



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
30 September 2022

Original: English

---

## Human Rights Council

### Fifty-first session

12 September–7 October 2022

Agenda item 9

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

## **Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Elaboration of Complimentary Standards on its eleventh session<sup>\*,\*\*</sup>**

*Chair-Rapporteur:* Kadra Ahmed **Hassan** (Djibouti)

### *Summary*

The present report is submitted pursuant to Human Rights Council decision 3/103 and Council resolutions 6/21 and 10/30. The report is a summary of the proceedings of the eleventh session of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Elaboration of Complementary Standards and the substantive discussions that took place during the session.

---

\* The annexes to the present report are circulated as received, in the language of submission only.  
\*\* The present report was submitted after the deadline so as to include the most recent information.



## **I. Introduction**

1. The Ad Hoc Committee on the Elaboration of Complementary Standards submits the present report pursuant to Human Rights Council decision 3/103 and Council resolutions 6/21 and 10/30.

## **II. Organization of the session**

2. The Ad Hoc Committee held the first part of its eleventh session from 6 to 13 December 2021. The session was adjourned owing to the absence of the Chair-Rapporteur, as an urgent personal matter required her to leave Geneva. The session was resumed and closed on 18 July 2022. During the eleventh session, the Committee held 15 meetings in a hybrid format at the Palais des Nations in Geneva.

### **A. Attendance**

3. The session was attended by representatives of Member States, non-Member States represented by observers, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council (see annex III).

### **B. Opening of the session**

4. The eleventh session of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Elaboration of Complementary Standards was opened by the Chief of the Rule of Law, Equality and Non-discrimination Branch, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR).

### **C. Election of the Chair-Rapporteur**

5. At its 1st meeting, the Ad Hoc Committee elected Kadra Ahmed Hassan, Permanent Representative of Djibouti to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, as its Chair-Rapporteur, by acclamation.

6. The Chair-Rapporteur thanked the Ad Hoc Committee for her election. She expressed the hope that participants would demonstrate cooperative and constructive engagement during the session, stressing that the views of all delegations and regional groupings and of civil society should be reflected as the Committee worked towards fulfilling its mandate.

7. She recalled that, pursuant to Human Rights Council decision 3/103 and resolutions 6/21 and 10/30, the Committee was mandated to elaborate, as a matter of priority and necessity, complementary standards in the form of either a convention or additional protocol(s) to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, filling the existing gaps in the Convention and also providing new normative standards aimed at combating all forms of contemporary racism, including incitement to racial and religious hatred. Since 2017, the Committee had been working under an updated mandate stemming from General Assembly resolution 71/181 and Human Rights Council resolution 34/36, in which the Assembly and the Council had requested the Chair-Rapporteur to ensure the commencement of the negotiations on the draft additional protocol to the Convention criminalizing acts of a racist and xenophobic nature. The General Assembly had subsequently made reference to that mandate in its resolutions 72/157, 73/262, 74/137, 75/237 and 76/226.

8. The Chair-Rapporteur noted that eliminating racial discrimination had been an objective of the United Nations since its creation, and was most clearly articulated in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. Nevertheless, in recent years, millions of people around the world had continued to be victims of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. In particular, people were victims of contemporary forms and manifestations of those phenomena, which were increasingly disseminated online and some of which were of a violent nature. That

highlighted the importance of the work of the Committee. She drew attention to the protests and movements that had occurred in many countries following the killing by the police of the unarmed American citizen, George Floyd. Furthermore, the unprecedented coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic had had particularly devastating health consequences for many racialized groups, including people of African descent, and had provoked acts of discrimination against people of Asian descent and hate speech directed at religious communities. She urged the Committee to increase its efforts to strengthen protection for the increasing number of victims of the contemporary manifestations of those scourges.

9. She provided several updates on issues that had arisen since the Ad Hoc Committee's tenth session, which had been held from 8 to 18 April 2019, and expressed the hope that the Committee would resume its work smoothly at the eleventh session, without losing the momentum of previous sessions. The Chair-Rapporteur outlined how, over the years, the Committee had laid the groundwork for moving forward, hearing input from over 70 experts on a variety of topics relating to contemporary racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. She recalled that, at its tenth session, the Committee had adopted by consensus a document entitled "Summary of issues and possible elements discussed pertaining to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 73/262 and Human Rights Council resolution 34/36 on the commencement of the negotiations on a draft additional protocol to the Convention criminalizing acts of a racist and xenophobic nature", which had allowed the Committee to begin charting its way forward on the complementary standard.

10. She recalled the intersessional expert consultation<sup>1</sup> that had taken place in Geneva from 21 to 22 October 2020 in a hybrid format to consider the tenth session elements document, the report of which all participants had received in advance.<sup>2</sup> She suggested that the specific legal expertise provided at that consultation should assist the Committee in finding a common understanding of the issues at hand, as well as determining the forthcoming process.

11. The Chair-Rapporteur said that she recognized that delegations held different views on some of the issues and expressed the hope that the Committee would hold open discussions and exchanges on its way to finding consensus.

12. She explained that the programme of work for the eleventh session was devoted to considering the experts' consultation report issue by issue, each of which would include a briefing from one of the experts involved in the intersessional consultation, followed by exchanges of views and discussions. The experts' legal advice and suggestions on the four issues – (a) dissemination of hate speech; (b) racial cybercrime (social media networks and companies); (c) all contemporary forms of discrimination based on religion or belief; and (d) preventive measures to combat racist and xenophobic discrimination – should help move the Committee's work forward.

13. Further to requests from the regional coordinators, the Chair-Rapporteur encouraged the participation of national technical experts and noted that one advantage of the hybrid meeting format was that it enabled national experts to participate virtually in the session, which would allow the Committee to have technical and substantial discussions to assist and enrich its work. She indicated that the last three days of the session would be dedicated to a general discussion and exchange of views, as well as the preparation of the conclusions and recommendations of the session.

14. The Chair-Rapporteur concluded by voicing her anticipation of the Committee's commitment to and support in fulfilling its mandate. She urged participants to continue to engage in the important process of addressing contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, which continued to occur and evolve in every region of the world.

<sup>1</sup> The expert seminar was held pursuant to paragraph 6 of Human Rights Council resolution 42/29.

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/2021-12/ReportIntersessionalLegalExpertConsultation.pdf>.

## **D. Adoption of the agenda**

15. At the 1st meeting, the Ad Hoc Committee adopted the following agenda for its eleventh session:

1. Opening of the session.
2. Election of the Chair-Rapporteur.
3. Adoption of the agenda and programme of work.
4. Updates on the Ad Hoc Committee and general presentation and overview of the intersessional expert session report.
5. Presentation on and discussion of the dissemination of hate speech.
6. Presentation on and discussion of all contemporary forms of discrimination based on religion or belief.
7. Presentation on and discussion of racial cybercrime.
8. Presentation on and discussion of preventive measures to combat racist and xenophobic discrimination.
9. General discussion and exchange of views.
10. Conclusions and recommendations of the session.
11. Adoption of the conclusions and recommendations of the session.

## **E. Organization of work**

16. Also at the 1st meeting, the Chair-Rapporteur introduced the draft programme of work for the session, which was adopted. The programme of work, as subsequently revised, is contained in annex II to the present report. The Chair-Rapporteur invited participants to make general comments. Delegations congratulated the Chair-Rapporteur on her election and made opening statements.

17. The representative of Cuba reiterated his country's commitment to the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee, and its willingness to continue striving constructively to make headway on achieving the mandate. Regrettably, 20 years after the adoption of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action and over half a century since the entry into force of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the goal of combating all forms of racism and discrimination based on race, xenophobia and other connected forms of intolerance was far from being achieved. Structural racism persisted and there had been a rise in hate speech and violence motivated by hatred against minorities, migrants, refugees and, in some cases, entire groups of people. The multifaceted global crisis heightened by the COVID-19 pandemic had only exacerbated that situation. The Constitution of Cuba, which had been adopted by referendum by a majority of the people in 2019, ratified and strengthened the right to equality and the prohibition of discrimination. Cuba was firmly committed to continuing to combat prejudice and racial stereotypes that might persist in its society. Cuba called for political will on the part of all States to join forces in combating racial discrimination and all forms of intolerance through constructive dialogue and collaboration in all United Nations forums.

18. The representative of Algeria said that Algeria attached great importance to the work of the Ad Hoc Committee and the need for complementary standards to strengthen the international human rights framework to combat racism, xenophobia, racial discrimination and related intolerance, and to face the current challenges in that regard. Algeria was concerned about the rise, within the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, in acts of racism, violence and hatred based on religion and race, particularly against persons of Arab and African descent and those who practised Islam, as well as refugees, migrants, women and children. Such acts resulted in populist and extremist ideologies, which were on the rise, as were policies based on racism and discrimination, which undermined those persons' dignity.

A culture of tolerance must be promoted by eliminating all policies and laws that were discriminatory by establishing clear deterrents and remedies.

19. The representative of Iraq highlighted the fact that racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance were completely at odds with the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Equality and non-discrimination were basic principles of international law and human rights. Despite the numerous initiatives taken by countries to combat racism and to ensure full enjoyment of human rights, many people were still victims of the phenomenon. The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination was the optimal tool to support international efforts to fight racism and to take appropriate measures to combat it. Racism continued to be widespread and was a source of instability in society, undermining democracy. An additional protocol to the Convention would need to contain the following elements: (a) criminalization of all contemporary forms of discrimination, including discrimination based on religion or belief, such as Islamophobia – currently the most widespread form of discrimination based on religion or belief; (b) respect for differences among cultures and countries; (c) consideration of the different circumstances of different countries; (d) respect for refugees, migrants and asylum-seekers; and (e) measures to combat the widespread manifestations of hate crime and discrimination on social media.

20. The representative of Japan said that Japan continued to address racism and racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. One example was the 2016 Hate Speech Elimination Act, which took into consideration the importance of upholding freedom of expression while promoting efforts to eliminate discriminatory speech and behaviour against persons of non-Japanese origin. The Ad Hoc Committee should remain focused on full and effective implementation of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination to achieve the goal of eliminating the scourge of racism in all its forms. As there was no clear agreement on whether there were gaps in the Convention or whether it failed to address contemporary forms of racism, it was inappropriate at the current stage to commence negotiations on an additional protocol to the Convention that would criminalize certain actions. Countering racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance was a challenge faced by every State that could be overcome through solidarity and cooperation. In line with the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, Japan encouraged all States to seek consensus. Japan remained strongly committed to eliminating all forms of racial discrimination.

21. The representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland stated that it was clear that the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination was, and should remain, the basis of all efforts to prevent, combat and eradicate racism. Implementation of the Convention was key to combating the spread of racism in all regions of the world. The Convention was a living instrument that was able to address new and emerging challenges. Throughout all 10 sessions of the Ad Hoc Committee, there had been no consensus on whether there were gaps in the Convention or whether it failed to address contemporary forms of racism. The members of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination had stated that there was no need for an additional protocol to the Convention and that the gaps existed in implementation or could be addressed in their general comments. Discussions still continued on the need for complementary standards to the Convention; the United Kingdom was of the view that an additional protocol to the Convention was not necessary. The fight against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance was ongoing and concerned everyone. The United Kingdom would remain engaged in discussions and looked forward to constructive dialogue and sharing best practice in that regard.

22. The representative of South Africa said that the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination was one of the preeminent conventions regarding the elimination of racism and racial discrimination in the world. Nevertheless, it had been adopted in 1965, when the world had been very different and not all States had been able to participate in its elaboration as free States and non-colonial entities. The world had changed considerably since then and had, in 2001, come together to update views about racism. By that time, almost all States had escaped the yoke of colonialism. In the outcome document of that conference, the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, States had

unanimously expressed their views on contemporary racism and their understanding of what constituted racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, as well as addressing issues such as systemic racism. South Africa had hoped that 20 years after the adoption of those texts, the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action would be fully implemented, but unfortunately a number of States did not wish to engage with the new way of understanding racism and how it affected the largest number of people in the world. Countries and groups that had not been part of the conversation in 1965 believed that there were gaps in the Convention and that the understanding of what constituted systemic racism and how it still affected the lives of people throughout the world needed to be clearly set out to ensure that all States had a common understanding of the issues. South Africa therefore encouraged all States to participate anew in the Ad Hoc Committee in order to fill those gaps. While the Convention was an almost universally ratified instrument, all instruments were updated. Throughout the United Nations system, most instruments had been updated with a number of additional protocols since their inception. There should be no blanket exception for the Convention. South Africa encouraged all States to work with the Committee with an open mind to find a common understanding.

23. The representative of China said that China set great store by the Ad Hoc Committee. It was regrettable that, 20 years after the adoption of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, the world was still witnessing rising racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. China fully supported the role of the Committee and looked forward to the continuation of the session, during which participants would hopefully have fruitful discussions and find ways to better address the current challenges facing the world.

24. The representative of Pakistan, speaking on behalf of the Organization for Islamic Cooperation (OIC), noted the high importance that OIC accorded to the Ad Hoc Committee's mandate. OIC renewed its support for elaborating complementary standards to strengthen the existing international human rights architecture against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. It was regrettable that, 14 years since the establishment of the Committee, meaningful progress remained elusive, yet the challenges in that thematic area had multiplied. The status quo was no longer acceptable. OIC was extremely concerned about the steady rise in incidents of discrimination, hatred, violence and hostility based on religion, especially against Muslim individuals and communities. Anti-Muslim hatred and Islamophobia, which were often tolerated or authorized by some States, remained pervasive, often under the guise of counter-terrorism or national security. The rise of populist politics and right-wing extremist ideologies across the globe was fuelling religious hatred and violence against the Muslim population. Influenced by such ideologies, several countries had introduced legislation institutionalizing discrimination against Muslims and stereotyping and restricting the wearing of headscarves or facial veils by Muslim women and girls. Refugees, migrants and indigenous communities were often also the targets of systemic discrimination, which undermined their dignity, rights and freedoms. The COVID-19 pandemic had further accentuated those disconcerting trends. OIC strongly condemned Islamophobia in all its forms and manifestations and reiterated its call for the reversal and repeal of such discriminatory laws. OIC believed that a culture of peace, harmony, mutual tolerance and accommodation were the essential antidotes to racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. Affirmative action needed to be accompanied by dissuasive measures, such as calling out patterns of impunity, holding perpetrators accountable and providing remedies to victims of those scourges. OIC reiterated the calls made by the Human Rights Council in its resolution 34/36 for the commencement of the negotiations on an additional protocol to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. The protocol would be a critical tool to help bridge the existing legal and regulatory gaps in combating all forms of contemporary racism, including Islamophobia. OIC assured the Chair-Rapporteur of its commitment to that endeavour.

