implications of the draft resolution.

1021. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.32 without a vote (resolution 27/27).

Technical assistance and capacity-building in the field of human rights in the Central African Republic

1022. At the 40th meeting, on 26 September 2014, the representative of Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.31, sponsored by Ethiopia on behalf of the Group of African States. Subsequently, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

1023. At the same meeting, the representatives of Italy, on behalf of the European Union, and of the Russian Federation made general comments on the draft resolution.

1024. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Central African Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

1025. 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.

1026. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.31 without a vote (resolution 27/28).

Technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in the Sudan

1027. At the 40th meeting, on 26 September 2014, the representative of Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.30/Rev.1, sponsored by Ethiopia, on behalf of the Group of African States. Subsequently, Indonesia and Turkey joined the sponsors.

1028. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation made general comments on the draft resolution.

1029. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Sudan made a statement as the State concerned.

1030. 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.

1031. At the same meeting, the representatives of Italy, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, and of the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

1032. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.30/Rev.1 without a vote (resolution 27/29).

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	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Liechtenstein
Albania	Denmark	Lithuania
Andorra	Djibouti	Luxembourg
Angola	Dominican Republic	Madagascar
Armenia	Ecuador	Malaysia
Australia	Equatorial Guinea	Malawi
Azerbaijan	Egypt	Mali
Bahamas	El Salvador	Malta
Bahrain	Eritrea	Marshall Islands
Belarus	Fiji	Mauritania
Bangladesh	Finland	Mauritius
Barbados	Georgia	Monaco
Belgium	Ghana	Mongolia
Bhutan	Greece	Morocco
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Guatemala	Mozambique
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Guinea	Myanmar
Brunei Darussalam	Honduras	Nepal
Bulgaria	Hungary	Netherlands
Burundi	Iceland	New Zealand
Cambodia	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Nicaragua
Cameroon	Iraq	Niger
Canada	Israel	Nigeria
Central African Republic	Jamaica	Norway
Chad	Jordan	Oman
Colombia	Kyrgyzstan	Panama
Comoros	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Papua New Guinea
Croatia	Latvia	Paraguay
Cyprus	Lebanon	Poland
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	Lesotho	Portugal
	Libya	Qatar
		Republic of Moldova
		Rwanda

Saint Kitts and Nevis	Suriname	Turkmenistan
Senegal	Swaziland	Tuvalu
Serbia	Sweden	Uganda
Seychelles	Switzerland	Ukraine
Singapore	Syrian Arab Republic	United Republic of Tanzania
Slovakia	Tajikistan	Uruguay
Slovenia	Thailand	Uzbekistan
Solomon Islands	Timor-Leste	Vanuatu
Somalia	Togo	Yemen
South Sudan	Tonga	Zambia
Spain	Trinidad and Tobago	Zimbabwe
Sri Lanka	Tunisia	
Sudan	Turkey	

Non-Member States represented by observers

Holy See
State of Palestine

United Nations

Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
United Nations Children's Fund	United Nations Environment Programme

Specialized agencies and related organizations

International Labour Organization	World Intellectual Property Organization
International Telecommunication Union	World Trade Organization
World Health Organization	

Intergovernmental organizations

Council of Europe	International Organization of la Francophonie
European Union	League of Arab States
International Development Law Organization	Organization of Islamic Cooperation
International Olympic Committee	

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

Australian Human Rights Commission	German Institute for Human Rights
Canadian Human Rights Commission	Greek National Commission for Human Rights
Conseil national des droits de l'homme du Maroc	Human Rights Commission of Malaysia
Danish Institute for Human Rights	Human Rights Defender of the Republic of Armenia
Defensoría del Pueblo de Colombia	Independent Commission for Human Rights of the State of Palestine
Defensoría del Pueblo de Ecuador	Instituto Nacional de Derechos Humanos de Chile
Defensoría del Pueblo of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela	International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights
Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain (by joint video message)	

National Human Rights Commission of Mexico
 National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia
 National Human Rights Commission of Nepal
 National Human Rights Committee of Qatar
 Netherlands Institute of Human Rights
 New Zealand Human Rights Commission
 Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission (by joint video message)
 Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights (Ombudsman) of the Republic of Azerbaijan

Office of the Human Rights Advocate of Nicaragua (*Procuraduría para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos*)
 Office of the Ombudsman (*Provedor de Justiça*) of Portugal (by video message)
 Office of the Public Defender (Ombudsman) of Georgia
 Ombudsman (*Defensor del Pueblo*) of Spain (by video message)
 Ombudsman of Bosnia and Herzegovina
 People's Advocate of Albania (by video message)
 Procuraduría de los Derechos Humanos de Guatemala
 Scottish Human Rights Commission (by joint video message)
 South African Human Rights Commission
 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
 Advocates for Human Rights
 Africa culture internationale
 African-American Society for Humanitarian Aid and Development
 African Association of Education for Development
 African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters
 African Development Association
 African Technical Association
 African Technology Development Link
 Agence internationale pour le développement
 Agir ensemble pour les droits de l'homme
 Al-Hakim Foundation
 Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man
 Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement
 Al-Khoei Foundation
 Alliance Defending Freedom
 Allied Rainbow Communities International
 Al Mezan Center for Human Rights
 Alsalam Foundation
 Alulbayt Foundation
 Al Zubair Charity Foundation
 American Anthropological Association
 American Civil Liberties Union
 Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain
 Amis des étrangers au Togo
 Amman Center for Human Rights Studies
 Amnesty International

