



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
16 June 2023

Original: English

---

## Human Rights Council

### Fifty-fourth session

11 September–6 October 2023

Agenda item 3

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

## **Report of the Working Group on the Right to Development on its twenty-fourth session (Geneva, 15–19 May 2023)**

*Chair-Rapporteur: Zamir Akram*



---

## Contents

	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction .....	3
II. Organization of the session. ....	3
III. Summary of proceedings.....	4
A. General statements.....	4
B. Interactive dialogue with the Special Rapporteur on the right to development and the Chair of the Expert Mechanism on the Right to Development .....	8
C. Consideration and intergovernmental negotiation of the second revised draft convention on the right to development .....	10
D. Consideration of the way forward.....	13
IV. Conclusions and recommendations .....	14
A. Conclusions .....	16
B. Recommendations.....	17
Annex	
List of participants.....	19

## I. Introduction

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 9/3, in which the Council decided to renew the mandate of the Working Group on the Right to Development until it had completed the tasks entrusted to it by the Council in its resolution 4/4, and that the Working Group should convene annual sessions of five working days and submit its reports to the Council.

2. The mandate of the Working Group on the Right to Development, as established by the Commission on Human Rights in its resolution 1998/72, is to monitor and review progress made in the promotion and implementation of the right to development as set out in the Declaration on the Right to Development, at the national and international levels, providing recommendations thereon and further analysing obstacles to its full enjoyment, focusing each year on specific commitments in the Declaration; to review reports and any other information submitted by States, United Nations agencies, other relevant international organizations and non-governmental organizations on the relationship between their activities and the right to development; and to present for the consideration of the Commission a sessional report on its deliberations, including advice to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) on the implementation of the right to development and suggesting possible programmes of technical assistance at the request of interested countries with the aim of promoting the implementation of the right to development.

3. In its resolution 51/7, the Human Rights Council stressed the importance of the realization of the mandate of the Working Group and recognized the need for renewed efforts with a view to overcoming the existing political impasse within the Working Group so that it may fulfil, in a timely manner, its mandate as established by the Commission on Human Rights in its resolution 1998/72 and the Human Rights Council in its resolutions 4/4 and 39/9. The Council also stressed the importance of constructive engagement at the twenty-fourth session of the Working Group, which would continue consideration of the draft convention on the right to development submitted by the Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group, and requested the Chair-Rapporteur to submit a second revised draft convention to the Working Group at its twenty-fourth session for intergovernmental negotiation and, following that process, to submit the final draft text of the convention on the right to development to the Human Rights Council.<sup>1</sup>

## II. Organization of the session

4. The Working Group held its twenty-fourth session from 15 to 19 May 2023. The session was opened by the Chief of the Right to Development Section of OHCHR and was addressed by the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights.<sup>2</sup> In her statement, the Deputy High Commissioner highlighted pressing global challenges, notably inequality, poverty, hunger and the climate crisis. She underlined that developing countries, and in particular least developed countries, suffered the most from the effects of an economic model – sustained by a financial system and architecture – that had failed to address these pressing issues. She echoed the call of the Secretary-General of the United Nations for radical transformation of the global financial system to tackle pressing global challenges. Recalling that the right to development was a human right, she noted that realizing this right ensured that States and other duty bearers, including international organizations and business enterprises, conducted impact assessments, collected relevant data, and respected the right to development, domestically and externally. She also recalled that the international community was celebrating the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and that OHCHR had dedicated April 2023 to the theme of a human rights economy. She explained that a human rights economy, which was informed by the right to development, placed people and the planet at the heart of economic policies, investment decisions,

<sup>1</sup> See [A/HRC/WG.2/24/2](#) and [A/HRC/WG.2/24/2/Add.1](#).

<sup>2</sup> All statements are available at <https://www.ohchr.org/en/events/events/2023/24th-session-working-group-right-development>.

consumer choices and business models, with the goal of measurably enhancing the enjoyment of human rights for all. Finally, she called upon all Member States to actively and constructively engage in the intergovernmental negotiations of a legally binding instrument on the right to development, as a means to accelerate its implementation and operationalization.

5. At its first meeting, on 15 May 2023, the Working Group re-elected by acclamation Zamir Akram as Chair-Rapporteur. In his opening statement, the Chair-Rapporteur recalled that the Working Group had played an important role in monitoring and reviewing progress made in implementing the right to development since its inception. The Working Group was and remained an important forum to bring States together and to make a solid contribution towards removing the obstacles in the way of development. He underlined that since becoming Chair in 2015, he had made every effort to ensure an open, participatory and consensus-oriented process, to enable all participants to engage actively in the work of the Working Group, and to bring positions closer together by building on agreed language. He recalled the agreement reached by Member States in 2007<sup>3</sup> on a programme of work of the Human Rights Council that was to lead to raising the right to development to the same level as and to be on a par with all other human rights and fundamental freedoms and noted the failed attempts to agree on criteria and operational subcriteria and standards for the realization of the right to development.

6. Given the lack of progress, in 2018 the Human Rights Council requested the Chair-Rapporteur to prepare a draft legally binding instrument on the right to development for discussion at the Working Group. The Chair-Rapporteur explained that the draft and its revisions were prepared with the help of a group of legal experts, whom he advised to base the language of the draft text on existing international legal instruments, including human rights treaties and relevant declarations and resolutions adopted by consensus, as much as possible. The purpose was to ensure the broadest possible acceptance of the text, if not consensus. The Council had requested him to submit to it the final draft text after intergovernmental negotiations at the Working Group. In his view, the process in this Working Group had reached a level of maturity beyond which the draft text required consideration by all States Members of the United Nations for eventual adoption. Accordingly, the Council might decide to transmit the draft text to the General Assembly for adoption of the text. He provided information about his meetings with a representative of the Office of Legal Affairs and the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who had encouraged him to move forward. He called on delegates to approach the discussions with an open mind, a spirit of collaboration and a commitment to finding common ground; to strive for a future where the right to development was fully realized for all, where no one was left behind.