25. The representative of the European Union stated that the European Union rejected and condemned all forms of discrimination and remained firmly committed to combating all forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, within the European Union and throughout the world. Those phenomena ran counter to respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality and respect for human rights, which underpinned the European Union and were common principles for all its member States. The European Union had taken significant steps since the Ad Hoc Committee had convened in

April 2019. In September 2020, the European Commission had adopted its first ever anti-racism action plan and in 2021, the Commission and the Portuguese presidency had organized an important summit against racism. In May 2021, a new anti-racism coordinator had been appointed, tasked with bringing anti-racism action to European institutions. Much emphasis was being placed on the implementation of the European Union anti-racism action plan and the European Commission had issued a new, reinforced Roma strategic framework focused on equality, inclusion and participation. It had also submitted the first ever comprehensive European Union strategy on combating antisemitism and fostering Jewish life. Furthermore, in an effort to promote the principle of non-discrimination and to prevent and combat racism, xenophobia and other related intolerance, the European Union also provided funding for building inclusive societies, fostering respect for diversity in education, and promoting pluralism and democracy abroad. The European Union believed that the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, to which all European Union member States were parties, was and should remain the basis of all efforts to combat, prevent and eradicate racism. The Convention was the bedrock of action and was a living instrument which was able to address both new and emerging challenges. Therefore, the joint focus should be on encouraging the full and effective implementation of the Convention. Highlighting the indivisibility and interdependence of all human rights, she said that the Convention should not be seen in an isolated manner, but rather read in conjunction with other existing instruments, including articles 19 and 20 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, on freedom of expression and incitement to hatred. There appeared to be no agreement upon whether there were gaps in the Convention or that it failed to address contemporary forms of racism, or evidence for that argument. The European Union remained committed to the primary objectives and commitments made at the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance and to engaging with the Intergovernmental Working Group on the Effective Implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. Nevertheless, it was questionable whether six weeks of meetings per year was the most effective use of resources in the fight against racism, given that the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly had recently created additional tracks to address racism. The European Union remained convinced that proliferation and duplication of the Durban follow-up mechanisms and processes should be avoided, and that resources should be primarily devoted to concrete measures to fight racism and all forms of discrimination on the ground and to overcome the underlying obstacles to the implementation of existing international instruments. The common duty of the United Nations was to combat the scourge of racism, which could only be achieved by overcoming divisions, including around the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, and addressing in a consensual way how genuine progress towards its common goal – a world free of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance – could be achieved. The European Union looked forward to sharing experiences of its own and to hearing contributions from all parts of the world.

26. The representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela said that the Ad Hoc Committee was an important mechanism with a clear mandate to elaborate complementary standards to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, pursuant to the resolutions of the General Assembly and resolution 34/36 of the Human Rights Council. It was an historic moment to address the mandate given to the Committee at a time when manifestations of racism and discrimination were still seen and the challenges continued to be numerous, particularly in developed countries where members of minorities were victims of exclusion, discrimination and poverty. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela condemned the rise in hate speech and incitement to hatred, as well as the rise in extremist far-right political parties that jeopardized the achievements made to protect the rights of vulnerable groups, particularly persons of African descent. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela valued the work of the Committee in developing complementary standards to the Convention, which would allow for progress and bridge gaps, providing a new norm to step up the struggle against all forms of contemporary racism, including incitement to racial and religious hatred. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela remained committed to fighting racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, as those challenges still posed major threats to all of humanity and must be confronted.

27. The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran said that his country aligned itself with the statement that had been made on behalf of OIC. He noted with regret that, despite the many relevant documents that had been issued and the numerous measures taken to combat racism, xenophobia and related intolerance, in particular 20 years after the adoption of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, the world was suffering from revived forms of racial discrimination. Fourteen years after the establishment of the important Ad Hoc Committee, meaningful progress had yet to be achieved on the elaboration of complementary standards. International outcry against emerging Islamophobia, racism, xenophobia and related intolerance, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic, had shown that the international community needed to identify the major obstacles in the way of combating racism and take serious action to eliminate them. There was no question that racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance remained a negation of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and that equality and non-discrimination were fundamental principles of international law. The COVID-19 pandemic had proved that effectively combating acts of racism and racial discrimination in all their forms was more necessary and urgent than ever. He called for the work on the draft additional protocol to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination to begin, as his country believed that the additional protocol would be an important tool to combat all forms of contemporary racism and discrimination.

28. The representative of Egypt expressed deep concern that the Ad Hoc Committee had not been able to deliver on its goals, despite long years of experience and work, and that negotiations continued to focus on whether it was necessary to establish complementary standards. He stressed the need to respect the mandate given to the Committee by the Human Rights Council and repudiated any attempts to call it into question, noting that it was crucial to continue the work given the rise in the scourge of racism and the increase in discrimination around the world. New manifestations of racism and racial discrimination had recently been seen, which had not initially been anticipated in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, hence the need for complementary standards, particularly in the light of the propagation of violence, hate speech, including at the official level, and violence against minorities, in particular within certain international forums where the issue was being debated. Currently, it was necessary to bridge existing gaps, be they in existing international instruments or national laws to combat racial discrimination. Egypt trusted that the Committee would build on earlier progress achieved so that complementary standards could be developed and observance of the Convention ensured.

### **III. General and topical discussions**

#### **A. Updates on the Ad Hoc Committee and general presentation and overview of the intersessional expert session report**

29. At its 2nd and 3rd meetings, the Ad Hoc Committee considered agenda item 4, updates on the Ad Hoc Committee and a general presentation and overview of the intersessional expert session report. At the 2nd meeting, the Chair-Rapporteur presented updates on the Ad Hoc Committee, as much had transpired since its tenth session. She summarized the proceedings of that session and highlighted some of its conclusions and recommendations, drawing attention to the document entitled “Summary of issues and possible elements discussed pertaining to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 73/262 and Human Rights Council resolution 34/36 on the commencement of the negotiations on the draft additional protocol to the Convention criminalizing acts of a racist and xenophobic nature”, which had been adopted at that session. She also gave an overview of the intersessional legal expert consultation, which had been held in a hybrid meeting on 21 and 22 October 2020 in Geneva. At that event, two legal experts from each region, a member of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance had met to consider the summary of issues and possible elements document drafted at the tenth session. The Chair-Rapporteur noted the presentation, at the seventy-fifth session of the



General Assembly, of the third progress report on the Ad Hoc Committee's work by the former Chair-Rapporteur and the interactive dialogue held with the Third Committee, pursuant to the Assembly's request in its resolution 73/262.

30. Also at the 2nd meeting, the representative of Cameroon made a general statement on behalf of the African Group. He said that the African Group regarded the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination as one of the preeminent documents in the fight against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. Nevertheless, the Group also understood it to be a product of its time, which remained one of the few international conventions not to have been elaborated upon or updated through additional protocols. He recalled that when the Convention had come into being, the vast majority of African States had still been under colonial rule, as had most countries in the global South. Those countries – still suffering under the rule of colonialism – had had little free input, if any, in the elaboration, definition and interpretation of what was deemed systemic or structural racism. Indeed, many States that had participated in drafting the Convention had themselves been structurally racist and had hardly recognized any rights for Africans or people of African descent. Only later, when more States had been unshackled from the oppression of colonialism, had the voice of those newly freed States been heard. It had taken until 2001 for the world finally to come together to draft a document that reflected the true aspirations of the vast majority of people around the world who were victims of racial discrimination. While that document, the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, reflected the true view of how the world saw racism and racial discrimination, sadly, 20 years after its adoption, many States that had excluded the victims of racism from participating in the elaboration of the Convention were still not engaging with the implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. The African Group found it difficult to understand why those same States could not see the need for the creation of a common understanding on racism and racial discrimination with those who had excluded the victims from the conversation and had perpetrated racism and still continued to do so, in many instances through systemic racism. The African Group called on all States to come together to have an honest discussion about a 56-year-old document and to realize that it had been written at a time when systemic racism and hate speech against Africans and people of African descent had in fact been the norm, not the exception. He urged the Ad Hoc Committee to work together to update that important Convention. It was difficult for those who had been excluded from the conversation 56 years ago to accept that it was unnecessary to elaborate upon what had been decided for them by others.

31. The representative of the European Union highlighted several crucial aspects of the report of the intersessional expert consultation. The report did not contain information on any agreement on the need for complementary standards to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. There had been much discussion among the experts on phrasing and on some of the terms contained in the summary of possible elements for a draft additional protocol. Indeed, in the report, the experts recommended that “the proposed elements should be reviewed for overbreadth and vagueness to satisfy the precise and detailed language, concepts, and definitions required by the principles of criminal law”. The European Union understood that to mean that the proposal was not ready to be taken to the next level and should be revisited and thoroughly reviewed before taking further steps. The experts had had similar discussions to those being held in the Ad Hoc Committee since its first session in 2009. The Committee had not concluded that there were substantive or procedural gaps in the Convention, which was also the view of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. At the eighth session of the Ad Hoc Committee, held in October 2016, the Chair of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, referring to the conclusions of that Committee's 2007 report on complementary international standards,<sup>3</sup> had stated that the substantive provisions of the Convention were sufficient to combat racial discrimination in contemporary conditions, adding that article 1 of the Convention provided the widest definition of racial discrimination. The five experts who had prepared that 2007 report had not gone so far as to conclude explicitly that there was a need for an additional protocol, stating rather that there was a need for refinement, which could be achieved through, for example, general comments. It was in that light that the European

<sup>3</sup> A/HRC/4/WG.3/7.

Union could not support the commencement of negotiations on an additional protocol to the Convention that would criminalize acts of a racist and xenophobic nature. The European Union was not, per se, against the principle of adopting complementary standards; it understood the need for a common understanding. It was more the fact that identification of gaps needed to be based on data, not views. The decision to adopt standards had to be rationally justified, evidence-based and ideally, reached by consensus. The European Union was not sure that those conditions were currently fulfilled, not because it thought that no progress was needed – there was always scope for progress – but rather, it was unclear whether progress would be made in that way.

32. At the 3rd meeting, the secretariat delivered a detailed overview of the consultation and the report thereof, which had been made available to participants prior to the beginning of the eleventh session. The Chair-Rapporteur invited participants to discuss the report.

33. The representative of South Africa asked whether the experts had provided advice on how to manage the differing views within the Ad Hoc Committee, as some States believed that there were no gaps in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination whereas others did not, and on how to move forward with the elaboration of complementary standards.

34. The representative of Pakistan, speaking on behalf of OIC, agreed with the statement of the representative of South Africa, noting that several questions raised by the legal experts reflected the diversity of views within the Ad Hoc Committee itself. He said that he would have appreciated answers to some of those questions from the legal experts. The discussions in the Committee had pointed toward gaps in several areas. He agreed with the experts that, when dealing with hate speech, the additional protocol should be aligned with articles 19 and 20 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, as the objective of the additional protocol was to bolster the existing human rights instruments on racism and combat new and emerging manifestations of it. He stressed that the new additional instrument must be in line with the existing instruments. Issues regarding the spread and virality of the content available online demanded particular attention. The position of OIC was that advocacy for hatred, violence and discrimination, both online and offline, should be prohibited. While affirmative actions were necessary, punitive measures were also significant in combating hate speech, especially when it was tantamount to inciting violence, including violence based on race, religion, colour or belief. The balance between rights and responsibilities lay at the core of international human rights law. He recalled that Human Rights Council resolution 16/18 provided a comprehensive action plan to foster dialogue when it came to religious hatred, and suggested that the Committee could utilize elements therefrom in the additional protocol. The experts appeared unanimous in the view that there were existing gaps in international legal standards to counter religious discrimination. He disagreed with their position that discrimination based on religion or belief should be segregated from racial discrimination, as that ran contrary to an intersectional approach. He noted that the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination had elaborated upon that in detail and that all human rights governance dealt with all forms of discrimination in the same document. He recalled that racial and religious hatred that constituted incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence were not segregated in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

35. The representative of Egypt stated that the report of the expert session was important because it pointed out the gaps in international conventions, which did not address certain crimes, thus requiring the elaboration of an additional protocol. He said that his country aligned itself with the statements that had been made by South Africa and on behalf of OIC. As the question of definitions had been raised by the experts, it was clear that there were gaps; the experts must advise on filling them. There was agreement at the international level on the need to prohibit various forms of discrimination, for which the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination provided a precedent. Those crimes were recognized and condemned by all when they took place.

36. At the request of the Chair-Rapporteur, the secretariat clarified that the objective of the legal expert consultation had been to solicit input from the experts on a preliminary basis on the elements document agreed to by the Ad Hoc Committee at its tenth session. It would

be the prerogative of the Committee to agree at the eleventh session on a future process regarding the filling of legal gaps or the gathering of additional legal advice.

## **B. Presentation on and discussion of the dissemination of hate speech**

37. At its 4th, 5th and 6th meetings, the Ad Hoc Committee considered agenda item 5 on the dissemination of hate speech. At the 4th meeting, Joanna Botha, Associate Professor and Head of the Department of Public Law at the Faculty of Law, Nelson Mandela University, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, and an Attorney of the High Court of South Africa, gave a presentation on the advice, recommendations and conclusions drawn by the experts on the dissemination of hate speech at their intersessional consultation, held on 21 and 22 October 2020. A summary of the presentation and the discussion that followed is provided in annex I to the present report.

38. Also at the 4th meeting, the Chair-Rapporteur informed the Ad Hoc Committee that she was obliged to absent herself from Geneva for several days owing to a personal emergency. Subsequent meetings were chaired by the interim chairs, Julia Imene-Chanduru, Permanent Representative of Namibia to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, and Salomon Eheth, Permanent Representative of Cameroon to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva.

## **C. Presentation on and discussion of all contemporary forms of discrimination based on religion or belief**

39. At its 7th and 8th meetings, the Ad Hoc Committee considered agenda item 6, all contemporary forms of discrimination based on religion or belief. Ms. Imene-Chanduru chaired the 7th meeting and Mr. Eheth chaired the 8th meeting. At the 7th meeting, the Committee heard a presentation from Doudou Diéne, former Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Côte d'Ivoire, former holder of the mandate of Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance and former official of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, on the advice, recommendations and conclusions drawn by the experts on the issue of all contemporary forms of discrimination based on religion or belief at the intersessional consultation. A summary of the presentation and the discussion that followed is provided in annex I to the present report.

40. At the end of the 8th meeting, the representative of South Africa mentioned that, during a review of the session documents, he had noted that the documents, including the report of the expert consultation, provided few concrete proposals of language to be used in a protocol, but rather listed questions and issues. He had hoped that the experts would have worked towards elaborating actual text. The secretariat clarified that the process had indeed commenced with the tenth session elements document and the outcome agreed to by States. The remit given to the legal experts pursuant to Council resolution 42/29 had been to consider the elements of a draft additional protocol to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination prepared by the Ad Hoc Committee at its tenth session and to prepare a report on the deliberations and recommendations for submission to the Committee at its eleventh session. At that stage, the experts had been able to provide comments, questions and legal insights and suggestions. The delegate of South Africa suggested that the secretariat might review the definitions contained in existing international documents and compile the existing consensus definitions for the Ad Hoc Committee's consideration.

## **D. Presentation on and discussion of racial cybercrime**

41. The Ad Hoc Committee considered agenda item 7, on racial cybercrime, at its 9th, 10th and 11th meetings, during which Ms. Imene-Chanduru and Mr. Eheth replaced the Chair-Rapporteur. At the 9th meeting, the Committee heard a presentation from Joanna Kulesza, Professor of International Law at the University of Lodz, Poland, member of the

Scientific Committee of the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights and Chair of the Advisory Board of the Global Forum on Cyber Expertise, reflecting on the advice, recommendations and conclusions reached by the experts on the issue of racial cybercrime at the intersessional consultation. A summary of the presentation and the discussion that followed is provided in annex I to the present report.