Amuta for NGO Responsibility
 Anglican Consultative Council
 AquaFed — International Federation of Private Water Operators
 Arab NGO Network for Development
 Archbishop E. Kataliko Actions for Africa “KAF”
 Article 19 — International Centre against Censorship
 Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact
 Asian-Eurasian Human Rights Forum
 Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development (Forum-Asia)
 Asian Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Network
 Asian Legal Resource Centre
 Asia-Pacific Human Rights Information Center
 Asociacion HazteOir.org
 Association congolaise pour le développement agricole
 Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism
 Association for Progressive Communications
 Association for the Prevention of Torture
 Association mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit
 Association of World Citizens
 Association Points-Coeur
 Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII
 Auspice Stella
 BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights
 Baha'i International Community
 Bischöfliches Hilfswerk Misereor e.V.
 B'nai B'rith
 Brahma Kumaris World Spiritual University
 Bridges International
 British Humanist Association
 Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies
 Cameroun terre nouvelle
 Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network
 Canners International Permanent Committee
 CAPAJ — Comision Juridica para el Autodesarrollo de los Pueblos Originarios Andinos

Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities)
 Center for Environmental and Management Studies
 Center for Inquiry
 Center for Reproductive Rights
 Centre de documentation, de recherche et d'information des peuples autochtones
 Centre Europe-Tiers Monde — Europe-Third World Centre
 Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy
 Centre indépendant de recherches et d'initiatives pour le dialogue
 Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales
 Centro Regional de Derechos Humanos y Justicia de Género
 Child Development Foundation
 Child Helpline International
 CIVICUS — World Alliance for Citizen Participation
 Collectif des femmes africaines du Hainaut
 Colombian Commission of Jurists
 Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme
 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 Saint Vincent de Paul
 Conectas Direitos Humanos
 Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations in Consultative Relationship with the United Nations
 Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd
 Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations
 Defence for Children International
 Development Innovations and Networks
 Dominicans for Justice and Peace — Order of Preachers
 Earthjustice
 East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project
 Eastern Sudan Women Development Organization
 ECPAT International
 Edmund Rice International Limited
 Egyptian Organization for Human Rights
 Equitas International Centre for Human Rights Education
 European Centre for Law and Justice
 European Disability Forum
 European Law Students' Association
 European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Association
 European Union of Public Relations
 Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit — COC Nederland
 Federation of Associations for the Defence and the Promotion of Human Rights — Spain
 Federation of Cuban Women
 Federation of Western Thracian Turks in Europe
 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
 Freedom House
 Friedrich Ebert Foundation
 Friends World Committee for Consultation
 General Research Institute on the Convention on the Rights of the Child
 Geneva for Human Rights — Global Training
 Global Helping to Advance Women and Children
 Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
 Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant
 Grupo Intercultural Almaciga
 Howard Center for Family, Religion and Society
 Humanist Institute for Co-operation with Developing Countries
 Human Life International
 Human Rights Education Associates
 Human Rights House Foundation
 Human Rights Law Centre
 Human Rights Now
 Human Rights Watch
 IDPC — International Drug Policy Consortium
 Il Cenacolo
 Indian Council of South America
 Indigenous Peoples of Africa Coordinating Committee
 Indigenous World Association
 Ingénieurs du Monde
 Initiatives of Change
 InnerCity Mission of Christ Embassy
 Institute for Family Policy
 Institute for Planetary Synthesis
 International Alliance of Women
 International Association for Democracy in Africa
 International Association for Religious Freedom
 International Association of Charities
 International Association of Democratic Lawyers
 International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists
 International Association of Schools of Social Work