7. The Working Group subsequently adopted its agenda<sup>4</sup> and programme of work.

8. During the session, the Working Group heard general statements and held an interactive dialogue with the Special Rapporteur on the right to development and the Chair of the Expert Mechanism on the Right to Development. It also considered the second revised draft convention on the right to development, and the way forward.

### III. Summary of proceedings

#### A. General statements

9. Representatives of the following States made statements: Algeria, Azerbaijan (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), China, Côte d'Ivoire (on behalf of the African Group), Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). A representative of the European Union also made a statement. A representative of the South Centre, an intergovernmental

<sup>3</sup> Human Rights Council resolution 4/4.

<sup>4</sup> [A/HRC/WG.2/24/1](#).

organization, made a statement. The following civil society organizations made statements: Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, intervening also on behalf of the Catholic-inspired NGOs of the Working Group on the Right to Development of the Geneva Forum,<sup>5</sup> Maloca Internationale and CETIM.

10. Azerbaijan (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries) stated that implementing the right to development as an inalienable human right was of utmost importance, particularly in the context of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Right to Development. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries reaffirmed that all human rights, including the right to development, were universal and interrelated. The right to development had to be central to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, integrated into national policies and mainstreamed into United Nations operational activities and multilateral trading frameworks. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries emphasized the role of international cooperation in supporting comprehensive development. The convention could make development a reality for all and elevate the right to development to the same level as other human rights.

11. Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) stated that the revised text of the draft convention captured important elements aimed at strengthening international cooperation and operationalizing the right to development. The Organization of Islamic Cooperation reiterated the universal and inalienable nature of the right to development and underscored the importance of its realization and enjoyment by everyone, everywhere. In keeping with the spirit of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, the Organization of Islamic Cooperation called for greater integration of the right to development into the international human rights framework. An early finalization of the legally binding instrument operationalizing the right to development along the lines of the two International Covenants was urgent in view of widening inequalities, poverty, food insecurity, energy scarcity, and unprecedented development challenges, exacerbated by climate change, the global pandemic, natural disasters, the global financial crisis and geopolitical developments, among others. Dwindling levels of official development assistance and rising debt burdens hindered progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals. Deep structural flaws in the global economic, financial and taxation architecture were impeding progress towards economic recovery and enhanced living standards. These challenges further limited developing countries' capacities to operationalize the right to development.

12. Côte d'Ivoire (on behalf of the African Group) expressed its support for the development of a legally binding instrument on the right to development. The right to development was interdependent and interconnected with civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights and had to be considered as equally important. The African Group highlighted the need for favourable international policies for development, enhanced international cooperation and solidarity, intensified efforts to reduce economic inequalities and increased support for developing countries in their efforts to advance economic, social and cultural rights. The African Group underscored the enduring relevance of the 1986 Declaration on the Right to Development and called for renewed commitments to its implementation.

13. The European Union stated its strong commitment to achieving sustainable and inclusive development and to implementing the 2030 Agenda. In its view, while development was a right and its realization contributed to the enjoyment of other human rights, achieving development was not a necessary condition for respecting human rights, and nor could lack of development justify human rights violations. The European Union raised questions about whether a legally binding instrument was the most appropriate way to achieve inclusive and sustainable development. Despite its position and in a spirit of constructiveness, the European Union had shared in December 2022 an input to the draft convention and provided written comments on the second revised text. The European Union stressed that discussions in the

<sup>5</sup> Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, Association Points-Cœur, AVSI Foundation, Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities), Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Dominicans for Justice and Peace (Order of Preachers), International Institute of Mary Our Help of the Salesians Sisters of Don Bosco, International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education, MIAMSI, New Humanity, Teresian Association, and International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development (VIDES).

Working Group must be inclusive and consensual, and that the decision to submit a final draft of the convention to the Human Rights Council must be collegial and respectful of different stances. In its view, it was premature to consider the second draft text as final. The European Union expressed concerns that some provisions might undermine States' obligations under existing treaties, including the two International Covenants. Creating responsibilities of an inter-State nature was not appropriate nor consistent with international human rights law. Individuals must be defined as rights holders, and States as duty bearers with primary responsibility for respecting, protecting and fulfilling human rights.

14. Many delegates recalled that the right to development was an inalienable human right, interrelated and interconnected with all other human rights. They stressed the importance and urgency of implementing the right to development for everyone, everywhere. Some delegations noted that implementing the right to development would contribute to addressing global challenges such as economic crises, climate change and conflicts.

15. Pakistan stated that greater cooperation, transparency in the international financial order and the fulfilment of financing for development commitments were needed to address global systemic challenges and to advance in the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. The revised draft text of the convention represented a breakthrough, as it encapsulated key elements for promoting sustainable development and operationalizing the right to development. It aptly contextualized all relevant aspects of the right to development, incorporated the essence of universal principles, outlined pathways to overcome challenges and emphasized the significant role of international cooperation. It was also in line with principles enshrined in international human rights law. Once finalized, agreed and adopted, the legally binding instrument would bring the right to development on a par with the normative framework on other human rights and would contribute to strengthening the rules-based international economic and financial order.

16. The Islamic Republic of Iran stated that poverty, inequality and unilateral coercive measures impeded the realization of the right to development. A binding instrument would strengthen the legal framework for the realization of the right to development. The commemorations of anniversaries of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action were an auspicious occasion for taking lasting steps towards the full realization of the right to development. Sri Lanka stated that international cooperation, coupled with national programmes, was crucial in ensuring the right to development for all people. Sri Lanka mentioned its progress on access to free and universal health care, education, safe drinking water and sanitation facilities, housing and electrification.

17. South Africa called for enhanced international cooperation and supported the elaboration of a legally binding instrument on the right to development which would support the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals. Nigeria stated that the lack of development opportunities negatively impacted the well-being of populations in developing countries and contributed to instability and to threats to peace and security. International solidarity and renewed collective international efforts towards the realization of the right to development were of utmost importance, since the responsibility for promoting the right to development, given its universality, could not rest solely on individual States.