## **E. Presentation on and discussion of preventive measures to combat racist and xenophobic discrimination**

42. According to its programme of work, the Ad Hoc Committee was scheduled to address agenda item 8, on preventive measures to combat racist and xenophobic discrimination, at its 12th meeting. The presentation from Anna Spain Bradley, Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion at the University of California, Los Angeles, and former Professor of Law at the University of Colorado, United States of America, on the advice, recommendations and conclusions drawn by the experts on that issue at the intersessional consultation could not take place owing to technical difficulties.

43. Chairing the meeting, Mr. Ehet invited delegates to deliver statements on preventive measures to combat racist and xenophobic discrimination. He suggested that they consider questions such as whether the additional protocol should contain only legally binding language and whether it should contain measures guaranteeing timely and effective investigation of allegations of acts of a racist and xenophobic nature, access to effective remedies for victims and legal resource assistance for victims to ensure access to effective remedies.

44. The representative of South Africa said that his delegation did not believe that the additional protocol should contain only legally binding language, as guiding principles were always welcome in such a document to assist with better understanding of the subject matter, terminology and how to interpret it. His delegation believed that guiding language would be appropriate.

45. The representative of the non-governmental organization International Human Rights Association of American Minorities stated that the inability to address apartheid and other crimes against humanity associated with racism owing to a lack of political will continued to be a problem. It would be important to consider the impact of Human Rights Council resolution 48/7 on the legacies of colonialism. Colonialism had been squarely placed on the agenda, along with crimes against humanity caused by racism, but there seemed to be a lack of political will or attempts to reduce the scope of apartheid in association with denial of the right to self-determination by the special procedures. He suggested that the Ad Hoc Committee should consider the need for the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive petitions and transmit them to appropriate entities within the United Nations system, in accordance with article 15 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

46. At the 13th meeting, Mr. Ehet, speaking as interim Chair, informed the Ad Hoc Committee that a decision had been taken regarding the holding of the eleventh session. Owing to a personal emergency, the Chair-Rapporteur would continue to be absent from Geneva. In view of the programme of work, there was a need to ensure her presence when considering the important issue of the conclusions and recommendations of the session. Therefore, it had been decided, in consultation with the Chair-Rapporteur, to adjourn the eleventh session and resume it as soon as possible in 2022.

## **F. Presentation and general discussion and exchange of views**

47. The eleventh session of the Ad Hoc Committee was resumed on 18 July 2002. At its 14th meeting, under agenda item 9, the Chair-Rapporteur provided brief updates on the Ad Hoc Committee and the Committee held a general discussion and exchange of views on the eleventh session, with a view to adopting the conclusions and recommendations of the session under agenda item 10.

48. At the 15th meeting, under agenda item 8, the Ad Hoc Committee heard the presentation from Ms. Spain Bradley (see para. 49 above), who summarized the guidance provided at the intersessional legal expert consultation on the issue of preventive measures to combat racist and xenophobic discrimination. A summary of the presentation and the discussion that followed is provided in annex I to the present report.

#### **IV. Adoption of the conclusions and recommendations of the eleventh session**

49. Also at the 15th meeting, the Ad Hoc Committee adopted the conclusions and recommendations of the eleventh session, under agenda item 10. The Committee, within its mandate, interacted with the legal experts on the four issues, as detailed below.

50. Concerning the dissemination of hate speech, the Ad Hoc Committee concluded that it should:

(a) Obtain contextual and legal assistance on filling possible legal gaps or elicit further expert input on specific issues such as criminalization, historical context of law and treaties, and definitions of terminology;

(b) Consider a document outlining language and definitions from existing international instruments that could be used for elaborating the additional protocol;

(c) Obtain international cooperation in preventing and combating the dissemination of hate speech and assistance in the elimination thereof.

51. Concerning all contemporary forms of discrimination based on religion or belief, the Ad Hoc Committee concluded that it should:

(a) Hold further discussions on combating all contemporary forms of discrimination based on religion or belief and identifying elements to be included in an additional protocol to bridge possible legal gaps;

(b) Consider using the elements contained in the action plan in Human Rights Council resolution 16/18 (combating intolerance, negative stereotyping and stigmatization of, and discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against, persons based on religion or belief) to foster discussions on religion or belief in the context of the additional protocol.

52. Concerning racial cybercrime, the Ad Hoc Committee concluded that it should:

(a) Study the work of other United Nations processes on addressing cybercrime, such as the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security, the Open-ended Working Group on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security, and the new Ad Hoc Committee to Elaborate a Comprehensive International Convention on Countering the Use of Information and Communications Technologies for Criminal Purposes, which was to be presented with the 2020 draft of an international convention on cybercrime in January 2022;

(b) Explore ways to link up elements of its work on racial cybercrime with the process and overall work of the United Nations on cybercrime, as detailed in subparagraph (a) above.

53. Concerning preventive measures to combat racist and xenophobic discrimination, the Ad Hoc Committee concluded that it should revisit the draft provisions of paragraph 108 (g) of the elements text to ensure greater specificity and consider alternative phrasing and language in those paragraphs.

## Annex I

### Summaries of the presentations and initial discussions on the agenda topics

#### Presentation and discussion on dissemination of hate speech

1. At its 4th, 5th, and 6th meetings, the Ad Hoc Committee considered agenda item 5 on the dissemination of hate speech. Joanna Botha, Associate Professor and Head of the Department of Public Law at the Faculty of Law, Nelson Mandela University, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, and Attorney of the High Court of South Africa, gave a presentation on the advice, recommendations, and conclusions drawn by the experts on the dissemination of hate speech at their intersessional consultation of 21–22 October 2020.
2. Ms. Botha briefly situated the background of the experts' mandate, "to consider the elements of a draft additional protocol to the Convention and to prepare a report on our deliberations and recommendations for the Ad Hoc Committee at its 11th session," and noted that the purpose of her presentation at the 11th session is to report on the first issue the experts considered: dissemination of hate speech, as addressed in paragraph 108(a)–(d) of [A/HRC/42/58](#), the report of the 10th session of the Ad Hoc Committee.
3. Ms. Botha then discussed article 4 of the ICERD – noting that article 4(a) has been the subject of much academic and political discussion – and outlined the interpretation of dissemination of hate speech in General Recommendation 35. She outlined the nexus between hate speech and discrimination, and highlighted the mandatory nature of article 4, which shows how central it is to the struggle against racial discrimination. She stated that it is a mistake to think that the ICERD defines hate speech, and that General Recommendation 35 clarifies this. She explained that racist hate speech can take many forms and is not confined to only explicitly racial remarks – it can include acts, signs, pamphlets, language, symbols, and can be both verbal and non-verbal, and occur offline or online. She also noted that recommendations apply to racist hate speech, whether from individuals or groups, in whatever form it manifests, orally or in print, or disseminated through electronic media, including the internet and social media, plus non-verbal forms of expression, for example display of racist symbols, images, and behaviour at public gatherings, including sporting events.
4. Ms. Botha then outlined state obligations regarding hate speech, which include giving urgent attention to all manifestations of racist hate speech and taking effective measures to combat them; taking "immediate and positive measures" to eradicate incitement and discrimination, and dedicating the widest possible range of resources to eradication of hate speech – including legislative, executive, administrative, budgetary, and regulatory instruments, plans, policies, programmes, and regimes; taking a holistic and integrated approach to regulation of hate speech; adopting legislation to combat racist hate speech that falls within the scope of article 4 of the ICERD.
5. Ms. Botha discussed factors and context to consider for criminalization, which she views as very important. Factors to consider include the content and form of speech; the economic, social, and political climate at play; the position or status of the speaker and the audience to whom speech is directed – which she considers very important, as a high-status speaker can lead to greater violence; the reach of the speech, or how broadly it is disseminated; and the objectives, or purpose, of the speech, which is important for determining incitement and whether a defence is available. Ms. Botha also stressed that restrictions cannot be too broad or vague. They must be formulated with precision, due regard, and a balanced approach. She noted, specifically that insult and slander cannot be criminalized for these reasons.
6. Addressing specific expert elaborations on the proposed draft elements in paragraph 108, Ms. Botha noted the experts' general discomfort with the wording. She recalled that the experts were uncomfortable that the criminal provisions would apply "irrespective of the author," as they all agreed authorship is a key component of a standard criminal law analysis, even though the experts understand the desire to capture both the original author and people who share the content. She explained that when an act is being criminalized, we need to

ensure that there is a very strict and precise definition being used, and that much of the language in paragraph 108 is not precise enough to meet this standard.

7. Ms. Botha noted the experts' suggestion that "acts" should be quite broad, including, for example, the display of signs, symbols, and gestures. She stressed the experts' position that, for criminalization to be appropriate, stronger definition for "racist," "xenophobic," and "religion/religious" should be elaborated. She also addressed the issue of online versus offline speech and that the experts agreed that everything which applies offline should also apply online, but there is more potential for material to "go viral" online, thus there is more potential for harm in that venue.

8. Discussing elements (a)–(c) of paragraph 108, Ms. Botha noted the experts' opinion that "hate speech" in 108(a) is far too broad and too vague. Terminology needs to have a precise, consistent definition and specific requirements when it is being used for the purposes of criminalization. She also believes there should be available defences, but that these do not necessarily need to be elaborated.

9. On 108(b) the experts agreed that the wording was quite problematic, as it conflates hate crimes and hate speech. Legally-speaking, as hate crime occurs when an existing criminal act is committed with a discriminatory bias. All States Parties should be regulating hate crimes, but there must be a distinction between regulation of hate crimes and criminalization of hate speech.

10. Ms. Botha relayed that the experts found paragraph 108(c) far too broad, but also redundant because a precise definition of hate speech would capture everything mentioned in this clause. She noted the experts felt it confused things rather than adding clarity or precision.

11. Regarding thematic issues, experts at the consultation focused on the interplay between criminal and civil law. While they believe criminalization of hate speech is necessary, it must be done with a precise definition and reserved for the most egregious cases. The experts also agreed – as has been stressed by CERD and the ICERD – that it would be misguided to rely only on legal measures and that positive and preventive measures are necessary as well. When law is involved, they also agreed that in addition to criminal law measures, civil law and effective human rights standards are of vital importance for a standard to have a broad range of recourse.

12. In response to Ms. Botha's presentation, the representative of South Africa acknowledged that the group of experts were asked specifically to look at the draft, and that he has heard their cautions to deal very specifically and carefully with language, but notes it would have been helpful to receive some language proposals as well. He shared that South Africa has been grappling with the subject of hate speech recently, and they have even had a case where someone said something discriminatory in Greece and it was prosecuted in South Africa, and requested that Ms. Botha share about the South African process.

13. Ms. Botha responded that, insofar as language is concerned, her presentation and the expert report have been shared with the Member States, and in her view when the dissemination of hate speech is criminalized, we need to use specific language, mainly "the advocacy of hatred against a person or group of persons based on the grounds which are specified in the Convention itself," potentially extending and exploring that, "and which incites to harm." From her perspective those are standard, clear terms that should be used for the criminalization of hate speech because it also captures hatred, intention, incitement, and harm – the key elements.

14. She also responded to the South African delegate's request to explain a bit about what is happening in South Africa, and she explained that the wording she had just suggested comes not only from the ICCPR, but also from the South African Constitution, which specifically protects freedom of expression but states that it does not extend to hate speech, as she has defined it.

15. Ms. Botha then outlined a piece of South African legislation known as the Promotion of Equality and Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act, which was passed in 2000, and prohibits unfair discrimination, anti-human rights legislation, creates equality courts, and prohibits hate speech. However, there is a problem with the prohibition of hate speech in this

Act, as it is done in very broad terms and has just been declared unconstitutional due to overbreadth, even at a human rights level. She stated that it is not only overbroad, but also vague and very confusing to understand, so now the legislature has to go back and create a more precise definition for hate speech so that it can be operative even, she stressed, at a human rights level in equality courts.

16. She then noted that the case the delegate raised about the individual who disparaged people of African descent in South Africa on a European beach was very well dealt with, because the South African equality act contains a wide range of remedies, including positive measures that can be put in place where people can be educated and compelled to experience what it is like to be a member of the marginalized group and to understand the implications thereof. She explained that the Equality Act does well to prohibit discrimination, but it does not do well on hate speech due to the overbroad definition, nor has it yet properly enacted the provisions promoting equality. She also noted that South Africa does not have a specific hate crime offence, nor does it regulate hate crimes properly, although a number of bills have been put forward. She stated that from her perspective, South Africa is a perfect example of a country which should be criminalizing hate speech and regulating hate crimes, but which is not doing so perhaps because of some uncertainty as to what the standards are.

17. The representative of the EU made a statement on dissemination of hate speech, sharing that the EU is deeply concerned with rising hate speech including online, and the use of digital tools to spread hatred and violence and we have been working to prevent such incidents related to direct and indirect discrimination in order to punish perpetrators as well as to ensure justice, protection, and support to victims, and has been working closely with online platforms and internet service providers on these matters. In general, she stated, the European Union does have quite firm framework legislation on combating certain forms of racism and xenophobic crimes, and this sets the frame for common response of all member states to hate speech and hate crimes since it obliges member states to penalize the public incitement to violence against a group of persons or a member of such a group defined by reference to race, colour, religion, descent, or national or ethnic origin and that has to do with hate speech specifically. She noted, furthermore, that member states of the European Union must also ensure that racist or xenophobic motivation is considered as an aggravating circumstance, or alternatively that such a motivation may be taken into account in determination of penalties for any other criminal offences. This legislation, she explained, is also complemented by rules to protect victims of crime since it obliges member states to ensure their non-discriminatory treatment of victims of crime, including in respect to their resident status, and pays particular attention to the victims of bias-motivated crime. The delegate shared that, when it comes to the opinions expressed during the expert consultation, the European Union shares many of the outlined on pages 6–8 of the report, and agrees with the position that the ICERD already covers hate speech, hate crimes, and racial superiority, as well as racial profiling and discriminatory access to human rights, and that CERD has already given recommendations on these issues to many individual countries, including Member States. She suggested that it may be useful to look first at what already existed before trying to add elements to the existing law.

18. Ms. Botha responded that she is aware of the EU's position in relation to the regulation of hate crimes and dissemination of hate speech, both online and offline, and agrees that what the EU does is exceptional, but stressed that, in her view, more is needed to ensure a common standard at the international level because the recommendations we have are merely that, and the Convention itself does not use the word hate speech at all. It is clear that other Member States and States Parties are not doing what is required of them, which could surely be addressed with clearer standards as to the level of compliance.

19. The representative of the Russian Federation expressed support that this work should continue, and made a comment about the presentation. The delegate noted that, despite efforts of the international community, around the world we are observing the more active use of hate speech, as well as incitement to acts of hatred and violence and the growth of extremist movements who spread an ethos of racial superiority. He said it is to be noted that these phenomena take place in states which declare themselves to be democratically mature, and to be promoting democratic standards, and such states take almost no actions or measures to halt hate speech, incitement to hatred, incitement to violence, and the right to free expression



and opinion. The Russian Federation considers this position to be damaging and to violate international standards in the area of human rights, which are undergirded by the International Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, as well as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Freedom of expression should not be justification for extremist movements to be able to promote any kind of racist dialogue, he stated. He also noted the danger we experienced in the first part of the 20th century, given the rise of Nazism. The representative raised serious concerns regarding the violation of human rights and dissemination of violent rhetoric in online spaces, and stated that this phenomenon is strengthened by contemporary technology. He stated it is clear that measures must be taken to prevent and halt the spread of hate speech in social media, and that it is important to recognise the necessity to create legislative, institutional, political, and administrative frameworks in the area of online communication.