International Bar Association
 International Buddhist Foundation
 International Catholic Child Bureau
 International Committee for the Indians of
 the Americas (Incomindios Switzerland)
 International Educational Development
 International Federation for Human Rights
 Leagues
 International Federation of Journalists
 International Federation of Social Workers
 International Federation of University
 Women
 International Fellowship of Reconciliation
 International Gay and Lesbian Human
 Rights Commission
 International Humanist and Ethical Union
 International Institute for Non-Aligned
 Studies
 International Institute for Peace
 International Institute for Peace, Justice and
 Human Rights
 International Kolping Society
 International Legal Foundation
 International Lesbian and Gay Association
 International Longevity Center Global
 Alliance
 International Movement against All Forms
 of Discrimination and Racism
 International Movement ATD Fourth World
 International Movement for Fraternal Union
 among Races and Peoples
 International Movement of Apostolate in
 the Independent Social Milieus
 International Muslim Women's Union
 International Network for Standardization
 of Higher Education Degrees
 International Network for the Prevention
 of Elder Abuse
 International Organisation for LDCs
 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 Service for Human Rights
 International Volunteerism Organization for
 Women, Education and Development —
 VIDES
 International Women Bond
 International Young Christian Workers
 International Youth and Student Movement
 for the United Nations
 Iranian Elite Research Center
 Islamic Human Rights Commission
 Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice
 delle Salesiane di Don Bosco
 Japan Federation of Bar Associations
 Jubilee Campaign
 Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of
 Torture
 Korea Center for United Nations Human Rights Policy
 La Brique
 Latter-Day Saint Charities
 Lawyers for Lawyers
 Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada
 Liberal International (World Liberal Union)
 Liberation
 Lutheran World Federation
 Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development
 MADRE, Inc.
 Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association
 Medical Care Development International
 Minority Rights Group
 Mothers Legacy Project
 Myochikai (Arigatou Foundation)
 National Alliance of Women's Organizations
 National Coalition Against Racial Discrimination
 New Humanity
 Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational
 and Transparty
 Nord-Sud XXI
 Norwegian Refugee Council
 Rencontre africaine pour la défense des
 droits de l'homme
 Reporters Sans Frontiers International —
 Reporters without Borders International
 Rural Community Development Program
 Russian Peace Foundation
 Save a Child's Heart in Memory of Dr. Ami Cohen
 Save the Children International
 Servas International
 Society for Development and Community Empowerment
 Society for Threatened Peoples
 Society of Iranian Women Advocating
 Sustainable Development of Environment
 Society Studies Centre
 Soka Gakkai International
 Solidarity for a Better World
 Soroptimist International
 SOS Kinderdorf International
 Sovereign Military Order of the Temple of Jerusalem
 Sudan Council of Voluntary Agencies
 Sudanese Women General Union
 Swedish NGO Foundation for Human Rights
 Syriac Universal Alliance
 Tchad Agir pour l'environnement
 Teresian Association
 Terre des Hommes International Federation
 UNESCO Etxea — UNESCO Basque Country Centre
 Union de l'action féminine
 Union of Arab Jurists
 United Nations Watch
 United Network of Young Peacebuilders
 (UNOY Peacebuilders)
 United Schools International
 UPR Info
 Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik

Victorious Youths Movement	World Environment and Resources Council
VIVAT International	World Evangelical Alliance
Women's Capacity Building and Development Organisation	World Federation of Khoja Shia Ithna-Asheri Muslim Communities
Women's Federation for World Peace International	World Federation of United Nations Associations
Women's Human Rights International Association	World Jewish Congress
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom	World Movement of Christian Workers
Working Women Association	World Muslim Congress
World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace	World Network of Users and Survivors of Psychiatry
World Barua Organization	World Organization against Torture
	World Student Christian Federation
	World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations
	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-seventh session*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/27/1 and Corr.1	1	Annotations to the agenda for the twenty-seventh session of the Human Rights Council: note by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/27/2	1	Report of the Human Rights Council on its twenty-seventh session
A/HRC/27/3	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Norway
A/HRC/27/3/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/27/4	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Albania
A/HRC/27/4/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/27/5	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Democratic Republic of the Congo
A/HRC/27/6	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Côte d'Ivoire
A/HRC/27/6/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/27/7	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Portugal
A/HRC/27/7/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/27/8	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Bhutan
A/HRC/27/8/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/27/9	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Dominica
A/HRC/27/10	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Democratic People's Republic of Korea
A/HRC/27/10/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/27/11	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Brunei Darussalam
A/HRC/27/11/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/27/12	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Costa Rica

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/27/12/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/27/13 and Corr.1	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Equatorial Guinea
A/HRC/27/13/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/27/14	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Ethiopia
A/HRC/27/14/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/27/15	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Qatar
A/HRC/27/15/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/27/16	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Nicaragua
A/HRC/27/16/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/27/17	1	Election of members of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee: note by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/27/17/Add.1	1	Addendum
A/HRC/27/18	2	Composition of the staff of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/27/19	2	Follow-up review of the management and administration of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights: report of the Joint Inspection Unit — note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/27/20	2, 3	Application of the technical guidance on the application of a human rights-based approach to the implementation of policies and programmes to reduce preventable maternal mortality and morbidity: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/27/21	2, 3	Analytical study focusing on gender-based and sexual violence in relation to transitional justice: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/27/22	2, 3	Birth registration and the right of everyone to recognition everywhere as a person before the law: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/27/23 and Corr.1	2, 3	Question of the death penalty: report of the Secretary-General