18. Saudi Arabia emphasized the comprehensive nature of the right to development and its role in improving the well-being of individuals and ensuring the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The convention on the right to development would elevate the right to development to an equal footing with other human rights and fundamental freedoms. Tunisia reiterated its support for the elaboration of a binding international legal instrument relating to the right to development, and stressed the importance of renewing, on the occasion of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, the collective international commitment for the effective realization of this right, strengthening international cooperation and solidarity and establishing fair and equitable international economic relations, in particular through the implementation of international commitments in terms of development aid and the alleviation of debts of developing and least developed countries. Tunisia stressed the need for cooperation and support by all parties for the right of countries to recover their assets that have been plundered and placed abroad and to use them in programmes for the development and well-being of their peoples, in

consolidating the principles of democracy and the rule of law, combating corruption, and laying the foundations of good governance. Malaysia stated that inclusivity was a key principle to ensure that all citizens benefited from development. Stronger collaboration and sharing of best practices were required to promote inclusivity and sustainable development. Malaysia supported the process of deliberating on and finalizing a convention on the right to development.

19. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland expressed the importance of human rights in development but questioned the need for a new legally binding instrument. The United Kingdom raised several concerns about the current draft, including the lack of clarity on the new rights, the absence of a definition of development, and the broad scope of the treaty. The United Kingdom emphasized the need for a focus on individual rights and questioned the inclusion of obligations that were not agreed upon and would potentially derail discussions in other forums. In its view, the draft omitted key human rights elements such as participation, democratic institutions, the rule of law and combating corruption. While presenting its concerns, the United Kingdom underscored its intention to foster understanding and find common ground, and stated that a step back would be needed to establish a shared objective and collaborative solutions.

20. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela stated that the right to development was a comprehensive process that encompassed the social, political and cultural development of peoples, and was linked to the creation of a democratic and equitable social and international order in which all human rights could be fully realized. Diverse and complex factors continued to hinder the enjoyment of this right, particularly in developing and least developed countries, including poverty, the negative consequences of economic crisis, lack of resources and technology transfer, debt burden and unilateral coercive measures. Algeria emphasized the need for fair international economic relations, social and economic progress, and equitable sharing of prosperity for the full recognition of the right to development. Algeria urged efforts to overcome obstacles to realization of the right, which included occupation, and the negative impact on development of the non-repatriation of illicit funds. The legally binding international instrument would help in addressing challenges posed by climate change, the pandemic, the financial crisis and geopolitical developments.

21. Mexico reiterated its commitment to sustainable development and the fight against poverty and inequalities. However, it had reservations about the usefulness of adopting a legally binding instrument on the right to development. The right to development was already enshrined in international instruments including the Charter of the United Nations, the 2030 Agenda and the Declaration on the Right to Development, through which full respect of the right was ensured. In its view, there was no right to be protected other than those already protected by other human rights norms or other norms of international law of a customary or conventional nature or by the general principles of law.

22. India stated that the full and effective implementation of the right to development was essential for sustainable development, and referred to national efforts on health, education, poverty reduction and climate action. India stated the importance of focusing the draft convention on codifying existing concepts, rights and obligations under international law, and of fostering consensus. In addition to national efforts in the realization of the right to development, Indonesia mentioned its support for the realization of the right to development in least developed countries through South-South cooperation. A draft convention would reinforce rather than dilute the importance and the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and would provide a comprehensive legal instrument to deal effectively with any development challenge, placing the right to development on an equal footing with other basic human rights.

23. Cuba stated that global systemic crises and the ineffectiveness of the international order perpetuated inequality and constituted a serious obstacle to the realization of the right to development, which was a universal and inalienable right of individuals and peoples. The unilateral coercive measures imposed on many developing countries negatively affected their development. Progress towards a binding international instrument, as promoted by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, must be approached with political will, cooperation and dialogue. China recalled the high-level meeting of the Human Rights Council commemorating the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Right to Development, at which States reaffirmed their commitment to promote and protect the right to development

and pointed out the serious challenges to the implementation of the right to development at the global level. China reiterated its proposal for the Global Development Initiative and stressed the importance of listening to the voices of developing countries, eliminating inequality, and promoting high-quality, inclusive and equitable development.

24. Uruguay stated that the right to development was enshrined in various international norms and instruments, including the Charter of the United Nations, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Declaration on the Right to Development, which set a series of commitments and served as a guide for States' efforts. The development agenda and the human rights agenda were intrinsically related, since development required a multidimensional and human rights-centred approach. Uruguay was not in favour of advancing in the negotiation of a treaty on the right to development. In its view, efforts had to be focused on the implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

25. Egypt highlighted the importance of Human Rights Council resolution 51/7, in which the Council recognized the need to overcome the political impasse within the Working Group and requested its Chair-Rapporteur to submit a second revised draft convention for intergovernmental negotiation. The right to development had not received adequate attention, and a legally binding instrument would make the right to development a reality for all.

26. Brazil emphasized that the discussions for an international instrument on the right to development had to be inclusive, ensure flexibility, cooperation, goodwill from all parties involved and ensure the participation of the majority of the international community, in order to be effective. The international instrument had to be carefully drafted to avoid undermining national or international law or duplicating existing human rights treaties. Since reaching a consensus might take time, the Working Group should remain as the main locus for inter-State discussions.

27. The South Centre highlighted the challenges that had been exacerbated by global crises, emphasizing the importance of promoting the right to development as a duty of the international community for a sustainable and inclusive recovery. The negotiations on the draft convention presented an opportunity to find common ground and address existing inequalities.

28. The Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, intervening also on behalf of the Catholic-inspired NGOs of the Working Group on the Right to Development of the Geneva Forum, stated that the elaboration of the draft convention presented an opportunity for recognizing and implementing the right to development. The revised text contained concrete, detailed and implementable norms. Maloca Internationale recalled that individuals and peoples, including Indigenous Peoples, were the beneficiaries of development, and discussed the impacts of mining, transnational organized crime and corruption on their development. Eliminating illicit financial flows by States, as called for in article 13 of the draft convention, required a strong and independent judicial system that investigated information provided by individuals. CETIM pointed to the urgency of rethinking the dominant development model which was at the origin of global multidimensional crises and inequalities. Furthermore, CETIM recalled that the convention could play a decisive role as a political and legal lever to promote the right to development, and that rural development was critical for development and required the effective participation of peasants and other people working in rural areas, who continued to be discriminated against and excluded from decision-making in many countries.