20. The representative of Pakistan posed a question about the contextual factors and 5 points outlined by Ms. Botha for determining hate speech. Recalling the workshop organized in Rabat a number of years ago by the OHCHR, he noted that some of the factors from the Rabat outcome were the same, but two or three were different. He requested the speaker to compare both thresholds, but also noted that under freedom of expression some States are making vague laws and providing space that could lead to hate speech and incitement to violence. He wondered if it would be feasible for any country to apply a five or six layer test to determine what constitutes hate speech, because many may not have the time or capacity to apply such an elaborate test, as it could result in a number of losses to innocent lives or damage to property.

21. Ms. Botha thanked the representative of Pakistan for mentioning the Rabat Plan of Action, which deals specifically with article 20 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and places an obligation on States Parties to limit freedom of expression to regulate hate speech. She went through the 6-part threshold test noting that the first step is context, which is very much the same as she mentioned earlier. The second is speaker and the speaker's status, and the audience to whom the speech is directed, which is also the same as one of the steps she mentioned. The third step is intent, and she expressed hope that she had been clear when commenting on the wording of paragraph 108(a) versus the recommendations of the Committee that she specifically dealt with intent and required the in the language used that there be the advocacy of hatred and the incitement of harm, and that is encapsulated in the intent requirement out of the test from the Rabat Plan. The fourth Rabat Plan requirement is content and form, which is exactly the same as the number one requirement of the recommendation coming from the Committee. The fifth, she stated, is the extent of the speech act, which is talking about reach, and when we speak of dissemination, we obviously mean speech that is disseminated and broadcast, not just a conversation. And the sixth requirement is likelihood, including imminence, which is looking at potential for harm – in other words that this speech act has a very real possibility not necessarily of causing physical harm to the group targeted, but could be indirect harm in the form of psychological and emotional well-being being undermined, but also it is the standing in society being undermined. That where a group is targeted because of who they are based on skin colour, religion, language, ethnicity, and cost as members of an outgroup that is not wanted that this undermines their standing in society which is an indirect harm, but also undermines the social cohesion that is necessary for a democratic state that actually prizes everybody's worth and capability.

22. Ms. Botha explained that her recommendations come directly from the CERD committee itself, and she believes it has encompassed what is in the Rabat Plan of Action. She agreed that this is an urgent and pressing matter which needs to be dealt with sooner rather than later. Insofar as the relevance of this test is concerned, she stated the point is that the wording of any protocol or complementary standard should be clear as to what states parties obligations are. This test – the Rabat Plan of Action test plus the test that she mentioned earlier would also assist domestic institutions in formulating their criminal prohibition and then prosecuting authorities being able to decide what speech falls in the ambit thereof. These, she explained, are considered standard, good requirements for regulating hate speech under the criminal law.

23. Noting there were no further requests for the floor at that time, the Chair-Rapporteur proceeded with a question of her own. She sought Ms. Botha and the delegations' views on the discussion elements paper circulated in advance of the 11th session, and sought further understanding on the benefits, risks, and challenges of a criminal law versus a civil law approach, and whether a regulatory framework is sufficient to eliminate hate and discrimination.

24. Ms. Botha responded first by outlining the risks. She explained that if the standard is not clear – if legislative measures are too broad, or too vague – they can end up stifling freedom of expression, which is vital to ensure the importance of democracy and the peoples' views and voices are heard, and that they feel valued. She notes that she has stressed throughout her presentation and this dialogue the importance of freedom of expression and proper balancing. She explained that the risk of an unclear standard is that, in an attempt to promote human equality and dignity, there might be a regulator that is too broad and captures insults and ridicule, which in her view should never form part of criminal legislation. That part should be reserved for civil law, but even with civil law and human rights law there is a need for a precise regulator – though in those cases it need not include intent, because it is the impact on the victim that is important.

25. As for the benefits, Ms. Botha noted that it is critically important that we do not see regulation in isolation. We need to appreciate that when we aim to combat, to eliminate, to protect victims of unfair discrimination and racial and religious violence, this is a huge problem that is caused by humanitarian crises, international conflicts, human mobility, migration, climate change, etc. She stressed that we need to understand the necessity of a multi-faceted approach to deal with this crisis. Human rights law is important, the civil law is important, the criminal law is exceptionally important to deal with those cases which are egregious, which aggravate hatred, which call for groups to be eliminated, that call for groups to be othered, not to be wanted at all, because when the victims of those speech acts were ignored, in essence it deemed them unworthy, that they were not wanted in our society, and the authorities are not prepared to put a law in place to deal with that type of situation. Ms. Botha noted that when a state enacts legislation at multiple levels to protect the victims of such speech discrimination, at a criminal level, a civil and human rights level, and has measures in place to overcome discrimination – positive measures – then the benefit is that everybody in society feels worthy and feels that the state respects their rights. The work done on victims and not being felt wanted and the state ignoring the symbolic value of the law in this respect is absolutely critical. She also stressed that we need to get it right, because freedom of expression is also important.

26. Addressing the question of challenges, Ms. Botha suggested the need to accept that this should not be a political process can be a challenge, as can egos, and historical challenges as to who can and cannot be racist and who can and cannot be protected. She said it is important to draw lines empathetically, fairly, and humanely, and to bring everyone to the table. She also stressed that she believes the benefits outweigh the risks and challenges.

27. The Chair-Rapporteur followed up by asking Ms. Botha what, to her view, does the additional protocol aim to prevent or protect against, and how would the additional protocol ensure regulation of hate speech does not place undue limits on freedom of opinion and expression?

28. Ms. Botha responded that, in her view, the additional protocol aims to prevent a situation where States Parties can say they are uncertain of what the standard is and what is required of them. She noted that the existing Convention is unclear on exactly what States are required to regulate, because it merely says “an offence punishable by law,” which could be interpreted to not necessarily include the criminal law. While she thinks that is a stretch, she stated it is clear that more certainty is needed as to what states' obligations should be in this respect, and also given the proliferation of what is going on now in the world in relation to discrimination and hate speech, it's clear that we need to do more. She reiterated that the Convention needs to be clearer, made priority, and it needs to be completely up-to-date with the online space. In her opinion, the existing Convention does not speak too clearly to what States Parties' obligations are.

29. On the issue of ensuring freedom of opinion and expression is protected, Ms. Botha noted that she has aimed to answer that, but wished to stress that the criminal law should be reserved only for those cases that fall within a very strict test, and that we have a threshold test that States Parties can use to assess what is and isn't speech deserving of criminal sanction. She further explained that penalties must be consistent, and that we need to look at custodial sanction. She noted these are very complex issues that need to be explored in more detail and tapped into to ensure there is due regard for all rights in the human rights framework.

30. The representative of South Africa commented that the African Group and South Africa have raised that the ICERD was written 56 years ago and that the writers, unfortunately excluded many of the people that were victims of racial discrimination, since they were mostly colonies and, in many of the countries, had no rights at all – including in some of the countries that actually proposed and wrote the document. The fight for racial freedom in those countries still had not finished, and it was only more than a decade later that many of the freedoms of movement and equality came about in many of these countries. In 2001 the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action brought almost 200 countries in the world together where the issue of the definitions and elaborations of what is understood as racial discrimination, racism, systemic racism, racist hate crimes and it was elaborated by countries which wrote the ICERD in 1965 and ones that were not at the conversation in 1965 working together. He stated that, unfortunately, some of those countries who wrote the 1965 document do not support the DDPA and are working very hard against it, while others support it. The problem was that the Convention must be one of the only conventions that is old and without an additional protocol. For example, the Convention on social and economic rights, women's rights, and children's rights have additional updates as the world has changed and people have accepted the rights of these groups, yet this Convention seems to be a "holy cow", and the African Group did not understand why some states considered it is so perfect as to not require any elaboration, especially because the document itself has only a small section that speaks in broad, general terms about racial discrimination. It did not specify what was meant by racial discrimination. He indicated the lack of participation from some of these countries, which was needed for further elaboration. In light of this, the representative asked, how the Committee might move forward. He highlighted the need to bring the Committee together to form a common understanding in order to elaborate and update the ICERD.

31. Ms. Botha replied that, in her view, recognizing this problem, perhaps in relation to the SDGs and looking at how SDGs are met might be useful. She believes the way forward is to acknowledge upfront that is a very real problem undermining our world, and victims and people are regularly targeted, ostracized, and made to feel othered. She noted that she suspects, ironically, that some of the Member States the representative mentioned do, in fact regulate this type of speech in their own countries very well, and further ironically some of the Member States who push for the additional protocol to be implemented actually in their own countries do not regulate online and offline hate speech and discrimination. Ms. Botha suggested that we need a common approach where there is buy in that this is an issue we all face. It is a reality that when people are made to feel unwelcome in a society because they are different, that you're undermining the whole ethos of society and who we are as a people. We need to acknowledge this problem and do more work like we did at Durban, which was in 2001 – but now we are in 2021. She noted that if we look at the SDGs, some of them spotlight exactly what is happening here, so perhaps the answer is to work together as teams and not in silos to do our best to change the world for the better. She stated that she does think it is time for us to move past a Convention that was developed in the 1960s.

32. The Chair-Rapporteur requested Ms. Botha's reflections on whether the additional protocol should provide guidance on offline and online provisions separately? She also asked who are the intended perpetrators of the criminal provisions, and does the identity of the author matter? Does the reach of a powerful author provoke a different response than a less powerful actor? What is the required intent to prove the criminal act?

33. Ms. Botha responded that, in her view, the basics – what the elements are – of hate speech at the criminal level are the same online or offline; but the reality is that with online hate speech and the hate groups and organization thereof there would need to be more specific requirements as to what constitutes online speech, as opposed to offline speech and what it

is that you're trying to regulate. She noted that, the basic elements should be the same for the offence, but you would need to require a bit more particularity as to the distinctions between the two. Experience shows, if one looks at the European example and the work that is being done by EU and indeed other countries, to regulate the issue of online hate speech, and cybercrime, and cyber speech, that you need to be more specific there.

34. On the second and third questions, which Ms. Botha found had some overlap, she responded that when you deal with a criminal sanction, the identity of an author and their reach that that would be a critical factor in deciding a) whether or not to prosecute, b) whether there has been incitement of hatred, because then you look at the audience as well – the intended audience as well as possibly the unintended audience, and c) would look at the impact of the harm. Because it's the potential for harm that is really important when deciding if someone should be prosecuted for the criminal offence of hate speech. Ms. Botha clarified that she was not suggesting that this be part of the elements, but when it comes to the hearing of the case and deciding whether or not to prosecute, and if this person is found guilty what the sanction should be, then undoubtedly the author of the speech is going to be really important. She explained that this is why she believes there is a problem with the wording to the introduction of to paragraph 108 where it say "irrespective of the author." She suggests that it be removed, and for it to be made clear that this is relevant to the consequences of hate speech.

35. Ms. Botha also raised the issue of required intent, and the need to distinguish between hate speech that is so serious as to warrant criminal regulation and hate speech which should be dealt with as a human rights-type intervention. She stated that intent is necessary in criminal law to protect freedom of expression: there must be intent to advocate hatred, which is different than insult, ridicule, and offense. She explained that hatred has been defined quite extensively in international law and also at various domestic levels. She noted that in her extensive work on the problem with hate, she has found it clear that hate against people who are different to us is a specific intent where you advocate that hatred, and you must also incite others to harm societal well-being or the group of individuals. So incitement requires intent, advocacy requires intent at the criminal level. At the human rights level, which is different from the criminal or civil levels, she notes it is necessary to look at the words that were actually used, who it targets, and the impact of that speech. But she stressed the need for a criminal law response as well and questioned why this type of hate is any different than murder or rape, for example, when the harm can be as severe.

36. The Chair-Rapporteur then questioned Ms. Botha about whether there are any existing regulations on hate speech outside of ICCPR article 20. Ms. Botha responded that the ICCPR is the go-to, but that there are other treaties that talk about discrimination and hate speech: CEDAW, for example, in the context of women. But in those cases, Ms. Botha explained, it is all done peripherally in a way that does not address the issue head-on. From her perspective, the primary international treaties are the ICERD and the ICCPR.

37. At its 5th meeting, the Chair-Rapporteur was called away from Geneva on an urgent personal matter, and Ms. Julia Imene-Chanduru, Permanent Representative of the Republic of Namibia to the United Nations in Geneva chaired the meeting. She recalled the presentation by Ms. Joanna Botha at the 4th meeting, and suggested the 5th meeting begin by considering the definitions in the Committee's discussions. She asked the Committee how to define racism, xenophobia, hate speech, hate crime, racial profiling, intolerance, racist and xenophobic content, and opened the floor for discussion, reminding delegates that the questions are from the elements document that had previously been circulated.

38. The representative of Venezuela delivered a statement about hate speech where he expressed appreciation for the work of the Committee and the discussions intended to steer it toward consensus on the elaboration of complementary standards which will allow a filling of gaps in the Convention, to strengthen the fight against racism, racial discrimination and forms of related intolerance, which include hate speech and incitement towards racial hatred. He requested that steps be taken to eliminate incitement to racial hatred as part of the complementary standards, and stated that all should be concerned about the upswing around the world, particularly in developed countries, of increased incitement of racial hatred and racial incitement as well as extremist speech all used by political parties including political parties of a neo-fascist and extreme right which put at risk all that had been achieved in the

field of human rights, in particular concerning Afro-descendants and other vulnerable groups. He explained that Venezuela itself has taken key steps to ensure that diversity is one of the strengths of the Venezuelan state through proactive approach to involve all sectors of society in line with the provisions of the convention. In 2017, it adopted constitutional law against hatred and for peaceful coexistence and tolerance, the purpose of which is to recognize diversity and ensure tolerance and prevent and stamp out any forms of hate or discrimination, harassment or violence.

39. The representative of Cameroon expressed the importance of this Committee to his country, and the essential, important nature of the subject matter it deals with. He wished to underscore the pertinence of ensuring that the Committee contribute to a specific determination and definition of the terminology. He noted that the majority of international texts, including the Charter and the Conventions, as well as various other international instruments contain very specific and clear definitions with regard to what is hate, racial hate speech, racism and all of the terminology concerning this subject matter. He stated that his delegation insisted that in an increasingly globalized world, that is pursuing ways of peaceful and harmonious coexistence, practices such as racism are not acceptable in the current era and they hinder development. The lack of a specific definition, which is duly aligned with the definitions which found in existing texts, and also found in national legislation, is a major failing which must be addressed. Today's societies are clamoring and making their claims in the different political movements across the political spectrum which are emerging. Therefore there is a need to contribute to specific definitions that are easy to interpret, use and understand, and which would facilitate the crafting of a universal international instrument that will be broadly and universally accepted. The work being undertaken is vitally important, underlining the necessity to be very precise and specific with language. The definition of terms, clarification of language and meaning would put an end to any confusion. The additional protocol should be a useful one, that will contribute to the harmonization of relationships in and between societies.

40. The representative of the IHRC stated that IHRC has launched educational campaigns on television and social media to combat false and misleading news and hate speech and reduce the stigmatization of people due to their infection with coronavirus.