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/27/24	2, 3	Summary of the high-level panel discussion dedicated to the sixty-fifth anniversary of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/27/25	2, 3	Summary of the full-day meeting on the rights of the child: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/27/26	2, 3	Summary of the high-level panel discussion on the question of the death penalty: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/27/27	2, 3	Consolidated report of the Secretary-General and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the right to development
A/HRC/27/28 and Corr.1	2, 3	Plan of Action for the third phase (2015–2019) of the World Programme for Human Rights Education: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/27/29	2, 3	Factors that impede equal political participation and steps to overcome those challenges: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/27/30	2, 3	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the rights of indigenous peoples
A/HRC/27/31	2, 3	Technical guidance on the application of a human rights based approach to the implementation of policies and programmes to reduce and eliminate preventable mortality and morbidity of children under 5 years of age: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/27/32	2, 3	Proceedings of the workshop on the impact of the application of unilateral coercive measures on the enjoyment of human rights by the affected populations, in particular their socioeconomic impact on women and children, in the States targeted: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/27/33	2, 3	Summary of the Human Rights Council panel discussion on the importance of the promotion and protection of civil society space: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/27/34	2, 3	Summary report on the panel discussion on preventing and eliminating child, early and forced marriage: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		Rights
A/HRC/27/35	2, 3	Summary of the Human Rights Council panel discussion on the safety of journalists: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/27/36	2, 3	Summary report on the high-level panel discussion on the identification of good practices in combating female genital mutilation: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/27/37	2, 3	The right to privacy in the digital age: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/27/38	2, 5	Cooperation with the United Nations, its representatives and mechanisms in the field of human rights: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/27/39	2, 8	National institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/27/40	2, 8	Activities of the International Coordinating Committee of National Human Rights Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in accrediting national institutions in compliance with the Paris Principles: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/27/41	2, 10	Technical assistance and capacity-building options for integrating human rights into national policies: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/27/42	2, 10	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the human rights situation and the activities of her Office in the Democratic Republic of the Congo
A/HRC/27/43	2, 10	Role and achievements of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights in assisting the Government and people of Cambodia in the promotion and protection of human rights: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/27/44	2, 10	Situation of human rights in Yemen: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/27/45	3	Report of the Working Group on the Right to Development on its fifteenth session (Geneva, 12–16 May 2014)
A/HRC/27/46	3	Report of the Independent Expert on the enjoyment of all human rights by older persons, Rosa Kornfeld-Matte

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/27/47	3	Report of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention: a compilation of national, regional and international laws, regulations and practices on the right to challenge the lawfulness of detention before court
A/HRC/27/48	3	Report of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention
A/HRC/27/48/Add.1	3	Opinions adopted by the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention at its sixty-sixth, sixty-seventh and sixty-eighth sessions
A/HRC/27/48/Add.2	3	Mission to Greece
A/HRC/27/48/Add.3	3	Mission to Brazil
A/HRC/27/48/Add.4	3	Mission to Hungary
A/HRC/27/48/Add.5	3	Mission to Morocco
A/HRC/27/48/Add.6	3	Mission to Greece: comments by the State on the report of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention
A/HRC/27/48/Add.7	3	Mission au Maroc: commentaires de l'Etat sur le rapport du Groupe de travail sur la détention arbitraire
A/HRC/27/49	3	Report of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances
A/HRC/27/49/Add.1	3	Mission to Spain
A/HRC/27/49/Add.2	3	Follow-up report to the recommendations made by the Working Group: missions to Argentina and Bosnia and Herzegovina
A/HRC/27/50	3	Annual report of 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
A/HRC/27/50/Add.1	3	Mission to Comoros (7–16 May 2014)
A/HRC/27/51	3	Report of the Independent Expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order, Alfred-Maurice de Zayas
A/HRC/27/52	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples, Victoria Tauli Corpuz
A/HRC/27/52/Add.1	3	The status of indigenous peoples' rights in Panama
A/HRC/27/52/Add.2	3	The situation of indigenous peoples in Canada
A/HRC/27/52/Add.3	3	The situation of indigenous peoples' rights in Peru with regard to the extractive industries
A/HRC/27/52/Add.4	3	Observations on communications

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/27/53	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery, including its causes and consequences, Urmila Bhoola
A/HRC/27/53/Add.1	3	Follow-up mission to Mauritania
A/HRC/27/53/Add.2	3	Follow-up mission to Kazakhstan
A/HRC/27/53/Add.3	3	Mission to Ghana (22–29 November 2013)
A/HRC/27/54	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the implications for human rights of the environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes, Baskut Tuncak
A/HRC/27/55	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation, Catarina de Albuquerque: common violations of the human rights to water and sanitation
A/HRC/27/55/Add.1	3	Mission to Brazil (9 to 19 December 2013)
A/HRC/27/55/Add.2	3	Mission to Jordan (11–16 March 2014)
A/HRC/27/55/Add.3	3	Handbook for realizing the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation
A/HRC/27/55/Add.4	3	Mission to Brazil: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur
A/HRC/27/55/Add.5	3	Mission to Jordan: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur
A/HRC/27/56	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence, Pablo de Greiff
A/HRC/27/56/Add.1	3	Mission to Spain
A/HRC/27/56/Add.2	3	Mission to Uruguay
A/HRC/27/56/Add.3	3	Misión a España: Comentarios del Estado al informe del Relator Especial
A/HRC/27/57	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
A/HRC/27/58	3, 5	Progress report of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee on the study on the possibilities of using sport and the Olympic ideal to promote human rights