## **B. Interactive dialogue with the Special Rapporteur on the right to development and the Chair of the Expert Mechanism on the Right to Development**

29. In his statement, the Special Rapporteur on the right to development outlined his vision of the right to development and for the implementation of his mandate, underscoring the importance of adopting a holistic understanding that included fundamental freedoms and went beyond mere economic growth. He stated that the right to development was relevant to all individuals worldwide, and highlighted the need for strengthened collaboration to fully



realize it. He identified seven “Ps” as critical for the implementation of the right to development at the local, national, regional and international level, as follows: people, participation, peace, planet, private sector, policy coherence and past. The Special Rapporteur expressed his intention to devote his two upcoming reports to explaining his vision of the mandate, and to the role of business in the realization of the right to development, respectively. He encouraged all stakeholders to provide input for these reports. The Special Rapporteur had provided comments on the current text of the draft convention, including on the role of businesses and their responsibility to undertake human rights due diligence, on the connections with other regional and global human rights processes, and on the relevance of adopting an intersectional approach and integrating the free, prior and informed consultation of Indigenous Peoples.

30. In her statement, the Chair of the Expert Mechanism on the Right to Development explained that the Expert Mechanism had completed its first three-year mandate, having conducted five thematic studies which provided guidance and recommendations on the implementation of the right to development. The Expert Mechanism would develop new studies on the basis of suggestions from Member States and stakeholders. The Chair emphasized the urgency of addressing obstacles and promoting concrete policy recommendations for the realization of the right to development. The Chair reiterated the Expert Mechanism’s support for a treaty to reaffirm the Declaration on the Right to Development that would underscore the principles of accountability, empowerment, participation, non-discrimination, equality and equity.

31. Azerbaijan (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries) encouraged Member States and relevant United Nations bodies to cooperate with the Expert Mechanism in promoting the implementation of the right to development. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries emphasized the complementary contributions of the Special Rapporteur and the Expert Mechanism to the effective implementation of the Working Group’s work. The convention, based on the principles enunciated in the Declaration on the Right to Development, would contribute to making development a reality for all.

32. The Islamic Republic of Iran stressed the contributions of the Special Rapporteur to realizing the right to development. South Africa encouraged cooperation with the right to development mandates, which shared common goals as articulated in the Declaration on the Right to Development. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela highlighted the importance of these mechanisms in addressing the obstacles to development, and stated its support for their work and the initiatives of the Human Rights Council to implement effectively the principles of the Declaration on the Right to Development. Egypt welcomed the efforts of the Expert Mechanism in identifying and sharing best practices. China recognized the efforts of the Expert Mechanism in drafting thematic reports and expressed its readiness to offer constructive input. India commended the commitment of the mechanisms dedicated to addressing the right to development and reiterated its support for regular interactions between the Special Rapporteur, the Expert Mechanism, and the Working Group on the Right to Development.

33. The Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, intervening also on behalf of the Catholic-inspired NGOs of the Working Group on the Right to Development of the Geneva Forum, highlighted the importance of peace in the realization of the right to development and asked for the views of the Chairs about whether article 22 on peace and security of the second revised text of the draft convention sufficiently captured the interlinkages between the right to development and peace.

34. In reply to the points raised during the interactive dialogue, the Chair of the Expert Mechanism emphasized the importance of the Expert Mechanism’s mandate and work to promote the right to development. The Expert Mechanism had presented a document with the minimal essential framework that – in its view – had to be included in a legally binding instrument on the right to development. The Chair recognized the significance of addressing poverty as a global challenge that affected all countries, regardless of their level of development. The Chair agreed that peace and security were paramount and interconnected with the right to development. In reply to questions, the Special Rapporteur expressed his commitment to collaborating with all delegations and stakeholders to integrate the right to development in all policies, emphasizing its interrelatedness with other human rights. He

emphasized the importance of the convention in recognizing the right to development as equally valuable as other human rights. He appreciated the support offered by various delegations and civil society organizations and expressed his willingness to work together to promote the right to development. Regarding draft article 22, he suggested that the convention address peace and security in generic rather than specific terms. He emphasized the role of other conventions and instruments to deal with peace and security, while recognizing that the right to development could help in addressing root causes of conflicts and maintaining peace.

### **C. Consideration and intergovernmental negotiation of the second revised draft convention on the right to development**

35. The Chair-Rapporteur provided information about the process undertaken to prepare the second revised text of the draft convention. He reiterated that it was not possible to reflect all comments and textual proposals in full in the body of the annual report to the Human Rights Council and that the secretariat had made available all submissions received, including the comments made during the previous two sessions of the Working Group, on the OHCHR website dedicated to the Working Group.<sup>6</sup>

36. The Chair-Rapporteur stated that the Working Group would first hear an overview of the comments and textual proposals on the second revised text of the draft convention, by Mihir Kanade, the Chair-Rapporteur of the expert drafting group, followed by general comments. Participants could then make comments and textual proposals on the second revised text. The Chair-Rapporteur also reminded participants to submit their comments and textual proposals in writing to the secretariat.

37. Mr. Kanade provided an overview of the comments and textual proposals that had been received on the second revised text of the draft convention. The revised text contextualized submissions considering international law and jurisprudence, treaty practices, interpretive elaboration, commentaries, and decisions of other mechanisms interpreting human rights treaties, primarily within the United Nations human rights system. Every attempt had been made to ensure that any substantive revisions were strictly grounded on, or consistent with, international law and jurisprudence. The deliberations of the expert drafting group were guided by the following three considerations:

(a) Proposals that strengthened and improved the text, consistently with international law, were accepted. Proposals that ultimately weakened the text due to inconsistency with international law, or by introducing further challenges to the effective implementation of the draft convention, were cautiously reviewed and scrutinized by the expert drafting group.