41. Ms. Imene-Chanduru then asked a further question of the Committee, requesting delegates' perspectives on whether there should be a distinction between the author of the speech and a person who forwards or shares it. The representative of South Africa responded that his country has been moving toward the criminalization of hate speech, and legislation has been drawn up and used in a number of cases where persons were seen to have used racial hate language that caused harm to the public. He noted some of these prosecutions have been quite successful and that as new laws are put in place, they are tested in the courts against the Constitution to ensure that it is defined and adheres to the best tests for what hate speech is. He agreed with the representative of Cameroon that it is extremely important for the Committee to elaborate further on the ICERD – as it is an older document and there is not common understanding of the terminology, and it would be very important to find common understanding. He expressed South Africa's understanding that there is a difference between the original author of hate speech, but the problem that comes with modern technology is while the original author might have been an important person, which makes it a serious issue due to the person's standing in the community, the problem is that these statements are often picked up by other internet influencers, and some of them have a much larger following than the original author themselves. They therefore spread it very quickly. He suggested that perhaps the Committee should classify between the two in its text and its language, but a lesser punishment or lesser form of damage done by the person who spreads it than the original author should not be assigned. While the intent of the original author is important, it could be possible for the person spreading the information to do more damage.

42. The representative of Cameroon stated that his South African colleague had raised a central issue of the debate, and noted that the problem facing the Committee is the question of whether the author of the crime and/or the accomplice to the crime should be held accountable, is a classic issue in criminal law. The question was who caused the greater harm, and what is the responsibility of the author and of the accomplice? He noted there is tremendous legal scholarship on this matter. But there needs to be a clear distinction between

the author and the person spreading the information. The delegate also raised the importance of intention, noting that perhaps there was a specific problem that the author was trying to resolve. He surmised that this work is quite delicate and will contribute to providing further specifics on the exact meaning of the terms and terminology that would be used in elaborating the additional protocol to the Convention.

43. Ms. Imene-Chanduru then asked whether the identity of the author matters: does the reach of a more powerful actor provoke a different response than a less powerful actor? The representative of Pakistan responded, stating that the person who is in power can damage the most with hate speech or incitement to violence, but for the sake of developing law or convention it would be difficult to differentiate on the individual based on their position, so in Pakistan's view, we need to treat them equally within the ambit of the additional protocol.

44. The representative of South Africa stated that the representative of Pakistan on behalf of the OIC made very valid points, adding that the position or status of a certain person may lead the audience to accept the words or speech more easily, therefore impacting the reach of the hate speech. But he questioned, how this could be differentiated in a treaty or document. He noted that a certain person may be very important in one country, but unknown in another. He stated that this equally in the text. He noted that, whilst in the end there is an effort to take the author to task in a legal situation, there they will judge the influence of such a person. But in a text you can't really do it. It's a fact that here one deals with the fundamental principle of it, and once it reaches prosecution, etc. if it ever goes that far, that's where the damage is done by the person would be evaluated and that includes the person's status in society. Because a person of high value and status in society can very easily do much more damage than an ordinary person does, but there should be no difference under the law. The law should treat everybody equally.

45. The representative of Cameroon commented that the relevant statements by the representatives of Pakistan on behalf of the OIC and South Africa raised the important issue of aggravating circumstances. When racial hate speech is disseminated by a high profile actor it was more likely to be accepted as this person is an authority. The author of the statement and the person who is spreading the hate speech disseminates the speech as a function of their social status was also an important consideration.

46. Ms. Imene-Chanduru posed another question to the Committee about whether there should be an emphasis on working with the private sector to accomplish the goals of the additional protocol. The representative of South Africa believed it extremely important to take the views of and work with civil society on these matters, as in the private sector and civil society there were media houses, which included social media systems. He noted that currently some of the social media platforms were addressing the issue of hate speech on their platforms, following pressure that various civil society movements. He stated that social media platforms could not argue they were only a platform for freedom of speech while cognizant of the harm which could result and that the platform is the vehicle that allows hate speech to be disseminated very easily and very far. He emphasized that civil society should help drive change and respond to calls from people, societies, and organizations in countries. He explained that South Africa's Constitution is very strict on freedom of speech, because of its past experience when apartheid restricted what people could say or publish. Therefore, South Africa believes the ability to say what needs to be said is sacrosanct, but no right is unlimited. He recalled that the ICERD itself and the ICCPR mention there are times when the ability for freedom of speech could be limited, and that no right is absolute. The Committee should be very careful and narrow its definitions and focus in order not to infringe upon freedom of speech, but that there be a careful consideration of the kind of speech that caused harm or damage. Therefore he agreed with Ms. Botha that sometimes in writing regionally the documents are quite broad, but we should narrow the definitions to better target hate speech.

47. Responding to South Africa, Ms. Imene-Chanduru noted the importance of starting with definitions. The representative of the IHRC took the floor to agree with the South African representative, stating that IHRC sees false media reporting as a contributor to creating problems without accountability. Therefore, international laws must bring accountability and be applied equally. He stated that it created confusion when there is false

media reports on private and religious matters, and urged focus on such laws and how to make them equitable and effective.

48. At the Committee's 6th meeting, Mr. Salomon Eheth stood in for the Chair-Rapporteur during her continued absence and resumed the discussion on item 5 concerning the dissemination of hate speech. He recalled the presentation at the 4th meeting by Ms. Joanna Botha, and the discussion at the 5th meeting regarding definitions. He opened the floor for comment and suggested revisiting the differences between a criminal law versus a civil law approach to the issue.

49. The representative of South Africa commented on the issue of defining terminology and noted that many of the terms are clearly defined in other documents, including the DDPA. As for the discussion of criminal versus civil law, the difference was that often the victim of hate crime or hate speech or racism was usually a person from a disadvantaged community. The problem of using a civil law process is that the aggrieved party would likely need to employ a legal professional to take the perpetrator to civil proceeding. This was unlikely due to the availability of resources for the aggrieved party. Even in countries where there are public prosecutors or lawyers to assist, that access to that is almost impossible. Looking at the criminal justice system, if the speech itself or the incitement itself is aggrieved enough that it causes harm – it is not normal speech – and must be legislated. While complicated, with clear definitions, or narrow definitions, on what hate speech constitutes, there should be an ability by states to protect all their citizens. Civil law could also be useful resources could be made available to assist people.

50. Mr. Eheth shared that it is important to consider both civil and criminal law in the protection of victims. He then guided discussion to the responsibility of the author and those who spread information, and opened the floor. He raised the point that the South African delegate made about the risks and benefits of civil and criminal law and the protection of victims. He also asked how the Committee would address overbreadth and vagueness, and use precise definitions of language. He asked how the additional protocol would ensure that the regulation of hate speech does not place undue limits on freedom of expression and opinion.

51. The South African representative responded saying that it is important that terms be defined but that he thinks that the legal experts and lawyers should have done so, but they just asked a lot of questions. He articulated that the difference between hate speech and normal speech is the intent of the person to use derogatory language that deliberately is of a higher calibre that degrades people to an extent that it shows the speaker's superiority over them and that negative characteristics are put forward against the other person. He continued that also requesting their audience to suppress or to shun the other person and marginalize them would be captured by this. He stated that incitement to hatred is the similar. He recalled the case of Rwanda where, before the genocide there public speakers on the radio dehumanizing a segment of the population by calling them cockroaches, and noting that it invoked notions of extermination them through various means. He recalled the effect of that kind of hate speech, which dehumanization incited other people to treat a group as inhuman. He concluded by saying that normal speech is not necessarily with the full intent to cause harm, whereas hate speech is used to dehumanize or cause harm to people.

#### **Presentation and discussion on all contemporary forms of discrimination based on religion or belief**

52. At its 7th and 8th meetings, the Committee considered item 6 on all contemporary forms of discrimination based on religion or belief. Ms. Julia Imene-Chanduru, Permanent Representative of Namibia to the United Nations at Geneva stood in for the Chair-Rapporteur at the 7th meeting, and Mr. Salomon Eheth, Permanent Representative of Cameroon to the United Nations at Geneva stood in for the 8th meeting. At the 7th meeting, the Committee heard a presentation from Mr. Doudou Diene, United Nations Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Cote d'Ivoire ; former United Nations Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance; and former UNESCO official on the advice, recommendations, and conclusions drawn by the experts on all contemporary forms of discrimination based on religion or belief at their intersessional consultation of 21–22 October 2020.

53. After his introduction by Ms. Imene-Chanduru, Mr. Diene began his presentation by outlining the relevant issues from the elements document and suggested that the main issue was to revisit paragraph 108(a)–(d) to elaborate actionable provisions, including a complete and precise definition of what constitutes “contemporary forms of discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief.” He stated that combining religion and belief in this additional protocol alongside racial discrimination could have unintended consequences for existing ICERD provisions, but that separate standards addressing race or religion and belief could lead to a protection gap for individuals experiencing multiple and compounding forms of discrimination.

54. Mr. Diene outlined the questions raised by the legal experts at their consultation of whether an additional protocol to the ICERD is the proper venue for addressing discrimination on the basis of religion or belief; whether there is a nexus between race or racial identity and religion or belief; if there is merit to the idea of limiting the additional protocol to instances where there is a clear confluence or intersection between race or racial identity and religion or belief; what does the criminalization of all contemporary forms of discrimination based on religion or belief entail; might the term xenophobia be broad enough to capture discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief; and what could or should be the precise definition of what constitutes religion?

55. Mr. Diene stated that, in his view, contextual issues will be very important in the decision making process, and proceeded to highlight issues he considers risk factors. He noted that we are living in the context of very profound and multiculturalization of societies, where the issue of racism and discrimination is present and strong, because different communities living together in a multicultural society leads to this tension.

56. Mr. Diene explained that immigration is profoundly changing the reality and perception of identity and relationships between different communities and that it is now being instrumentalized by political parties. He also highlighted the ideological context, marked by the central issue of the link between identity and state security practices. He explained that since 9/11, this has become central, and the issue of race and religion have become entwined. He noted that the concept of terrorism is central in the way that governments are touching on race and religion.

57. He then explored the contradictory current context regarding belief, where there is a powerful movement on one side for respecting freedom of opinion and expression and freedom of information, but in the same society there is a strong dynamic of more people not believing in religion while using religion as an ideological instrument.

58. Mr. Diene also raised the issue of political agendas where some political parties – particularly extreme right parties – link race and religion together in their political messaging, and he cautioned that they are very close to gaining power and their influence is increasing. Mr. Diene then drew a connection to the context of neoliberalism, where the market is a central force, and consequently promoting materialist values rather than the human values linked to religion or belief.

59. Finally, Mr. Diene referred to what he considers a very slow crisis of erosion of international law where, after 9/11, there has been a debate between lawyers and experts about whether torture is acceptable to save lives. The simple fact that lawyers have been discussing this indicates to him that there is an erosion of international law, and it touches on complementary standards.

60. Ms. Imene-Chanduru thanked Mr. Diene, summarised some of the issues and questions raised by his presentation before opening the floor. The representative of Cameroon thanked Mr. Diene for his in-depth, extensive, and relevant analysis. He wished to stress the fact that religion-based discrimination is a fundamental concern both in international law and in domestic law – proof of this being that in international law all relevant instruments condemn all discrimination based on religion. All national domestic laws, considering the pyramid of laws, starting with the constitution, laws and rules, all prohibit all forms of discrimination based on religion. Having said that, religious beliefs, religious convictions, constitute fundamental human rights and they are all well protected in law and enshrined in law. The representative agreed that as the world moves towards globalization, huge migratory



flows and migration are being witnessed and the contemporary times were one of cultural plurality which emphasized the need to see social cohesion forged.

61. He also expressed his agreement with Mr. Diene about the ideological and international law contexts. The representative wished to focus on political movements that are making their voices heard globally and developing philosophies which might well infringe the idea of social cohesion and living together which might impact of people's freedom of religion and the protection of these fundamental rights. He noted that it is this kind of stigmatization and discrimination which modern society, moving towards globalization, must avoid and combat. He agreed with Mr. Diene that the world is a material one to the extent that belief in human values and humanism are almost taking a backseat, with materialism taking a front seat. All human rights recognize these rights, but the advent of technology is developing in such a way and at such a pace that one could think that everybody is developing in the same way. He also agreed with Mr. Diene about the issue of terrorism, noting that these issues are enshrined in international law, and that with the spike in terrorism these rights could have a tendency to be infringed.

62. The representative of South Africa responded to Mr. Diene's presentation, specifically concerning whether the term xenophobia wide enough to include other discriminatory terms, including that of religion. He recalled discussions from item 5 on dissemination of hate speech where experts recommended that it is very important from a legal basis for the text to be clear and that terminology should be narrow enough to focus and prosecute people who use such language or hate speech. The question therefore is if xenophobia, or the terminology for xenophobia becomes broader so as to include specific speech against religion will it not make it more difficult for any legal process in courts of law for the judges and juries, etc. to be able to ascertain what was the hate speech, incitement, or discrimination involved. The delegate noted that most Constitutions, including South Africa's, have very strict rules for discrimination on the basis of religion, any kind of religion. He agreed that countries are becoming much more multicultural than they were before and that tolerance and non-discrimination are changing, and the attitudes of countries have to change along with the demographics. He noted that the expert also raised the issue that there is a changing religious focus in certain countries, and a large shift toward people becoming non-religious as well, therefore laws have to adapt. The representative then asked Mr. Diene if the definition of xenophobia was broadened, would it not become more difficult to put into practice any discriminatory issues based on xenophobia. The representative questioned whether it would not be best, best when it comes to discrimination based on religious to focus on it separately rather than including it in the broad term of xenophobia.

63. The representative of Pakistan delivered a statement on behalf of the OIC, noting that international human rights law is explicit in the responsibility of all states to uphold the human rights obligations without any discrimination on the basis of race, colour, sex, language, and religion. This principle is codified and spelled out in the landmark Universal Declaration of Human Rights, all global human rights governance, as well as the Durban Declaration. The OIC knows the diversity of views of legal experts with reference to religious discrimination, either through an exclusively separate legal instrument or plugging the gaps with an additional protocol to the ICERD. Further, it is evident from these discussion that substantive gaps do exist in international legal standards for protection against discrimination on the basis of religion or belief. This recognition of legal gaps underscores the need for a legal instrument to counter contemporary forms of discrimination including Islamophobia. The OIC stands ready to begin negotiations on a new instrument while at the same time building on the committee's valuable work to strengthen the ICERD through an additional protocol. Evaluating this challenge from the perspective of multiple and compounding forms of intersectionality of discrimination remains paramount. CERD has been and continues to raise its concern over continuing incidents of discrimination on the basis of religion, including Islamophobia in certain countries. In its General Recommendation 32 CERD has recognized the intersectionality of racial and religious discrimination, which is also rooted in individuals national and ethnic origin. To a wide protection gap reinforcing ICERD through additional protocols is therefore timely and ripe to combat contemporary forms of discrimination. For these reasons the OIC reaffirms its commitments to remain constructively engaged with trust that other stakeholders will constructively participate and engage to

commence the process of negotiation on a legally binding instrument or an additional protocol to ICERD.

