



General Assembly

Distr.: General
7 May 2019

Original: English


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

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

Vice-President and Rapporteur: Mothusi Bruce Rabasha **Palai** (Botswana)

GE.19-07475(E)



Please recycle 



Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Part One: Resolutions, decisions and President's statements adopted by the Human Rights Council at its twenty-eighth session	4
I. Resolutions.....	4
II. Decisions.....	5
III. President's statements	6
Part Two: Summary of proceedings.....	7
I. Organizational and procedural matters.....	7
A. Opening and duration of the session.....	7
B. Attendance	7
C. High-level segment.....	7
D. General segment	11
E. Agenda and programme of work	12
F. Organization of work.....	13
G. Meetings and documentation.....	13
H. Visits.....	14
I. Selection and appointment of mandate holders	14
J. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	14
K. Adoption of the report of the session.....	14
II. Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General.....	16
A. Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.....	16
B. Reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General.....	17
C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	18
III. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development.....	20
A. Panel discussions	20
B. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders	24
C. Interactive dialogue with special representatives of the Secretary-General.....	30
D. General debate on agenda item 3	32
E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	34
IV. Human rights situations that require the Council's attention	49
A. Oral update by the commission of inquiry on human rights in Eritrea	49
B. Interactive dialogue with the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic.....	49
C. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders	50
D. General debate on agenda item 4.....	51
E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	53
V. Human rights bodies and mechanisms	57
A. Forum on Minority Issues.....	57

B.	Special procedures	57
C.	General debate on agenda item 5	57
VI.	Universal periodic review	59
A.	Consideration of review outcomes.....	59
B.	General debate on agenda item 6	126
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	127
VII.	Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories	129
A.	Oral update by the independent international commission of inquiry to investigate all violations of international humanitarian law and international human rights law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, particularly in the occupied Gaza Strip, in the context of the military operations conducted since 13 June 2014.....	129
B.	Interactive dialogue with the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967.....	129
C.	Reports of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General	130
D.	General debate on agenda item 7	130
E.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	131
VIII.	Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action.....	134
A.	General debate on agenda item 8	134
B.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	135
IX.	Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action.....	136
A.	Debate on the state of racial discrimination worldwide.....	136
B.	General debate on agenda item 9	136
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	137
X.	Technical assistance and capacity-building.....	138
A.	Panel discussions	138
B.	Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders	139
C.	General debate on agenda item 10.....	141
D.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	142
Annexes		
I.	Attendance.....	145
II.	Agenda	152
III.	Documents issued for the twenty-eighth session.....	153
IV.	Special procedures mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its twenty-eighth session	181

Part One

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

I. Resolutions

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
28/1	Composition of staff of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights	26 March 2015
28/2	Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights	26 March 2015
28/3	Ensuring use of remotely piloted aircraft or armed drones in counter-terrorism and military operations in accordance with international law, including international human rights and humanitarian law	26 March 2015
28/4	The right of persons with disabilities to live independently and be included in the community on an equal basis with others	26 March 2015
28/5	The negative impact of the non-repatriation of funds of illicit origin to the countries of origin on the enjoyment of human rights, and the importance of improving international cooperation	26 March 2015
28/6	Independent Expert on the enjoyment of human rights by persons with albinism	26 March 2015
28/7	Renewal of the mandate of the open-ended intergovernmental working group to consider the possibility of elaborating an international regulatory framework on the regulation, monitoring and oversight of the activities of private military and security companies	26 March 2015
28/8	The effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights	26 March 2015
28/9	Mandate of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights	26 March 2015
28/10	The right to food	26 March 2015
28/11	Human rights and the environment	26 March 2015
28/12	Question of the realization in all countries of economic, social and cultural rights	26 March 2015
28/13	Birth registration and the right of everyone to recognition everywhere as a person before the law	26 March 2015
28/14	Human rights, democracy and the rule of law	26 March 2015
28/15	The right to work	26 March 2015
28/16	The right to privacy in the digital age	26 March 2015
28/17	Effects of terrorism on the enjoyment of human rights	26 March 2015
28/18	Freedom of religion or belief	27 March 2015

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
28/19	Rights of the child: towards better investment in the rights of the child	27 March 2015
28/20	The continuing grave deterioration in the human rights and humanitarian situation in the Syrian Arab Republic	27 March 2015
28/21	Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran	27 March 2015
28/22	Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea	27 March 2015
28/23	Situation of human rights in Myanmar	27 March 2015
28/24	Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan	27 March 2015
28/25	Right of the Palestinian people to self-determination	27 March 2015
28/26	Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan	27 March 2015
28/27	Human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem	27 March 2015
28/28	Contribution of the Human Rights Council to the special session of the General Assembly on the world drug problem of 2016	27 March 2015
28/29	Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping and stigmatization of, and discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against, persons based on religion or belief	27 March 2015
28/30	Technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in Libya	27 March 2015
28/31	Technical assistance and capacity-building for Mali in the field of human rights	27 March 2015
28/32	Technical assistance and capacity-building in strengthening human rights in Iraq in the light of the abuses committed by Daesh and associated terrorist groups	27 March 2015
28/33	Strengthening of technical cooperation and consultative services in Guinea	27 March 2015
28/34	Prevention of genocide	27 March 2015

II. Decisions

<i>Decision</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
28/101	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Italy	18 March 2015
28/102	Outcome of the universal periodic review: El Salvador	18 March 2015
28/103	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Plurinational State of Bolivia	18 March 2015
28/104	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Fiji	18 March 2015
28/105	Outcome of the universal periodic review: San Marino	18 March 2015
28/106	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Kazakhstan	19 March 2015
28/107	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Angola	19 March 2015

<i>Decision</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
28/108	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Islamic Republic of Iran	19 March 2015
28/109	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Iraq	19 March 2015
28/110	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Madagascar	19 March 2015
28/111	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Slovenia	19 March 2015
28/112	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Egypt	20 March 2015
28/113	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Bosnia and Herzegovina	20 March 2015
28/114	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Gambia	26 March 2015

III. President's statements

<i>President's statement</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
PRST/28/1	Twentieth anniversary of the Fourth World Conference on Women and of the adoption of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action	25 March 2015
PRST/28/2	Seventieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War	26 March 2015
PRST/28/3	Situation of human rights in Haiti	27 March 2015

Part Two

Summary of proceedings

I. Organizational and procedural matters

A. Opening and duration of the session

1. The Human Rights Council held its twenty-eighth session at the United Nations Office at Geneva from 2 to 27 March 2015. The President of the Human Rights Council opened the session.

2. At the 1st meeting, on 2 March 2015, the President of the General Assembly (by video message), the Secretary-General (by video message), the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Federal Councillor and Head of the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Didier Burkhalter, addressed the plenary.

3. At its 15th and 16th meetings, on 9 March 2015, the Human Rights Council observed International Women's Day, which had been celebrated the day before. At the 15th meeting, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement. At the same meeting, the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Choi Seokyoung, also on behalf of Australia, Indonesia, Mexico and Turkey, made a statement. At the 16th meeting, the Council watched a video that had been prepared by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR).

4. At the 43rd meeting, on 20 March 2015, the representative of Tunisia made a statement with regard to the attack that had occurred on 18 March 2015 in Tunisia.

5. In accordance with rule 8 (b) of the rules of procedure of the Human Rights Council, as contained in part VII of the annex to Council resolution 5/1, the organizational meeting of the twenty-eighth session was held on 16 February 2015.

6. At the same meeting, pursuant to a recommendation of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, as contained in his letter of 13 February 2015 to the President of the Human Rights Council, the Council decided to postpone its consideration of the report of OHCHR on promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka until its thirtieth session (see also paragraph 42 below).

7. The twenty-eighth session consisted of 59 meetings over 20 days (see para. 50 below).

B. Attendance

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

C. High-level segment

9. At its 1st to 3rd, 5th to 8th and 10th meetings, held from 2 to 5 March 2015, the Human Rights Council held a high-level segment, at which 92 dignitaries addressed the plenary, including one president, one prime minister, six vice-prime ministers, 47 ministers, 20 vice-ministers, 12 other dignitaries and five representatives of observer organizations.

10. The following dignitaries addressed the Human Rights Council during the high-level segment, in the order that they spoke:

(a) At the 1st meeting, on 2 March 2015: the President of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Gjorge Ivanov, the Prime Minister of Fiji, Josiaia Voreqe Bainimarama, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Belgium, Didier Reynders, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign and European Affairs of Croatia, Vesna Pusić, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign and European Affairs of Slovakia, Miroslav Lajčák, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Paraguay, Eladio Ramón Loizaga Lezcano, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, Bert Koenders, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Sergey V. Lavrov, the Minister of State and Foreign Affairs of Portugal, Rui Chancerelle de Machete, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran, M. Javad Zarif, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Botswana, Pelonomi Venson-Moitoi, the Secretary of State of the United States of America, John F. Kerry;

(b) At the 2nd meeting, on the same day: the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Maldives, Dunya Maumoon, the Assistant Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation Affairs of Qatar, Mohammed bin Abdulrahman bin Jassim al-Thani, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Thailand, Tanasak Patimapragorn, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sweden, Margot Wallström, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Liechtenstein, Aurelia Frick, the Minister of Human Rights of Iraq, Mohammed Mahdi Ameen al-Bayati, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Georgia, Tamar Beruchashvili, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade of Hungary, Péter Szijjártó, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sri Lanka, Mangala Samaraweera, the Minister and President of the Human Rights Commission of Saudi Arabia, Bandar bin Mohammed Alaiban, the Undersecretary for Multilateral Affairs and Human Rights of Mexico, Juan Manuel Gómez Robledo, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Argentina, Eduardo Antonio Zuain, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Turkey, Naci Koru, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Slovenia, Bogdan Benko;

(c) At the 3rd meeting, on the same day: the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cuba, Bruno Rodríguez Parrilla, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Albania, Ditmir Bushati, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of South Sudan, Barnaba Marial Benjamin, the State Secretary of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Norway, Bård Glad Pedersen, the Parliamentary Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, Takashi Uto, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Guatemala, Carlos Ramiro Martinez, the Minister of State for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Baroness Anelay, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cyprus, Alexandros N. Zenon, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine, Sergiy Kyslytsya, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Libya, Hassan al-Saghir, the President of the International Committee of the Red Cross, Peter Maurer;

(d) At the 5th meeting, on 3 March 2015: the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Germany, Frank-Walter Steinmeier, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria, Ramtane Lamamra, the Federal Minister for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs of Austria, Sebastian Kurz, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cameroon, Pierre Moukoko Mbonjo, the Attorney General of the Federation and the Minister for Justice of Nigeria, Mohammed Bello Adoke, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic, Lubomír Zorálek, the Commissioner for Human Rights and Humanitarian Action of Mauritania, Aichetou Mint M'Haiham, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Armenia, Edward Nalbandian, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of El Salvador, Carlos Castaneda, the Undersecretary of State at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Poland, Henryka Mościcka-Dendys, the Minister Delegate to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Morocco, Mbarka Bouaida, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Peter Stenlund, the State Secretary of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Serbia, Roksanda Ninčić, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Viet Nam, Nguyen Quoc Cuong, the State Secretary for European Integration of Montenegro, Aleksandar Andrija Pejović, the Secretary-General of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, Iyad Ameen Madani;

(e) At the 6th meeting, on the same day: the Minister of the People's Power for Foreign Affairs of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Delcy Eloína Rodríguez Gómez, the Minister for Justice of Namibia, Utoni Nujoma, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ri Su Yong, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Emigrants of Lebanon, Gebran Bassil, the Minister for International Relations and Cooperation of South Africa, Maite Nkoana-Mashabane, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nepal, Mahendra Bahadur Pandey, the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and Vice-President of the European Commission of the European Union, Federica Mogherini, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Martin Lidegaard, the Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs of Uganda, Henry Okello Oryem, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Spain, Ignacio Ybáñez, the Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea, Cho Tae-yul, the Undersecretary for the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Bahrain, Abdulla Abdullatif Abdulla, the Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Juan Carlos Alurralde, the Secretary-General of the Commonwealth, Kamalesh Sharma;

(f) At the 7th meeting, on 4 March 2015: the Deputy Prime Minister for the Social Sector and Human Rights of Equatorial Guinea, Alfonso Nsue Mokuoy, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bangladesh, Abul Hasan Mahmood Ali, the Minister for Human Rights, Consolidation of Democracy, responsible for the implementation of the recommendations of the Truth, Justice and Reconciliation Commission of Togo, Yacoubou Hamadou, the Minister for Justice, Keeper of the Seals and Government Spokesperson of the Niger, Marou Amadou, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan, Erlan A. Idrissov, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Costa Rica, Manuel González Sanz, the Minister for Justice and Human Rights of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Alexis Thambwe Mwamba, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Immigration of the Bahamas, Frederick A. Mitchell, the Minister Delegate to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Regional Cooperation of Burkina Faso, Moussa B. Nebie, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Latvia, Edgars Rinkēvičs, the Minister for Justice and the Attorney-General of Sierra Leone, Franklyn Bai Kargbo, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Tunisia, Taieb Baccouche, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade of Ireland, Charles Flanagan, the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Emirates, Anwar Mohamad Gargash, the Deputy Minister for Justice, Constitutional and Religious Affairs of Mozambique, Joaquim Verissimo, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Myanmar, Thant Kyaw;

(g) At the 8th meeting, on the same day: the Undersecretary for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Italy, Benedetto Della Vedova, the State Secretary for Global Affairs of Romania, Carmen Liliana Burlacu, the Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Chile, Edgardo Riveros Marín, the Deputy Minister for Justice of the Sudan, Isam Eldin Abdelgadir Elzien Mohamed, the Assistant Foreign Minister of Egypt, Hisham Badr, the Deputy Minister for Justice, Constitutional and Religious Affairs of Mozambique, Joaquim Verissimo, on behalf of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries;

(h) At the 10th meeting, on 5 March 2015: the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation of the Congo, Basile Ikouébé, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mongolia, Lundeg Purevsuren, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Colombia, María Ángela Holguín Cuéllar, the President of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights of the African Union, Sylvie Kayitesi.

11. At the 3rd meeting, on 2 March 2015, the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ethiopia, Japan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia and the Syrian Arab Republic made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

12. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Japan, Saudi Arabia and the Syrian Arab Republic made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

13. At the 6th meeting, on 3 March 2015, the representatives of Azerbaijan, Bahrain, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Japan, Myanmar, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation and Turkey made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

15. At the 8th meeting, on 4 March 2015, the representative of the Russian Federation made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

16. At the 10th meeting, on 5 March 2015, the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus and Turkey made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

High-level panel discussion on human rights mainstreaming

18. At its 4th meeting, on 3 March 2015, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 16/21, a high-level panel discussion on promoting the mainstreaming of human rights throughout the United Nations system, with a focus on the enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights.

19. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel discussion. The Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Abbas Bagherpour Ardekani, gave a keynote address on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

20. At the same meeting, the panellists Martin Khor, Juan Somavía, Kristin Hetle, Alexey Borodavkin and Juan Carlos Monedero Fernández-Gala made statements. The Council divided the panel discussion into two parts.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), El Salvador, India (also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bhutan, China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Myanmar, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Thailand, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam), Indonesia, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Switzerland¹ (also on behalf of Austria, Liechtenstein and Slovenia), United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

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

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation.

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

23. During the second part of the panel discussion, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Brazil, China, France, Portugal, Sierra Leone, United Arab Emirates;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Burkina Faso, Chile, Ecuador, Egypt, Sudan, Thailand;

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

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

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

High-level panel discussion on the question of the death penalty

25. At the 9th meeting, on 4 March 2015, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 26/2, a high-level panel discussion on the question of the death penalty, with a focus on regional efforts aimed at the abolition of the death penalty and the challenges faced in that regard.

26. The United Nations Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel discussion. The former president of the Swiss Confederation, Ruth Dreifuss, moderated the panel discussion.

27. At the same meeting, the panellists Zainabo Sylvie Kayitesi, Stavros Lambrinidis, Tracy Robinson, Mohammed Bedjaoui and Sara Hossain made statements. The Council divided the panel discussion into two parts.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Argentina, Botswana, Namibia, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore¹ (also on behalf of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Brunei Darussalam, China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam and Yemen), Timor-Leste¹ (also on behalf of Angola, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Portugal and Sao Tome and Principe);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Norway;

(c) Observer for a national human rights institution: Human Rights Commission of Malaysia (by video message);

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Penal Reform International, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

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

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Brazil, France, Indonesia, Ireland, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Paraguay, Portugal, Russian Federation, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Jamaica, Liechtenstein, Republic of Moldova, Slovenia, Sudan, Turkey;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, Franciscans International, Friends World Committee for Consultation.

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

D. General segment

32. At the 10th meeting, on 5 March 2015, a general segment was held, during which the following addressed the Human Rights Council:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Brazil, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Ghana, India, Indonesia;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Belarus, Iceland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Monaco, Nicaragua, Republic of Moldova, Syrian Arab Republic, Uzbekistan, Zimbabwe;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: International Development Law Organization;

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

(e) Invited members of civil society: Pelenisa Alofa, Aliaksandr Bialiatski, Shane Jett, Hassan Shire.

33. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Japan made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

34. At the same meeting, the representatives of China and Japan made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

E. Agenda and programme of work

35. At its 11th meeting, on 5 March 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted the agenda and programme of work of the twenty-eighth session.

36. At the 14th meeting, on 6 March 2015, the President referred to the letter of 3 March 2015 from the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights while countering terrorism, Ben Emmerson, requesting that the submission of his report and interactive dialogue be postponed to the twenty-ninth session of the Council.

37. At the 32nd meeting, on 16 March 2015, the President referred to the letter of 9 March 2015 from the Chair of the independent international commission of inquiry to investigate all violations of international humanitarian law and international human rights law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, particularly in the occupied Gaza Strip, in the context of the military operations conducted since 13 June 2014, Mary McGowan Davis, inviting the Council to consider the possibility of postponing the submission and presentation of the report of the commission of inquiry to the twenty-ninth session of the Council.

38. At the same meeting, in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Chief of the Programme Support and Management Services of OHCHR made a statement on the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of a decision to postpone the submission and presentation of the report.