(b) Proposals that repeated or duplicated provisions in the draft convention were not accepted. Any proposed revisions that would be contrary to existing international law or would potentially result in a conflict with or outright breach of existing international law were avoided.

(c) Proposals that sought contextual elaboration of the draft convention text were noted for possible inclusion in the commentaries to the second revised draft convention. Only suggestions that were relevant to the context of the provision concerned were accepted.

38. Mr. Kanade also outlined some of the general contours of the revisions. In particular, he explained comments received and changes made to draft articles 2, 5, 13, 16, 25, 30 and 35. Apart from these main modifications, several other changes were made, which would be reflected in a track changes version and explained in the commentaries.

39. Mr. Kanade addressed the comments made by the United Kingdom and clarified various concerns raised. He emphasized that the draft convention did not provide a specific definition but descriptions of development, acknowledging it as a comprehensive process aimed at improving the well-being of the entire population. He stated that the right to development was about the right to participate in, contribute to and enjoy development, and

<sup>6</sup> See <https://www.ohchr.org/en/hrc-subsiidiaries/iwg-on-development>.

that development itself was a human right. He explained that the draft convention made it clear that individuals determined what development was for them. Draft article 4 defined the right to development, stating that its rights holders were individuals and peoples, and making specific reference to participation. Mr. Kanade invited delegates to refer to the commentaries for a deeper understanding of the normative sources of the provisions contained in the second draft. He reiterated that the expert drafting group had made all attempts to ensure that the convention was based on existing international legal instruments.

40. Azerbaijan (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries) emphasized the need to promote and protect all universally recognized human rights, including the right to development. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries urged States to implement the policies and measures necessary for the realization of the right to development as a fundamental human right, and called for expanded cooperation and the removal of obstacles to development at the national and international levels.

41. The Islamic Republic of Iran emphasized the importance of a conclusive outcome through a legally binding instrument on the right to development. A binding instrument would establish a robust framework for cooperation, support sustainable development, and provide guidance, mechanisms, and collaboration opportunities to address development challenges. South Africa stated that the draft text was a significant contribution towards the practical realization of the right to development for all and to elevate this inalienable right to its rightful place alongside other human rights and fundamental freedoms. As a State party to the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, South Africa recognized and supported the right to development at the international and domestic levels.

42. Chile expressed its commitment to human rights, including the right to development, but maintained its reservations about the need for a legally binding instrument. In its view, there was lack of broad consensus and clarity regarding the content of the right. Concerns were raised about the rushed presentation of the final draft and the absence of gender-inclusive language. Chile called for negotiations to continue to develop a text that would generate consensus across the international community, and to strengthen the right to development in conjunction with other human rights.

43. The Chair-Rapporteur expressed his willingness to reach consensus and the right language in the draft text. He urged delegations to provide alternative ideas and language proposals that could be considered by the Working Group. He recalled the decision by the Human Rights Council to submit a draft convention by its September 2023 session.

44. China appreciated the efforts made to balance different perspectives and stated the need for deliberations on the definition of the right to development and for a balance between rights and responsibilities and clarity on the functions and mandate of monitoring mechanisms. The Russian Federation welcomed the inclusion of some of its comments but noted that most of its substantive legal comments were not included in the second revised text. A number of provisions were not aligned with norms and principles of international law and were based on experts' interpretations or opinions. A legally binding instrument must be carefully drafted to avoid undermining international human rights law, or contradictions and overlap with other human rights treaties.

45. Argentina acknowledged the progress in the language of the text but highlighted some elements of concern and inconsistencies. In its view, the language used in the text had to be simpler and more direct, particularly on specific State obligations, and incorporate inclusive gender perspectives. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela emphasized the urgency of making progress on an international legally binding instrument on the right to development, which would strengthen social protection systems and address obstacles to development. Mexico acknowledged the explanations provided by Mr. Kanade but raised concerns about the lack of clarity about the object and purpose, and about the subject of the rights and the responsibilities. Mexico emphasized the need for precise definitions and gender-inclusive language.

46. The Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, intervening also on behalf of the Catholic-inspired NGOs of the Working Group on the Right to Development of the Geneva Forum, CETIM and the World Organization of the Scout Movement, expressed support for the second revised draft. The World Organization of the Scout Movement emphasized the

role of young people in development and their right to participate. CETIM underlined the evolving nature of international law and emphasized the progress made in the second revised draft, while acknowledging the need for further improvements.

47. The Working Group then proceeded to consider the draft articles of the second revised draft convention on the right to development. The secretariat made all comments and textual proposals received available on the OHCHR website dedicated to the Working Group.<sup>7</sup>

48. Representatives of the following States made comments and textual suggestions for the second revised draft convention on the right to development: Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Representatives of the following civil society organizations also made comments and textual suggestions: Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, intervening also on behalf of the Catholic-inspired NGOs of the Working Group on the Right to Development of the Geneva Forum, CETIM, World Organization of the Scout Movement, Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights and Maloca Internationale.<sup>8</sup>

49. The comments on the title, the preamble and part I (arts. 1–3) included requests to shorten and streamline the preamble and bring it into line with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Some delegates suggested changing the wording in the title from convention to covenant, whereas one delegate was opposed to this, arguing that it was premature to elevate it to a covenant unless there was broad consensus. Others requested that references be added to people-centred development, young people, children, and peasants and other persons working in rural areas, as well as to age, disability and gender equality. Views differed on the inclusion of gender in this and other sections of the draft convention. Some delegates requested replacing “human rights-based development” with “development that fully respects international human rights”, while others were opposed to changing the language of draft article 3. There were requests for clarifications on the right and responsibility of individuals, peoples, groups and organs of society to promote and protect human rights.

50. The comments on part II (arts. 4–7) and part III (arts. 8–18) related – inter alia – to a definition or clarifications on development and the right to development, clear identification of beneficiaries, clarifications on the general obligations of States parties, and who could be party to the convention. Comments were also made on the duty to cooperate. Views differed on references to equality between men and women, as well as on references to gender discrimination.