64. Ms. Imene-Chanduru sought reflections from the expert and posed two additional questions: first, is an additional protocol to the ICERD a proper venue to address discrimination on the basis of religion or belief; and second, what does criminalization of all contemporary forms of discrimination based on religion or belief entail? Mr. Diene responded that the Committee must consider two central points: first, that societies have been evolving for many years, especially considering powerful forces like immigration, and race and religion are not being associated with each other and instrumentalized as part of a political agenda for many powerful parties. This, he explained, means that there is a linkage in the contemporary intercultural and multicultural world. The race of people is being linked to their religious ideology. Experts at the consultation gave some meaningful points of reflection, but he wished to highlight the complex dynamic in which we are living. He said that in the post-George Floyd era as far as race is concerned, this means societies have witnessed and recognized that racism is violent. It kills. It kills individuals like George Floyd, but also groups. In some countries it is a slow-motion genocide, and recent genocide that we have seen in Africa and elsewhere.

65. Mr. Diene suggested that to combat the growing racism, we need to focus and promote the different instruments and institutions we have established to combat racism and help member states to do it, which means that we have to recognize the very excellent work being done by ICERD, because ICERD has not ignored the linkage between the two and the intersectionality. But given the centrality of racism I think it's important not to change the ICERD's mandate. Secondly, Mr. Diene said, we must recognize that religion is being instrumentalized by political groups using violence and religion, but at the same time communities that are at the forefront of developing materialistic values are going through violence and economic and social hardships and calling for meaningful life and they are relying on spiritual values. He said there is a test for spirituality and religion that must be taken into account. The consequence of this is that, while it is important to keep in mind the interconnectedness of the two issues, different mechanisms and institutions should do their work, but separated in terms of additional protocols. He stated that in his view, with the erosion of international law, the drafting of an additional protocol may be a difficult exercise, and it may not be to the international community's means to deal with race and religion as they are in their own fields but keeping in mind their linkage.

66. Mr. Diene concluded by highlighting what he sees as the three contemporary risk factors: first, the political instrumentalization and conflation of race and religion, and linkage many governments have made between state security and identity; second, immigration is altering the construction and reality of national identities and is drawing fear from certain communities, especially in Europe, and bringing the fact that political agendas are being based on the fear of immigration; and third, the context of neoliberalism, where the market is becoming the central force, and finance and the economy and materialistic values are prevailing, and communities where religion is taking less of a focus, political parties are linking these two issues. He stated that, while the churches are being emptied, the political parties are using nationalism to say they are defending Christian values, while not practicing them. He also reminded the Committee that religion, particularly Islam – though not the majority of Islam at all – is being used by certain groups as a means of violence and as political speech.

67. Mr. Diene urged the Committee to defend and protect the legal instruments that have been achieved so far. He said that if different instruments like the ICERD, ILO and others were accepted by governments and if they respect the integration of those norms in international law, he thinks they may change their policy.

68. Ms. Imene-Chanduru returned to the question posed by South Africa about whether incorporating religion into the term xenophobia would broaden that term too much. Mr. Diene stated that in some ways he had answered that, but thinks that broadening the linkage and engaging in the very long process of drafting and formalizing an additional protocol may weaken the defence of countries in front of actual present-day challenges of the ideological instrumentalization of race and religion. He expressed his belief that we must reinforce existing international instruments and institutions and accept the separation, because in some

ways the linkage is an ideological weapon being used by extreme right parties, those who are engaged in the strategy of identity as a central issue and defending their old national identities which they have built and adopted centuries ago – which included discrimination of different races, communities, and religions – and now refuse to recognize multiculturalism and pluralism. He suggested that we work on promoting pluralism and integrating that concept into the work being done, asking different mechanisms and institutions to make it more comprehensive, and calling on government to give value to the notion of pluralism in their societies, Constitutions, and instruments.

69. Mr. Diene expressed his belief that, while the media may make it appear so, we are not witnessing the increase of racism or intolerance, but rather witnessing a mutation, profound change, or the birth of multicultural, multi-ethnic, and multireligious societies, and all births are violent. He elaborated that we are living in the context of transformations, and the societies we are living in in a few years race and religion will be forces of transformation. These forces of transformation are being rejected by the old forces of ideological identity.

70. He noted that the law is an important instrument, but not unique and that the cultural and spiritual forces of civil society have an important role to play, so it will be important in the Committee's work to invite legal experts by also take a multidisciplinary approach by inviting sociologists, anthropologists, and religious and spiritual leaders to testify about what they are encountering. He suggested that one of the weak parts of our strategy is that we have not strengthened the human dimension, which means understanding the powerful forces structuring societies and the international community.

71. The representative of Pakistan took the floor to pose a question to Mr. Diene. Noting first that they had read in the report of the legal experts while they were discussing discrimination on the basis of religion or belief and there were views from some of the experts in the report that we need to separate racial discrimination from religious discrimination because one can change their religion and race cannot be changed and certainly some other issues but Pakistan and the OIC do not agree with the argument, but they would like to know the expert's perspective on this. The representative explained that when reading the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, other declarations, governance, the ICCPR, ICERD, or talking about discrimination, we need to prohibit discrimination based on race, colour, language, or religion, and it has been indicated in the same article. The delegate sought clarity on why some legal experts give this argument and the reason behind it.

72. Mr. Diene responded that the answer is not simple, as there is an ideological debate going on new in the context of the linkage by governments and political forces of identity and security in the context where security is given very central priority. In the context where the market, in many ways is dehumanizing societies, promoting materialistic forces, and marginalizing spiritual and cultural and human values. In those contexts it should be recognized that the two are being linked and may be linked in historical contexts. But to combat each of them, we have to separate them very profoundly. Recognizing that tension, identifying the nature of that tension is the fact that this linkage is being ideologically instrumentalized, but at the same time knowing that is urgent and central to defend, promote the different instruments we have approved in all these past years on race and religion, and the institutions like ICERD and others we have established. Mr. Diene's expressed concern that if the that linkage is accepted those political forces, who refuse the process of multiculturalization will be reinforced, and the strategy to combat racism will be weakened.

73. Ms. Imene-Chanduru recalled that Mr. Diene mentioned that behind the complexity is the linkage between the two and that the two need to be separated, and asked how he proposed this might be done. Mr. Diene reiterated that the answer is not simple, the formulation of recommendations that may help existing institutions to link this complex reality and this dynamic of transformation and integrate that in their work would be useful. This means that the UN system and human rights mechanisms and institutions have to be strengthened, defended, but nuanced, and it needed to analyze why societies are becoming more multicultural at this time due to the dynamic of history, migration. The structure of power which still does not reflect this diversity, and the promotion of materialistic values and the denial of centrality of spiritual values for different societies should also be explored. This understanding is important, therefore the work of the Committee should have a

multidisciplinary approach through the involvement of lawyers, experts in human rights law, and social human science experts as well.

74. At the beginning of the 8th meeting, Mr. Eheth noted the important discussion held in the 7th meeting on item 6, and reflected on and summarized the presentation by Mr. Diene, and opened the floor requesting further comments on the issues raised at the 7th meeting.

75. The representative of the European Union delivered a statement, noting that the EU's position has long been that substantive discussions on issues such as the Rabat Plan of Action and the Istanbul Process are not part of the Ad Hoc Committee and should not be considered by the Committee. She clarified that this is not to say that these are not important topics, on the contrary, but the EU thinks that mixing the two processes – one is the fight against racism and the other is the fight against religious intolerance – in the end risks weakening them both, and therefore it is good to have these discussions separately and reinforce the fight against intolerance in each of these respective fields. She wished to underline that the report mentions that the experts generally also drew a hard line between racial discrimination and discrimination based on religion or belief. They explicitly recommend that paragraph 108(d) be revisited and that there should be reconsideration of whether an additional protocol to the ICERD is an appropriate venue for addressing discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief, and also recommend to reflect on whether the notion of criminalization, as such, is the right path. Consequently, the EU would like to strongly encourage the Ad Hoc Committee to follow the experts' lead on this matter and speak to that same position, though she recognizes this is likely not what many colleagues in the room want to hear, but it is her mandate to repeat this position.

76. The representative of South Africa noted the statement of the EU and indicated understanding of the position, noting South Africa had asked similar questions at the 7th meeting. He stated that he understands the experts also focused on the fact that there is a lot of intersectionality between religious intolerance and also the movement of certain people to join the two – racism and religious intolerance – and that often when they are speaking of one they also aim at the other. The representative notes that Mr. Diene mentioned xenophobia and when it is aimed at religions it is also aimed at those same peoples' race, that it intersects; and where it comes to this Committee, we should be looking at the use, especially by certain politicians, of the two where religion and race are both intersecting and hate speech and intolerance is aimed at both at the same time. The delegate noted that, as other colleagues mentioned earlier in the session, the importance of the Rabat process and other processes within the Human Rights Council to deal with religious intolerance are very important. His understanding from Mr. Diene's presentation is to look at the intersectionality of the two where they are used at the same time to aim at specific vulnerable groups.

77. The representative of Pakistan responded to the EU's comments, wishing to convey that the discussion of religion and intolerance on other platforms including the Istanbul Process meetings does not prevent us from discussing this issue in the Ad Hoc Committee, and in line with the mandate given by the Human Rights Council as we are moving towards negotiations to strengthen the international legal framework on racism and racial discrimination. He stated that, as highlighted by South Africa, the issue of intersectionality with regard to the basis of discrimination on multiple and aggravated forms of discrimination cannot be ignored. Pakistan thinks that in its last report the Committee rightly highlighted the issues, and noted that one thing the legal experts agreed on was that there is a gap in existing international standards in dealing with religious discrimination, although there were differences in their views on whether they should be dealt with in the additional protocol or whether there should be a separate protocol or separate instrument. But there was no ambiguity with regard to the gaps, and certainly a number of other issues have been highlighted over previous years that require the attention of the ad hoc committee to strengthen of collective endeavours in the fight against racism, so we think that's a very pertinent topic to be reflected in the additional protocol.

78. Mr. Eheth suggested focusing the Committee's analysis on the merits of the idea of limiting the additional protocol to instances where there is a clear confluence on the intersection between racial identity and religion or belief. The representative of South Africa stated that considered it a good idea to focus on the confluence of the two.

79. Mr. Eheth asked about the term ‘xenophobia’ and whether it was broad enough to capture discrimination on the basis of religion or belief. The South African delegate explained that, as far as South Africa understands, xenophobia is the discrimination, the fear of foreigners, of outsiders, of people other than oneself. He said that where it comes to religious belief that could occur specifically from inside your own country among your own citizens, not just people from outside or foreigners who come into your system. From his point of view, xenophobia would be too narrow to also capture religious discrimination from within the country itself. He reiterated his concern from the 7th meeting: if the term xenophobia gets broadened too much, it can basically then encompass everything; anything of anybody who’s different to the majority, which will encompass so many different kinds of discrimination. For legal problems, during a court proceeding dealing with hate speech, etc. it would be very difficult to effectively prosecute when a term is too broad. He thinks that, in the case of intersectionality between the two where certain intolerance for religion is often equated directly with a certain “race”, there is a clear intersectionality towards that. He noted that in Africa and many other places, people from various groups practice the same religion, and there can be intolerance towards those religions regardless of racial, national or ethnic origin. Xenophobia would catch everything, especially internally, and also thinks it should remain narrowly defined for when you aim or have prejudice against foreigners, or people coming into a country, or immigrants. This would be easier for courts to deal with than a broader definition.

80. The EU delegate agreed on the issue of intersectionality, and stated that the EU is also of the opinion that if you want to fight racism and racial discrimination in all its forms that require an intersectional approach. The key question is rather in the case of international law in general, what is needed and are the instruments there. She recalled that Mr. Diene also mentioned that there are good instruments already, and the ICERD is already being used to promote these kinds of approaches. In regard to discrimination based on religion or belief, she believes the ICERD forms a good basis and there are a number of general comments that add to the ICERD and that interpret the ICERD. Indeed, if the conclusion of this Committee is that more work needs to be done with regard to this specifically, then this could be something that the CERD Committee itself, could reflect upon if it believed that further guidance is needed as they have done for the past number of years on specific topics. She also wished to highlight more generally that part of the reason the EU is a bit reluctant in going along this path is because they have quite a solid framework on all these points, and feel strongly about protecting it. She noted that there is always room for improvement, which is also the case for the EU which they do recognize.

81. The representative of South Africa noted that the EU has been using regional laws and there is a lot of good practice within that system. He posed the question about court cases in the EU and asked whether those best practices could be shared with the Committee so that it may consider internalizing them, as these are the laws. He stated that the problem was that while general comments are good guidelines, how could they be internalized in a better form where states would be more inclined to implement them in a better manner. He requested that if the EU had found a way to put these general comments into hard law, that would be valuable information to share with the Committee.

### **Presentation and discussion on racial cybercrime**

82. The Committee considered item 7 on racial cybercrime at its 9th, 10th, and 11th meetings, for which Ms. Julia Imene-Chanduru, Permanent Representative of Namibia to the United Nations at Geneva and Mr. Salomon Eheth, Permanent Representative of Cameroon to the United Nations at Geneva once again acted as interim Chairpersons, in the absence of the chair.

83. At the 9th meeting the Committee heard a presentation from Ms. Joanna Kulesza, Professor of international law, Faculty of Law and Administration, University of Lodz, Poland; member of the Scientific Committee of the European Union Fundamental Rights Agency; and Chair of the Advisory Board of the Global Forum on Cyber Expertise, reflective of the advice, recommendations, and conclusions drawn by the experts on the topic of racial cybercrime at their intersessional consultation of 21–22 October 2020.

84. Ms. Kulesza began by displaying a list of documents that she strongly supports analysis of for the purpose of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee, and noting that international law does offer a detailed framework for addressing the challenges racial cybercrime has put on the international agenda. She explained that she would like to focus her intervention on one particular example, the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime, or Budapest Convention, so that she may draw conclusions and recommendations from lessons learned from that particular experience. She began with a brief analysis of the successes and challenges of the Convention, and more specifically on the first additional protocol addressing freedom of expression issues, hate speech, and what could be referred to as racial cybercrime.

85. Ms. Kulesza explained that the Budapest Convention is, arguably, the only international law treaty that addresses the challenges of racial cybercrime. She noted it is just 47 states within the Council of Europe, but the Budapest Convention's reach is much broader as it includes states from outside the Council of Europe, including Africa, South America, Asia, and notably the United States who have been very involved in the drafting. She pointed to the success of 66 ratifications, but also highlighted those who have decided not to adopt the Budapest Convention.

86. Ms. Kulesza noted that there are ever more states considering signing and ratifying the Budapest Convention, but when the numbers and the process behind it were considered, it must be noted there are certain states that are missing from those that are willing to accede to the convention. For example Ireland has signed it, but not ratified, as has South Africa and Poland. While not ratifying the convention does not imply that racial cybercrime is not addressed, she was trying to draw law-making conclusions, so those that are absent should be paid particular attention so the Committee might prepare a more accommodating instrument.

87. Ms. Kulesza stated that if she were to summarize this document briefly, she would say that the Cybercrime Convention in itself is a success. It is the only internationally-binding treaty on cybercrime, and it defines individual cybercrimes. No other international document does that. She explained that critics, however, highlight the fact that the collection of individual cybercrimes is somewhat arbitrary. You will find DDOS attacks, you will find data interventions as cybercrimes, you will find child abusive material – distribution, possession – as a cybercrime, rightfully so. But right next to it in the cybercrime convention, you will find intellectual property violations considered on equal footing as cybercrime and that has been one of the arguments that has been raised against ratifying the cybercrime convention by some of the great absentees.

