



General Assembly

Distr.: General
16 August 2023

Original: English

Human Rights Council Fifty-third session

Summary record of the 38th meeting

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Friday, 14 July 2023, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Bálek (Czechia)

Contents

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

Agenda item 1: Organizational and procedural matters

Closure of the session

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of the present record to the Documents Management Section (DMS-DCM@un.org).

Any corrected records of the public meetings of the Council at this session will be reissued for technical reasons after the end of the session.



The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda item 10: Technical assistance and capacity-building *(continued)*
(A/HRC/53/L.1)

Draft resolution A/HRC/53/L.1: Cooperation with and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights

1. **Ms. Filipenko** (Ukraine), introducing the draft resolution, said that it was a follow-up to the five previous resolutions of the same title, the proposed changes being purely technical in nature. Its main objective was to ensure that the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights continued to issue oral updates to the Council on the situation in Ukraine, based on the findings of the human rights monitoring mission in Ukraine and the discussions of those findings in interactive dialogues. The mission was currently monitoring the situation on the ground and was regularly submitting evidence-based reports on human rights violations stemming from the war of aggression being waged by the Russian Federation and its temporary occupation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and parts of Donbas.
2. Just that week, the Council had held an interactive dialogue to discuss the oral updates provided by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) on the detention of civilians and the Secretary-General's interim report on the situation of human rights in the temporarily occupied Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, Ukraine. In the High Commissioner's intervention, he had confirmed that, now more than ever, Ukraine required assistance to strengthen the capacities of its national institutions and social protection services in order to ensure accountability and the provision of redress for victims of conflict-related violence.
3. Besides monitoring and reporting, OHCHR conducted legal analysis on behalf of Ukraine and issued recommendations relating to different areas, thereby equipping the country with practical tools for assisting victims of human rights abuses. The draft resolution would enable Ukraine to further consolidate the international assistance that it needed to address human rights challenges in the current extraordinary circumstances. She urged the members of the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.
4. **The President** announced that four States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which had no programme budget implications.

General statements made before the voting

5. **Ms. Taylor** (United States of America) said that the United States was proud to support the draft resolution, which simply sought to ensure that objective reporting on Ukraine by the High Commissioner remained on the Council's agenda. Although there was mounting evidence that war crimes were being committed in Ukraine, the draft resolution reflected a restrained approach in that it was merely asking the High Commissioner to continue presenting oral updates on the situation in Ukraine to the Council. The human rights monitoring mission in Ukraine had been conducting its work for almost a decade, that is, since the Russian Federation had first invaded part of Ukrainian territory. As the Russian Federation continued its relentless attacks and human rights abuses across Ukraine, the reporting undertaken by the High Commissioner was more important than ever.
6. It was worth acknowledging that the draft resolution was being submitted by Ukraine despite the fact that some of the High Commissioner's reporting had been critical of actions taken by the Ukrainian forces and authorities. Her delegation commended the Government of Ukraine for being open to scrutiny by OHCHR even as the country was fighting for its very survival. Regrettably, the Russian Federation had not demonstrated any openness to scrutiny.
7. In the view of her delegation, there was no reason why the draft resolution should not be adopted by consensus. All members of the Council should wish to hear what the High Commissioner had to say about the human rights situation in Ukraine. Her delegation therefore urged the members to adopt the draft resolution.

8. **Mr. Maisuradze** (Georgia) said that his delegation strongly supported the adoption of the draft resolution and was deeply concerned about the ongoing war of aggression against Ukraine, a war initiated by the Russian Federation that had cost tens of thousands of lives and left nearly half the population in pressing need of humanitarian aid. The High Commissioner's reports reflected the ongoing human rights violations committed by the Russian authorities, especially against persons living in the east of Ukraine and the temporarily occupied Autonomous Republic of Crimea. Given that situation, it was essential for OHCHR and other international human rights mechanisms to secure immediate, safe and unimpeded access to the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine.

9. His delegation urged the Russian Federation to uphold its obligations under international human rights law and to withdraw all its forces from Ukraine and provide international human rights and humanitarian institutions with unhindered, immediate and safe access to persons held in Russian territory or in areas controlled or temporarily occupied by the Russian Federation. He wished to reiterate his country's unwavering support for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders, including its territorial waters. He called on all members of the Council to support Ukraine by adopting the draft resolution by consensus.