39. At the same meeting, pursuant to its President's proposal, the Council decided to request the commission of inquiry to present a procedural oral update on 23 March 2015, without an interactive dialogue, and to postpone the submission and consideration of the report of the commission of inquiry to the twenty-ninth session of the Council.

40. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made a statement as the State concerned.

41. At the 36th meeting, on 18 March 2015, pursuant to its President's proposal, the Council decided to postpone the consideration of the universal periodic review outcome of the Gambia to 26 March 2015 due to the additional time required to receive the position of the Gambia on the recommendations made during its review at the twentieth session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review.

42. At the 55th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the President recalled the decision of the Council at its organizational meeting of 16 February 2015 to postpone the consideration of the report of OHCHR on promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka until its thirtieth session (see para. 6 above). In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Chief of Programme Support and Management

Services of OHCHR made a statement on the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of that decision.

F. Organization of work

43. At the 4th meeting, on 3 March 2015, the President outlined the modalities for the panel discussions, which were summarized in the concept notes. The panel discussions would be two minutes for statements by States Members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.

44. At the 10th meeting, on 5 March 2015, the President outlined the modalities for the general segment, which would be five minutes for statements by States Members of the Council and three minutes for statements by observer States and other observers.

45. At the 11th meeting, on the same day, the President outlined the modalities for the interactive dialogue on the annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, which would be three minutes for States Members of the Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

46. At the 15th meeting, on 9 March 2015, the President outlined the modalities for the clustered interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders under agenda item 3, pursuant to the practice introduced at the twenty-seventh session of the Human Rights Council. The total duration of each clustered interactive dialogue would not exceed four hours. Each special procedure mandate holder in a cluster would introduce his or her reports within 15 minutes and respond to questions and make concluding remarks within 15 minutes. As soon as the list of speakers was available following the electronic registration, the secretariat would calculate the estimated time necessary to complete the clustered interactive dialogue with the mandate holders. If the total duration of a given interactive dialogue was estimated to last less than four hours, the speaking time limits would be five minutes for States Members and three minutes for observer States and other observers. However, if it was estimated to be more than four hours, the speaking time limits would be reduced to three minutes for States Members and two minutes for observer States and other observers. If that measure was deemed insufficient to ensure that the total duration did not exceed four hours, the speaking time limit would be further reduced, with a minimum of 1.5 minutes per speaker.

47. At the 18th meeting, on 10 March 2015, the President outlined the modalities for individual interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders, which would be three minutes for States Members of the Human Rights Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

48. At the 27th meeting, on 13 March 2015, the President outlined the modalities for the general debates, which would be three minutes for States Members of the Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

49. At the 37th meeting, on 18 March 2015, the President outlined the modalities for the consideration of the outcomes of the universal periodic review under agenda item 6, which would be 20 minutes for the State concerned to present its views; where appropriate, two minutes for the national human rights institution with “A” status of the State concerned; up to 20 minutes for States Members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and United Nations agencies to express their views on the outcome of the review, with varying speaking times according to the number of speakers in accordance with the modalities set out in the appendix to resolution 16/21; and up to 20 minutes for stakeholders to make general comments on the outcome of the review.

G. Meetings and documentation

50. The Human Rights Council held 59 fully serviced meetings during its twenty-eighth session.

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

H. Visits

52. At the 12th meeting, on 5 March 2015, the Prime Minister of Tuvalu, Enele Sosene Sopoaga, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

53. At the 17th meeting, on 9 March 2015, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Erkki Tuomioja, also on behalf of Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Myanmar, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Sudan, Spain, the Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam and the State of Palestine, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

I. Selection and appointment of mandate holders

54. At its 59th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the Human Rights Council appointed, pursuant to Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21 and decision 6/102, four special procedure mandate holders (see annex IV).

J. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Twentieth anniversary of the Fourth World Conference on Women and of the adoption of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action

55. At the 52nd meeting, on 25 March 2015, the President of the Human Rights Council introduced draft President's statement A/HRC/28/L.35.

56. At the same meeting, the representative of China made general comments on the draft President's statement.

57. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft President's statement (PRST/28/1).

Seventieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War

58. At the 55th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the President of the Human Rights Council introduced draft President's statement A/HRC/28/L.44.

59. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft President's statement (PRST/28/2).

K. Adoption of the report of the session

60. At the 59th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the following observers made statements with regard to the adopted resolutions:

(a) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Canada, Costa Rica, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Switzerland, Tunisia (also on behalf of Albania,

Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America);

(b) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: European Union, International Organization of la Francophonie.

61. At the same meeting, the Vice-President and Rapporteur of the Human Rights Council made a statement in connection with the draft report of the Council on its twenty-eighth session.

62. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted ad referendum the draft report on the session (A/HRC/28/2) and entrusted the Rapporteur with its finalization.

63. At the same meeting, the observers for the Association of World Citizens and the International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, the Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights Watch and the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues) made statements in connection with the session.

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

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

A. Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

65. At the 11th meeting, on 5 March 2015, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement in connection with his annual report (A/HRC/28/3).

66. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 11th and 12th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the High Commissioner questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina, Bahrain² (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Botswana, Brazil (also on behalf of Chile, Colombia and Uruguay), China, Cuba, Ecuador² (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Egypt² (also on behalf of Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Myanmar, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Thailand, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe), El Salvador, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)² (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Ireland, Japan, Maldives, Morocco (also on behalf of the member and observer States of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Namibia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Georgia, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mali, Myanmar, Nepal, Niger, Norway, Oman, Philippines, Republic of Moldova, Senegal, Slovenia, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, European Union;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of the Company of the Daughters of Charity of Saint Vincent de Paul, Edmund Rice International Limited, Fondazione Marista per la Solidarietà Internazionale ONLUS, the International Catholic Child Bureau, the International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco and the Teresian Association), Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Center for Reproductive Rights, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos – Asociación Civil, Human Rights Watch, International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (also on behalf of Apprentissages sans frontières, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, the Catholic International Education Office, the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd,

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

Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order of Preachers, the International Catholic Child Bureau, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, New Humanity, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale, the Teresian Association and the Women’s Board Educational Cooperation Society), International Service for Human Rights, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Liberation, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Reporters Sans Frontières International – Reporters Without Borders International.

67. At the 11th and 12th meetings, on the same day, the High Commissioner answered questions and made comments.

68. At the 12th meeting, on the same day, the High Commissioner answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

69. At the same meeting, the representatives of Egypt, Qatar, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

70. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Qatar, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

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

71. At the 27th meeting, on 13 March 2015, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights presented the thematic reports prepared by OHCHR and the Secretary-General under agenda items 2 and 3.

72. At its 27th, 28th and 29th meetings, on the same day, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on the thematic reports presented by the Deputy High Commissioner (see paras. 181 and 182 below).

73. At the 45th meeting, on 23 March 2015, the Deputy High Commissioner presented the reports prepared by OHCHR and the Secretary-General under agenda items 2 and 7 (see para. 957 below).

74. At the 52nd meeting, on 25 March 2015, the Deputy High Commissioner presented the report of OHCHR on the human rights situation in Iraq in the light of abuses committed by the so-called Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant and associated groups (A/HRC/28/18). In accordance with Council resolution S-22/1, the presentation was followed by an interactive dialogue.

75. At the same meeting, the Minister of Human Rights of Iraq, Mohammed al-Bayati, made a statement as the State concerned.

76. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Deputy High Commissioner questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, China, France, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Denmark, Egypt, Greece, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Lebanon, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Switzerland, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Hakim Foundation, Al-Khoei Foundation, Assyrian Aid Society – Iraq, Assyrian Universal Alliance – Americas Chapter Inc., Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities), Human Rights Watch, International

Educational Development, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Minority Rights Group, Union of Arab Jurists, World Jewish Congress.

77. At the same meeting, the representative of Iraq made final remarks as the State concerned.

78. Also at the same meeting, the Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

79. At the 52nd meeting, on 25 March 2015, the Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights introduced the country-specific reports submitted by the Secretary-General and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights under agenda item 2 (A/HRC/28/3/Add.1, A/HRC/28/3/Add.2, A/HRC/28/3/Add.3, A/HRC/28/20 and A/HRC/28/26).

80. At the same meeting, the representatives of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Colombia, Cyprus, Guatemala and Iran (Islamic Republic of) made statements as the States concerned.

81. During the ensuing general debate, at the 53rd meeting, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Ireland, Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Iceland, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), Netherlands (also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America), United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Burundi, Greece, Norway, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Advocates for Human Rights, Amnesty International, Association for the Prevention of Torture, Assyrian Universal Alliance – Americas Chapter Inc. (also on behalf of the Assyrian Aid Society – Iraq), Centre Europe-Tiers Monde – Europe-Third World Centre, Colombian Commission of Jurists, Indian Council of South America, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Service for Human Rights, Peace Brigades International Switzerland (also on behalf of the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues and the World Organisation Against Torture), World Barua Organization, World Organisation Against Torture.

82. At the same meeting, the representatives of Cyprus, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia and Turkey made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

83. At the 53rd meeting, on 25 March 2015, the Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights presented the reports prepared by the High Commissioner under agenda items 2 and 10 (see paras. 1036–1039 below).

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Composition of staff of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

84. At the 55th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.13, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Venezuela (Bolivarian

Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Cabo Verde, Egypt, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nigeria, the Philippines, the Russian Federation and Singapore joined the sponsors.

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

86. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil, Ireland, Mexico and Pakistan made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

87. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Ireland, a separate vote was taken on paragraph 17 of the draft resolution as orally revised. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, China, Congo, Cuba, El Salvador, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Côte d'Ivoire, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Gabon, Ghana, Kenya, Paraguay

88. The Human Rights Council adopted paragraph 17 of draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.13 as orally revised by 24 votes to 19, with 4 abstentions.

89. At the same meeting, the representatives of Botswana and Latvia, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, made statements in explanation of vote before the vote relating to the draft resolution as orally revised.

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

In favour:

Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Maldives, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

91. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.13 as orally revised by 31 votes to 16 (resolution 28/1).

92. At the same meeting, the representative of China made general comments and the representatives of Argentina, Namibia, Paraguay and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

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

A. Panel discussions

Full-day discussion on specific themes relating to human rights and climate change

93. A full-day discussion on specific themes relating to human rights and climate change was held on 6 March 2015, in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 26/27. The discussion was divided into two panel discussions: the first panel discussion was held at the 13th meeting, on 6 March 2015, and the second panel discussion was held at the 14th meeting, on the same day.

94. The topic of the first panel discussion was identifying challenges and ways forward towards the realization of human rights for all, including the right to development, in particular those in vulnerable situations, as well as measures and best practices to promote and protect human rights that can be adopted by States in addressing the adverse effects of climate change on the full and effective enjoyment of human rights.

95. The Secretary-General of the United Nations made introductory remarks by video message. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel discussion. The Executive Director of the South Centre, Martin Khor, moderated the panel discussion.

96. At the 13th meeting, for the first panel discussion, the panellists Anote Tong, Abul Hassan Mahmood Ali, Mary Robinson, Dan Bondi Ogolla, Victoria Tauli-Corpuz and Mithika Mwenda made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the first panel discussion into two parts, both held at the 13th meeting, on the same day.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Bangladesh (also on behalf of Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Ecuador³ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, India, Paraguay, Philippines³ (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Kiribati, Madagascar, Maldives, Nepal, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu, the United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu and Viet Nam), Sierra Leone;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Chile, Sweden (also on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Norway), Holy See;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Centre Europe-Tiers Monde – Europe-Third World Centre, Lutheran World Federation (also on behalf of ACT Alliance – Action by Churches Together).

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

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

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Estonia, France, Ghana, Indonesia, Ireland, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Costa Rica, Fiji, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nepal, Spain, Switzerland;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Franciscans International (also on behalf of the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd), International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

100. At the same meeting, the panellists of the first panel discussion answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

101. The second panel discussion was held at the 14th meeting, on the same day. The topic of the panel discussion was the adverse impacts of climate change on States' efforts to progressively realize the right to food, and policies, lessons learned and good practices.

102. The Special Rapporteur on the right to food, Hilal Elver, made a statement (by video). The Independent Expert on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment, John Knox, moderated the panel discussion.

103. At the same meeting, the panellists Enele Sosene Sopoaga, Renan B. Dalisay, Xiangjun Yao, Olav Fykse Tveit, Elizabeth Mpofo and Ana-Maria Suarez Franco made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the second panel discussion into two parts, both held at the 14th meeting, on the same day.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Cuba, Maldives, South Africa;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Egypt, Fiji, Slovenia, Uruguay;

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

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

(e) Observer for a non-governmental organization: Action Canada for Population and Development.

105. At the end of the first part of the second panel discussion, at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, Gabon, Ireland, Nigeria, Portugal, Qatar;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bhutan, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Peru, Sudan;

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

(d) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: International Development Law Organization.

107. At the same meeting, the panellists of the second panel discussion answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

108. Also at the same meeting, the President of the Mary Robinson Foundation – Climate Justice, Mary Robinson, made closing remarks on the full-day discussion.

Annual interactive debate on the rights of persons with disabilities

109. At its 20th meeting, on 10 March 2015, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 25/20, its annual interactive debate on the rights of persons with disabilities in the form of a panel discussion. The focus of the discussion was on article 19 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities on living independently and being included in the community.

110. The Director of the Research and Right to Development Division of OHCHR made an opening statement for the panel discussion.

111. At the same meeting, the panellists Hyung Shik Kim, Catalina Devandas Aguilar, Alina Grigoras, Gunta Anca and Quincy Mwiya made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two parts.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Bahrain³ (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Ecuador³ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Germany, Ireland, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Sierra Leone, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Finland (also on behalf of Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), Greece, Nicaragua, Togo;

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

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights (Ombudsman) of Azerbaijan;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

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

114. During the second part of the panel discussion, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Brazil, China, Cuba, France, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, Portugal, Russian Federation, South Africa, United Arab Emirates;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Costa Rica, Egypt, Israel, New Zealand, Republic of Moldova, Turkey;

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

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

(e) Observer for a non-governmental organization: Down Syndrome International.

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

Annual full-day meeting on the rights of the child

116. On 12 March 2015, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 25/6, an annual full-day meeting on the rights of the child. The focus of the meeting was the theme of “towards better investment in the rights of the child” and the report of the United

Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (A/HRC/28/33). The meeting was divided into two panel discussions: the first panel discussion was held at the 24th meeting, on 12 March 2015, and the second panel discussion was held at the 26th meeting, on the same day.

117. The first panel discussion was held at the 24th meeting, on the same day. The Director of the Research and Right to Development Division of OHCHR made an opening statement for the first panel discussion. The Human Rights Council then watched a video entitled “Children’s Voices”. The Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Uruguay to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Ricardo González Arenas, moderated the panel discussion.

118. At the same meeting, for the first panel discussion, the panellists Bob Muchabaiwa, Jorge Cardona, Shaamela Cassiem and Jingqing Chai made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the first panel discussion into two parts, both held at the 24th meeting, on the same day.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Bahrain³ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Canada³ (on behalf of the member and observer States of the International Organization of la Francophonie), France, Paraguay, Portugal, Russian Federation, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Croatia (also on behalf of Austria and Slovenia), Norway (also on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Sweden), Togo, Turkey;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l’enfant (also on behalf of the Geneva Infant Feeding Association, International Movement ATD Fourth World, Plan International and Save the Children International), Plan International (also on behalf of the Geneva Infant Feeding Association, Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l’enfant, International Movement ATD Fourth World and Save the Children International).

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

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, China, Estonia, Germany, India, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Chile, Israel, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Nepal, Nicaragua, Poland, Singapore, Slovakia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand;

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

(d) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: International Development Law Organization;

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

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, International Catholic Child Bureau (also on behalf of Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities), the Company of

the Daughters of Charity of Saint Vincent de Paul and the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd), Myochikai (Arigatou Foundation).

122. At the same meeting, the panellists of the first panel discussion answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

123. The second panel discussion was held at the 26th meeting, on the same day. The Special Adviser of the Secretary-General on Post-2015 Development Planning made an opening statement for the panel discussion. The Ambassador and Head of the Permanent Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations Office and other international organizations at Geneva, Peter Sørensen, moderated the panel discussion.

124. At the same meeting, the panellists Stefanie Conrad, Enrique Vásquez, Marc Dullaert and Yehualashet Mekonen made statements. The Human Rights Council divided the second panel discussion into two parts, both held at the 26th meeting, on the same day.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Cuba, Ecuador³ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Kazakhstan, Qatar, Sierra Leone;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Colombia, Monaco, Sudan;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation, Save the Children International (also on behalf of the Geneva Infant Feeding Association, Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant, International Movement ATD Fourth World and Plan International), World Organisation Against Torture (also on behalf of Defence for Children International).

126. At the end of the first part of the second panel discussion, at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Ghana, Indonesia, Maldives, Montenegro;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Ecuador, Egypt, Malaysia;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Drepanie, Human Rights Advocates, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Environment and Resources Council, World Jewish Congress.

128. At the same meeting, the panellists of the second panel discussion answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

B. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders

Independent Expert on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment

129. At the 15th meeting, on 9 March 2015, the Independent Expert on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment, John Knox, presented his reports (A/HRC/28/61 and Add.1–2).

130. At the same meeting, the representative of France made a statement as the State concerned.

131. Also at the same meeting, the Commission nationale consultative des droits de l'homme – France made a statement.

132. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador⁴ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Gabon, Ghana, Indonesia, Ireland, Maldives, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Chile, Costa Rica, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Philippines, Slovenia, Switzerland, Uruguay, Holy See;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Earthjustice, Franciscans International (also on behalf of the Center of Concern), Friends World Committee for Consultation, Human Rights Advocates, Human Rights Now, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

133. Also at the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights

134. At the 15th meeting, on 9 March 2015, the Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights, Juan Bohoslavsky, presented his reports (A/HRC/28/59 and Add.1, and A/HRC/28/60 and Corr.1).

135. At the same meeting, the representative of Iceland made a statement as the State concerned.

136. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina, Bahrain⁴ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Bangladesh, Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador⁴ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, India, Indonesia, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Chile, Egypt, Sudan, Tunisia;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales, Franciscans International (also on behalf of the Center of Concern).