88. Ms. Kulesza explained that the norms in the Budapest Convention are not self-executing, and highlighted two provisions of the additional protocol to indicate the mechanism behind it. She elaborated that the Cybercrime Convention needs to be transposed into national law, which effectively might imply the lack of uniformity among states or states parties. 66 states have ratified the convention. This is a success because the topic is so controversial, but at the same time the level of ratification is not as high as we might want it to be for a treaty that addresses a global challenge.

89. She also noted that there is not a cooperation mechanism that is automatically triggered. The Budapest Convention provides for states to act together on a largely voluntary basis. It is a very flexible standard that allows a state party to deny assistance in a cybercrime investigation. She noted that the Octopus Conference assists in the implementation, but it is a largely informal platform. Looking at the jurisdictional framework, it is also a reiteration of principles of international law and there is not a convention body that could assist member states or states parties in solving disputes or interpretation issues.

90. Ms. Kulesza suggested that the Budapest Convention offers a solution to the challenge that the Ad Hoc Committee is addressing, particularly through its additional protocol. She noted that this is the additional protocol because the drafting states could not agree on the scope of racial cybercrime that should be added to the Convention itself, and it had proven to be too contentious because of political, social, and ethical issues.

91. Ms. Kulesza noted that the additional protocol contains a definition of “racist and xenophobic material”, the distribution of which is to be prohibited. She explained that the

formulation in the convention implies that states are to implement national laws that will achieve that aim, and the definition of racist and xenophobic material in the additional protocol to the Budapest Convention is not inventive. She elaborated that it barely repeats everything that we have known in international law and covers any written material, image, or other representation of ideas or theories that are directed at advocating, promoting, inciting hatred, discrimination, or violence against any individual or group based on racial or national or ethnic criteria if used as a pretext for any of these factors. Nothing near a comprehensive definition or as clear a definition as we could have based on current international law and human rights. She also noted the additional protocol articles that oblige each party to adopt such legislative or other measures as may be necessary to prohibit such activities.

92. Further to this, Ms. Kulesza highlighted that article 3, regarding the crime of racist discriminatory material being distributed, emphasizes the exemptions. Fundamentally, she notes the protocol itself introduces exemptions for states where a prohibition of such content would not reflect national values or be affordable under national laws. Consequently, she explained, if there is no law on hate speech in a given country, then likely that state would be exempt from implementing provisions of the protocol.

93. Ms. Kulesza then discussed the low ratification rate, as only 33 parties have ratified the additional protocol, including some states that are members of the Council of Europe, which tells us how controversial this regulation – as precise as it is – continues to be on a political level.

94. Ms. Kulesza then drew the Committee's attention to two current United Nations processes on cybersecurity. One is the United Nations Group of Governmental Experts (UNGGE), and the other is the United Nations Open-Ended Working Group. The scope of these two groups and their mandates are very similar, but the construction of their mandates is different. The UNGGE is composed government experts appointed by a select group of states with a select group of members, whereas anyone can join the open-ended working group to try and shape the way international law is applied in cyberspace.

95. Looking at the final conclusions of these groups, Ms. Kulesza notes one element is clear, which is that international law in its entirety applies in cyberspace, including all the provisions that have been subject to the elaborations of this Ad Hoc Committee. She also drew the Committee's attention to recent calls to establish an ad hoc committee that would look into confluence of international conventions on countering the use of information and communications technologies for criminal purposes, which will likely be launched in early 2022. This initiative was established in 2019 and in 2020 a draft was submitted of a potential international convention on cybercrime, detached from the Budapest Convention, which will likely be presented in January 2022 to the newly formed group of experts, which might be a chance to feed into ongoing processes with the expertise that has already been granted by the group, or on the contrary to relieve those experts of the work that will probably give them additional challenges while trying to reiterate these issues.

96. Ms. Kulesza concluded her presentation by noting that these instruments are merely the UN processes, but that there are other activities on the table. She explained that Internet governance – norms, principles, and laws – are developed by three groups of stakeholders: governments, business and civil society, and end-users and academics like herself. She highlighted two examples of complementary work. The first of which was Microsoft's 2018 tabling of the digital Geneva Convention to ensure that humanitarian law is applied online. She suggested that this was an interesting proposal because a large international company was inciting governments to keep cyberspace peaceful, including laws that would prohibit promotion of genocide. Ms. Kulesza noted that this proposal did not meet with much governmental support because it came from a private US company. But it also is a reflection of current ongoing processes within the business community.

97. In her second example, Ms. Kulesza highlighted a group she is involved with – the Internet Cooperation for Assigned Names and Numbers, which acts as the internet's phone book. It is very technical, and works toward cybersecurity with reference to what they call DNS abuse. She explained that there is a DNS abuse framework, or policy, which she believes may prove more effective than the legal measures we have in place thus far. It is the most effective measure in place right now, but it does not cover hate speech or racial

cybercrime, as there is not consensus among registries and registrars that anything to do with hate speech or freedom of expression falls within the DNS abuse category. Ms. Kulesza explained that the DNS abuse definition includes child and sexual abuse material, as well as intellectual property rights violations, but does not include any kind of free speech categories and does not reference hate speech, or include any kind of privacy violations.

98. In terms of recommendation for venues to observe further advancement of racial cybercrime discussions, Ms. Kulesza pointed to ICANN, the UNGGE and open-ended working group, as well as the work of the new committee on cybercrime. Also the ITU and NATO, and technical organizations like the Internet Engineering Task Force.

99. The representative of South Africa noted that, whilst the Budapest Convention has been ratified by many countries, it is not a UN convention that would then be universally accepted by countries once signed, and there are a number of other issues with it that make it difficult for some countries to accept. He asked Ms. Kulesza, based on her study of the issue of cybercrime relating to racism, which texts she believes the Committee should take into an account in its document. He further elaborated that South Africa is quite active in dealing with issues of hate speech and racism on the internet, and that these issues are taken up at various levels. He noted that she has done a great deal of work across the board, and asked if there was a way experts like herself could propose language to the Committee that would be acceptable to all states. He acknowledged that Europe is doing a lot through their national laws and asked if there might be a way some of these regional laws and cases could be brought to this committee to be elevated as an international standard. He notes that modern technology platforms could become massive disseminators of hate crime and hate speech and racism, and often people are not held accountable for it, including the original author and the people who spread it. He commented that sometimes the initial author is not a very influential person, but the people who spread it are, and there can be two different motivations for that: one to raise awareness of stopping this type of hate crime, and the other to spread the message further. He asked how to accurately reflect all of this in the language.

100. Ms. Kulesza responded that she had a suggestion for a point of departure, that being the Budapest Convention and its additional protocol. She stated she personally views it as a well-balanced exercise that accounts for the different elements of international debate highlighted in the South African delegate's intervention. She suggested looking to articles 2 and 3, and potentially 4-6 of the additional protocol for wording that reflects current international compromise on racial cybercrime. While she is well-aware that this is not an international instrument, she stated that it is open to international signature and ratification and is, to her knowledge the best reflection of current international compromise. She did caution, however, that none of the 33 states who have ratified this language are big states who wish to govern cyberspace by their rules. She recommended, therefore, to start with the wording based articles 2 and 3 of the additional protocol and to seek input from the technical community. She noted there is a governmental advisory committee within ICANN, which could be a stream of expertise into technical solutions that would be effective to combat racial cybercrime.

101. The representative of the EU noted that, while the online world offers great opportunities for economic growth and is an enabler for communication serving freedom and democracy, it also offers unlimited platforms for extremism and intolerance to spread virally in a way that would have been unthinkable basically 15 years ago. And hate speech online not only harms targeted groups and individuals, it also stops citizens from speaking out for freedom, tolerance, and non-discrimination in online environments. Meaning that it has a chilling effect on the democratic discourse on online platforms. The European Commission has over the past years worked intensely to ensure that the internet remains a free, safe, and tolerant space where European Union laws are enforced with full respect to the right of freedom of expression and significant measures have been made in particular to counter the proliferation of illegal hate speech online, as defined by national laws implementing the framework decision on racism and xenophobia. Among the main measures taken in this area, the European Commission has agreed with Facebook, Microsoft, Twitter and YouTube a Code of Conduct on countering illegal hate speech online to help users notifying illegal hate speech in these social platforms and to improve support to civil society, as well as coordination with national authorities. The Commission, closely manages the progress made



on the implementation of the code, and regularly reports on its activities in this area. The results do show a very positive trend, because 2.5 years after the signature of the code, evaluations showed that IT companies respond within 24 hours in the majority of cases and remove on average 72% of reported content, compared to 59% in 2017 and only 28% in 2016. In addition to this progress in the removal of hate speech, the Code of Conduct has fostered synergies between the IT companies civil society, and member states' authorities in the form of a structured process of mutual learning and exchange of knowledge. And this has contributed to the effectiveness of the notification procedures and the quality of the content management policies in the companies. And it has also encouraged joint projects and learning opportunities in the area of education and counternarratives.

102. Another best practice or a development, with regard to racial cybercrime is that the commission published on the 22nd of July this year [2021], a study called *Heroes and Scapegoats Right Wing Extremism in Digital Environments*. And the study focuses on the different aspects of digital violence in right wing extremist content. So with that we mean visual or textual messages that express acceptance, condoning, justification, or acclamation of violence for the sake of a racial, nationalistic ideal. And the different strains of violent right-wing extremist content include identitarianism, counter-jihad, national socialism, white supremacy, and eco fascism. And emerging content strains include accelerationism, siege culture, and hive terrorism. The main aspects of this content that are examined in this report are either target-oriented, like toxic language including hate speech, dehumanizing language, and far right conspiracy theories; or perpetrator oriented. And the study also maps the online landscape and describes how this content is expressed on different platforms. Lastly the European Commission provides financial support to national authorities and civil society in this area through rights, equality, and citizenship program, as well as, for example, through the safer internet program, which aims at protecting children using the internet and other communication technologies – for example by fighting against racist and xenophobic content. With regard to the report of the expert seminar and based on national and regional experiences, it is worth investing in coregulation models and corporate social responsibility structures. We furthermore agree that all guidance should come from article 20 of the ICCPR as far as limiting the right to freedom of expression and opinion is concerned. The expert fully agreed with the references made to the Budapest Convention on cybercrime, because for all member states it is also a key document in this regard.

103. Ms. Kulesza replied that she strongly supports all those instruments, but was bound by the brevity of her presentation and wanted to highlight an instrument that was available for universal ratification.

104. The representative of Pakistan on behalf of the OIC took note of Ms. Kulesza's comments regarding the Budapest Convention, but would have appreciated hearing more about the views and observations of the legal experts on racial cybercrime, and details that might facilitate the work of the Committee for developing elements for the additional protocol. He noted that the Committee could take guidance from the Budapest Convention, but emphasized that the current discussion was in regards to an additional protocol under the ICERD. He asked for the view of the expert on three elements: first, why online hate speech is difficult to counter and why there are more challenges as opposed to offline. He elaborated that we cannot differentiate at times between the writer and the individual who disseminated because of the vague nature of the content available online at times, and at times it is difficult to identify the author. There is vagueness in terms of online material and material in cyberspace. Secondly, he sought advice on the issue of virality and spread, as it is very fast and need tools to counter these challenges. Thirdly, he sought input on how to address the challenges posed by private sector influence, particularly in cases where it is more influential than the government in terms of resources. He requested the expert's opinion on countering these challenges in the additional protocol because Pakistan thinks the ICERD cannot address those challenges because it was negotiated years ago, and we are witnessing multiple and compounding forms of discrimination.

105. Ms. Kulesza replied that she was just using the Budapest Convention to point out phrasings that might be useful to the work of the Committee, as she believes it resembles as closely international consensus as we have gotten in the international dialogue. She continued to answer that, when we speak about viral spreading of content and the power that platforms

hold, she would refer to the final points of her presentation. She believes that only through strong public-private partnerships, can this element of cybercrime be mitigated. She noted this might imply that the Ad Hoc Committee may consider including in their final wording a reference to the need to work together with private actors, and it might imply the need to go back to look at social responsibility of business as a necessary measure to implement existing human rights law. She expressed her strong support that the general provisions of international human rights law fail to address current challenges and it is the task of the Committee to try and adjust these principles to fit current challenges, and she believed that this could only be achieved by working together with the private sector. She reiterated that internet governance is the joint elaboration of norms and standards by governments, civil society, and business. Only through a reference to what is in international human rights law with regards to corporate social responsibility can these aims be achieved.

106. She also suggested that installing a platform, or body, that would resort to solving jurisdictional issues might be useful, and also pointed to the EU, where informal collaborations like the code of conduct working together with service providers to identify challenges and stop viral spread before it increases has proven effective. She also suggested building partnerships with the DNS community to work on stopping racial cybercrime through the DNS abuse framework. She noted, however that these are practical and pragmatic answers, whereas the mandate of the Committee is to work on the wording of law.

107. The representative of South Africa noted that an issue with a universally-available regional instrument for many states is the requirement to report consistently to a regional organization on the issue is not always feasible and therefore it could be suggested that an international instrument under the UN would more likely be universally ratified by all states. He asked if Ms. Kulesza might share further insights on some other instruments, especially language that the Committee could consider to move forward. He noted that the sooner this could be accomplished in an additional protocol, the less harm that would be done.

108. He continued to state that, although it was a very good document, the ICERD was written in 1965, and the world has changed a lot and the people who were in the room in 1965 were not the victims of the discrimination and it was only many decades later that many of the people who were not in the room were able to voice their concerns and definitions and elaborate on how they saw racism and systemic racism, hate speech, etc. where certain speech were very acceptable in 1965 and was not seen as hate speech or even racism because it was an accepted norm. A few decades later that was absolutely not the case and therefore it was difficult to understand when it was said that the ICERD is perfect and did not require further elaboration and that there are no gaps. He noted that in 2001, 200 countries came together and found consensus language on these issues, defining them, getting common understanding when they wrote the DDPA – the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. He asked the expert how she might propose some other relevant language because in 2001, while internet and cell phones were very new the DDPA actually referred to it and about discrimination in the new technologies. He inquired about how to merge all the valuable language from regional instruments to use for the Committee's elaborations, as South Africa did not believe the ICERD did not have gaps, considering their country and people were not part of the conversation in 1965 and were victims of racial discrimination.

109. Ms. Kulesza responded that she pleased to support the Committee, but that she had not proposed wording for the Committee to consider at this specific point. She indicated that she would be pleased to follow up, and noted that the drafting and wording of the ICERD dating back to the 1960s might not be relevant to all the circumstances we are facing today. She explained that, through her research she has come to stand with those that say the technology is changing too rapidly for us to be able to develop a time-resistant international instrument. This is not to say that such a wording of a provision targeting racial cybercrime should not be elaborated, but that she has learned that the quickest, most efficient way to address these processes and the internet governance ambience might not be through law and elaborating a binding standard for states, but rather working together with those who make those day-to-day decisions. She suggested if we work together with those actors, we deploy artificial intelligence analysis of algorithms to understand how the viral spread is imposed we might be able to achieve quicker and more tangible results. She stated she would be happy

to work on wording that would be accurate today in 2021, and probably 2022, but that it would be a challenge to frame wording that would still be viable in 2025 or 2031.