10. **Mr. Idris** (Eritrea) said that his delegation wished to request a vote on the draft resolution. Technical assistance and capacity-building that addressed institutional and organizational shortcomings or a lack of resources were of strategic importance in promoting national development. In such situations, Eritrea supported the use of human rights agendas to foster institutional capacity-building. However, States that requested technical assistance and capacity-building should adhere to the aim and spirit of such agendas and comply with the Council's relevant resolutions and principles. The draft resolution under discussion did not include references to any internal human rights challenges and did not mention the plight of the country's ethnic and linguistic minorities, specifically, its Russian-speaking population. The draft resolution was driven by ulterior political motives, including territorial claims, that would best be addressed through other channels and platforms. His delegation strongly opposed the use of human rights platforms and agendas as a cover for political machinations and urged the members of the Council to vote against the adoption of the draft resolution.

11. **Mr. Pecsteen de Buytswerve** (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Union that were members of the Council, said that the draft resolution concerned the human rights situation in Ukraine and was not intended to target any third State. For almost a decade, the human rights monitoring mission in Ukraine had helped to promote and protect human rights in that country. The advice provided by the mission to the Government of Ukraine had been instrumental in strengthening the protection of human rights and promoting access to justice. The mission had also supported cooperation between Ukraine and human rights mechanisms, including United Nations treaty bodies, special procedure mandate holders and international institutions. The continued presence of the mission was critical to enhancing such cooperation. The European Union strongly supported the efforts made by Ukraine to enhance human rights protection despite the brutal, unprovoked and unjustified war of aggression being waged by the Russian Federation. The European Union reiterated its unwavering support for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders and its inherent right to defend itself against the Russian aggression.

12. Time and time again, the Russian Federation had blatantly violated international human rights law and international humanitarian law. The High Commissioner's latest report documented numerous cases of arbitrary detention, enforced disappearance, torture, ill-treatment, and summary executions committed by the Russian Federation during its invasion of Ukraine. The European Union called on the international community to support efforts made by Ukraine to protect the human rights of all persons, including persons belonging to minorities, within its internationally recognized borders. It therefore supported the draft resolution and called on all members of the Council to adopt it.

13. **Mr. Bonnafont** (France) said that his delegation commended the remarkable work carried out by the human rights monitoring mission in Ukraine. That work was now all the more essential as, for more than 500 days, the Russian Federation had been waging a war of

aggression against Ukraine, with increasingly deleterious consequences for Ukraine and the rest of the world. In the past weeks, Russian missiles had targeted apartment blocks, restaurants and even a humanitarian aid centre. In view of the extraordinary situation, the request set out in the draft resolution was modest, namely, that OHCHR should be permitted to continue presenting quarterly oral reports on the information gathered on the ground. Although the request was unexceptional, it was vital for preserving memory, documenting evidence and preventing impunity. The consultation work carried out by the Ukrainian delegation in drafting the text had been impeccable. All members wishing to make comments on the draft had been able to do so.

14. For those reasons, his delegation hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted. The aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine flouted all the principles of the United Nations. It represented an unacceptable use of force, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations, and involved daily violations of human rights and humanitarian law. If the international community failed to react to such violations, it would be resigning itself to a world in which the sovereignty of States depended solely on relations of power. For that reason, France and its partners would continue to support Ukraine and the Ukrainian people in their legitimate right to defend their sovereignty, territorial integrity and freedom.

15. **Mr. Manley** (United Kingdom) said that his delegation wished to commend the Ukrainian delegation on the restraint that it had shown in drafting such a short technical text when Ukraine was being subjected to such horrific aggression by the Russian Federation. His delegation was dismayed that, once again, the Council was being asked to vote on a draft resolution concerning the promotion of human rights in a country that openly collaborated and cooperated with OHCHR, in stark contrast to the Russian Federation.