137. Also at the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the right to food

138. At the 16th meeting, on 9 March 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the right to food, Hilal Elver, presented her report (A/HRC/28/65).

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Bahrain⁴ (on behalf of the Group of Arab

⁴ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

States), Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador⁴ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, France, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Burkina Faso, Egypt, Eritrea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Luxembourg, Malaysia, Niger, Norway, Serbia, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Turkey;

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Centre Europe-Tiers Monde – Europe-Third World Centre, Foodfirst Information and Action Network, Franciscans International, Friends World Committee for Consultation, Indian Council of South America, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Lutheran World Federation (also on behalf of ACT Alliance – Action by Churches Together), ONG Hope International.

140. At the 17th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context

141. At the 16th meeting, on 9 March 2015, the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context, Leilani Farha, presented her report (A/HRC/28/62).

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Bahrain⁴ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Bangladesh, Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador⁴ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ethiopia, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Egypt, Finland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Norway, Serbia, Sweden, Thailand, Togo;

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

(d) Observer for the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Khoei Foundation, BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Human Rights Advocates, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development.

143. At the 17th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment

144. At the 17th meeting, on 9 March 2015, the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, Juan Méndez, presented his reports (A/HRC/28/68 and Add.1–4).

145. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico, Tajikistan and Tunisia made statements as the States concerned.

146. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 17th meeting, on 9 March 2015, and the 18th meeting, on 10 March 2015, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, Brazil, China, Congo, Cuba, Estonia, France, Indonesia, Ireland, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Belarus, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Egypt, Georgia, Greece, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Ukraine, Uruguay;

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

(d) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, European Union;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Association for the Prevention of Torture, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos – Asociación Civil, Conectas Direitos Humanos, Penal Reform International, World Organisation Against Torture.

147. At the 18th meeting, on 10 March 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders

148. At the 17th meeting, on 9 March 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, Michel Forst, presented his reports (A/HRC/28/63 and Add.1).

149. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 17th meeting, on 9 March 2015, and the 18th meeting, on 10 March 2015, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, Brazil, Cuba, Estonia, France, Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Latvia, Morocco, Netherlands, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Austria, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Norway, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uruguay, State of Palestine;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, European Union;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Amnesty International, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Human Rights House Foundation, International Service for Human Rights, Liberation, Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational and Transparty, Social Service Agency of the Protestant Church in Germany.

150. At the 18th meeting, on 10 March 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

151. At the 19th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Azerbaijan, Belarus, Cuba, the Sudan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities

152. At the 18th meeting, on 10 March 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities, Catalina Devandas Aguilar, presented her report (A/HRC/28/58).

153. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 18th and 19 meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Brazil, China, Cuba, Ghana, India, Mexico, Morocco, Paraguay, Qatar, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Georgia, Greece, Israel, Italy, Malaysia, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Spain, Sudan, Thailand;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: European Disability Forum, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

154. At the 19th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief

155. At the 19th meeting, on 10 March 2015, the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, Heiner Bielefeldt, presented his reports (A/HRC/28/66 and Add.1–4).

156. At the same meeting, the representatives of Kazakhstan and Viet Nam made statements as the States concerned.

157. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 19th meeting, on the same day, and at the 21st meeting, on 11 March 2015, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, France, Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Morocco, Netherlands, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Eritrea, Fiji, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Singapore, Slovakia, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, Holy See;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, European Union, International Development Law Organization, Organization of Islamic Cooperation;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Khoei Foundation, Espace Afrique International, Franciscans International, Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Lesbian and Gay Association, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (also on behalf of Franciscans International), Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

158. At the 21st meeting, on 11 March 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

159. At the 23rd meeting, on the same day, the representative of China made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights

160. At the 21st meeting, on 11 March 2015, the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, Farida Shaheed, presented her reports (A/HRC/28/57 and Add.1–2).

161. At the same meeting, the representative of Viet Nam made a statement as the State concerned.

162. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 21st and 22nd meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Bahrain⁴ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Bangladesh, Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador⁴ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Estonia, France, Indonesia, Japan, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Norway, Sudan, Thailand;

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

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Commission nationale des droits de l'homme de Mauritanie;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Human Rights Advocates, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Publishers Association.

163. At the 22nd meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography

164. At the 21st meeting, on 11 March 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, Maud De Boer-Buquicchio, presented her report and that of her predecessor (A/HRC/28/56 and Add.1).

165. At the same meeting, the representative of Honduras made a statement as the State concerned.

166. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 21st and 22nd meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador⁴ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Estonia, France, Gabon, Indonesia, Latvia, Mexico, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Russian Federation, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Belarus, Burkina Faso, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Norway, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand;

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

(d) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, European Union;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, Edmund Rice International Limited, the International Catholic Child Bureau, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco and the World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations), CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, ECPAT International (End Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and Trafficking in Children for Sexual Purposes), European Centre for Law and Justice, International Institute for Peace, Justice and Human Rights, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

167. At the 22nd meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on minority issues

168. At the 36th meeting, on 18 March 2015, the Special Rapporteur on minority issues, Rita Izsák, presented her reports (A/HRC/28/64 and Add.1–2).

169. At the same meeting, the representatives of Nigeria and Ukraine made statements as the States concerned.

170. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, also at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), China, Estonia, Latvia, Mexico, Pakistan, Russian Federation, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Austria, Greece, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Libya, Lithuania, Myanmar, Switzerland, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Adalah – The Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel, Assyrian Universal Alliance – Americas Chapter Inc., Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos – Asociación Civil, Human Rights House Foundation, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, Minority Rights Group, Syriac Universal Alliance, Federation Syriaque International, World Jewish Congress.

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

C. Interactive dialogue with special representatives of the Secretary-General

Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children

172. At the 23rd meeting, on 11 March 2015, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children, Marta Santos Pais, presented her report (A/HRC/28/55).

173. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 23rd meeting, on 11 March 2015, and at the 25th meeting, on 12 March 2015, the following made statements and asked the Special Representative questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador⁵ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Estonia, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Kuwait, Mali, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Rwanda, Senegal, Slovenia, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence internationale pour le développement, Alsalam Foundation, ECPAT International (End Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and Trafficking in Children for Sexual Purposes), Human Rights Advocates, International Catholic Child Bureau (also on behalf of the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd), Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization.

174. At the 25th meeting, on 12 March 2015, the Special Representative answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict

175. At the 23rd meeting, on 11 March 2015, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, Leila Zerrougui, presented her report (A/HRC/28/54).

176. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 23rd meeting, on 11 March 2015, and at the 25th meeting, on 12 March, the following made statements and asked the Special Representative questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, China, Ecuador⁵ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Estonia, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Georgia, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Kuwait, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mali, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Rwanda, Slovenia, South Sudan, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukraine, State of Palestine;

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

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

(e) Observer for the International Committee of the Red Cross;

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence internationale pour le développement, Al-Khoei Foundation, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Colombian Commission of Jurists, Franciscans International (also on behalf of the Swiss Catholic Lenten Fund), International Institute for Peace, Justice and Human Rights,

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

International Organization for Least Developed Countries, Liberation, Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés, World Jewish Congress.

177. At the 25th meeting, on 12 March 2015, the Special Representative answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

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

179. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Armenia and Azerbaijan made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

D. General debate on agenda item 3

180. At the 27th meeting, on 13 March 2015, the Inspector of the Joint Inspection Unit, Gopinathan Achamkulangare, presented the report of the Joint Inspection Unit.

181. At its 27th, 28th and 29th meetings, on the same day, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on thematic reports under agenda items 2 and 3, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania (also on behalf of Andorra, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bulgaria, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America), Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of) (also on behalf of Antigua and Barbuda, Cuba, Dominica, Ecuador, Grenada, Nicaragua, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Botswana, Brazil (also on behalf of Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Paraguay, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Chile⁵ (also on behalf of Denmark, Ghana, Indonesia and Morocco), China, Cuba, Ecuador⁵ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador (also on behalf of Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Japan, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Sierra Leone, the United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), India, Indonesia (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)), Iran (Islamic Republic of)⁵ (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Ireland, Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Lebanon⁵ (also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, the Congo, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Mali, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia and the Holy See), Mexico (also on behalf of Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, Israel, Kenya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Monaco,

Montenegro, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Senegal, Slovenia, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda and Uruguay), Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan (also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam), Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Turkey⁵ (also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Yemen), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America (also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belarus, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Egypt, Libya, Lithuania, Niger, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs (also on behalf of the African Development Association, the Association Dunenyo and the Victorious Youths Movement), African Technology Development Link, Agence internationale pour le développement, Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship (also on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union, Amnesty International, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues and Reporters Sans Frontiers International – Reporters Without Borders International), Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities), the Company of the Daughters of Charity of Saint Vincent de Paul, the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order of Preachers, Edmund Rice International, the International Catholic Child Bureau, the International Movement ATD Fourth World and New Humanity), Auspice Stella, British Humanist Association, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Canners International Permanent Committee, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, Center for Inquiry, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Colombian Commission of Jurists, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Conectas Direitos Humanos, European Centre for Law and Justice, European Union of Public Relations, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Friends World Committee for Consultation, Helios Life Association, Human Rights Advocates, Institute for Women's Studies and Research, International Association

for Democracy in Africa, International Association for the Defence of Religious Liberty – Association internationale pour la défense de la liberté religieuse, International Association of Schools of Social Work, International Catholic Migration Commission (also on behalf of Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities), the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, the Congregations of St. Joseph, Curia Generalizia Agostiniana, Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order of Preachers, Fondazione Marista per la Solidarietà Internazionale ONLUS, Franciscans International, Fundación Migrantes y Refugiados sin Fronteras, Human Rights Watch, the International Catholic Child Bureau, the International Council of Psychologists, the Labour, Health and Human Rights Development Centre, the Outreach Social Care Project, Passionists International, the Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants, the Poverty Elimination and Community Education Foundation, Save the Climate, Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur, Stichting Justitia et Pax Nederland and the United Methodist Church – General Board of Church and Society), International Educational Development, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (also on behalf of the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies and Reporters Sans Frontières International – Reporters without Borders International), International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Institute for Non-Aligned Studies, International Institute for Peace, Justice and Human Rights, International Service for Human Rights, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Japanese Workers’ Committee for Human Rights, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, MINBYUN – Lawyers for a Democratic Society, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Permanent Assembly for Human Rights, Prevention Association of Social Harms, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l’homme, Society for Threatened Peoples, Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of Environment, Soka Gakkai International (also on behalf of the Al-Hakim Foundation, the Asia-Pacific Human Rights Information Center, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Equitas centre international d’éducation aux droits humains, Human Rights Education Associates, the Institute for Planetary Synthesis, the International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, the International Network for the Prevention of Elder Abuse, the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education, Latter-Day Saint Charities, Servas International, Soroptimist International, the Sovereign Military Order of the Temple of Jerusalem and the Teresian Association), United Nations Watch, United Schools International, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Victorious Youths Movement, World Environment and Resources Council, World Evangelical Alliance, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress.

182. At the 29th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of China, Ethiopia and Thailand made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights

183. At the 55th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran,⁵ on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.1, sponsored by the Islamic Republic of Iran, on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, and co-sponsored by China. Subsequently, Brazil, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Paraguay and the Russian Federation joined the sponsors.

184. At the same meeting, the representative of Latvia, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, made general comments on the draft resolution.

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

186. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.1 without a vote (resolution 28/2).

187. At the 59th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

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

188. At the 55th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the representative of Pakistan, also on behalf of Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Cuba, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Nigeria, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Yemen, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.2, sponsored by Pakistan and co-sponsored by Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Yemen. Subsequently, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Chile, Nigeria, South Africa and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

189. At the same meeting, the representatives of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments on the draft resolution.

190. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of the Republic of Korea and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

In favour:

Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, China, Congo, Cuba, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, Indonesia, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Albania, Bangladesh, Côte d'Ivoire, Estonia, Ethiopia, Germany, India, Latvia, Montenegro, Netherlands, Portugal, United Arab Emirates

192. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.2 by 29 votes to 6, with 12 abstentions (resolution 28/3).

The right of persons with disabilities to live independently and be included in the community on an equal basis with others

193. At the 55th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the representatives of Mexico and New Zealand introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.5, sponsored by Mexico and New Zealand and co-sponsored by Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, the Niger, Panama, Paraguay,

Peru, Portugal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cabo Verde, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, the Czech Republic, El Salvador, Haiti, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Morocco, Namibia, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, San Marino, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

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

195. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Brazil, also on behalf of China, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Pakistan, the Russian Federation and South Africa, made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

196. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.5 as orally revised without a vote (resolution 28/4).

The negative impact of the non-repatriation of funds of illicit origin to the countries of origin on the enjoyment of human rights, and the importance of improving international cooperation

197. At the 55th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the representative of Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.8, sponsored by Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States. Subsequently, China, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation with the exception of Albania), Sri Lanka and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

198. At the same meeting, the representative of Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, orally revised the draft resolution.

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

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

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

In favour:

Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Japan, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Latvia, Montenegro, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

202. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.8 as orally revised by 33 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions (resolution 28/5).

203. At the 59th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Independent Expert on the enjoyment of human rights by persons with albinism

204. At the 55th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the representative of Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.10, sponsored by Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by Belgium, Croatia, Denmark, Israel, Italy, Poland and Portugal. Subsequently, Andorra, Bulgaria, Chile, Cuba, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Japan, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Slovenia, Thailand, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam joined the sponsors.

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

206. At the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

207. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.10 without a vote (resolution 28/6).

208. At the 59th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of Sierra Leone made general comments after the vote.

Renewal of the mandate of the open-ended intergovernmental working group to consider the possibility of elaborating an international regulatory framework on the regulation, monitoring and oversight of the activities of private military and security companies

209. At the 55th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the representative of Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.11/Rev.1, sponsored by Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of). Subsequently, Ecuador joined the sponsors.

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

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

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

In favour:

Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Montenegro, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Kazakhstan, United States of America

213. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.11/Rev.1 by 32 votes to 13, with 2 abstentions (resolution 28/7).

214. At the 59th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of South Africa made general comments after the vote.

The effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights

215. At the 55th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.14, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Algeria, Argentina, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), the Russian Federation, South Africa and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

216. At the same meeting, the representative of Argentina made general comments on the draft resolution.

217. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and Mexico made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

In favour:

Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Montenegro, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Mexico

219. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.14 by 31 votes to 14, with 1 abstention⁶ (resolution 28/8).

220. At the 59th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Mandate of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights

221. At the 55th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.15, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Algeria, Austria, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Croatia, Cyprus, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Georgia, Greece, Italy, Mexico, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Portugal, Spain, the Sudan and the Syrian Arab Republic. Subsequently, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States),

⁶ Gabon did not cast a vote. The representative of Gabon subsequently stated that the delegation had intended to vote in favour of the draft text.

Andorra, Bahrain (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Haiti, Indonesia, Ireland, Malaysia, Norway, Paraguay, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

222. At the same meeting, the representatives of Japan, Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution.

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

224. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.15 without a vote (resolution 28/9).

225. At the 59th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

The right to food

226. At the 55th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.16, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Algeria, Andorra, Bahrain (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Croatia, Cyprus, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Luxembourg, Monaco, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, San Marino, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Australia, Austria, Cabo Verde, Costa Rica, Georgia, Haiti, Ireland, Japan, Lithuania, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Myanmar, Norway, the Russian Federation, Serbia and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

227. At the same meeting, the representative of Latvia, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, made general comments on the draft resolution.

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

229. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.16 without a vote (resolution 28/10).

230. At the 59th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Human rights and the environment

231. At the 55th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the representatives of Costa Rica⁷ (also on behalf of Maldives, Morocco, Slovenia and Switzerland) and Morocco introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.19, sponsored by Costa Rica, Maldives, Morocco, Slovenia and Switzerland and co-sponsored by Angola, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritania, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Senegal, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Uruguay, Yemen and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cabo Verde, Chad, Chile, the Congo, Côte D'Ivoire, the Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Iceland, Libya, Mexico, the Niger, Nigeria, the Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Serbia, Seychelles, the Sudan and Togo joined the sponsors.

232. At the same meeting, the representative of Costa Rica, also on behalf of Maldives, Morocco, Slovenia and Switzerland, orally revised the draft resolution.

⁷ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

233. Also at the same meeting, the representative of India (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Egypt, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, South Africa and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)) made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

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

235. At the same meeting, the representatives of South Africa and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

236. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.19 as orally revised without a vote (resolution 28/11).

237. At the 59th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representatives of Brazil and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

Question of the realization in all countries of economic, social and cultural rights

238. At the 55th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the representative of Portugal introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.20, sponsored by Portugal and co-sponsored by Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Uruguay and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cabo Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, Georgia, Guinea, Iceland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Norway, Rwanda, Serbia, South Africa, Tunisia, Ukraine, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam joined the sponsors.

239. At the same meeting, the representative of South Africa made general comments on the draft resolution.

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

241. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.20 without a vote (resolution 28/12).

242. At the 59th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Birth registration and the right of everyone to recognition everywhere as a person before the law

243. At the 55th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the representatives of Mexico and Turkey introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.23, sponsored by Mexico and Turkey and co-sponsored by Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Denmark, Djibouti, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United States of America and Uruguay. Subsequently, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cabo Verde, Chile, the Czech Republic, Ecuador, Greece, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Pakistan, Poland, Rwanda, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

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

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

246. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.23 without a vote (resolution 28/13).

Human rights, democracy and the rule of law

247. At the 56th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the representatives of Romania⁷ (also on behalf of Morocco, Norway, Peru, the Republic of Korea and Tunisia) and Morocco introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.24, sponsored by Morocco, Norway, Peru, the Republic of Korea, Romania and Tunisia and co-sponsored by Angola, Australia, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Colombia, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, New Zealand, Panama, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste and the United States of America. Subsequently, Albania, Algeria, Austria, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cabo Verde, the Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Djibouti, Finland, Germany, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Lithuania, Mali, Monaco, the Niger, the Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, Switzerland, Togo, Ukraine, Uruguay and Zambia joined the sponsors.

248. At the same meeting, the representative of China, also on behalf of Cuba, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), introduced an oral amendment to paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

249. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Pakistan, Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of Bahrain and the United Arab Emirates), the Russian Federation, the United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments on the draft resolution and the oral amendment.