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/27/59	3, 5	Progress report of the Advisory Committee on the role of local government in the promotion and protection of human rights, including human rights mainstreaming in local administration and public services
A/HRC/27/60	4	Report of the independent international commission of inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/27/61	5	Report on the twenty-first annual meeting of special rapporteurs, independent experts and chairpersons of working groups of the special procedures of the Human Rights Council: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/27/62	5	Reports of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee on its twelfth and thirteenth sessions: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/27/63	5	Report of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on a draft United Nations declaration on the right to peace
A/HRC/27/64	5	Report of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples on its seventh session, Geneva, 7–11 July 2014
A/HRC/27/65	5	Access to justice in the promotion and protection of the rights of indigenous peoples: restorative justice, indigenous juridical systems and access to justice for indigenous women, children and youth, and persons with disabilities: study by the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
A/HRC/27/66	5	Promotion and protection of the rights of indigenous peoples in disaster risk reduction, prevention and preparedness initiatives: study by the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
A/HRC/27/67	5	Final summary of responses to the questionnaire seeking the views of States and indigenous peoples on best practices regarding possible appropriate measures and implementation strategies to attain the goals of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: report of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
A/HRC/27/68	9	Report of the Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent on its fourteenth session
A/HRC/27/68/Add.1	9	Mission to Brazil

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/27/69	10	Report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Sudan, Mashood A. Baderin
A/HRC/27/69/Add.1	10	Comments by the State
A/HRC/27/70	10	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Cambodia, Surya P. Subedi
A/HRC/27/70/Add.1	10	Comments received from the Government of Cambodia on the Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Cambodia, Surya P. Subedi
A/HRC/27/71	10	Report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Somalia, Bahame Tom Nyanduga
A/HRC/27/72	3,4,7,9,10	Communications report of Special Procedures
A/HRC/27/73	2, 3	Summary report on the recommendations of the panel discussion on gender stereotyping and on women's human rights in the context of sustainable development agenda: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/27/74	2, 10	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the situation of human rights in South Sudan
A/HRC/27/75	2, 10	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the situation of human rights in Ukraine
A/HRC/27/76	2, 7	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the implementation of Human Rights Council resolution S-21/1 on ensuring respect for international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem

Documents issued in the conference room papers series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/27/CRP.1	4	Selected testimonies from victims of the Syrian conflict
A/HRC/27/CRP.2	2	Oral update of the High Commissioner for Human Rights on promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka

Documents issued in the limited series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/27/L.1	3	Enforced or involuntary disappearances
A/HRC/27/L.2	3	Human rights and unilateral coercive measures
A/HRC/27/L.3	3	The right to development
A/HRC/27/L.4	3	Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence
A/HRC/27/L.5 and Rev.1	4	The continuing grave deterioration in the human rights and humanitarian situation in the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/27/L.6	3	Local government and human rights
A/HRC/27/L.7	3	The safety of journalists
A/HRC/27/L.8	3	Panel discussion on realizing the equal enjoyment of the right to education by every girl
A/HRC/27/L.9 and Rev.1	10	Technical assistance and capacity-building for Yemen in the field of human rights
A/HRC/27/L.10 and Rev.1	9	Mandate of the Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent
A/HRC/27/L.11 and Rev.1	3	The human right to safe drinking water and sanitation
A/HRC/27/L.12	3	Intensifying global efforts and sharing good practices to effectively eliminate female genital mutilation
A/HRC/27/L.13	3	Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the implications for human rights of the environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes
A/HRC/27/L.14	3	Promoting human rights through sport and the Olympic ideal
A/HRC/27/L.15 and Rev.1	5	Promotion of the right to peace
A/HRC/27/L.16	3	Mandate of the Independent Expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order
A/HRC/27/L.17	3	The use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination
A/HRC/27/L.18 and Rev.1	10	Enhancement of technical cooperation and capacity-building in the field of human rights
A/HRC/27/L.19 and Rev.1	3	Preventable maternal mortality and morbidity and human rights
A/HRC/27/L.20	3	World Programme for Human Rights Education: adoption of the plan of action for the third phase