16. There was no reason why any member of the Council should do anything other than vote enthusiastically in favour of the draft resolution. All the States represented in the chamber were signatories to the Charter and should therefore support the aim of maintaining international peace and security. In Ukraine, the international community had witnessed blatant disregard for the Charter, and growing evidence of war crimes and crimes against humanity, all since President Putin had ordered the full-scale invasion of another sovereign State.

17. The High Commissioner's team in Ukraine carried out invaluable monitoring and reporting work and provided essential guidance and support to the Ukrainian Government. That support must be maintained, particularly now that Ukraine was being subjected to the horrifying realities of a brutal war. He urged all members of the Council to adopt the draft resolution.

18. **Ms. Stasch** (Germany) said that it should not become common practice for a vote to be requested on draft resolutions under agenda item 10 that merely requested technical cooperation. The Council should not deny Ukraine the possibility of receiving support from OHCHR. The well-balanced text was the product of transparent and constructive negotiations. It was necessary to adopt it because human rights violations had been reported on a daily basis since the start of the war of aggression and because objective sources of information were essential to curbing the rapid spread of disinformation. The human rights monitoring mission provided objective and trustworthy information. Her delegation therefore called on all members of the Council to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

19. **The President** said that the Russian Federation would not speak as it did not consider itself to be concerned by the draft resolution.

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

20. **Ms. Li Xiaomei** (China) said that China had maintained a consistent position on the situation in Ukraine. The sovereignty and territorial integrity of States must be respected, the Charter of the United Nations must be upheld, and all countries' legitimate security concerns should be taken seriously. Any action that was conducive to a peaceful resolution of the crisis deserved to be supported. Together with the international community, China stood ready to continue playing a constructive role in working for a political solution to the crisis in Ukraine. In the current circumstances, there was an urgent need for a ceasefire to be established and for the war to end, rather than for more weapons to be added to the conflict. The situation

required dialogue and negotiation instead of escalation, and peace talks instead of confrontation between the opposing camps.

21. A number of countries had recently put forward peace initiatives, demonstrating the growing support for peace talks. Her delegation hoped that the Council and the sponsors would heed the call for reason issued by the international community and refrain from politicizing human rights issues. Any action taken by the Council in connection with the situation in Ukraine should be oriented towards finding a political solution to the crisis. The draft resolution touched on issues that were beyond the Council's mandate and could undermine the search for such a solution. In view of the above, her delegation backed the request for a vote on the draft resolution and would vote against it.

22. **Mr. Villegas** (Argentina) said that his delegation urged all parties to respect international human rights and humanitarian law and to investigate all violations, holding the perpetrators to account and ensuring the right to justice, truth, reparation and guarantees of non-repetition. The draft resolution, if adopted, would help to promote and protect human rights in Ukraine. For that reason, his delegation would vote in favour of its adoption.

23. **Mr. Eheth** (Cameroon) said that, from the outset of the hostilities between the Russian Federation and Ukraine, Cameroon had called for the peaceful settlement of the dispute in accordance with the principles of the Charter. Cameroon, along with the rest of the African continent, was heavily involved in the search for dialogue-based solutions that would lead to the restoration of peace. In that connection, a high-level mission of African heads of State had recently visited Moscow and Kyiv.

24. In Africa, the vast majority of people were wondering what was at stake in the war, which had already claimed tens of thousands of victims on both sides, created large numbers of refugees and displaced persons, and destroyed property and infrastructure. The Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) stated that, since wars began in the minds of men, it was in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed. That maxim inspired and motivated the approach taken by Cameroon to the situation in Ukraine. In such situations, African wisdom recommended neutrality – an active neutrality, oriented towards the search for peace, that had nothing to do with non-alignment or the pursuit of any particular geostrategic interest. Rather, it was based on the principles of humanism, dialogue and the promotion of peace.

25. The work of the Council was to be commended as it responded to the imperative obligation to provide assistance. However, his delegation continued to believe that the most effective form of assistance was to do everything possible to bring hostilities to an end as quickly as possible and restore peace. For all those reasons, his delegation would abstain from voting on the draft resolution.

26. *At the request of the representative of Eritrea, a recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Argentina, Belgium, Benin, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Honduras, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Paraguay, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Somalia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against:

China, Cuba, Eritrea.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cameroon, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, South Africa, Sudan, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam.