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

251. At the same meeting, the representatives of France, Ireland and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on the oral amendment to paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

252. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Morocco, a recorded vote was taken on the oral amendment to paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Congo, Cuba, El Salvador, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Brazil, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Namibia

253. The Human Rights Council rejected the oral amendment to paragraph 3 of the draft resolution by 18 votes to 23, with 6 abstentions.

254. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of China, a separate vote was taken on paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Albania, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Congo, Cuba, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

255. The Human Rights Council adopted paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.24 by 28 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.

256. At the same meeting, the representatives of Bangladesh, China, Cuba, South Africa and Viet Nam made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on the draft resolution.

257. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of South Africa, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Albania, Argentina, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Pakistan, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

258. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.24 by 35 votes to none, with 12 abstentions⁸ (resolution 28/14).

The right to work

259. At the 56th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the representatives of Egypt⁹ (also on behalf of Greece, Indonesia, Mexico and Romania) and Greece introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.26, sponsored by Egypt, Greece, Indonesia, Mexico and Romania and co-sponsored by Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, El Salvador, Guatemala, Italy, Libya, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Morocco, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, the Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cabo Verde, China, Colombia, Djibouti, Ecuador, Georgia, Honduras, India, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Panama, the Philippines, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Uganda, Viet Nam and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

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

⁸ The representative of Algeria subsequently stated that there had been an error in the delegation's vote and that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft text.

⁹ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

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

262. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.26 without a vote (resolution 28/15).

263. At the 59th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

The right to privacy in the digital age

264. At the 56th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the representative of Brazil, also on behalf of Austria, Germany, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Norway and Switzerland, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.27, sponsored by Austria, Brazil, Germany, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Norway and Switzerland and co-sponsored by Angola, Argentina, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Chile, Denmark, Djibouti, El Salvador, Georgia, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Tajikistan, Timor-Leste, Uganda, Uruguay, Zambia and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Albania, Armenia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cabo Verde, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Latvia, Lebanon, Monaco, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Sierra Leone and Sweden joined the sponsors.

265. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Cuba, the Russian Federation and Saudi Arabia, also on behalf of Bahrain and the United Arab Emirates, made general comments on the draft resolution. The representative of Saudi Arabia, also on behalf of Bahrain and the United Arab Emirates, disassociated the respective States from the consensus on the thirteenth preambular paragraph and paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

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

267. At the same meeting, the representatives of South Africa and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote. In his statement, the representative of South Africa disassociated the State Member from the consensus on the draft resolution.

268. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.27 without a vote (resolution 28/16).

Effects of terrorism on the enjoyment of human rights

269. At the 56th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the representatives of Egypt⁹ (also on behalf of Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Djibouti, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, the Niger, Oman, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, the Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen and the State of Palestine) and Jordan introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.30, sponsored by Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco and Saudi Arabia and co-sponsored by Bahrain, Cuba, Djibouti, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Oman, Sierra Leone, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Angola, Iraq, the Niger, the Sudan and Togo joined the sponsors.

270. At the same meeting, the representative of Egypt (also on behalf of Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Djibouti, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, the Niger, Oman, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, the Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen and the State of Palestine) orally revised the draft resolution.

271. Also at the same meeting, in accordance with rule 116 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the representative of Mexico moved the adjournment of the consideration of the draft resolution as orally revised.

272. Subsequently, the representatives of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America made statements in favour of the motion. The representatives of Saudi Arabia and Cuba made statements against the motion.

273. Under the same rule, a recorded vote was taken on the motion to adjourn the consideration of the draft resolution as orally revised. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Albania, Estonia, France, Germany, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, India, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Abstaining:

Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Indonesia, Ireland, South Africa, Viet Nam

274. The Human Rights Council rejected the motion to adjourn the consideration of the draft resolution as orally revised by 14 votes to 23, with 10 abstentions.

275. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Morocco, Saudi Arabia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

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

277. At the same meeting, the representatives of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Mexico, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, South Africa and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

In favour:

Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Botswana, Gabon, Ghana, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Qatar

279. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.30 as orally revised by 25 votes to 16, with 6 abstentions (resolution 28/17).

280. At the 59th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representatives of Japan and Paraguay made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

Freedom of religion or belief

281. At the 57th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of Latvia, on behalf of the European Union, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.12, sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Canada, Georgia, Guatemala, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Peru, Serbia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United States of America and Uruguay. Subsequently, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Chile, Colombia, El Salvador, Israel, Japan, Monaco, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Sri Lanka and Thailand joined the sponsors.

282. At the same meeting, the representative of Latvia, on behalf of the European Union, orally revised the draft resolution.

283. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.12 without a vote (resolution 28/18).

Rights of the child: towards better investment in the rights of the child

284. At the 57th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representatives of Latvia, on behalf of the European Union, and Uruguay,⁹ on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.28, sponsored by Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, the Congo, Georgia, Iceland, Kazakhstan, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste and Turkey. Subsequently, Angola, Barbados, Benin, Canada, Côte D'Ivoire, Japan, the Philippines, Rwanda, San Marino and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

285. At the same meeting, the representatives of India and Qatar, on behalf of the Gulf Cooperation Council, made general comments on the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Qatar, on behalf of the Gulf Cooperation Council, disassociated the States members of the Gulf Cooperation Council from paragraphs 10, 16 (b), 28, 29 and 30 of the draft resolution.

286. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Pakistan (also on behalf of Bangladesh), the Russian Federation, South Africa and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote. In her statement, the representative of the Russian Federation disassociated the State Member from the consensus on paragraph 30 of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Pakistan disassociated the States Members of Bangladesh and Pakistan from the consensus on paragraphs 10, 12 (a), 12 (d), 14, 16, 28, 29, 30, 49 and 50 of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of South Africa disassociated the State Member from the consensus on the first preambular paragraph and paragraph 30 of the draft resolution.

287. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.28 without a vote (resolution 28/19).

288. At the 59th meeting, on the same day, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Prevention of genocide

289. At the 59th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representatives of Armenia and Rwanda introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.25, sponsored by Armenia and co-sponsored by Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, the Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, France, Greece, Israel, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Slovenia, Spain, Timor-Leste and Uruguay. Subsequently, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte D'Ivoire, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Romania, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tanzania, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Zambia joined the sponsors.

290. At the same meeting, the representative of Armenia orally revised the draft resolution.

291. Also at the same meeting, the President announced that amendments A/HRC/28/L.39, A/HRC/28/L.40, A/HRC/28/L.41 and A/HRC/28/L.43 to draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.25 as orally revised had been withdrawn.

292. At the same meeting, the representative of Cuba introduced amendment A/HRC/28/L.38 to draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.25 as orally revised. Amendment A/HRC/28/L.38 was sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by India and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Algeria, Bangladesh, Egypt, Pakistan and Sri Lanka joined the sponsors.

293. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Pakistan introduced amendment A/HRC/28/L.42 to draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.25 as orally revised. Amendment A/HRC/28/L.42 was sponsored by Pakistan and co-sponsored by Algeria, Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka joined the sponsors.

294. At the same meeting, the representatives of Cuba, France, India and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised and the amendments.

295. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/28/L.38.

296. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of France, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/28/L.38. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Côte d'Ivoire, Estonia, France, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Algeria, Congo, El Salvador, Gabon, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Qatar

297. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/28/L.38 by 14 votes to 23, with 10 abstentions.

298. At the same meeting, the representative of Latvia, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote on amendment A/HRC/28/L.42.

299. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of France, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/28/L.42. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, El Salvador, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Côte d'Ivoire, Estonia, France, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Congo, Ethiopia, Gabon, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Qatar

300. The Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/28/L.42 by 15 votes to 23, with 9 abstentions.

301. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Cuba, a separate vote was taken on the twenty-second preambular paragraph and paragraph 17 of the draft resolution as orally revised. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Albania, Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ghana, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, India, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Abstaining:

Algeria, China, Gabon, Kazakhstan, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, South Africa, Viet Nam

302. The Human Rights Council adopted the twenty-second preambular paragraph and paragraph 17 of draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.25 as orally revised by 28 votes to 8, with 11 abstentions.

303. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Cuba, Pakistan, South Africa and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on the draft resolution as orally revised. In their statements, the representatives of Cuba, Pakistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) disassociated the respective States Members from the consensus on the twenty-second preambular paragraph and paragraph 17 of the draft resolution as orally revised. In his statement, the representative of South Africa disassociated the State Member from the consensus on the draft resolution as orally revised.

304. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.25 without a vote (resolution 28/34).

305. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Saudi Arabia, also on behalf of Bahrain and the United Arab Emirates, and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote after the vote. In his statement, the representative of Saudi Arabia, also on behalf of Bahrain and the United Arab Emirates, disassociated the respective States Members from the consensus on the twenty-second preambular paragraph and paragraph 17 of the resolution.

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

A. Oral update by the commission of inquiry on human rights in Eritrea

306. At the 30th meeting, on 16 March 2015, the Chair of the commission of inquiry on human rights in Eritrea, Mike Smith, presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 26/24, an oral update.

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

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

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

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Czech Republic, Djibouti, Norway, Sudan, Switzerland;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship, Human Rights Watch, International Fellowship of Reconciliation.

309. At the same meeting, the representative of Eritrea made final remarks as the State concerned.

310. Also at the same meeting, the Chair answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

B. Interactive dialogue with the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic

311. At the 33rd meeting, on 17 March 2015, the Chair of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic, Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro, presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 25/23, the reports of the Commission (A/HRC/28/69 and Corr.1).

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

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria, Botswana, China, Cuba, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Portugal, Qatar (on behalf of the Gulf Cooperation Council), Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark (also on behalf of Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, New Zealand, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Holy See;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies (also on behalf of the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues), CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Human Rights Watch, Presse Emblème Campagne, Syriac Universal Alliance, Federation Syriaque International, Union of Arab Jurists, World Jewish Congress.

314. At the same meeting, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic made final remarks as the State concerned.

315. Also at the same meeting, the Chair answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

316. At the 35th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Lebanon, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic and Turkey made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

C. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders

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

318. At the 30th meeting, on 16 March 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Marzuki Darusman, presented his report (A/HRC/28/71).

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

320. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, also at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, China, Cuba, Estonia, France, Ghana, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belarus, Canada, Czech Republic, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Myanmar, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Zimbabwe;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Human Rights Watch, People for Successful Korean Reunification, United Nations Watch.

321. At the same meeting, the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea made final remarks as the State concerned.

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

Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

323. At the 31st meeting, on 16 March 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ahmed Shaheed, presented his report (A/HRC/28/70).

324. At the same meeting, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran made a statement as the State concerned.

325. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, also at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, Cuba, France, Germany, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Netherlands, Portugal, Russian Federation, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belarus, Belgium, Canada, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Eritrea, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Myanmar, New Zealand, Norway, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Zimbabwe;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Baha'i International Community, Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, International Educational Development, International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission, Prevention Association of Social Harms, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik (also on behalf of the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission), Women's Human Rights International Association.

326. At the same meeting, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran made final remarks as the State concerned.

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

Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar

328. At the 32nd meeting, on 16 March 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, Yanghee Lee, presented her reports (A/HRC/28/72 and Add.1).

329. At the same meeting, the representative of Myanmar made a statement as the State concerned.

330. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, also at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, China, Cuba, Estonia, France, Ghana, India, Ireland, Japan, Netherlands, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam (on behalf of ASEAN);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belarus, Cambodia, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lithuania, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims, Human Rights Now, Human Rights Watch, International Educational Development, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues.

331. At the same meeting, the representative of Myanmar made final remarks as the State concerned.

332. Also at the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

D. General debate on agenda item 4

333. At its 34th and 35th meetings, on 17 March 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 4, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, France, Germany, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of)¹⁰ (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Ireland, Japan, Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Iceland, Liechtenstein and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), Netherlands, Qatar (on behalf of the Gulf Cooperation Council), Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

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

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Africa culture internationale, African Development Association, African Technical Association, African Technology Development Link, Agence internationale pour le développement, Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, Association of World Citizens, Auspice Stella, Baha'i International Community, British Humanist Association, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Canners International Permanent Committee, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, Center for Inquiry, Center for Reproductive Rights, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (also on behalf of Conectas Derechos Humanos and the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues), Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Edmund Rice International Limited (also on behalf of Fondazione Marista per la Solidarietà Internazionale ONLUS), European Union of Public Relations, Family Planning Association of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Franciscans International, Human Rights House Foundation (also on behalf of Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship, CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation and the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues), Human Rights Watch, Indian Council of South America, Institute for Women's Studies and Research, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Institute for Non-Aligned Studies, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, International Muslim Women's Union, International Service for Human Rights, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Maryam Ghasemi Educational Charity Institute, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Presse Emblème Campagne, Prevention Association of Social Harms, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Russian Peace Foundation, Society for Threatened Peoples, Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of Environment, United Nations Watch, United Schools International, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Victorious Youths Movement, VIVAT International, Women's Human Rights International Association, World Barua Organization, World Environment and Resources Council, World Evangelical Alliance, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress.

334. At the 35th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belarus, Canada, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, the Russian Federation, Saudi

¹⁰ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Arabia, South Sudan, the Sudan, Thailand, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

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

336. At the 57th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, also on behalf of France, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and the United States of America, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.6, sponsored by France, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden. Subsequently, Bahrain, Chile, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors.

337. At the same meeting, the representative of Lebanon introduced amendment A/HRC/28/L.36 to draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.6. Amendment A/HRC/28/L.36 was sponsored by Iraq, Lebanon and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

338. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Qatar, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution and the amendment.

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

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

341. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/28/L.36. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Cuba, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Albania, Argentina, Botswana, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Maldives, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bangladesh, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, India, Kenya, Mexico, Namibia, Nigeria, Paraguay, South Africa, Viet Nam

342. Amendment A/HRC/28/L.36 was rejected by 10 votes to 23, with 14 abstentions.

343. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, China, Cuba, the Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote on the draft resolution.

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

In favour:

Albania, Argentina, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Bangladesh, Brazil, Congo, Ethiopia, India, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, South Africa, Viet Nam

345. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.6 by 29 votes to 6, with 12 abstentions (resolution 28/20).

Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

346. At the 57th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of Sweden,¹⁰ also on behalf of the Republic of Moldova, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.17, sponsored by the Republic of Moldova, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Costa Rica and San Marino joined the sponsors.

347. At the same meeting, the representatives of Latvia, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution.

348. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran made a statement as the State concerned.

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

350. At the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil, China, Cuba, Japan, Pakistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

In favour:

Albania, Argentina, Botswana, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, the former Yugoslav Republic of

Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Abstaining:

Algeria, Brazil, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates

352. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.17 by 20 votes to 11, with 16 abstentions (resolution 28/21).

353. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Indonesia made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

354. At the 57th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representatives of Latvia, on behalf of the European Union, and Japan introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.18, sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Canada, Georgia, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Maldives, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and the United States of America. Subsequently, Chile, Costa Rica, Iraq and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

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

356. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea made a statement as the State concerned.

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

358. At the same meeting, the representatives of Argentina, Brazil, China, Cuba, Pakistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

In favour:

Albania, Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Congo, Ethiopia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa

360. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.18 by 27 votes to 6, with 14 abstentions (resolution 28/22).

361. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Indonesia made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Situation of human rights in Myanmar

362. At the 57th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of Latvia, on behalf of the European Union, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.21/Rev.1, sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and the United States of America. Subsequently, Canada, Costa Rica, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Switzerland and Turkey joined the sponsors.

363. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), the Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam made general comments on the draft resolution. In their statements, the representatives of China, India and the Russian Federation disassociated the respective States Members from the consensus on the draft resolution.

364. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Myanmar made a statement as the State concerned.

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

366. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.21/Rev.1 without a vote (resolution 28/23).

367. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Japan made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

V. Human rights bodies and mechanisms

A. Forum on Minority Issues

368. At the 36th meeting, on 18 March 2015, the Special Rapporteur on minority issues, Rita Izsák, introduced the recommendations adopted by the Forum on Minority Issues at its seventh session, held on 25 and 26 November 2014 (A/HRC/28/77).

B. Special procedures

369. At the 36th meeting, on 18 March 2015, the Chair of the Coordination Committee of Special Procedures, François Crépeau, presented the report on the twenty-first annual meeting of special rapporteurs/representatives, independent experts and working groups of the special procedures of the Human Rights Council, including updated information on the special procedures, which was held in Geneva from 29 September to 3 October 2014 (A/HRC/28/41).

C. General debate on agenda item 5

370. At its 36th and 37th meetings, on 18 March 2015, and its 42nd meeting, on 20 March 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 5, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, Cuba, India, Ireland, Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Namibia, Sierra Leone, United States of America, Uruguay¹⁰ (also on behalf of Algeria, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Norway, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uruguay, Zimbabwe;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Adalah – The Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel, African Technical Association, African Technology Development Link, Agence internationale pour le développement, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Assyrian Universal Alliance – Americas Chapter Inc., Auspice Stella, Canners International Permanent Committee, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales, Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Conectas Direitos Humanos, Ecumenical Federation of Constantinopolitans, Espace Afrique International, European Union of Public Relations, Human Rights House Foundation, Indian Council of South America, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Institute for Non-Aligned Studies, International Muslim Women's Union, International Service for Human Rights, Iranian Elite Research Center, Japanese Workers' Committee for Human Rights, Liberation, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Rencontre africaine pour

le défense des droits de l'homme, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, United Schools International, US Human Rights Network, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization, World Environment and Resources Council, World Muslim Congress.

VI. Universal periodic review

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

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

A. Consideration of review outcomes

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

Italy

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

(a) The national report submitted by Italy in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/ITA/1 and Corr.1 and 2);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/ITA/2 and Corr.1);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/ITA/3).

375. At its 37th meeting, on 18 March 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Italy (see sect. C below).

376. The outcome of the review of Italy comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/28/4), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/28/4/Add.1).

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

377. The head of the delegation stated that the second review of Italy had contributed significantly to its taking stock of its domestic situation in the field of human rights. He greatly appreciated the attention paid by all the delegations that had participated in the interactive dialogue. Their contributions had led Italy to analyse each issue that had been raised and to discuss with the relevant public administrations, civil society and parliamentarians the opportunity to evaluate the level of protection of human rights and to adopt useful legislative and operational measures.