Documents issued in the limited series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/27/L.21	10	National policies and human rights
A/HRC/27/L.22	3	Human rights and indigenous peoples
A/HRC/27/L.23	3	Preventable mortality and morbidity of children under 5 years of age as a human rights concern
A/HRC/27/L.24	3	Civil society space
A/HRC/27/L.25	8	National institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights
A/HRC/27/L.26	3	Effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights: the activities of vulture funds
A/HRC/27/L.27 and Rev.1	8	Human rights, sexual orientation and gender identity
A/HRC/27/L.28	3	The right of the child to engage in play and recreational activities
A/HRC/27/L.29 and Rev.1	3	Equal participation in political and public affairs
A/HRC/27/L.30 and Rev.1	10	Technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in the Sudan
A/HRC/27/L.31	10	Technical assistance and capacity-building in the field of human rights in the Central African Republic
A/HRC/27/L.32	10	Technical assistance and capacity-building for human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo
A/HRC/27/L.33	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.2
A/HRC/27/L.34	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.24
A/HRC/27/L.35	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.24
A/HRC/27/L.36	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.24
A/HRC/27/L.37	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.24
A/HRC/27/L.38	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.24
A/HRC/27/L.39	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.24
A/HRC/27/L.40	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.24
A/HRC/27/L.41	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.24
A/HRC/27/L.42	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.24
A/HRC/27/L.43	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.24
A/HRC/27/L.44	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.2
A/HRC/27/L.45	8	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.27/Rev.1

Documents issued in the limited series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/27/L.46	8	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.27/Rev.1
A/HRC/27/L.47	8	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.27/Rev.1
A/HRC/27/L.48	8	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.27/Rev.1
A/HRC/27/L.49	8	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.27/Rev.1
A/HRC/27/L.50	8	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.27/Rev.1
A/HRC/27/L.51	8	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/27/L.27/Rev.1

Documents issued in the Government series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/27/G/1	3	Note verbale dated 12 August 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/27/G/2	4	Note verbale dated 15 August 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
A/HRC/27/G/3	4	Letter dated 8 September 2014 from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Armenia to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/27/G/4	4	Letter dated 15 September 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/27/G/5	2, 3	Note verbale dated 19 September 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

Documents issued in the Government series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/27/G/6	6	Note verbale dated 24 September 2014 from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Mauritius to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/27/G/7	9	Note verbale dated 22 September 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/27/G/8	2, 3	Note verbale dated 26 September 2014 from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Estonia to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/27/G/9	6	Note verbale dated 3 October 2014 from the Permanent Mission of Tunisia 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/27/G/10	1	Note verbale dated 26 September 2014 from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of the Sudan to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/27/G/11	4	Letter dated 20 October 2014 from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/27/G/12	4	Letter dated 13 November 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

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/27/NGO/1	7	Written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 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/27/NGO/2	3	Written statement submitted by Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/3	10	Written statement submitted by Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/4	7	Written statement submitted by Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/5	4	Written statement submitted by Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/6	4	Written statement submitted by the Arab NGO Network for Development, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/27/NGO/7	4	Written statement submitted by the Arab NGO Network for Development, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/27/NGO/8	6	Written statement submitted by the Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/9	3	Written statement submitted by the International Federation on Ageing, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/10	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/11	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/12	3	Written statement submitted by the Society Studies Centre (MADA ssc), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/13	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/27/NGO/14	3	Written statement submitted by the Himalayan Research and Cultural Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/15	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/16	3	Written statement submitted by the Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/27/NGO/17	4	Written statement submitted by Rencontre Africaine pour la defense des droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/18	3	Written statement submitted by the HelpAge International, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/19	3	Joint written statement submitted by the Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, Association Points-Coeur, Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Dominicans for Justice and Peace — Order of Preachers, Edmund Rice International Limited, International Catholic Child Bureau, International Kolping Society, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development — VIDES, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, Mouvement International d'Apostolate des Milieux Sociaux Independants, Pax Romana (International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs and International Movement of Catholic Students), non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, World Movement of Christian Workers, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/27/NGO/20	9	Written statement submitted by the Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europe, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/21	3	Written statement submitted by the Al-khoei Foundation, 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/27/NGO/22	3	Written statement submitted by the AI-khoei Foundation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/23	3	Written statement submitted by the AI-khoei Foundation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/24	3	Written statement submitted by the AI-khoei Foundation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/25	3	Joint written statement submitted by Save the Children International, World Vision International, non-governmental organizations in general consultative status, Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant, Defence for Children International, Geneva Infant Feeding Association, International Federation of Social Workers, International Social Service, Plan International, Inc., SOS Kinderdorf International, Terre des Hommes International Federation, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/26	3	Written statement submitted by the International Association for the Defence of Religious Liberty — Association Internationale Pour La Defense de la Liberte, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/27	4	Written statement submitted by Article 19 — The International Centre Against Censorship, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/27/NGO/28	3	Written statement submitted by Article 19 — The International Centre Against Censorship, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/27/NGO/29	3	Written statement submitted by the Alliance Defense Fund, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/30	3	Written statement submitted by the Alliance Defense Fund, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/31	3	Written statement submitted by the Alliance Defense Fund, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/32	3	Written statement submitted by the Alliance Defense Fund, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/33	2	Exposición escrita presentada por el Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas (ACNU), organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/27/NGO/34	2	Exposición escrita presentada por el Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas (ACNU), organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/27/NGO/35	4	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/36	5	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/37	7	Joint written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/38	9	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/39	4	Joint written statement submitted by the Women's Human Rights International Association (WHRIA), France Libertes: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, International Educational Development, Inc., non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/27/NGO/40	3	Written statement submitted by the Working Women Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/41	3	Written statement submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights (JKCHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/42	4	Written statement submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights (JKCHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/43	7	Written statement submitted by the BADIL Resource center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/44	4	Written statement submitted by the BADIL Resource center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee rights, 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/27/NGO/45	4	Written statement submitted by the Child Foundation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/46	10	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/47	7	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/48	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/49	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/50	3	Written statement submitted by the National Association of Community Legal Centres Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/51	4	Written statement submitted by the Al-Hakim Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/52	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/53	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/54	3	Written statement submitted by the International Institute for Peace, Justice and Human Rights (IIPJHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/55	7	Written statement submitted by the Action contre la faim, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/56	3	Joint written statement submitted by Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities), New Humanity, non-governmental organizations in general consultative status, Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, Edmund Rice International Limited, International Association of Charities, International Catholic Child Bureau, Pax Romana (International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs and International Movement of Catholic Students), non-governmental