51. The comments on part III (arts. 19–24) related – inter alia – to restrictions on the right to development for national security or public order reasons, the hierarchy of rights and its consistency with international law, data collection and statistics, and the role of international organizations. On part IV (arts. 25–27), the comments related to – inter alia – the reporting requirements, the selection of experts, including gender balance and the competences required, and the preparation of general comments. The comments on part V (arts. 28–38) related – inter alia – to alternative dispute resolution methods before resorting to the International Court of Justice. Some delegates called for clarity, consistency and a well-defined implementation mechanism.

52. The Chair-Rapporteur and Mr. Kanade replied to the comments made. The Chair-Rapporteur reminded all participants to submit their comments and textual proposals in writing to the secretariat. The Chair-Rapporteur and the expert drafting group would carefully review and address them in finalizing the text. The Chair-Rapporteur acknowledged the broad agreement expressed on most aspects of the draft convention. He also noted that some areas had generated considerable discussion, such as the gender issue. He clarified that the language used in the draft was based on existing international treaties, such as the Convention

<sup>7</sup> See <https://www.ohchr.org/en/hrc-subsiidiaries/iwg-on-development>.

<sup>8</sup> The recordings of the 4th and 5th meetings are available at <https://media.un.org/en/asset/k1w/k1wfoo9k4a> and <https://media.un.org/en/asset/k10/k10bvvc0t6> respectively.

on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. He recalled that it was not within the Working Group's mandate to rewrite existing or introduce new concepts beyond what was available in international treaties. Mr. Kanade formulated clarifications, including on the addition made to and comments received on draft articles 13, 17 and 35.<sup>9</sup>

#### **D. Consideration of the way forward**

53. The Chair-Rapporteur expressed his appreciation to all delegates for their participation in the negotiations on the revised draft convention and thanked the group of experts for their exceptional work. He welcomed the inputs received and the extensive discussions held. He recalled the mandate given to the Chair-Rapporteur by the Human Rights Council in its resolution 51/7 requesting him to submit the final revised text of the draft convention to the Council. Members of the Council would then decide on the way forward.

54. The Chair-Rapporteur stated that he would submit the final draft text of the draft convention to the Human Rights Council in September 2023 and recommend that the Council submit the text to the General Assembly for appropriate action. In his view and from the discussions held during the session of the Working Group, it was clear that the General Assembly was a universal, inclusive and appropriate forum for the discussions on the draft convention.

55. Argentina (also on behalf of Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Honduras, Panama, Paraguay and Peru) noted that while the second revised draft text addressed some of the concerns expressed during the negotiations, the text was not yet a consensual one. The visions stated by some delegations denoted the persistence of differences on the draft text. In order to bridge these and to reach consensus, it was crucial that discussions on the text continue. Closing the discussions in the Working Group in Geneva and considering the draft text as a final one would be premature. It did not seem prudent or an efficient use of resources to send these open discussions to New York. The delegations expressed their belief that in a spirit of dialogue, cooperation and political will, the Human Rights Council would have the ability to decide that such an important negotiation would continue in Geneva and would be held in the most inclusive manner.

56. Pakistan noted both convergence and divergence in the deliberations during the session, which helped identify key elements for addressing socioeconomic challenges hindering sustainable development. Pakistan emphasized the need to determine a point to close the discussions and believed that the draft convention should be discussed by the body in the United Nations with universal membership.

57. South Africa recognized that divergence was a natural part of negotiations and suggested moving the process to the General Assembly in New York for fresh impetus and universal participation.

58. Cuba supported the interventions made by Pakistan and the comments from South Africa on the need to move the negotiations to New York. This would not mean closing the negotiation process but bringing it to an organ with universal composition and expertise in treaty negotiations, which would enrich the deliberations and refine the text of the draft convention.

59. The Islamic Republic of Iran stated that the Working Group had reached a good foundation. It called for political will and decision-making to move the work forward and expressed its support for presenting the second revised text to the Council with a view to continuing negotiations at the General Assembly.

60. Azerbaijan encouraged continuation of the process in line with Human Rights Council resolution 51/7, in which the Chair was requested to submit the final draft text to the Council.

61. Ecuador stated that, while previous textual suggestions that it had formulated had been considered, some critical aspects of the draft text still required further clarification. In its

<sup>9</sup> The recording of the 6th meeting is available at <https://media.un.org/en/asset/k1w/k1w70s6d3c>.

view, the draft text contained a number of essential elements on which a critical mass of States had not reached consensus and there were critical elements that were missing in the text. Further deliberations were required to adequately progress in elaborating the legally binding instrument. By way of example, Ecuador noted that an operational definition of several concepts was required, such as the concept of the “right to development” itself; it stated that the draft convention should exclude any type of interpretation that could imply that development could justify the violation of human rights; and it joined those delegations that pointed to the presence of regressive language on gender equality. Ecuador stressed that the process should allow the necessary space and time for States to continue to engage in dialogue and contribute constructively to the drafting of the instrument, in order to obtain a text that was as inclusive, participatory and democratic as possible.

62. The Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, intervening also on behalf of the Catholic-inspired NGOs of the Working Group on the Right to Development of the Geneva Forum, stated that the Human Rights Council resolution was very clear that the negotiation process had to move to the General Assembly where the process could not be further delayed, considering the efforts that had been made and for the well-being of many persons in the world.

63. The Chair-Rapporteur expressed his view that providing more time for the discussions would not bridge differences that had existed in the past three decades. A significant number of countries would want to see this process moving forward. The Human Rights Council, during its session in September 2023, would decide on the way forward.

#### **IV. Conclusions and recommendations**

64. At the final meeting of its twenty-fourth session, held on 19 May 2023, the Working Group adopted by consensus the present conclusions and recommendations, in accordance with its mandate as established by the Commission on Human Rights in its resolution 1998/72.

65. The Working Group also adopted by consensus the present report ad referendum. Concluding statements were made by Azerbaijan (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), China, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lebanon (on behalf of the Arab Group), Maldives, Pakistan and South Africa, and by the European Union. The Associazione Papa Giovanni XXIII, speaking on behalf of the Catholic-inspired NGOs of the Working Group on the Right to Development of the Geneva Forum, Maloca Internationale, CETIM and the International Human Rights Council also made concluding remarks.