378. In comparison with the State's first review, where Italy had implemented 74 out of 78 recommendations that it had accepted and several recommendations that it had not accepted, it had received 186 recommendations during its second review and had decided to

examine them in detail. Italy had provided a comprehensive response in the addendum. It had accepted almost all of the recommendations made. Overall, it had accepted 176 recommendations and noted 10.

379. The head of the delegation then gave the floor to the President of the interministerial committee for human rights, who made remarks on the recommendations that Italy had noted.

380. With regard to recommendations 145.1 to 145.6 on the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, Minister Plenipotentiary de Martino underlined the fact that the Italian legislative framework already guaranteed the rights of regular and irregular migrants. Following the ratification of the Domestic Workers Convention (No. 189) and the Migrant Workers Convention (No. 143) of the International Organization for Labour (ILO), Italy had accepted being reviewed periodically on the implementation of those conventions at the domestic level. Furthermore, Italy was committed to promoting a debate on that topic at the European level, as requested both in the United Nations and Council of Europe systems.

381. Concerning recommendations 145.126 and 145.127 on the prohibition of all corporal punishment of children, the Minister stressed that the protection of children from all forms of violence within the family, including even mild corporal punishment, was enshrined in articles 2, 3, 29, 30 and 31 of the Constitution, which clearly flowed from the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Moreover, the Criminal Code firmly provided for the punishment with imprisonment for any ill-treatment of children within the family.

382. With regard to recommendation 145.170 on the suspension of summary returns of migrants to Greece, Italy had not carried out such returns to Greece. All the operational procedures implemented at sea by Italy had always been done using a case-by-case approach. That is, each migrant had been properly identified and all personal details had been managed by the competent authorities in order to monitor each case and the relevant measures taken.

383. With regard to recommendation 145.182 on the inclusion of all migrants in national programmes to integrate and ensure their human rights, integration programmes were regularly made available to all regular migrants entitled to stay in Italy. As for migrants arriving in Italy by sea, the State was fully committed to receiving and hosting them with full respect for their human rights. As of 18 March 2015, over 70,000 migrants had been hosted in different kinds of centres. Inclusion within national plans and integration programmes was permitted only for refugees, asylum seekers or those entitled to humanitarian protection.

384. The Minister then described the further steps that Italy would take as a follow-up to its second review.

385. As Italy recalled on the occasion of the dialogue organized by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) on 10 December 2014, a new approach to search and rescue at sea was needed, while also promoting greater international cooperation and readiness to share responsibilities. In recent months, Italy had been facing an escalating humanitarian crisis in the Mediterranean, with more than 170,000 people arriving on its shores. One hundred thousand people had been rescued through Operation Mare Nostrum, which was the widest humanitarian operation ever conducted by Italy on a bilateral basis. Still, the active search and rescue activities were regrettably not enough to save everybody. Italy remained deeply committed to the principles of protection at sea and to the two components of active search and rescue operations in the Mediterranean.

386. The new European Operation Triton was a step towards sharing responsibility among European countries. Italy was taking full part in the European efforts and would continue to do its share to prevent further loss of life in the Mediterranean by following European Union directives aimed at adopting common procedures on international protection and ad hoc measures on the reception of and assistance for categories of vulnerable migrants.

387. The European Union, under the Italian presidency, had taken steps to ensure better coordination between the internal and external dimension of its action so as to make

migratory policies an integral component of the external action of the European Union. The Italian presidency supported dialogue with countries of origin and countries of transit in the belief that regional processes with Africa, falling within the framework of the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility of the European Union, were essential. One of the major accomplishments of the presidency had been the organization of the fourth Euro-African Ministerial Conference on Migration and Development within the Rabat Process, hosted in Rome in November. Italy had launched the EU–Horn of Africa Migration Route Initiative, which was aimed at creating a new partnership between countries of the European Union, countries of the Horn of Africa and transit countries in the Mediterranean region.

388. The Minister also pointed out that the access of migrants to health-care assistance had always been guaranteed regardless of their migration status.

389. Moreover, expulsion procedures had been simplified and accelerated, including through the adoption of a domestic protocol to that end.

390. Within the current overall justice reform process, several measures had been introduced to reduce prison overcrowding, as recognized by the European Court of Human Rights following the *Torregiani et. al v. Italy* judgment.

391. Italy placed great importance on the principle of non-discrimination, irrespective of religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation. During its presidency of the European Union, Italy had hosted, in Rome a joint high-level event on non-discrimination entitled “Shaping the future of equality policies in the European Union”.

392. With regard to gender issues, and in view of the celebration in 2015 of the adoption in 1995 of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, Italy, during its presidency of the European Union, had also organized in Rome, in October 2014, a high-level conference entitled “Gender equality in Europe: unfinished business? Taking stock 20 years after the Beijing Platform for Action”.

393. National policies on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence were based on integrating prevention, protection and repressive measures, to be implemented jointly using a multidisciplinary approach by the public and private sectors, aimed at coordinated action in all relevant fields (social, education, information and legal), in accordance with, inter alia, the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention). According to that holistic approach, a revised national action plan on all forms of violence against women had been adopted in 2013.

394. In order to give practical relevance to the national strategy on lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons adopted in 2013, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs had organized a conference in May 2014 to take stock of the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons in the international framework.

395. Lastly, the Chamber of Deputies had decided to discuss that week the bill for the ratification of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, which was expected to be approved soon.

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

396. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Italy, 16 delegations made statements.

397. Togo noted with satisfaction that most of the recommendations made had been supported by Italy, and stated that Italy would spare no effort to put them into effect.

398. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela highlighted the approval of a law that provided for the decriminalization of irregular migration, and the ruling of the Constitutional Court that removed migration as an aggravating circumstance for a crime. It acknowledged the efforts made by Italy to implement the recommendations accepted during its first review, particularly those relating to migration. It encouraged Italy to continue to ensure respect for the human rights of that vulnerable group.

399. Burkina Faso thanked Italy for the information provided, which confirmed its view that Italy was determined to reach an optimum level in implementing human rights, despite the many challenges confronting the State.

400. China commended Italy for its acceptance of the majority of the recommendations, including those made by China. It referred to the commitment of Italy to the protection of vulnerable groups. China also referred to the increase in official development assistance to developing countries and the maritime relief assistance to refugees, which it hoped that Italy would strengthen. It underlined the need for international cooperation to promote human rights in developing countries in order to solve the problem of illegal migration.

401. Côte d'Ivoire welcomed the reforms undertaken by Italy to make its national legislation consistent with international standards. It encouraged Italy to consolidate its efforts to improve the situation of migrants, to promote gender equality, and to bolster measures to combat human trafficking, racial discrimination and social prejudice. It called upon Italy to continue its cooperation with the international community.

402. The Council of Europe referred to the recommendations made by its various monitoring bodies, which remained particularly concerned by the insufficient protection of migrants, refugees and asylum seekers, racist and xenophobic attitudes, the overcrowding of prisons and the excessive length of judicial procedures. It appreciated the measures Italy had taken to address those issues and commended the State for the steps it had taken to develop a legal framework to combat human trafficking, to provide victims with long-term assistance and to include the Roma and Sinti communities.

403. Cuba urged Italy to continue to fight discrimination in all its forms. It acknowledged the efforts made in that regard and the allocation of significant financial resources. Cuba urged Italy to continue to make progress in the area of immigration and to improve in areas such as the arrival process for, and the detention and integration of, migrants. It thanked Italy for having accepted the two recommendations made by Cuba.

404. Egypt was encouraged by the efforts of Italy in promoting human rights for women, children and migrants and in combating human trafficking. It applauded the State for its efforts to increase sea rescue operations and for having worked with countries in the region concerning migration management. Egypt encouraged Italy to address challenges relating to racism, racial discrimination and xenophobia. It was pleased that Italy had accepted two of its three recommendations.

405. Ethiopia commended Italy for having identified priority areas in the promotion and protection of human rights and for having accepted a significant number of recommendations, including those made by Ethiopia. It was pleased with the ongoing efforts made by Italy to promote and protect human rights on, inter alia, discrimination, women's rights, gender equality, social assistance, education and health care.

406. Greece welcomed the strengthening of the legislative and institutional framework for the protection of human rights. It understood the challenges of huge migratory pressure, the complexity of the issue, and the need to address its humanitarian dimension by promoting international and regional cooperation, solidarity and shared responsibility. Greece supported the commitment of Italy to promoting a debate at the European level on combating trafficking in persons.

407. The Islamic Republic of Iran welcomed the acceptance by Italy of a number of recommendations, including four recommendations made by its Government. It looked forward to hearing about the action taken to implement the recommendations accepted. It urged Italy to address racial discrimination, discriminatory treatment of migrants and victims of human trafficking, discrimination against immigrants and foreigners, and violence against women.

408. Kuwait welcomed the legislative role played by the Italian Parliament in discussions on the establishment of an independent national human rights commission in accordance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (Paris Principles). It thanked Italy for its national action plan on the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, which the State had submitted to the European Commission.

409. Libya commended Italy for its effective participation in its second review and was pleased with the efforts it had made to promote and protect human rights. Libya thanked Italy for having taken significant steps by accepting 176 recommendations, which was great evidence that Italy was fully committed to the protection and promotion of human rights.

410. The Philippines welcomed the measures taken to counter discrimination and to address violence against women. It commended Italy for the efforts it had made to protect the rights of migrants and to combat human trafficking. It encouraged Italy to ensure that its domestic regulations on irregular migrants were always consistent with international human rights standards. It appreciated the State's acceptance of its recommendation on periodically assessing its migration policies. It reiterated its desire for Italy to consider acceding to the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

411. Sierra Leone thanked Italy for its constructive engagement in the universal periodic review mechanism and for its presentation of the human rights situation in the country. It encouraged Italy to provide further information on any efforts that it was considering with regard to countering racism and eliminating violence against women.

412. The Sudan commended the acceptance by Italy of most of the recommendations made and appreciated the steps the State had taken to promote and protect the human rights of its citizens. It also thanked Italy for having accepted the two recommendations made by the Sudan. It wished Italy success in its efforts in implementing the recommendations accepted.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

413. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Italy, eight other stakeholders made statements.

414. The International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES, on behalf of a coalition of non-governmental organizations, welcomed the acceptance by Italy of a significant number of recommendations. It urged Italy to pay special attention to the integration of children with disabilities, Roma children and unaccompanied foreign minors into the formal education system. Concerning trafficking in children and women, it stressed that the number of identified trafficked or exploited victims, especially undocumented migrants, had progressively increased. It called upon Italy to promptly adopt effective measures to address that pressing issue. With regard to violence against and discrimination of women in various contexts, including at the workplace, it urged Italy to eradicate multiple forms of discrimination against women and to take measures to combat unemployment and underemployment, especially with regard to young people and women.

415. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland, on behalf of a coalition of non-governmental organizations, welcomed the acceptance by Italy of all the recommendations on the human rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons. However, it underlined the fact that the recommendations could not be considered implemented. One of the recommendations referred to marriage equality but there were only two bills at the Senate and no discussion was scheduled. Regarding the recognition of same-sex relationships in the form of civil partnership, there was only a bill under discussion in the Justice Commission of the Senate, with no guarantee of its adoption. Concerning legislative actions to combat discrimination on the basis of sex and sexual orientation, there was a highly controversial bill voted on by the Low Chamber but criticized by non-governmental organizations on the ground that an exception to the ban had been recognized. It urged Italy to implement the recommendations entirely and to increase resources to fight discrimination.

416. Save the Children International recommended that Italy approve the bill of law before Parliament and ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure. In 2014, 170,000 migrants had arrived in Italy by sea, including over 13,000 accompanied children and 13,000 unaccompanied children. It recommended that Italy approve bill of law AC 1658 in the shortest time possible in order to put in place a national system for the reception and protection of unaccompanied foreign

minors. It also recommended that Italy introduce the legislative reforms necessary to explicitly ban all forms of corporal punishment and other humiliating and degrading forms of behaviour towards children, including in the home.

417. Franciscans International regretted that no recommendation had been made on environmental and human rights abuses caused by business activities. Italy had been marked by alarming environmental scandals; however, no mention had been made on the environmental disaster involving Ilva, Europe's largest steel plant, which had been blamed for causing environmental disasters and serious health problems of local people, as well as the Eternit case, which involved the deaths of hundreds of workers by asbestos poisoning. Franciscans International welcomed the recent adoption of norms establishing new crimes relating to environmental pollution and disasters. It called upon Italy to ensure that the bill was translated into concrete measures leading to greater protection for workers and for people in general, to effective remedies and to punishment for environmental crimes.

418. Amnesty International welcomed the recommendations on refugees and migrants and called upon Italy to implement them urgently. Shortly after the review of Italy in October 2014, the State had ended Operation Mare Nostrum, and Amnesty International had repeatedly called upon Italy, and upon institutions and States members of the European Union, to ensure that a search and rescue operation of at least a comparable scale and mandate be urgently put in place. It was deeply concerned about violations of the rights of Roma and urged Italy to implement the recommendations on Roma rights. It also urged Italy to implement the numerous recommendations on introducing the crime of torture in accordance with the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and on creating a national human rights institution based on the Paris Principles.

419. Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII encouraged Italy to pay particular attention to the protection of the child from conception. It recommended that Italy, among others, elaborate a national plan with uniform guidelines to promote and protect the right to life of the soon-to-be-born child, put in place all the measures necessary to promote anonymous childbirth as an extreme alternative to abortion, and adopt specific legal and economic means in favour of pregnant women in a quandary. On the child's right to a family, it recommended that Italy fully apply national standards for foster care, create a database of children with disabilities who could be adopted and ensure support for families willing to adopt or foster them, and fully recognize family associations during the complete process of the foster care project.

420. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme referred to reforms to the draft law on the crime of torture, the establishment of a national human rights commission, the repeal of the status of illegal migrants from the list of aggravating circumstances, and the establishment of the national office against racial discrimination. It commended Italy for its efforts in Operation Mare Nostrum and requested that countries of origin, transit and destination be involved in the management of migratory flows. It remained concerned, however, about discrimination against migrants and minorities, such as Roma, Sinti and Camminanti. It called upon Italy to earmark sufficient resources to the national office against racial discrimination and the national human rights commission, and to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

421. The World Evangelical Alliance referred to the renewal of the commitment of Italy to counter all forms of religious discrimination. However, it regretted that some religious minorities faced restrictions and discrimination. In Lombardy, a regional law on territorial planning imposed disproportionately burdensome measures for the construction of places of worship for non-Catholic communities. Existing places of worship were also submitted to requirements that made most of them de facto illegal in that region. Those provisions had been used by local authorities to target minority groups, in particular Muslim communities and Evangelical churches attended by migrants. It hoped that, in the process of implementing its universal periodic review commitments, Italy would take adequate measures to remedy the situation.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

422. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 186 recommendations received, Italy had supported 176 recommendations and noted 10.

423. In conclusion, the Ambassador expressed appreciation for all the comments made and indicated that they would be taken into proper consideration by the Italian authorities. He stated that that was a demonstration of a positive effect of the review process on all Member States.

424. The Minister stated that Italy would undergo the midterm review of the implementation of the recommendations it had accepted and noted in its second review. In doing so, Italy would continue close consultation, as in past years, with civil society and non-governmental organizations with regard to the issues raised in the universal periodic review and beyond.

El Salvador

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

(a) The national report submitted by El Salvador in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/SLV/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/SLV/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/SLV/3).

426. At its 37th meeting, on 18 March 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of El Salvador (see sect. C below).

427. The outcome of the review of El Salvador comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/28/5), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/28/5/Add.1).

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

428. The delegation stated that the Government had participated in its second review with openness because it recognized the importance of the review as a mechanism of dialogue among peers regarding the challenges to be overcome in order to guarantee the full enjoyment of human rights.

429. Many of the 159 recommendations received by El Salvador had called upon the State to continue the efforts or actions it was already taking in various areas, particularly the protection of vulnerable groups and the development of a social agenda that El Salvador was already implementing as part of a commitment of the Administration to its population.

430. During its review, the delegation, with the valuable support of the troika members, had preliminarily examined the recommendations received and was in a position to accept 97 of them. Many of those recommendations had already been implemented or were in the process of being implemented at the time of the review.

431. The remaining 62 recommendations had gone through a process of internal consultation among various government institutions. As a result, El Salvador had submitted an explanatory addendum with details on the State's position on each remaining recommendation. Regarding recommendations 105.59 and 105.60 on freeing women and girls from incarceration for having had an abortion or miscarriage, which had not been explicitly mentioned in the addendum, the delegation clarified that the Government had

noted them in the same way as those recommendations mentioned in paragraph 20 of said document.

432. In the addendum, the Government committed to continue to promote a national discussion on the signing and ratification of international instruments, subject to the procedure established in the Constitution.

433. Further, El Salvador pledged to continue to work on reducing inequalities and disparities, especially among vulnerable groups. The Government had already developed strategies to promote policies of inclusion and equal opportunities, including the law on development and social protection, which had established a national system for development, protection and social inclusion that would be a means to implement many of the recommendations received.

434. The delegation acknowledged the value of the recommendations and the cooperative spirit in which each State had made them. It also referred to the importance of the participation of Salvadoran civil society and of the office of the human rights advocate in the review, and added that they played an important role in the promotion and advancement of human rights in El Salvador.

435. For El Salvador, the rule of law and human rights were its main priority.

436. The implementation of many of the recommendations would be challenging and would require dialogue, consensus building and agreements between different sectors and actors. That was possible in El Salvador because, during the past five years, the Administration had established the foundations of a new form of Government that was more democratic, inclusive, participatory and transparent, which would ensure full respect for human rights.

437. That was reflected in the five-year development plan for 2014–2019, which, after extensive public consultation, would guide the process to build a more productive, educated and safer El Salvador that should offer better living opportunities to its population.

438. The delegation offered to report periodically on the implementation of the recommendations received and stated that the report of the Working Group would also become an important guide for the State's actions in the next four years.

439. The delegation concluded by stating that El Salvador faced challenges, such as the situation of migrant boys and girls, that required additional joint efforts and appealed to the international community for its support and solidarity. That was why the delegation had delivered before the Human Rights Council a joint statement on unaccompanied migrant boys and girls and human rights, which had been supported by 27 countries. The delegation referred to the need to continue the dialogue on that issue until the Human Rights Council adopted a resolution with the support of all Member States.