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/57	2	Written statement submitted by the Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/58	3	Written statement submitted by the Marangopoulos Foundation for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/59	6	Joint written statement submitted by Korea Center for United Nations Human Rights Policy, Human Rights Now, International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR), MINBYUN — Lawyers for a Democratic Society, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/60	3	Joint written statement submitted by Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities), New Humanity, non-governmental organizations in general consultative status, Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, Dominicans for Justice and Peace — Order of Preachers, International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (OIDE), International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development — VIDES, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/61	5	Joint written statement submitted by the Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, Pax Romana (International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs and International Movement of Catholic Students), non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/62	3	Written statement submitted by the Al Zubair Charitable Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/63	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/64	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/65	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, 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/27/NGO/66	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/67	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/68	5	Written statement submitted by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/69	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/70	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/71	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/72	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/73	4	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/74	3	Written statement submitted by Liberal International (World Liberal Union), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/75	3	Written statement submitted by the Eastern Sudan Women Development Organization, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/76	3	Written statement submitted by the International Institute for Peace, Justice and Human Rights (IIPJHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/77	3	Written statement submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/78	3	Written statement submitted by the Howard Center for Family, Religion and Society, 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/27/NGO/79	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/80	8	Exposé écrit présenté par Marangopoulos Foundation for Human Rights, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/27/NGO/81	3	Joint written statement submitted by the France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact, International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, Netherlands Centre for Indigenous Peoples (NCIV), Society for Threatened Peoples, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Indian Council of South America (CISA), non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/27/NGO/82	4	Written statement submitted by the Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/83	3	Written statement submitted by the Alulbayt Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/84	7	Written statement submitted by the Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/85	7	Written statement submitted by the Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/86	7	Written statement submitted by the Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/87	3	Written statement submitted by the Women's International Zionist Organization, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/88	5	Written statement submitted by the IDPC Consortium, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/89	3	Written statement submitted by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/90	3	Written statement submitted by the Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, Inc., 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/27/NGO/91	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/92	7	Written statement submitted by Press the Emblem Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/93	9	Written statement submitted by the Servas International, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/27/NGO/94	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/95	3	Exposición escrita presentada por la Permanent Assembly for Human Rights, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/27/NGO/96	3	Exposición escrita presentada por la Permanent Assembly for Human Rights (Asamblea Permanente por los Derechos Humanos), organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/27/NGO/97	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/98	3	Written statement submitted by the Asylum Access, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/99	4	Written statement submitted by the Press Emblem Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/100	5	Joint written statement submitted by the African American Islamic Institute, non-governmental organization in general consultative status, the International Association of Peace Messenger Cities, Abibimman Foundation, Abiodun Adebayo Welfare Foundation, American Association of Jurists, Amis des Etrangers au Togo (A.D.E.T.), Arab African American Womens' Leadership Council Inc., Asociación Española para el Derecho Internacional de los Derechos Humanos AEDIDH, Association Mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit, Association pour l'Intégration et le Développement Durable au Burundi, BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, Bangwe et Dialogue, Belgrade Centre for Human Rights, Centre for Democracy and Development, Commission africaine des