27. *Draft resolution [A/HRC/53/L.1](#) was adopted by 28 votes to 3, with 16 abstentions.*

Agenda item 1: Organizational and procedural matters (A/HRC/53/1)*Selection and appointment of mandate holders*

28. **The President** said that four special procedure mandate holders were to have been appointed at the current session. On the basis of the recommendations of the Consultative Group, he had circulated a list of proposed candidates and, subsequently, a revised list. However, as a long series of consultations with the parties concerned had failed to produce a consensus, he proposed that the appointments should be deferred to the Council's fifty-fourth session. The mandates of the four current mandate holders would be extended until the appointment of their successors. He took it that the Council wished to endorse that course of action.

29. *It was so decided.*

Report on the fifty-third session

30. **Ms. Macdonal Alvarez** (Plurinational State of Bolivia), Vice-President and Rapporteur, said that an advance unedited version of the draft report of the Human Rights Council on its fifty-third session (A/HRC/53/2) had been circulated. The structure of the report reflected the 10 items on the Council's agenda. The secretariat would finalize the report after the session and circulate it for comments. During the session, the Council had completed its extensive programme of work, holding no fewer than 22 interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders and expert mechanisms, 9 interactive dialogues with the High Commissioner, 3 enhanced interactive dialogues and 1 urgent debate, as well as adopting 13 outcome documents under the universal periodic review process and resolutions and decisions covering a wide range of issues.

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

32. *It was so decided.*

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

33. **Mr. Rabie** (Observer for Egypt) said he welcomed the fact that the Council had held an urgent debate on religious hatred constituting incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence, and that a resolution condemning such acts had been adopted. His delegation also welcomed the adoption of draft resolutions [A/HRC/53/L.24/Rev.1](#), [A/HRC/53/L.30/Rev.1](#) and [A/HRC/53/L.19](#). However, Egypt wished to dissociate itself from preambular paragraph 12 of draft resolution [A/HRC/53/L.22](#) on the impact of arms transfers on human rights and from paragraph 7 of draft resolution [A/HRC/53/L.28/Rev.1](#) on the right to a nationality. With reference to draft resolution [A/HRC/53/L.25/Rev.1](#) on technical cooperation and capacity-building in Colombia, Egypt deeply regretted that a highly controversial issue had been pushed by certain delegations under agenda item 10 and dissociated itself from preambular paragraph 16.

34. He wished to express his gratitude to the Portuguese delegation for the efforts it had expended to produce a balanced text on the right to education. In the same vein, he appreciated the fact that his delegation's proposals had been integrated by Mexico into the resolution on the human rights of migrants by strengthening the language on the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration and by addressing racially and religiously motivated violence. Lastly, his delegation hoped to be involved in constructive efforts to find common language that enjoyed consensus. In that connection, however, his country wished to dissociate itself from ill-defined terms such as "multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination".

35. **Ms. Widyaningsih** (Observer for Indonesia) said that her delegation believed that technical cooperation and capacity-building were instrumental in improving a State's human rights record. In that regard, she wished to acknowledge the importance that draft resolution [A/HRC/53/L.25/Rev.1](#) had for Colombia and to thank that country for its commitment to the

promotion and protection of human rights and for its cooperation with the Council. Unfortunately, however, the text of the resolution as adopted contained controversial elements that did not align with the social, cultural and religious values of a large number of States Members of the United Nations and, most importantly, that had never been agreed in international human rights law.

36. It was even more unfortunate that the resolution should have been adopted under agenda item 10, as a core principle of technical cooperation was that it should be constructive. In the view of her delegation, members of the Council were more than capable of exercising wisdom, taking due account of the sensitivities of others and adopting consensual language in a spirit of unity and cooperation. Sadly, some chose to sacrifice consensus in pursuit of their own political ends. For its part Indonesia, while respecting States' different social contexts and national circumstances, dissociated itself from preambular paragraph 16 of the resolution. She wished to reiterate her country's strong commitment to protecting the human rights of all persons without discrimination on any grounds and its support for Colombia in its efforts to enhance its capacities in that area.