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

440. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of El Salvador, 11 delegations made statements.

441. Cuba thanked El Salvador for having accepted the two recommendations it had made, which were on improving the standard of living of the population, the rights of children and women, and the right to health care for the entire population. It congratulated the Government on the progress it had made in human rights and highlighted the progress it had made in the area of health, which had enabled the expansion of primary care coverage. The results of the review confirmed the commitment of the Government of El Salvador to the universal periodic review.

442. Ecuador acknowledged the commitment of El Salvador to the universal periodic review as a mechanism that promoted the protection of human rights at the national and international levels. It welcomed the efforts of the State to share during the review its good practices and challenges in protecting vulnerable groups. It highlighted the fact that many delegations had praised the initiatives of El Salvador to promote social inclusion and the participation of the population in different areas relating to its welfare.

443. Kuwait commended El Salvador for its efforts to implement the recommendations made during the review and for the tangible progress it had made since its first review. It praised the State's commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights, which were a cornerstone of its national plans and public policy. Kuwait valued the endeavours of the Government to achieve key structural reforms and to work on developing and improving the living standards of different categories of society. It also acknowledged the reform of the national health system, which was aimed at providing comprehensive primary health care through direct cooperation with community organizations.

444. Nicaragua congratulated El Salvador on having accepted most of the recommendations made and its commitment to continue to work on the promotion and protection of human rights. Nicaragua highlighted the State's achievements in realizing the rights of persons with disabilities, combating violence against women and restoring human rights of indigenous peoples. It encouraged El Salvador to continue to play a leadership role as a member of the Human Rights Council with regard to issues relevant to the countries of Central America, such as the protection and promotion of the rights of unaccompanied migrant children.

445. The Philippines was pleased that El Salvador had accepted its recommendation on the implementation of anti-trafficking laws and programmes. It expressed support for the efforts of El Salvador to harmonize domestic laws with international human rights standards and noted the work it had done to improve public awareness about the dangers of the cross-border migration of unaccompanied minors. It was confident that El Salvador would work with its partners to address the root causes of that migration, and find effective solutions more accessible to victims of trafficking. The fight against poverty and social exclusion remained priorities. The engagement of the international community would facilitate the efforts of El Salvador to meet its international human rights obligations and implement the recommendations.

446. Sierra Leone commended El Salvador for its commitment to promoting human rights and for its cooperation and participation during its review. It was pleased that several of its recommendations had enjoyed the support of El Salvador. Sierra Leone commended El Salvador for its efforts to implement measures and policies that would further promote the rights of children, and consequently, integrate the related recommendations and proposals into national instruments.

447. Sri Lanka pointed out that its recommendations had enjoyed the support of El Salvador and it encouraged the State to continue its ongoing efforts to strengthen institutional and legislative measures to guarantee the rights of vulnerable groups, including indigenous peoples. It commended the Government for the importance it placed on protecting the rights of migrant workers of El Salvador. The establishment of the National Council for Citizen Security and Coexistence to ensure public security and peaceful coexistence was a praiseworthy initiative.

448. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela recognized the great importance El Salvador placed on complying with the recommendations it had accepted. The review showed the efforts and achievements of the Government with regard to the enjoyment of human rights of the population of El Salvador. It referred to the successful continuation of the programme of communities with solidarity to provide the neediest families with comprehensive care, and the anticipated achievement of the Millennium Development Goal on reducing maternal mortality. The transparent participation of El Salvador in the review process was a positive development that showed the commitment of the Government to the full realization of the fundamental rights of its people.

449. The Plurinational State of Bolivia congratulated El Salvador on its achievements in the area of human rights. It stressed that the second review showed the effort made and progress achieved by El Salvador, particularly in protecting and promoting the rights of children, women, indigenous peoples, older persons and persons with disabilities. The State's acceptance of the recommendations were a sign of its commitment to its people and to the progressive development of human rights.

450. China was pleased that El Salvador had played an active and constructive role in its second review, having accepted most of the recommendations. In particular, El Salvador

had firmly pledged to continue to promote policies to protect and support women, to strive to eliminate violence against women and children, to ensure that all children, whether from urban or rural areas, enjoyed equal opportunities to education, and to pursue a poverty alleviation strategy.

451. Côte d'Ivoire welcomed the interest of El Salvador in the recommendations it had received and its support for those it had accepted. It was convinced that the implementation of those recommendations would effectively contribute to the strengthening of measures to achieve the full enjoyment of human rights. Côte d'Ivoire encouraged the Government to guarantee the rule of law and the enjoyment of civil and political rights of all citizens. It also encouraged El Salvador to consolidate its efforts relating to social development, the strengthening of public safety, and the protection of children, older persons and vulnerable categories of people. It requested El Salvador to continue its cooperation with the international community.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

452. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of El Salvador, eight other stakeholders made statements.

453. The Office of the Human Rights Advocate acknowledged the importance of the role played by the universal periodic review in monitoring the human rights situation in all States Members of the United Nations and, in the present case, helping to highlight the challenges and violations that occurred in El Salvador. The Office had contributed its own report for the review. El Salvador had received 159 recommendations that showed concern about the many severe human rights problems impacting the country. Sixty-two of those recommendations were the subject of internal consultations. The Office recommended that the Government accept all the recommendations it had received, particularly those aimed at solving the biggest human rights challenges faced by El Salvador, and urged the Government to strictly comply with its human rights obligations.

454. Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco and the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES drew attention to the situation of the rights of children and young persons living or working on the street. Thus, they welcomed the acceptance by El Salvador of recommendations 103.23 and 103.24 on the prevention of violence against children and recommendation 103.31 on adopting a policy to prevent children from living on the street, and underlined the importance of their rapid and effective implementation. They acknowledged that, in the past four years, the Government had offered basic protection of that vulnerable group through the institute for children and adolescents but noted that it was available only in the capital and during the day. They regretted the lack of comprehensive and multidisciplinary studies on the above-mentioned phenomenon and recommended that the Government ensure that there was data collection and the exchange of information at the national level on children working or living on the street. Lastly, they expressed concern about the situation of those young persons living or working in the street who, when they became adults, would no longer receive assistance from any institution.

455. The Center for Reproductive Rights referred to the law that criminalized abortion without exception and stated that El Salvador had one of the world's most extreme abortion bans. It referred to 17 women who had been sentenced to up to 40 years in prison for their pregnancies having ended due to natural causes, and the pardon of "Guadalupe", a rape survivor who had been imprisoned for homicide after a pregnancy-related complication. The Center also noted that six United Nations human rights experts had urged El Salvador to pardon all women jailed for pregnancy complications and to repeal the law on abortion. It added that 15 women were still wrongfully in prison. It requested the Government to amend the laws imposing a total ban on abortion, prevent women seeking emergency obstetric care from being reported to the authorities, stop the prosecution of women on charges of abortion until the legislation was amended, ensure that judicial investigations and prosecutions adhered to the tenets of due process and release the 15 women wrongfully imprisoned.

456. International Educational Development stated that the Government had taken office shortly before the review, and thus many of the documents did not reflect the current situation. It welcomed the new status of indigenous peoples and the establishment of sign language as an official language. In spite of progress in the ratification and implementation of human rights instruments, El Salvador had significant problems relating to the marginalization of civil society and the power of gangs. In that regard, such threats to young people had resulted in the flight of unaccompanied young persons to the United States of America, where many were detained in camps. Resolving that problem would require the concerted efforts of the Governments concerned and UNHCR.

457. Amnesty International stated that El Salvador had one of the world's most draconian abortion laws, which criminalized abortion on all grounds. It referred to the case of "Guadalupe", who had been sentenced to 30 years in prison for aggravated homicide after having suffered a miscarriage when she was 18 years old, and whose pregnancy had resulted from a rape. It welcomed her release and urged authorities to review the sentences of all women imprisoned for pregnancy-related complications. Amnesty International referred to 14 review recommendations on sexual and reproductive rights, and welcomed the acceptance by El Salvador of two recommendations on access to sexual and reproductive health services. It expressed disappointment that the Government had noted 10 recommendations on decriminalizing abortion and removing the ban on it. It also acknowledged that the delegation had orally noted two recommendations on releasing all women imprisoned for having undergone an abortion or having suffered a miscarriage, and urged the Government to set those women free.

458. Action Canada for Population and Development welcomed the acceptance by El Salvador of recommendation 103.9 on the protection of women who were victims of discrimination and violence based on sexual orientation or gender condition. It urged the Government to cooperate with local non-governmental organizations in its implementation. It also welcomed the State's willingness to take action on recommendations 105.32 to 105.36 on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons, and urged the Government to adopt a gender identity law allowing transgender persons to change their identity documents. Action Canada for Population and Development welcomed the acceptance by the Government of recommendations 105.61 and 105.62 on sexual and reproductive health services but was disappointed that it had not accepted recommendations 105.49 to 105.58 on abortion law reform. El Salvador had not provided written responses for recommendations 105.59 and 105.60 on releasing all women and girls who were in prison for having had an abortion or a miscarriage and urged it to immediately release all such women and girls.

459. Centre Europe-Tiers Monde – Europe-Third World Centre welcomed recommendation 103.39 on the human right to water and urged the Government to recognize that right before 30 April 2015 through amendments to article 69 of the Constitution. It acknowledged the positive role played by the Government, by not granting mining permits, to prevent environmental degradation and water pollution. It referred to the case of the Australian company OceanaGold, which, by contesting the sovereign decision of the Government through international arbitration tribunals such as the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes, had insisted on initiating a mining project that would adversely impact the population and water sources. It encouraged the Government to keep strong in its opposition to such projects. It concluded by requesting the Government to continue to guarantee the safety of human rights defenders and local people and to investigate crimes against environmentalists.

460. The International Lesbian and Gay Association was pleased that the Government had made some progress in the area of the social inclusion of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons and had made statements on eradicating exclusion, discrimination and violence based on non-heterosexual orientation or transsexual gender identity. However, the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex population remained the victims of hate crimes. In March 2015 four trans women had been killed, and allegations, statistics and reports showed that violence towards and the exclusion of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons continued to grow. The International Lesbian and Gay Association hoped that the Legislative Assembly would adopt the law on

identity, criminalize hate crimes in the criminal procedure and penal codes, and define policies to eradicate exclusion on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity. The Association thanked those delegations that had made recommendations on the human rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons and added that it hoped that the Government would go beyond the mere acceptance of those recommendations and implement them fully.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

461. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 159 recommendations received, El Salvador had supported 117 recommendations and noted 42.

462. The delegation of El Salvador reiterated its appreciation to the States that had expressed their support, which reinforced the commitment of El Salvador to the effective implementation of the recommendations. That support was an additional incentive that contributed to the greater observance of human rights in El Salvador.

463. The Government had a constructive attitude towards all the recommendations it had received and would inform the Human Rights Council on the progress made and the difficulties encountered in implementing them.

464. In conclusion, the delegation stated that, as a member of the Human Rights Council, it was committed to making every effort to ensure the promotion and protection of human rights in El Salvador.

Gambia

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

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

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

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

466. At its 54th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the Gambia (see sect. C below).

467. The outcome of the review of the Gambia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/28/6), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/28/6/Add.1).

468. On 26 March 2015, the Vice-President stated that the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Gambia had been initially scheduled to take place on 18 March. He explained that the adoption could take place only if the State had indicated a clear position on all the recommendations made during its review and indicated that, on 18 March, no position on the recommendations had been communicated by the Gambia. The Vice-President added that contact had been maintained with the Gambia to ensure that such a position was communicated during the current session of the Human Rights Council and the authorities had been made aware of the importance of adhering to the established calendar for the adoption of outcomes of reviews at the corresponding sessions of the Council.

469. The Vice-President stated that, on 18 March 2015, the Human Rights Council had agreed to postpone to 26 March the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Gambia to give the authorities additional time to submit the State's position on all the recommendations made during its review. He indicated that, on 24 March, the Gambia had

eventually provided its position and views on the recommendations in writing, which could be found in the addendum to the report of the Working Group, and in an additional informal document. Lastly, the Vice-President stated that the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Gambia would take place without the participation of a representative of the State and on the basis of the information provided in writing.

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

470. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Gambia, 12 delegations made statements.

471. Kuwait commended the Gambia for the progress it had made in strengthening and protecting human rights. It welcomed the efforts made to promote human rights in many areas, particularly in education and health, for the welfare of the people. Kuwait also commended the Gambia for its efforts to establish a national human rights institution in conformity with international standards.

472. Libya appreciated the openness of the Gambia during its review and its acceptance of most of the recommendations, which confirmed the commitment of the Gambia to strengthen human rights in the country.

473. Sierra Leone commended the Gambia for its efforts to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms. Noting with concern that none of the recommendations made during its review had enjoyed the support of the Gambia, Sierra Leone urged the Government to adopt the recommendations with a view to incorporating them into national legislation. It also encouraged the Gambia to modify its legislation by raising the legal age of marriage to 18 years in order to offer girls better protection from harmful practices, including child marriage.

474. Togo referred to the recommendations accepted by the Gambia and encouraged it to continue its efforts relating to the welfare of the people. It invited the international community to lend its support to the Gambia in the implementation of the recommendations accepted.

475. While recognizing the steps the Gambia had taken to implement some of the recommendations on the rights of women and children from the previous review, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland called upon the Government of the Gambia to implement all the recommendations from the first and second reviews. Regretting that the authorities had not adhered to their own written agreement to allow unhindered access of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions during their visits to the country, it called upon the Government to engage cooperatively with both mandate holders and to ensure that there would be no reprisals against individuals who cooperated with them. It also strongly urged the Gambia to strive towards non-discrimination towards all and to set aside the “aggravated homosexuality” bill of 2014. Finally, it was concerned about the unlawful detention of individuals following the events of 30 December 2014 and held the Government to its commitment that any of those suspected of involvement in the coup d’état would receive a fair trial.

476. The United States of America was deeply concerned by the human rights situation in the Gambia and supported the recommendations on investigating torture allegations and on protecting freedom of expression. It urged the Government to give access to and cooperate with the special procedures. It also referred to reports stating that the Government of the Gambia had held in incommunicado detention individuals whom it believed had been involved in or had information about the attempted coup d’état. Noting that the authorities had also targeted individuals because of their perceived sexual orientation or gender identity and had enacted legislation for the so-called crime of “aggravated homosexuality”, it called upon the Government to defend and protect the human rights of all Gambians, regardless of their sexual orientation or gender identity. Lastly, it reiterated its call for the Gambia to investigate reported and alleged forced disappearances, including the

disappearance of American citizens Alhaji Ceesay and Ebrima Jobe and the disappearance of Gambian journalist Ebrima Manneh.

477. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela pointed out that, under the education-for-all initiatives, the Gambia was among the first countries in Africa to achieve the Millennium Development Goals on universal primary education and gender equality. It was pleased with the progress made by the Gambia in implementing the recommendations accepted during its first review, and appreciated its will to achieve that objective.

478. Botswana commended the Gambia for its efforts to raise awareness about the dangers of child sexual abuse and exploitation and to increase public awareness campaigns to educate people on the effects of female genital mutilation. It encouraged the Gambia to continue to address the issues of child marriage, maternal and infant mortality, human trafficking, and the enjoyment of civil and political rights. Botswana noted with appreciation the measures the Gambia had taken to reduce poverty, including such policies and strategies as Vision 2020 and the Programme for Accelerated Growth and Employment.

479. China appreciated the acceptance by the Gambia of a large number of recommendations, and its commitment to realizing and promoting the economic, social and cultural rights, including rights to development, of its people. China hoped that the Gambia would continue to develop its economy, increase employment, reduce poverty and improve people's living standards. It stated that, as a developing country, the Gambia faced many challenges in promoting social and economic development and in protecting human rights. China hoped that the international community would provide the Gambia with constructive assistance, while respecting its will, including by providing it with support in its engagement with the universal periodic review.

480. Cuba reiterated that it was pleased that the Gambia had taken important steps in the field of human rights. It highlighted in particular the educational reforms that had been initiated. Furthermore, the Gambia had strengthened the rights of persons with disabilities, the conditions of detention and the fight against human trafficking. Cuba urged the international community to strengthen its cooperation with and financial assistance to the Gambia on issues chosen by the country.

481. Ghana welcomed the steps taken by the Gambia to ensure the enjoyment of basic human rights by its people and the efforts it had made to ensure increased enrolment in schools and the development of early childhood education centres. It encouraged the Gambia to channel the same efforts into the fight against female genital mutilation and to take all the measures necessary, including through legislation, to reduce the rather high incidence of the practice in the country. Ghana called upon the international community to assist the Gambia in sensitizing its people against the ills of female genital mutilation and to provide it with the technical assistance necessary in that regard. Ghana also encouraged the Gambia to consider favourably the recommendations on ratifying the human rights instruments to which it was not a party and the recommendations that would improve the lives of the people.

482. The Sudan was pleased that the Gambia had accepted most of the recommendations and thanked it for its acceptance of the two recommendations made by the Sudan. It also wished the Government and the people of the Gambia every success in their efforts to implement the recommendations accepted.

2. General comments made by other stakeholders

483. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Gambia, four other stakeholders made statements.

484. Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship and the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues welcomed the recommendations made by States on the protection of human rights defenders, the improvement of the human rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons, the abolishment of the death penalty, the decriminalization of defamation and the need to review the Criminal Code with regard to false information. They called upon the Gambia to put an end to the persecution of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons, pointing out recent incidents, when dozens

of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons were detained and subjected to torture. Article 19 and the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues urged the Gambia to facilitate visits by the special procedures and to allow them unimpeded access to the country. They noted with regret the lack of progress in the area of human rights and called upon Member States to set up a mechanism for monitoring the human rights situation in the Gambia.