110. The representative of the IHRC took the floor with a statement that, according to the European Convention on Cybercrime held in Budapest in 2001, the fact is that national criminal courts today are facing fundamental difficulties which is the time lost between discovering violations of new technologies and amending the penal laws to combat them. Necessary amendments to national penal codes are often slow because they require the following steps to be achieved by discovering the content of violence in new technology, finding loopholes in the penal code to address them, and adopting new laws that criminalize computer-related offences. There are challenges in combating cybercrime such as the need for equipment and techniques that may not be available to investigate potential criminal acts, and the requirement to have regular updating of laws to accommodate new technologies. IT would be important to involve the private sector and civil society in combating cybercrime to assist public authorities.

111. Ms. Kulesza said she was pleased to comment on this statement, but that these comments would be somewhat departed from the racial cybercrime debate. She duly noted the representatives' observations, and strongly agreed that there was a slowness to the judicial process, noting that this has been a challenge addressed since the start of cyber investigations. She noted there is work being done in the European Union with advancing the conversation with critical infrastructure operators, including the DNS operators, and a large component of private-public partnerships as well. She suggested that these comments concerned issues of encryption, privacy, the right to have encryption keys by law enforcement authorities, and she noted a vivid ongoing debate around active cyber defence – the issue of infiltrating other networks, in the jurisdiction, or under the control of other states to obtain evidence or stop an attack. That is an ongoing international law discussion focused on cybersecurity and she strongly supported the observations made. She stated that these debates on the processes – the collection of electronic evidence; stopping of a cybercrime as it unfolds, was beyond the ambit of her current intervention, which focused on the problem of racial cybercrime.

112. Ms. Imene-Chanduru asked Ms. Kulesza elaborate further on article 3 of the Budapest Convention that she mentioned earlier. Ms. Kulesza explained the language, starting with article 2, explaining that racist and xenophobic material means any written material, any image, or any other representation or ideas or theories which advocate, promote, or incite hatred, discrimination or violence against any individual or group of individuals based on race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin, as well as religion if used as a pretext for any of these factors.

113. She suggested that the Committee may also consider the current discussion around gender-based violence where gender is added to the scope of categories indicated when trying to define hate speech. While possibly a political issue, her recommendation would be to consider including such xenophobic material and also the concept of gender.

114. She continued that article 3 prohibits, as per national law, the distribution or otherwise making available of so-defined racist and xenophobic material to the public through a computer system. She noted the provisions of the Budapest convention indicates that such an act is to be committed intentionally and without a right, which she understands that, as per the explanatory report, for this to be the result of a certain compromise made by the negotiating parties. She reminded the Committee that the provisions of the Budapest Convention are non self-executing. She said she welcomes observations from the Committee about the possibility of installing a universal point of reference or commissioner, if it was appropriate, to support that work with a dedicated point of reference for defining racial cybercrime.

115. Ms. Kulesza noted the exemptions in article 3, paragraph 2 and 3, stating she believes this wording reflects the current compromise; however, it also reflects the challenge faced when looking at defining racist or xenophobic material, in general, here referred to as racial cybercrime. She read through the provision to highlight the challenge: “A party may reserve the right not to attach criminal liability to conduct as defined by paragraph one where the material we have defined for the purposes of this convention as racist or xenophobic

advocates, promotes, or incites discrimination that is not associated with hatred or violence, provided that other effective remedies are available.”

116. She noted that there is an ongoing debate around civil law remedies to the violation of individual rights. She viewed hate speech as falling outside the category of free speech and effectively requiring a criminal law provision. The consensus reflected in the Budapest Convention, however, does give a state the freedom to decide whether it wishes to introduce other effective remedies outside the scope of penal law. Paragraph 3 goes even further to trying to seek that balance between national and international understanding of freedom of expression. “A party may reserve the right not to apply paragraph 1, which provides for the prohibition of dissemination of racist and xenophobic material to those cases of discrimination for which duty to established principles in its national legal system concerning freedom of expression provide for effective remedies, as we have referenced in paragraph 2.”

117. Ms. Kulesza then briefly noted that as a non-binding norm, article 4 refers to providing for criminal offences under domestic law, when committed intentionally and without the right, one threatens through a computer system with the commission of a serious criminal offence as defined in domestic law, persons for the reason that they belong to the group distinguished by race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin as well as religion if used as a pretext for any of these factors, alternatively if that threat is addressed to a group of persons which is distinguished by any of these characteristics. She concluded that those are the examples she would use as a point of departure for the wording of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee.

#### **Preventive measures to combat racist and xenophobic discrimination**

118. At the second meeting of the 11th session on 18 July 2022, the Committee heard a presentation from Ms. Anna Spain Bradley, Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion at the University of California Los Angeles and former Professor of Law at the University of Colorado summarizing the advice and comments provided at the intersessional legal expert consultation on the issue of preventive measures to combat racist and xenophobic discrimination.

119. Ms. Spain Bradley began her presentation by recalling the urgency for elaborating an additional protocol that has been felt in the years following the murder of George Floyd in the United States. She noted that the legal experts highlighted that the obligations to which States have already agreed remain necessary.

120. In evaluating the documentation from the 10th session of the Ad Hoc Committee, Ms. Spain Bradley explained that the experts began their discussion by positing the question of how to criminalize harms that are racist and xenophobic in nature in both real world and online contexts. She said the experts suggested the Committee look at how to address harms caused by individuals as well as groups and entities. The experts, she recalled, also offered language suggestions to make items clearer and more specific to avoid language that is vague, and she offered examples such as “cultural diversity,” which she said is too narrowly constricted; and “education and awareness,” which experts found to be overbroad.

121. Ms. Spain Bradley told the Committee that the legal experts talked at length about which measures state actors could take, and what to do with private actors and about online acts. She recalled the experts’ emphasis on the importance of having states truly commit to education that is honest and full, and to acknowledge that history is subjective. More specifically, they discussed the need for education and training of specific groups – notably that governments should ensure that all people working for them are properly equipped to act in a way that does not further perpetuate racism and discrimination (including police).

122. Regarding the experts’ thematic discussions, Ms. Spain Bradley indicated they found it paramount that the Committee endeavour to clarify what the existing obligations are, and where they would extend to in the elaboration of a new complimentary standard. They suggested obligations should be extended to places and spaces that did not exist at the time the ICERD was drafted and signed.

123. Ms. Spain Bradley also noted the legal experts’ insistence that there needs to be greater clarity around definitions in the additional protocol. They highlighted that neither racism or xenophobia are defined under international law, and that the International Court of

Justice has had questions about the definitions that currently exist in the ICERD, most notably in regard to the definition of nationality and national origin.

124. Ms. Spain Bradley highlighted the need for practical realism about the role, type of, and reason for education and training. She noted that this is a broad category of activity, and that research shows that certain kinds of education are more useful: for example, doing activities with people who are different from ourselves has been shown to create new neural pathways in the brain and new habits.

125. Ms. Spain Bradley recalled the experts' suggestion that there is a need to distinguish between different kinds of racism that exist: systemic and structural racism in an entire field; institutional racism within an organization; interpersonal racism; and intrapersonal racism (that is, unconscious or implicit bias). They noted that preventive measures would need to distinguish between these and address each one.

126. She also stated that the experts discussed the increasing challenge of human migration and the need to address harms that they experience on the basis of their identities – particularly how religious and racial discrimination are sometimes connected, and there is a nuance needed to address both.

127. Ms. Spain Bradley concluded her presentation by stating that preventive measures are truly needed today, and that resources need to be put forth to address this cause. She suggested that we remind ourselves of the values of the United Nations Charter and for which the United Nations stands, and recalled that the fight against racism is a fight for dignity.

128. Responding to Ms. Spain Bradley's presentation, the representative of the European Union noted that there is already a preamble to the ICERD that speaks to preventive measures, as does article 3. Thus, in the EU's reading of the ICERD, there are already strong measures there. She asked Ms. Spain Bradley what is to be gained by adding more to it? The representative also recalled expert suggestions that the Committee be careful about including in a legally binding document items that are recommendations, and that the EU agrees on the goal, but perhaps not on the method for achieving it and sought guidance from Ms. Spain Bradley on how to address this.

129. The representative of South Africa expressed his understanding from Ms. Spain Bradley's presentation that experts do believe there are gaps that could be filled, and that states need to make sure they are doing training. He asked Ms. Spain Bradley what about non-state actors? He also noted that the ICERD does not speak much to systemic or structural racism, and asked how the Committee could deal with systemic, structural, and institutional racism that is engrained in both states and non-state actors when many countries do not criminalize racism or racial discrimination.

130. The delegation of Pakistan on behalf of the OIC stated that increasingly visible discrimination across the globe, particularly in relation to refugee and asylum seeker programs that discrimination based on race, nationality, or colour is being witnessed. He asked Ms. Spain Bradley – working under the assumption that there are serious legal gaps in the ICERD – which state obligations and non-state obligations should the Ad Hoc Committee consider?

131. Responding to the EU, Ms. Spain Bradley emphasized the need to understand that the goal of elimination of all forms of racial discrimination was absolutely true in 1965. She said the declaration had language that said this is a pervasive global problem that needs to be addressed, but that the two strong threads if it's not in the treaty, then treaty [the ICERD] walked this back a bit. She stated that there have been frustrations, her own included, about the limits of what has been achieved following the ICERD. This connects, she explained, to how we define racism and race, because we hear some countries saying that it doesn't happen in their own countries. In her opinion, we are now back in a perspective that people are being harmed and the harms are much broader than they were in 1965, and that if we understand the elimination of all forms of racism then we reach the second question about what is needed for prevention.

132. On the issue of prevention, Ms. Spain Bradley highlighted two viewpoints: first that states are only obligated to do what is in the ICERD, and second that treaty language can be

interpreted in light of the world we live in today – for example, in light of issues like migration where states are seeking guidance.

133. Ms. Spain Bradley highlighted another discussion about the criminalization of racist acts and the question of whether intent must be shown or whether it is just the outcome that should be the prevailing way to look at it. She discussed the need for states to harmonize legal mechanisms to hold non-state actors accountable, noting that without harmonization it is unlikely that non-state actors will be held accountable.

134. In addressing the question of Pakistan on behalf of the OIC, Ms. Spain Bradley communicated her understanding of the urgency, and noted that there are at least three cases the International Court of Justice is looking at related to the ICERD – particularly as the ICERD covers nationality, but not national identity. She suggested that this is a challenge that could be resolved through the elaboration of a complementary standard.

135. The Chair-Rapporteur asked two questions of Ms. Spain Bradley to assist in clarifying specific elements later: first, should the additional protocol promote restorative justice measures in cases of non-violent crime? Second, should the additional protocol contain measures guaranteeing timely and effective investigations and access to effective remedies for victims?

136. Ms. Spain Bradley replied by acknowledging that, speaking to the additional protocol, she wished to acknowledge that when speaking about prevention we are looking at societies and cultures as ecosystems. She explained that in closed ecosystems where people have to remain where they are, restorative justice is paramount, as it provides an approach where offenders can remain in this society. First, she suggested, it must be answered whether racism is a crime. If so, then restorative justice may be one way of accounting for that crime. If we criminalize, she stated, we will have to think of ways to account for what we have labelled as offences.

137. She also explained that, if people are going to be prosecuted, they will need to know for what they are being prosecuted, and will need to be accorded due process rights. These include knowing what the details of the offences are and expectations about the process. She stated that if an additional protocol calls for these kinds of accounting, it would need to be linked to the question of prevention and to the question of criminalization. She noted that some forms of restorative justice can be preventative, but not all.

## Annex II

### Programme of Work – 11th Ad Hoc Committee on the Elaboration of Complementary Standards, 6–17 December 2021 (as adopted 06.12.2021)

<i>1<sup>st</sup> week</i>					
<i>Monday 06.12</i>		<i>Tuesday 07.12</i>	<i>Wednesday 08.12</i>	<i>Thursday 09.12</i>	<i>Friday 10.12</i>
10:00 – 12:00	<u>Item 1</u> Opening of the Session Mr. Yury Boychenko, Chief, Anti-Discrimination Section OHCHR	<u>Item 4 continued</u> General presentation and overview of the intersessional expert consultation report	<u>Item 5 continued</u> Dissemination of hate speech  Discussion	<u>Item 6</u> All contemporary forms of discrimination based on religion or belief  Expert introduction by Doudou DIÉNE, United Nations Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Côte d'Ivoire; former United Nations Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance; former UNESCO official	<u>Item 7</u> Racial cybercrime  Expert introduction by Joanna KULESZA, Professor of international law, Faculty of Law & Administration, University of Lodz, Poland; member of Scientific Committee of the European Union Fundamental Rights Agency; Chair of the Advisory Board, Global Forum on Cyber Expertise
	<u>Item 2</u> Election of the Chairperson				
	<u>Item 3</u> Adoption of the Agenda and Programme of Work -- General statements				
15:00 – 17:00	<u>Item 4</u> Updates on the Ad Hoc Committee	<u>Item 5</u> Dissemination of hate speech Expert introduction by Joanna BOTHÁ, Associate Professor and the Head of Department of Public Law, Faculty of Law, Nelson Mandela University, South Africa; Attorney of the High Court of South Africa	<u>Item 5 continued</u> Dissemination of hate speech  Discussion	<u>Item 6 continued</u> All contemporary forms of discrimination based on religion or belief  Discussion	<u>Item 7 continued</u> Racial cybercrime  Discussion

		<i>2<sup>nd</sup> week</i>				
		<i>Monday 13.12</i>	<i>Tuesday 14.12</i>	<i>Wednesday 15.12</i>	<i>Thursday 16.12</i>	<i>Friday 17.12</i>
10:00 – 12:00	<u>Item 7 continued</u>		<u>Item 8 continued</u>	<u>Item 6 continued</u>	<u>Item 9 continued</u>	<u>Item 10 continued</u>
	Racial cybercrime Discussion		Preventive measures to combat racist and xenophobic discrimination  Discussion	All contemporary forms of discrimination based on religion or belief  Discussion	General discussion and exchange of views  <u>Item 10</u>  Conclusions and recommendations of the session	and Conclusions and recommendations of the session
15:00 – 17:00	<u>Item 8</u>		<u>Item 8 continued</u>	<u>Item 9</u>	<u>Item 10 continued</u>	<u>Item 11</u>
	Preventive measures to combat racist and xenophobic discrimination  Expert introduction by Anna SPAIN BRADLEY, Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, University of California Los Angeles, Scholar and expert on international law and human rights; former Professor of Law, University of Colorado		Preventive measures to combat racist and xenophobic discrimination  Discussion	General discussion and exchange of views	Conclusions and recommendations of the session	Adoption of the conclusions and recommendations of the 11th session



---

## **Annex III**

### **List of attendance**

#### **Member States**

Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Cameroon, China, Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Finland, Germany, Haiti, Indonesia, Iraq, Libya, Luxembourg, Mexico, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe.

#### **Non-Member States represented by observers**

Holy See, State of Palestine.

#### **Intergovernmental Organizations**

European Union, Organization of Islamic Cooperation.

#### **Non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council**

International Human Rights Association of American Minorities (IHRAAM), International Human Rights Council, Human Rights Association for Community Development in Assiut, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations (ISMUN), Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association.

#### **Non-governmental organizations not in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council**

ISMTS, UN Diplomatic Committee International Organization, Regional Court in Kielce/Poland.

---