37. **Mr. Lauber** (Observer for Switzerland) said that he wished to thank other delegations for their engagement on draft resolution [A/HRC/53/L.3/Rev.1](#). He welcomed the adoption of the text while regretting, nonetheless, the large number of amendments that had been submitted. By underscoring the importance of full, free and informed consent and recognizing, for the first time, forced marriage as a form of gender-based violence, the resolution was a vital tool for protecting the rights of women and girls against child, early and forced marriage.

38. Switzerland also welcomed the adoption of draft resolution [A/HRC/53/L.2](#) and wished to congratulate Argentina for the efforts it had made to extend the mandate of the Working Group on business and human rights. His country was satisfied with the text of draft resolution [A/HRC/53/L.1](#) and welcomed the oral updates by OHCHR, which would serve to keep the Council informed of the situation in Ukraine. Switzerland regretted the fact that draft resolution [A/HRC/53/L.20](#) had not defined recent expansions in the use of the death penalty in Belarus as a human rights violation, notably of article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. With reference to [A/HRC/53/L.30/Rev.1](#), he wished to recall that the conditions for the voluntary, safe, dignified and sustainable return of Rohingya and other minorities to Myanmar did not exist. Consequently, his delegation could not support the text in its current form.

39. **Ms. Abbas** (Observer for Israel) said that her delegation welcomed the adoption of draft resolutions [A/HRC/53/L.1](#), [A/HRC/53/L.5/Rev.1](#), [A/HRC/53/L.6](#), [A/HRC/53/L.12](#), [A/HRC/53/L.16](#), [A/HRC/53/L.17](#), [A/HRC/53/L.20](#) and [A/HRC/53/L.21](#). Regarding [A/HRC/53/L.11](#), she wished to point out that disability was a social construct and that Israel – which was committed to the elimination of discrimination, including stereotypes and stigmas – could not support any reference to the medical paradigm that advocated disability prevention. Multiple efforts had been made to attack language on gender and sexual orientation and gender identity by parties who had sought to introduce amendments to draft resolutions [A/HRC/53/L.25/Rev.1](#), [A/HRC/53/L.3/Rev.1](#) and [A/HRC/53/L.5/Rev.1](#). While claiming to reject any imposition of values, those parties were, in fact, seeking to impose their own values. In that regard, Israel called for coherence and for respect for diversity, and she congratulated the member States that had rejected those proposals.

40. With reference to draft resolution [A/HRC/53/L.27/Rev.1](#), her delegation believed that the Council was not the forum to make categorical statements on the subject. Like many other States, Israel promoted a balanced approach which entailed acknowledging the potential risks of new and emerging digital technologies and the need to ensure human rights safeguards, while at the same time recognizing the positive potential those technologies had. It was important to note that, while the Council had been discussing the possible negative impact of artificial intelligence (AI), the International Telecommunication Union had been holding a summit under the title “AI for Good”.

41. **Mr. Ahmadi** (Observer for the Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation aligned itself with the statement delivered by the Organization of Islamic Cooperation during the consideration and adoption of draft resolution [A/HRC/53/L.25/Rev.1](#). It was to be

regretted that all proposed amendments to draft resolutions [A/HRC/53/L.3/Rev.1](#) and [A/HRC/53/L.5/Rev.1](#) had been rejected. Those amendments, some of which his country had sponsored, reflected the views of countries belonging to different regions, legal systems and cultures and had been submitted to ensure that the resolutions remained consistent with universally agreed terms and human rights instruments.

42. In that connection, his delegation wished to dissociate itself from all paragraphs that included references to rights not enshrined in international human rights law, as well as from all operative and preambular paragraphs containing challenging terms including “comprehensive sexuality education” and “bodily autonomy”. He wished to emphasize, moreover, that his country would understand and interpret the concepts and terms in the adopted resolutions in accordance with its own national laws and regulations.

43. **Mr. Eremin** (Observer for the Russian Federation) said that his delegation did not agree with all the resolutions that had been adopted during the session and wished to condemn attempts to politicize human rights and to use them to achieve geopolitical ends. In particular, he rejected the one-sided and biased resolutions on Ukraine, Belarus, Eritrea and Syria. The Russian Federation was unable to support the consensus on draft resolution [A/HRC/53/L.13](#) on civil society space as it took no account of the many legitimate concerns voiced by a number of States.