485. Amnesty International referred to the further deterioration of the human rights situation in the Gambia. Pointing out that, after the failed alleged coup in December 2014, at least 30 persons had been held in incommunicado detention without charge, it called upon the Government to comply with the resolution of the African Commission to invite a fact-finding mission to the country. Recalling that several States had urged the Gambia to facilitate visits requested by the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, Amnesty International stated that, during its latest visit to the Gambia, in November 2014, the Government had denied it unrestricted access to prisons. Based on frequent reports of torture against human rights defenders, journalists and political opponents, it urged the Gambia to investigate all complaints relating to torture and ill-treatment and expressed its disappointment that authorities had not accepted the recommendations on ratifying the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. It also expressed its concern that the Gambia had accepted recommendations on guaranteeing freedom of expression only subject to its restrictive laws. Prior to the State's review, it had expressed concern about the risk of reprisals against Gambian citizens seeking to engage with the review. Noting that, during the visit by the special rapporteurs, many individuals interviewed by them had expressed fear of reprisal, Amnesty International urged the Human Rights Council to follow that situation closely so that Gambians could safely engage with United Nations human rights mechanisms without fear of reprisal. It noted with regret that even harsher sentences had been introduced for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons despite numerous recommendations on decriminalizing same-sex relations. Lastly, it exhorted the Council to pay more sustained attention to the situation in the Gambia due to the large scale of human rights violations there.

486. CIVICUS – The World Alliance for Citizen Participation commended the Gambia for having accepted the recommendations on protecting and promoting freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly. However, it was disappointed that the Government had rejected the recommendations on amending the legislation to remove restrictions on freedom of expression, which had a major impact on human rights defenders and journalists. It was also concerned about the ongoing persecution and detention of civil society activists and dissenters, the violations and restrictions on civil liberties, the intimidation of journalists and the regular suspension of media outlets. CIVICUS reiterated its calls for the Gambia to take measures to guarantee the full respect of freedom of expression and the press. It also called upon the Government to abolish all legislative provisions restricting the freedom of expression and to create an enabling environment to strengthen the work of human rights defenders, journalists and civil society representatives. Lastly, CIVICUS called upon the Gambia to extend a standing invitation to all special procedures, to improve cooperation with OHCHR and to fully implement the recommendations it had accepted.

487. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme welcomed the efforts made by the Gambia in the field of education and in the fight against illiteracy. Those efforts had allowed the Gambia to be among the African States that had achieved the Millennium Development Goals on education. It regretted, however, that the majority of the recommendations from the first review had not been implemented. The situation of human rights had deteriorated dramatically in recent years because of the assassination attempts, intimidation and harassment exercised by the intelligence services and security forces against opponents, trade unions, journalists and human rights defenders. Moreover, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme was concerned about the fate of those accused of taking part in the attempted coup against the President of the Gambia in December 2014. The alleged perpetrators had been tortured by the presidential guards and their fate was unknown; the Gambia had reinstated the death penalty in 2012. Given the

gravity of the situation in the Gambia, it requested the transfer of the headquarters of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights from Banjul to a State in Africa that respected human rights. Lastly, it invited the Gambia to fight human trafficking and sex tourism, and to cooperate with the special procedures.

3. Concluding remarks of the State under review

488. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided by the authorities of the Gambia in the addendum to its report, out of 171 recommendations received, the Gambia had supported 93 recommendations and noted 78.

Plurinational State of Bolivia

489. The review of the Plurinational State of Bolivia was held on 28 October 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by the Plurinational State of Bolivia in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/BOL/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/BOL/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/BOL/3).

490. At its 38th meeting, on 18 March 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the Plurinational State of Bolivia (see sect. C below).

491. The outcome of the review of the Plurinational State of Bolivia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/28/7), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/28/7/Add.1).

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

492. In her introductory remarks, the Permanent Representative of the Plurinational State of Bolivia pointed out that the State had submitted its national report, which had been prepared in consultation with civil society organizations. It had included information on the progress made and the challenges faced in the promotion and protection of human rights. The Government was firmly committed to meeting all its international human rights obligations.

493. During its review, the Plurinational State of Bolivia had supported 178 recommendations and noted 15 recommendations, which had not been updated and did not reflect the real situation in the country.

494. The Plurinational State of Bolivia had already begun holding interministerial meetings to share the report of the Working Group and to promote the incorporation of the recommendations it had supported into annual operative programmes, in accordance with the different mandates of the ministries. It would also hold meetings with other branches of the State with the same objective. Furthermore, it was working on an institutional process for the implementation of the recommendations and the preparation of progress reports.

495. The Plurinational State of Bolivia provided information on the progress it had made relating to the recommendations that were already in the process of implementation, including in such areas as the political participation of women, social protection policies, the right to housing, citizens' security, additional measures to combat violence against women, the participation of indigenous peoples in decision-making and the administration of justice.

496. The general elections held in October 2014, which had resulted in the re-election of the President with more than 61 per cent of the vote, would allow for the consolidation of the democratic and cultural revolution, which was aimed at achieving “*vivir bien*” (“good living”) for all people. One of the most important gains had also been the increase in the political participation of women in the new Legislative Assembly.

497. During the previous year, the coverage of the conditioned transfer programmes benefiting vulnerable sectors of the population had been extended to include students in the sixth grade of secondary-level education, and an additional bonus was paid to older persons. A new incentive to recognize excellence among secondary students had also been created. Furthermore, the State continued to make progress in the implementation of the programme to provide students with laptops.

498. In order to strengthen the participation of indigenous peoples in decision-making, an international parliamentary meeting had been held in 2014 in view of the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples.

499. The Plurinational State of Bolivia continued to work to improve access to justice and to ensure concrete changes, and a national judicial meeting would be held that year.

500. The human rights public policy and the human rights action plan for 2015–2020 had been approved by the national human rights council, and were currently ongoing. The action plan incorporated all the recommendations received from the treaty bodies of the international instruments ratified by the State and the recommendations made during its universal periodic review.

501. The Children and Adolescents Code approved in 2014 was being implemented to guarantee children their full and effective enjoyment of human rights and for their development, keeping the best interest of the child as a guiding principle.

502. Regarding the right to health, the Plurinational State of Bolivia was continuing to implement the national strategic plan on sexual and reproductive health for 2009–2015.

503. In November 2014, the Family Code and the Family Procedure were promulgated. The social rights of families were strengthened with due respect for diversity.

504. The implementation of the law to address overcrowding in prisons and the effectiveness of the penal procedure system that had been adopted in 2014 was also initiated. The law was aimed at expediting cases, and it established new options to end preventive detention.

505. The inter-institutional commissions continued their work to input updated data for the human rights indicators developed by the national statistics institute, such as on the right to work, on the right to have access to justice, food, health care, drinking water, education and housing, on violence against women and on trafficking.

506. The Plurinational State of Bolivia was fully committed to human rights, as recognized in its Constitution and the fact that it was a party to international human rights conventions, which were being implemented with the full participation of civil society.

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

507. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, 17 delegations made statements.

508. The Philippines welcomed the State’s laws, policies and programmes addressing discrimination and violence, particularly against women and children. It recognized the State’s leadership in the development of international human rights norms pertaining to the rights of peasants and the protection of indigenous peoples and communities. It hoped that the Plurinational State of Bolivia would continue to improve its protection mechanisms for migrants and consider establishing return programmes for migrants as a way to bridge social protection policy gaps.

509. The Russian Federation pointed out that the Plurinational State of Bolivia had supported most of the recommendations, which showed its commitment to the promotion

and protection of human rights and its readiness to cooperate further with international mechanisms. It emphasized the fact that progress had been made in the field of human rights protection, particularly in the areas of social and economic rights.

510. Sierra Leone pointed out that all of its recommendations had been supported. It applauded the efforts of the State to address various gender-related issues and encouraged it also to tackle violence against and the sexual abuse of girls.

511. Sri Lanka was pleased that its recommendations had been supported. It commended the State for its efforts to promote and protect socioeconomic rights, especially in the areas of health, education, agriculture and gender equality. It referred to the increased budget allocations for health and the intersectoral and intercultural approach based on universality, equality and access to services. It recognized the measures taken to exchange and use indigenous knowledge and to strengthen that group's capacity.

512. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela commended the Plurinational State of Bolivia for its achievements, particularly in the area of economic, social and cultural rights, and encouraged it to continue to consolidate its social protection system. It was pleased that the State had achieved the Millennium Development Goal on eradicating extreme poverty.

513. Algeria commended the State for having supported most of the recommendations. It welcomed its ongoing efforts in the framework of its plurinational plan for newborns, children and teenagers for 2014 to 2025 and in fighting extreme poverty.

514. China noted that the Plurinational State of Bolivia had supported most of the recommendations, including its recommendations on protecting the environment while achieving harmonious development between humans and nature, and on continuing the comprehensive promotion of economic and social development while prioritizing poverty eradication and further improving living standards.

515. Cuba was pleased that the Plurinational State of Bolivia had accepted its two recommendations. The State had indicated that it had already implemented those recommendations or was in the process of implementing them. Cuba would continue to support the State's efforts to achieve the well-being of the people.

516. Ecuador commended the Plurinational State of Bolivia for the progress it had made and for its commitment to addressing challenges. It was pleased that the State had given visibility to efforts, achievements and challenges relating to the rights of women and their participation in different settings. It commended the State for its commitment to fighting poverty and discrimination.

517. El Salvador highlighted the progress made by the Plurinational State of Bolivia in the promotion and protection of human rights with a social, inclusive and participative vision. It commended the State for the progress it had made with regard to children, women and indigenous peoples. It encouraged the State to continue its cooperation with the special procedures and the Human Rights Council.

518. India pointed out that the Plurinational State of Bolivia had supported 178 out of 193 recommendations. It was pleased that the State had supported its two recommendations on continuing to improve access to justice and on continuing to pay attention to issues relating to women and children. India trusted that, in the coming years, the State would further intensify its efforts to implement the recommendations it had supported.

519. The Islamic Republic of Iran acknowledged that its recommendations had been supported. It praised the efforts made by the Plurinational State of Bolivia in reducing extreme poverty, as well as the launch of the plan on human rights education, the decision to launch a national day against all forms of discrimination, and the formulation of an action plan to eliminate racism and discriminatory practices.

520. Ireland was pleased that its two recommendations had been accepted. It enquired about the progress made in implementing the recommendations accepted and encouraged the Plurinational State of Bolivia to submit a voluntary midterm report. It regretted that the State had not accepted recommendations on the judicial process despite a profound crisis in the administration of justice. Ireland urged the State to ensure that all killings be subject to

impartial investigation and to strengthen and ensure the rule of law. It also urged the State not to tolerate impunity.

521. Kuwait appreciated the efforts made by the Plurinational State of Bolivia to implement the recommendations and commended the State for its efforts to improve education and health and for having adopted an economic and social production model aimed at reducing extreme poverty. It valued the State's efforts to address the challenges that hampered the achievement of the welfare of people and the establishment of a social democratic State governed by the rule of law, while looking forward to ensuring the protection of human rights through the adoption of national plans that guaranteed a life with dignity and productivity.

522. Malaysia commended the Plurinational State of Bolivia for its continuous efforts and the progress made in promoting and protecting the human rights of its citizens, including in poverty eradication, labour and employment policies, children and women's rights, and education. It was pleased that its recommendations on eradicating extreme poverty and on providing funds to support the programme on supplying drinking water had been accepted.

523. Nicaragua welcomed the report of the Plurinational State of Bolivia on the work it had already initiated to follow up on the recommendations from its second review. It commended the State for having supported most of the recommendations it had received, and encouraged it to continue its efforts in the areas of health, education, environment and the protection of children. It encouraged the State to continue its leadership in the Human Rights Council in addressing the promotion and protection of the rights of peasants and indigenous peoples.

524. Pakistan acknowledged the efforts made by the Plurinational State of Bolivia to improve socioeconomic development in the country. It was pleased that the State had supported most of the recommendations, including those made by Pakistan.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

525. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, 11 other stakeholders made statements.

526. The International Lesbian and Gay Association pointed out that, since 2009, the Plurinational State of Bolivia had spoken about non-discrimination in the Constitution. There had also been a promulgation of laws and decrees in that regard. It was pleased that the State had supported most of the recommendations and had indicated that civil society would monitor their implementation. It regretted that the State had not supported the recommendation on the derogation of legislation that limited the rights of persons on the grounds of sexual identity. It urged the Government to adopt provisions that would guarantee the same rights for all members of society.

527. The Indian Council of South America referred to recommendation 113.46 on ensuring that legislation on consultation with indigenous groups was well formed, that it took into account the concerns of indigenous peoples and that it was implemented effectively. It was concerned about the voices critical of the National Council of Ayllus and Markas of Qullasuyu (CONAMAQ) and the Confederation of Indigenous Peoples of Bolivia being silenced.

528. The Colombian Association of Jurists referred to the recommendations on judicial independence that the Plurinational State of Bolivia had supported. It was concerned, however, about the disciplinary and criminal proceedings brought by the Legislative Assembly against three judges in 2014. Noting that the State had announced reforms of the judicial system in 2015, it asked when the State would consider transferring responsibility for discipline to a new independent body with guarantees of fairness and defined grounds for removal. It also asked how it would ensure that reforms on the role and independence of the judiciary were consistent with universal and regional standards.

529. Franciscans International was pleased that the Plurinational State of Bolivia had supported most of the recommendations, but it felt the need to stress that work in some areas needed to be strengthened, such as in the area of violence against women and the

restructuring of the judicial system so that it guaranteed the right to due process. It highlighted the importance of the participation of and consultation with indigenous peoples.

530. Human Rights Watch continued to be concerned about the law governing the operation of civil society organizations, which prevented human rights defenders from working independently. The Plurinational State of Bolivia had supported a number of recommendations on the judiciary, and Human Rights Watch hoped that judicial reform would strengthen the independence of the judiciary in the country. There was a need, however, to ensure that crimes that constituted gross human rights violations were not judged in military courts. It regretted that the State had not supported recommendations on the eradication of child labour. It believed that there was a need for the State to show a stronger commitment to implementing the recommendations it had supported.

531. Amnesty International called upon the Plurinational State of Bolivia to implement the recommendations it had supported, particularly those considered to be already implemented or in the process of being implemented, as many of them were relating to issues for which more needed to be done. It recalled that the State had supported recommendations on ending impunity and strengthening efforts to create an independent truth commission. Noting that the State had not supported all the recommendations on structural problems within the judiciary, namely delays, corruption and a lack of capacity, Amnesty International called upon the State to reconsider its position and to implement all the recommendations on the strengthening of the judiciary.

532. Action Canada for Population and Development was pleased that the Plurinational State of Bolivia had supported recommendations on sexual and reproductive rights. It applauded its acceptance of recommendation 113.31 on the revision of laws criminalizing women and girls for seeking an abortion and doctors who practised it. It recommended that the State revise its Penal Code and create legislation providing unrestricted access to safe, legal and affordable abortion services.

533. Centre Europe-Tiers Monde – Europe-Third World Centre commended the Plurinational State of Bolivia for the progress it had made in addressing economic, social and cultural rights, particularly in the areas of extreme poverty and the right to health, food, water and education. It further recognized the role played by the State at the international level in the promotion of economic, social and cultural rights.

534. United Nations Watch pointed out that the Plurinational State of Bolivia had supported the majority of the recommendations. It was concerned, however, that it may not be fully committed to implementing them and that not enough was being done to eradicate underage employment. Referring to the efforts by the State to eliminate all forms of discrimination and violence against women, it pointed out that there were legal barriers preventing the implementation of laws to protect women. It expressed its support for the recommendations on preventing prison overcrowding and ensuring the protection from sexual abuse of children living in detention with their families.

535. The International Fellowship of Reconciliation stated that an opportunity had been missed during the review to make recommendations on conscientious objectors to military service. It reiterated the concerns that had been expressed by the Human Rights Committee in its concluding observations on the third periodic report of the Plurinational State of Bolivia (CCPR/C/BOL/CO/3) with regard to the lack of an alternative civilian service for conscientious objectors and its recommendation on legislative action in that regard. The International Fellowship of Reconciliation urged the State to remedy the gap in the protection of the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion.

536. The American Association of Jurists was impressed by the fundamental changes in the legislative, social and economic fields. It was pleased that nations and indigenous peoples, native and peasants, had the right to implement their own justice systems. It commended the Plurinational State of Bolivia for the various efforts it had made and encouraged the State to pursue a socioeconomic policy to improve living conditions. It recognized the constructive engagement of the State in the Human Rights Council and with the special procedures, and welcomed the renewal of the collaboration agreement with OHCHR.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

537. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, of the 193 recommendations received, the Plurinational State of Bolivia had supported 178 recommendations and noted 15.

538. The Plurinational State of Bolivia would continue to engage in dialogue with civil society with the aim of improving the promotion and protection of human rights in the country.

539. The delegation thanked the other delegations for the constructive dialogue, and the troika of Benin, Costa Rica and Pakistan and the secretariat for their support during the review.

Fiji

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

(a) The national report submitted by Fiji in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/FJI/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/FJI/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/FJI/3).

541. At its 38th meeting, on 18 March 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Fiji (see sect. C below).

542. The outcome of the review of Fiji comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/28/8), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/28/8/Add.1).

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

543. In October 2014, Fiji had announced its acceptance of 98 of the 138 recommendations made, and that 12 of the 98 recommendations accepted had already been implemented.

544. In the addendum to the report of the Working Group, Fiji had explained its position on the 40 recommendations that were pending, as it was necessary either to consult with the relevant independent institutions or to refer the recommendations to the relevant government agencies for their input and advice.

545. The Constitution of Fiji contained for the first time a comprehensive and progressive Bill of Rights that allowed for the realization of socioeconomic rights, in addition to civil and political rights, as human rights, and recognized and protected indigenous peoples – the iTaukei and the Rotumans – with regard to their unique culture, tradition, customs, language and the customary ownership of their land.

546. Fiji had set itself a time frame of 10 years within which it would endeavour to ratify all the core human rights instruments. The delegation was pleased to announce that, in March 2015, the Parliament of Fiji had approved the ratification of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, with some reservations.

547. The Constitution had established the Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Commission. Its commissioners were to be appointed through the constitutional offices commission. The Government had asked the NGO Coalition on Human Rights in Fiji to

submit names for possible commissioners and had requested the assistance of OHCHR to build capacity within the Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Commission and looked forward to receiving such assistance.