66. Azerbaijan, speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, believed that a convention on the right to development could make development a reality for all, ensure the operationalization of the right to development as a priority to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals, and raise the right to development, as set out in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, to the same level and to be on a par with all other human rights and fundamental freedoms. It urged all Member States to pay particular attention to the right to development in the context of the elaboration of their national policies in line with the 2030 Agenda, and called upon the United Nations, and its funds and programmes, and the specialized agencies, to mainstream the right to development in their policies and operational activities, as well as in policies and strategies of the international financial and multilateral trading system.

67. The European Union believed that the process had to be as inclusive and consensual as possible, as this was the only way to ensure universality and that all States took ownership of the process. It emphasized the importance of inclusivity and called for further discussions and a consensual approach on the right to development. It noted that Member States were far from a consensus, even far from an agreement on the basic principles of this instrument, that various contentious proposals had been made and that neither Geneva nor New York were the place to resolve these long-standing differences of position. Negotiations on a potential instrument with a legally binding nature had always had a consensual approach, with broad support from civil society and rights holders, and the European Union believed that it should not be any different this time around. The European Union stated that it was premature to

consider the current draft text as final and called for the draft convention to comply with international law.

68. Lebanon, speaking on behalf of the Arab Group, stressed the importance of implementing the mandate of the Working Group, as per the respective Human Rights Council resolutions. Despite the evolution of the right to development over time, it had not received the momentum that it deserved. There was an urgent need for a concerted global effort to address interrelated challenges, including food insecurity, climate change, and the debt and energy crises, through a comprehensive strategy that provided global solutions to address the root causes of these challenges. Lebanon therefore called on all members to contribute actively and constructively to the discussions in the Working Group in order to reach a widely recognized convention that would be an important step in the right direction, and to strengthen the basis for inclusive growth by revitalizing the global partnership for development.

69. Maldives stressed that the right to development was an indispensable human right, and a necessary means of achieving a more equitable, prosperous and sustainable future for all. As a small island developing State, it faced serious challenges posed by climate change and had limited resources that hindered its efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. Promoting environmentally sound sustainable practices and addressing the special needs of small island States were crucial to ensuring realization of the right to development.

70. South Africa reaffirmed its commitment to the promotion and protection of all human rights without discrimination. It supported the call of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries to mainstream the right to development in policies and operational activities of the United Nations, and its funds and programmes, and the specialized agencies, as well as in international financial and multilateral trading systems, and encouraged all Member States to engage with this process with a view to finalizing the deliberations, working towards removing obstacles to the legal recognition of this fundamental treaty in the most ambitious manner possible and ensuring that it became a reality.

71. Pakistan believed that the General Assembly was the appropriate platform for further discussions on the draft convention. There was an urgent need to move beyond rhetoric to firm commitments in order to operationalize the right to development and improve people's living standards. Strengthening the normative legal framework and finalizing the draft convention would help mobilize resources and make development a reality.

72. China recognized the efforts made under the leadership of the Chair-Rapporteur and expressed appreciation for the in-depth discussions conducted by the participating parties regarding the second draft of the convention.

73. The Islamic Republic of Iran recognized the difficulty of reaching consensus on all sections, concepts and topics covered by the convention, which was also the case with other human rights instruments. It emphasized the need to bring negotiations and discussions to a conclusion. It believed that while the current text might not fully satisfy all sides, it had the potential to serve as a basis for finalizing the document. A legally binding instrument on the right to development would establish a robust legal framework and provide avenues for cooperation and empowerment, supporting sustainable and inclusive development. The Islamic Republic of Iran reiterated that measures that impeded equal and respectful cooperation among countries hindered the full realization of the right to development and should be avoided.

74. The Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, intervening also on behalf of the Catholic-inspired NGOs of the Working Group on the Right to Development of the Geneva Forum, hoped that the adoption of a legally binding instrument by the General Assembly would be realized very soon for the sake of every person and all the peoples of the world, especially the most vulnerable, and hoped that such an instrument would be named in the International Covenant on the Right to Development. Noting the persisting polarization, it called for the concerns of the people of the world to be put at the centre, to overcome division and walk towards unity. The world needed the unity of all States, as a human family.

75. Maloca Internationale highlighted the right to self-determination and reiterated that the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169) and the United Nations

Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples should be mentioned in article 17 of the negotiated text. It highlighted the need for effective rule of law, good governance and accountability to realize the right to development.

76. CETIM noted with regret that some States had not understood or did not want to understand the historic moment and the potential and importance of the document. In its opinion, the future covenant was mature enough to be adopted. While some of the criticisms or proposals made during the session were constructive, others were not, and were clearly aimed at distorting the very content of the future covenant. CETIM recalled the mandate and the urgency, and that the objective was to operationalize the right to development.

77. The International Human Rights Council said that all States had to undertake efforts in line with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the right to development. It emphasized the importance of efforts for the respect of human rights and the right to development of peoples. It highlighted the responsibility of States and stakeholders in undertaking development efforts for individuals affected by poverty and the pandemic.

78. In his concluding remarks, the Chair-Rapporteur stated that he would submit a revised text of the draft convention on the right to development, along with the annual report of the Working Group, to the Human Rights Council at its September 2023 session. It was then up to the Council to decide how it wished to proceed on the matter. He regretted that some States had chosen not to participate in the negotiations on the draft convention, and advised that all comments and textual proposals would be duly considered in the revision of the draft by the expert drafting group and himself before it was finalized and submitted to the Council. He reiterated that he remained committed to an inclusive, participatory and consensual conduct of the work of the Working Group and would continue to do so.