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		<p>promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme, Dominican Union of Journalists for Peace, Human Rights Commission of Pakistan, Humanitaire Plus, Indigenous World Association, International Association of Schools of Social Work, International Federation of Women in Legal Careers, International Federation of Women Lawyers, International Institute for Child Protection, International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR), International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Lama Gangchen World Peace Foundation (LGWPF), Movement for the Protection of African Child (MOPOTAC), Pax Christi International, International Catholic Peace Movement, Peace Family and Media Association, People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy, Perfect Union, Shirley Ann Sullivan Educational Foundation, Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur, Society of Catholic Medical Missionaries, Temple of Understanding, Umuada Igbo Nigeria, United States Federation for Middle East Peace, Women Environmental Programme, Women's World Summit Foundation, Womensport International, World Association for Psychosocial Rehabilitation, World for World Organization, Yayasan Pendidikan Indonesia, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Dzeno Association, Institute for Planetary Synthesis, International Society for Human Rights, Widows for Peace Through Democracy, non-governmental organizations on the roster</p>
A/HRC/27/NGO/101 and Corr.1	3	<p>Joint written statement submitted by the Open Society Institute, American Civil Liberties Union, Amnesty International, Human Rights First, Human Rights Watch, International Commission of Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status</p>
A/HRC/27/NGO/102	3	<p>Written statement submitted by the International Network of Liberal Women, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status</p>
A/HRC/27/NGO/103	8	<p>Written statement submitted by the Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status</p>
A/HRC/27/NGO/104	4	<p>Written statement submitted by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status</p>

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/27/NGO/106	4	Written statement submitted by the Women's Human Rights International Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/107	3	Written statement submitted by the Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/108	9	Written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/109	9	Written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/110	4	Written statement submitted by the Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/111	3	Written statement submitted by the Global Helping to Advance Women and Children, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/112	1, 7	Written statement submitted by United Nations Watch, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/113	3	Exposé écrit présenté par Rencontre Africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/27/NGO/114	2	Written statement submitted by the Center for Global Nonkilling, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/115	2	Written statement submitted by Le Collectif des Femmes Africaines du Hainaut (C.F.A.H.), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/116	4	Written statement submitted by the Third World Institute — Instituto del Tercer Mundo, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/117	2	Written statement submitted by the Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, 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/27/NGO/118	3	Written statement submitted by the International Alliance of Women, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/119	7	Exposición escrita presentada por el Federación de Mujeres Cubanas, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/27/NGO/120	3	Exposición escrita presentada por el Federación de Mujeres Cubanas, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/27/NGO/121	4	Written statement submitted by the International Buddhist Relief Organization, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/122	3	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Organisation Mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/27/NGO/123	4	Written statement submitted by the Association of World Citizens, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/27/NGO/124	6	Written statement submitted by the International Institute for Peace, Justice and Human Rights (IIPJHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/125	4	Written statement submitted by the International Institute for Peace, Justice and Human Rights (IIPJHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/126	3	Written statement submitted by the Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of Environment, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/127	3	Written statement submitted by the Korea Center for United Nations Human Rights Policy, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/128	2	Written statement submitted by the Friends World Committee for Consultation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/27/NGO/129	4	Written statement submitted by the ODHIKAR — Coalition for Human Rights, 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/27/NGO/130	3	Written statement submitted by the International Institute for Peace, Justice and Human Rights (IIPJHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

Documents issued in the national institutions series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/27/NI/1	3	Information presented by the National Human Rights Commission of Mauritania: note by the secretariat
A/HRC/27/NI/2	3	Information presented by the National Human Rights Council of Morocco: note by the secretariat
A/HRC/27/NI/3	3	Information presented by the Public Defender of Georgia: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/27/NI/4	3	Information presented by the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/27/NI/5	3	Joint information presented by 22 A Status NHRIs: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/27/NI/6	6	Information presented by the Albanian People's Advocate (Ombudsman): note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/27/NI/7	6	Information presented by the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/27/NI/8	3	Information presented by the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/27/NI/9	6	Written submission by the Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/27/NI/10	3	Information presented by the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Republic of Azerbaijan: note by the Secretariat

Annex IV

Advisory Committee members elected by the Human Rights Council at its twenty-seventh session and duration of terms of membership

<i>Member</i>	<i>Term expires in</i>
Mohamed Bennani (Morocco)	30 September 2017
Laurence Boisson de Chazournes (France)	30 September 2017
Laura Crăciunean (Romania)	30 September 2017
Obiora Okafor (Nigeria)	30 September 2017
Anantonia Reyes Prado (Guatemala)	30 September 2017
Changrok Soh (Republic of Korea)	30 September 2017
Ahmer Bilal Soofi (Pakistan)	30 September 2017

Annex V

Special procedure mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its organizational meeting of 6 November 2014

Independent Expert on capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights

Mohammed Ayat (Morocco)

Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Sudan

Aristide Nononsi (Benin)

Special Rapporteur on the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation

Léo Heller (Brazil)

Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities

Catalina Devandas Aguilar (Costa Rica)

Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent (member from Asia-Pacific States)

Ricardo III Sunga (Philippines)

Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent (member from Eastern European States)

Michal Balcerzak (Poland)

Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances (member from Western European and other States)

Bernard Duhaime (Canada)