44. His country also wished to dissociate itself from draft resolution [A/HRC/53/L.9](#) as it referred to the concept of “climate justice”, which did not enjoy universal support, and to other concepts which had nothing to do with the mandate of the Council. References to “human rights defenders” in draft resolutions [A/HRC/53/L.13](#), [A/HRC/53/L.25/Rev.1](#) and [A/HRC/53/L.27/Rev.1](#) would be interpreted by his country in accordance with the relevant General Assembly resolution. His delegation could not support references in [A/HRC/53/L.27/Rev.1](#) to a “human rights-based approach”, which was not a term that enjoyed the support of most States.

45. The reference in draft resolution [A/HRC/53/L.28/Rev.1](#) to a general recommendation of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women did not mean that his country agreed with the content of that recommendation. A number of resolutions employed the term “gender”, which his delegation understood to mean biological sex. Thus, the terms “gender-based violence” and “gender-based discrimination” in draft resolutions [A/HRC/53/L.3/Rev.1](#), [A/HRC/53/L.5/Rev.1](#), [A/HRC/53/L.10](#), [A/HRC/53/L.22](#), [A/HRC/53/L.25/Rev.1](#), [A/HRC/53/L.27/Rev.1](#) and [A/HRC/53/L.28/Rev.1](#) were taken to mean the negative phenomena that women were confronted with. His delegation also dissociated itself from ambiguous terms that did not enjoy full support, such as “gender-responsive” in draft resolutions [A/HRC/53/L.3/Rev.1](#), [A/HRC/53/L.5/Rev.1](#), [A/HRC/53/L.13](#) and [A/HRC/53/L.28/Rev.1](#); “sexual orientation or gender identity” in draft resolution [A/HRC/53/L.25/Rev.1](#); and “comprehensive sexuality education” in [A/HRC/53/L.5/Rev.1](#).

46. **Ms. Koncz-Kiss** (Observer for Hungary) said she was happy to see that the topic of eliminating violence against women and girls was high on the Council’s agenda and she applauded the support that had been shown for draft resolution [A/HRC/53/L.5/Rev.1](#), which her country had sponsored. In particular, she welcomed the resolution’s thematic focus on violence against women and girls in criminal justice detention. Hungary attached great importance to the 2030 Agenda and the realization of the Sustainable Development Goals. Accordingly, in paragraph 6 (g), Hungary would have preferred to see the term “sexual and reproductive health-care services” which was the agreed language used in target 3.7. Her country would interpret the phrase “sexual and reproductive health services” in the light of Goal 3 of the Sustainable Development Goals.

47. **Ms. Oduwaiye** (Observer for Nigeria) said that it was with deep reservations and profound dismay that her delegation had seen the terms “comprehensive sexuality education”, “right to bodily autonomy” and “intimate partner violence” introduced into draft resolutions [A/HRC/53/L.3/Rev.1](#) and [A/HRC/53/L.5/Rev.1](#). They were controversial terms which lacked international consensus and their usage had consistently been rejected by several States Members of the United Nations. Such language remained unacceptable to her

delegation and her country, which wished to dissociate itself from the use of those terms in the two resolutions.

48. Her delegation also wished to reiterate that all instances of the word “gender”, which featured in several resolutions – including in compound terms such as “gender-related technologies”, “gender-responsive”, “gender-based violence” and “gender-based discrimination” – would be construed to refer strictly to the two categories of male and female, the sexes into which human beings were divided according to their reproductive capacities. Any attempt to depart from that interpretation would constitute a gross misrepresentation and a violation of the relevant paragraphs of international human rights treaties. The terms used in all the resolutions adopted at the current session would be interpreted in accordance with the country’s national laws and international human rights obligations.

The discussion covered in the summary record was suspended at 3.55 p.m. and resumed at 4.05 p.m.

Closure of the session

49. After the customary exchange of courtesies, **the President** declared the fifty-third session of the Human Rights Council closed.

The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.