## A. Conclusions

79. **The Working Group expressed its appreciation to all those who contributed to the proceedings at its twenty-fourth session.**

80. **The Working Group took note with appreciation of the opening remarks made by the Deputy High Commissioner, in which she reiterated the full support of OHCHR for the Working Group and for the full realization of the right to development.**

81. **The Working Group welcomed the re-election of the Chair-Rapporteur and commended him for his able stewardship in guiding the deliberations during the session. It also expressed gratitude and appreciation to the Chair-Rapporteur and the experts who had supported him in the elaboration of the second revised text of the draft convention on the right to development and the commentary thereto submitted at the request of the Human Rights Council. In that context, the Working Group expressed its appreciation for the interaction with the experts.**

82. **The Working Group also expressed its appreciation for the interactive dialogue held with the Special Rapporteur on the right to development and the Chair of the Expert Mechanism on the Right to Development, which had provided an opportunity to exchange views on the second revised text of the draft convention, the benefits of the operationalization of the right to development and the ways to overcome the obstacles and challenges to the full enjoyment of that right.**

83. **The Working Group discussed how a legally binding instrument might contribute to making the right to development a reality for all, by creating conditions, at the national and international levels, conducive to its realization and to halting all measures that might have an impact on the right to development – in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the Declaration on the Right to Development and other relevant international instruments and documents. It stressed that the provisions of the draft convention needed to be in line with international human rights law.**

84. **The Working Group took note of the views of the majority of States, which expressed concern about the negative impact on the economy and society and the consequent exacerbation of inequalities within and between countries due to conflicts,**



climate change, natural calamities, the pandemic and the global financial crisis. The majority of States stressed the need for collective action in responding to these challenges and the socioeconomic consequences thereof, and in advancing sustainable development and the realization of all human rights, including the right to development. They highlighted the need for the convention on the right to development to be finalized for further consideration by the General Assembly, as its early adoption would help in operationalizing the right to development. They called for a greater focus on international development assistance, and on means of financing for development, in the text of the draft convention.

85. The Working Group took note of several States' views stressing that it should continue considering the draft convention and emphasizing that the provisions of the convention also needed to be in line with international human rights standards. Some others also emphasized the need to define the right to development in the draft convention.

86. The Working Group took note of the divergent views on the second revised text of the draft convention on the right to development and of the fact that a number of States continued to engage in the Working Group by restating their position that they were not in favour of an international legal standard of a binding nature on the right to development, as they did not believe that this was an appropriate and efficient mechanism to realize sustainable development. Those States are of the view that at this stage, States must concentrate their efforts on the effective implementation of the 2030 Agenda, which comprises a wide and comprehensive range of consensual commitments. As some States neither supported nor engaged in the negotiations on the draft convention, the outcome of those negotiations did not necessarily reflect their views.

87. The Working Group encouraged the relevant bodies of the United Nations system, within their respective mandates, including the specialized agencies, and the funds and programmes of the United Nations system, and other relevant international organizations and stakeholders, including civil society organizations, to give due consideration to the right to development in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, to contribute to the work of the Working Group and to cooperate with the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Expert Mechanism and the Special Rapporteur in the fulfilment of their mandates with regard to the implementation of the right to development.

## **B. Recommendations**

88. The Working Group made the following recommendations:

(a) The High Commissioner and OHCHR should take the measures necessary to ensure a balanced and visible allocation of resources and pay due attention to the visibility and effective implementation and mainstreaming of the right to development by systematically identifying and undertaking tangible projects dedicated to that right, and should continue to update the Human Rights Council and the Working Group on progress in that regard;

(b) The Working Group should continue to implement its mandate through a collaborative process of engagement, in accordance with Commission on Human Rights resolution 1998/72 and other relevant resolutions of the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly;

(c) The Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group should conduct further consultations with all Member States, international organizations, the Expert Mechanism, the Special Rapporteur, OHCHR, United Nations agencies, regional economic commissions and other organizations on the realization of the right to development, including for the next steps forward on the draft convention on the right to development, taking into account the discussions held at the twenty-fourth session of the Working Group and the presentations made by the experts invited thereto;

(d) **The High Commissioner should include in his next annual report an analysis of the realization of the right to development, taking into account existing challenges and obstacles to the realization of that right and making recommendations on how to overcome them and concrete proposals for supporting the Working Group in fulfilling its mandate;**

(e) **The Working Group should invite the Special Rapporteur and the Chair of the Expert Mechanism to continue to contribute to the work of the Working Group;**

(f) **The High Commissioner should continue to facilitate the participation of experts in the future sessions of the Working Group and to provide advice with a view to contributing to the implementation of the mandate of the Working Group;**

(g) **The Chair-Rapporteur should present the report of the Working Group on its twenty-fourth session to the General Assembly at its seventy-eighth session and report on activities to promote the integration of the right to development in efforts to implement the 2030 Agenda.**

## Annex

### List of participants

#### States members of the Human Rights Council

Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cameroon, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechia, Gambia, Honduras, India, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Romania, Senegal, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Viet Nam

#### States Members of the United Nations

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Burundi, Cambodia, Colombia, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Lebanon, Malta, Mauritius, Myanmar, Nauru, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Türkiye, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

#### Non-member observer States

Holy See

#### Intergovernmental organizations

European Union, International Labour Organization, Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, Organization of Islamic Cooperation, South Centre

#### National human rights institutions

Comisión Nacional de los Derechos Humanos (Mexico)

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

Action Canada for Population and Development, Alliance Defending Freedom, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, Centre Europe – tiers monde, China Society for Human Rights Studies, Genève pour les droits de l'homme: formation internationale, Human Rights Watch, Instituto Alana, International Human Rights Commission Relief Fund Trust, International Human Rights Council, International Lesbian and Gay Association, International Society for Peace and Safety, International-Lawyers.Org, Les Caribous Libérés, Ligue Camerounaise des droits de l'homme, Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, Maloca Internationale, NGOs Computer Literacy Shelter Welfare, Rawalpindi Cantt., Ohaha Family Foundation, Patriotic Vision, Pleaders of Children and Elderly People at Risk "PEPAINGO", Pompiers humanitaires, Regroupement des Jeunes Africains pour la Démocratie et le Développement – Section Togo, Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung – Gesellschaftsanalyse und Politische Bildung e.V., Society for International Development, Teresian Association, United Nations of Youth, Network – Nigeria, Vision mondiale de la santé "VIM'S", World Organization of the Scout Movement