548. The Government had presented a bill to Parliament at its first sitting in 2015 for the removal of all references to the death penalty in the military laws, and the bill had been subsequently approved by Parliament. Thus, Fiji had completely abolished the death penalty from all its laws.

549. Addressing the recommendations on the establishment of a constitutional commission to conduct a review of the Constitution, Fiji reiterated its position that the Constitution was an expression of the will of the Fijian people and the Constitution itself stipulated a process whereby parliamentary approval must be sought for a referendum to take place prior to any amendments being made to the Constitution.

550. Fiji was committed to inviting special procedure mandate holders to the country and would endeavour to invite one mandate holder per year for key areas identified by the Government. The delegation referred to the Prime Minister's address to the high-level segment of the twenty-eighth session of the Human Rights Council, in which he invited to Fiji the Special Rapporteur on the human rights to safe drinking water and sanitation and the Special Rapporteur on the right to education, and stated that Fiji was looking forward to the assistance and benefit that that would bring.

551. Regarding the recommendation on ensuring that the issue of violence against women be considered by the Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Commission, the Bainimarama administration had put in place a legislative framework to address violence against women. It included new legal provisions for the offence of rape and sexual assault, the abolition of the law of corroboration and limited questioning about the complainant's sexual history.

552. The Cabinet had approved the national gender policy in 2014 and the inclusion of gender competence training of the civil service, the police and the judiciary in the State's gender-mainstreaming policy. Following general elections in 2014, Parliament had the highest percentage of women ever and the highest percentage in the Pacific region.

553. The effective implementation of its laws and policies also required that civil society play a strong role in helping to shape attitudinal change. Fiji accepted the fact that, if violence against women were to be dealt with effectively, patriarchy itself must be challenged and dismantled. In that regard, Fiji also encouraged civil society organizations to undergo gender competence and legal training.

554. In March 2015, the Court of Appeal of Fiji had ruled that the statutory requirement for the corroboration of evidence of children was contrary to the equality and anti-discrimination provision in the Constitution. As a result of the judgment, the corroboration section of the Juveniles Act was struck down and declared invalid, thereby showing the readiness and willingness of the judiciary to apply international human rights law domestically, which was enabled through section 7 of the Constitution.

555. The Constitutional Redress Rules were amended in March 2015 by the chief justice, allowing for easier access to the courts by litigants alleging that their rights had been contravened. That was crucial, as the majority of such litigants were marginalized members of society. Those mechanisms, together with consistent and regular human rights and gender training for all judges and magistrates, would rapidly lead to emerging and progressive human rights jurisprudence.

556. Regarding the recommendations on freedom of the media, Fiji reiterated that the Constitution unequivocally recognized freedom of the press as pivotal to freedom of speech, expression, thought, opinion and publication. Fiji recognized its historical past of racism and religious prejudice, a past in which the media had sadly played a pivotal and negative role. Through the Media Industry Development Authority, the State encouraged the media to work on a development model of media freedom. Notwithstanding the criticism of the Media Industry Development Decree, no media organization had been prosecuted for any editorial content, nor had any journalist been prosecuted under that law.

557. The delegation referred to its response to a communication from the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment about the alleged rape and abduction of a woman in which the State had shown that, following a thorough investigation conducted by the police, there had been no grounds on which to initiate a prosecution.

558. Five months earlier, Fiji had facilitated a visit of a direct contacts mission of the International Labour Organization (ILO), which had prepared a constructive report recommending a way forward for Fiji, and that the Government had already begun to implement the recommendations in the report. The Government had already met with stakeholders who were directly impacted by the Essential National Industries (Employment) Decree to discuss issues pertaining to that law. Those stakeholders would formulate any proposed amendments to the Decree for onward transmission to the Cabinet and to Parliament. The Government was also in the process of executing a memorandum of understanding that would include an undertaking to review the Decree, which was a positive step in the further improvement of the labour laws of Fiji.

559. Fiji had implemented a significant number of economic and social reforms, which included free education, free medicine, free water, and electricity at subsidized rates for certain categories of citizens. Furthermore, legislation had been passed to increase the employer's contribution to future pensions from 8 per cent to 10 per cent of gross wages so that 18 per cent of a worker's annual salary would now contribute to the creation of a proper pension fund and social security.

560. In conclusion, the delegation stated that Fiji welcomed genuine assistance and collaboration to improve the human rights of all Fijians and would continue to institute major, practical and sustained reforms.

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

561. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Fiji, nine delegations made statements.

562. Indonesia commended the Government for its successful election in 2014, and pointed out that Indonesia had co-led as a member of the Multinational Observer Group. It hoped that the democratization process in Fiji would further strengthen constitutional reforms, increase active participation and promote long-term stability. Indonesia was pleased that Fiji was ratifying the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and expressed its readiness to support Fiji through the Convention against Torture Initiative. Indonesia commended the Government for renewing its efforts to accelerate the effective implementation of the National Gender Policy according to clear and measurable targets.

563. Kuwait congratulated Fiji on the progress it had made in implementing the recommendations, particularly those on promoting human rights. It welcomed the State's clear commitment to upholding the universal principles and values as set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Those principles and values were also found in the Constitution of 2013, which stressed the need to uphold social and economic rights, along with civil and political rights, and for them to apply equally to all people in the country. Kuwait congratulated Fiji on the organization of its elections and on the fairness of those elections.

564. New Zealand expressed its support for the active engagement of Fiji in the review process and recognized that there had been a number of significant developments since the session of the Working Group. New Zealand welcomed the removal of the death penalty from the Military Code, the bringing of charges against police and military officers relating to the death of a prisoner in police custody, the establishment by the Government of a legal aid commission and its commitment to establishing a constitutional offices commission, which in turn had led to the establishment of the Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Commission. New Zealand was encouraged by the increased ranking of Fiji in the World Press Freedom Index of Reporters without Borders, recent changes in parliamentary scrutiny and debate, and the establishment of standing committees, such as those on public

accounts, economic affairs and natural resources. While welcoming the ratification by Fiji of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, New Zealand urged the State to give due consideration to the impact of reservations on achieving the full realization of the Convention.

565. Sierra Leone noted with satisfaction the acceptance by the Government of Fiji of the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Sierra Leone, and looked forward to their subsequent implementation. It highly valued the cooperation and constructive engagement shown by Fiji in the universal periodic review mechanism and commended the Government for its continued efforts to further protect women and girls from violence.

566. Sri Lanka was pleased to note that the recommendations it had made had enjoyed the support of Fiji. It commended the people of Fiji for the elections held in September 2014 and for having taken steps towards democratic and civilian constitutional rule. It encouraged the new Government to continue to take all the steps required to work with all the parties concerned to consolidate the success achieved through the landmark election. Sri Lanka trusted that the new Government, while identifying the deficiencies and challenges it faced, would take the steps necessary to promote and protect the rights of the people of Fiji. The international community, including the Human Rights Council, should look at ways to provide Fiji with technical assistance and capacity-building, in full cooperation with the Government, while taking into account its specific needs and priorities.

567. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela stated that the Government of Fiji had made a great many efforts to fulfil the commitments it had made to the Working Group and had offered complete and open cooperation. It particularly welcomed the progress made by Fiji in bringing about free access to early childhood education and in, inter alia, primary and secondary education. More than 900 schools had benefited from education subsidies. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela commended the Government for the efforts it had made to fulfil its human rights commitments despite the severe limitations the country experienced, particularly the challenges posed by climate change.

568. China commended Fiji for its constructive participation in the review and for having accepted a large number of recommendations, which showed the State's positive commitment to strengthening international cooperation and the protection and promotion of its people's human rights. China commended Fiji for having accepted the recommendations it had made on continuing to prioritize poverty reduction in its national development strategy and on improving people's well-being. China encouraged Fiji, with the support of the international community, to steadily implement all the recommendations accepted to achieve progress in comprehensive human rights.

569. Cuba was pleased that Fiji had accepted its recommendation on the implementation of its national policy for persons with disabilities. It referred to the praiseworthy work of Fiji to ensure that the needs of that group of the population were met and guaranteed. It reiterated its gratitude to Fiji for the State's commitment to ensuring that education was free at the primary and secondary levels. Cuba once again urged the international community to support the efforts the State was making in the sectors that Fiji had identified as priorities.

570. India congratulated the delegation of Fiji on the successful completion of the State's review and was encouraged to see wide representation in the delegation, which reflected the commitment of Fiji to the review process. India was pleased that the new Constitution of 2013 affirmed the fundamental principles and values set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, eliminated the enforcement of ethnic voting, and included social and economic rights along with civil and political rights. It was encouraged by the fact that Fiji had accepted many of the 138 recommendations, including the two made by India on taking steps to ensure the compliance of the Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Commission with the Paris Principles and the expeditious enactment of the Freedom of Information Bill. India believed that Fiji had gained much from its participation in the review and wished it success in its future endeavours.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

571. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Fiji, four other stakeholders made statements.

572. The Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative congratulated Fiji for having taken initial steps towards a revived democracy by holding elections. Freedom of expression, peaceful assembly and political representation continued to be marred by the draconian decrees and legislation adopted by the previous military regime. While the Government had opened space for public debate and had ended official censorship, journalists continued to face arrest, arbitrary detention and heavy fines under the Media Industry Development Decree, and the Political Parties Decree prohibited union leaders and public officers from forming political parties. It welcomed the State's decision to ratify the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, but, noting its reservations to the Convention and its past irregularities in preventing torture and other abuse against peaceful protesters, it urged the Government to repeal military decrees violating human rights and to facilitate visits by the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and the Special Rapporteur on the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association. Referring to the reported political influence on the appointment, removal and work of judges and lawyers, it stated that the Government should install the checks and balances necessary for the independence of the judiciary and extend an invitation to the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers. According to the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, the Constitution adopted in 2013 did little to address the above-mentioned challenges.

573. Minority Rights Group welcomed the removal of the death penalty from the military code and Parliament's endorsement of the ratification of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. It was concerned, however, that the Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Commission lacked adequate resources, that the chair and members of the Commission had yet to be appointed, that the body tasked to make those appointments under the Constitution had yet to be established and that no time frame was in place to set up those institutions. It was also concerned about the fact that Fiji had not accepted recommendations on legitimizing the Constitution of 2013. It stated that a comprehensive review of the Constitution by an independent body was instrumental in the consolidation of democracy in Fiji, as it would add credibility to the Constitution and ensure that it was representative of the people. Minority Rights Group was concerned about the lack of political will to remove oppressive provisions imposed by decree. The Government had rejected all the recommendations on removing restrictions on the right to freedom of expression, association and assembly from the legislative framework, which was contrary to the recommendations accepted on protecting those rights. Pointing out that Fiji would be a candidate for election to the Human Rights Council in 2016, it called upon the State to take immediate measures to implement the recommendations from the review and to work closely with civil society in that regard.

574. Human Rights Watch stated that the universal periodic review of Fiji had taken place at an important point in the State's history, including because in 2014 it had held its first general elections in eight years. Pointing out that Member States had called for the abolition of decrees restricting freedom of the media, it deeply regretted that Fiji had refused to accept the recommendations in that regard and to acknowledge concerns that the framework restricted the right to freedom of expression and encouraged censorship. Government interference and intimidation continued; for example, in June of the previous year, the Media Industry Development Authority had called for the investigation of two journalism academics because they had commented on the military's use of torture. Pointing out that Fiji had permitted the visit of the ILO direct contacts mission in October 2014 to examine serious allegations of abuses of workers' rights, Human Rights Watch urged Fiji to continue to engage with ILO and the international community, including with global union federations, in order to reach a commitment in that regard. It welcomed the State's commitment to facilitate one visit of special procedures per year and urged the Government to swiftly facilitate the visit of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, and to commit to fully investigating allegations of torture by security forces. Fiji should, without delay, ratify additional core

human rights instruments, such as the International Covenants on Human Rights, and ensure that local laws were aligned with their provisions.

575. Amnesty International welcomed recent actions by the Government, including the repeal of the death penalty for all crimes, thereby becoming the ninety-ninth abolitionist country, the prompt investigation and charging of those responsible for a recent death in custody, and the announcement of its commitment to ratifying the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. It also welcomed the review by the Government of the Essential National Industries (Employment) Decree, which reportedly severely restricted collective bargaining rights, the right to strike and the right to form and join trade unions in certain sectors. It urged the Government to ensure that the Decree be amended to meet international labour standards. While Fiji had made progress in recognizing economic and social rights, Amnesty International regretted that civil and political rights were not yet equally promoted and protected. A number of cases of torture and ill-treatment had not been investigated by the authorities, and freedom of expression remained restricted by a range of national laws, including the Media Industry Development Decree. While welcoming the acceptance by Fiji of many recommendations, in particular the recommendation on issuing a standing invitation to special procedures, it urged the Government to accept requests to visit Fiji by the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers, and to fully cooperate with them. It was disappointed that Fiji had been unable to accept recommendations on amending national legislation to ensure that it guaranteed freedom of expression, assembly and association in line with international human rights law.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

576. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 138 recommendations received, Fiji had supported 112 recommendations and noted 26.

577. The delegation of Fiji thanked the respective States for their input and for their encouragement of the development of a human rights culture in Fiji.

578. The delegation of Fiji also thanked the non-governmental organizations for having acknowledged the advances Fiji had made. Unfortunately, some of the comments made by certain non-governmental organizations were not based on facts, and in recent years, a number of police officers and military officers had been charged, convicted and imprisoned for the abuse or assault of persons in custody.

579. The delegation of Fiji reiterated that, at a stakeholders meeting on the Essential National Industries (Employment) Decree held in March 2015, there had been a general consensus and government recognition that the law needed to be improved.

580. Regarding issues relating to freedom of expression and the development of jurisprudence, the delegation reported that the provisions of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights would prevail where any laws were contrary to their principles and provisions. The Bill of Rights specifically incorporated international human rights law into domestic law.

San Marino

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

(a) The national report submitted by San Marino in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/SMR/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/SMR/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/SMR/3).

582. At its 38th meeting, on 18 March 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of San Marino (see sect. C below).

583. The outcome of the review of San Marino comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/28/9), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/28/9/Add.1).

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

584. San Marino had been seriously committed to the universal periodic review since the first cycle, and its authorities and population were aware of the importance of promoting and protecting the fundamental rights and freedoms of human beings in all circumstances. The Ministry for Foreign Affairs had prepared its national report in close cooperation with all the relevant ministries. After the session of the Working Group, the State had carefully reviewed all the recommendations and had accepted 46 out of 74. For some of them, San Marino had already carried out certain initiatives, while new actions should be launched for others. In that context, since the session of the Working Group, Parliament had adopted a law on providing persons with disabilities with assistance, social inclusion and rights, pursuant to recommendations 78.39 to 78.42. San Marino had also submitted an addendum, wherein it had provided replies to the 17 recommendations that were pending. It had not accepted the recommendations relating to the ratification of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and the European Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitation to Crimes against Humanity and War Crimes. It had not ratified those instruments because of its limited human resources in the public service, which therefore limited the number of new treaty commitments to which San Marino could adhere. Therefore, San Marino would not accept those recommendations as it could not implement them in the following four years; there were no political motives behind the decision not to accept them. San Marino had not accepted the recommendation on introducing reforms to ensure equal protection for same-sex couples because its legal system did not currently afford the same rights to same-sex couples as it did for heterosexual couples. The two recommendations on the decriminalization of defamation had not been accepted because, based on the Criminal Code, the persistence of the crime of defamation did not restrict freedom of expression and effectively contributed to the maintenance of a delicate balance between the right to information and the right to privacy. The other nine pending recommendations had been accepted, bringing the total number of recommendations accepted to 55 out of 74. With regard to the implementation of the 55 recommendations accepted, San Marino would report on respecting international human rights standards at a later stage during the review. Such respect was the fundamental pillar of society, particularly nowadays, when all States faced heavy economic, food and social crises that could threaten peace and security.

585. The recommendations received during its second review would help San Marino deepen reflection, stimulate debate and encourage changes. The review played an important role because, through the review, States were called upon to revise their laws and practices on the basis of the recommendations they received.

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

586. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of San Marino, six delegations made statements.

587. The Council of Europe congratulated San Marino on the success of its universal periodic review. It highlighted three issues that were frequently raised by its monitoring bodies. First, San Marino should strengthen the fight against corruption and uphold transparency in public administration, and, notably, it should adopt tools to avoid conflicts of interest. Second, with regard to racism and intolerance, it recommended that the State establish an independent organ at the national level to combat racism, xenophobia, anti-

Semitism and intolerance and review legislation regarding the residence and work permits of foreign health workers in the private sector. With regard to the protection of national minorities, it recommended that San Marino continue awareness-raising efforts on the importance of tolerance and intercultural dialogue, promote and facilitate the integration of immigrants, and ensure the effective implementation of the law against racial, ethnic, religious and sexual discrimination. It invited the State to consider ratifying the Istanbul Convention.

588. Kuwait praised San Marino for its presentation, the efforts it had made to implement the review recommendations and the progress it had made since its previous review. It commended the State for the comprehensive legislative reforms that had been made to ensure equality before the law without discrimination and to ensure equal access to public services in accordance with the relevant international human rights instruments. Kuwait appreciated the State's efforts to ratify a number of important international conventions and protocols of the Council of Europe, such as the Council of Europe Convention on the Protection of Children against Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse and Protocol No. 15 amending the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

589. Sierra Leone commended San Marino for its transparent and open engagement with the universal periodic review mechanism and for the numerous efforts it had made to further promote and protect the rights of its citizens. It was pleased that the recommendations it had made had enjoyed the support of San Marino. It urged the State nonetheless to consider ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

590. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela stated that San Marino had fully and openly cooperated with the universal periodic review mechanism. The State's replies contained detailed descriptions of the policies adopted, through the approval of important legislative provisions on violence against women and other protection measures, for the protection of the rights of women and the promotion of their participation in society. During the period under review, San Marino had acceded to a number of international human rights instruments, and made important progress in the field of human rights.

591. Burkina Faso thanked San Marino for the information it had given to the Human Rights Council within the context of its second review. As a member of the troika for San Marino, it had been in a position to fully appreciate the efforts made by the State to implement human rights effectively. It congratulated San Marino on its willingness to cooperate with the review process and the treaty bodies. It believed that the State would continue its efforts to face challenges in the implementation of human rights.

592. China appreciated the efforts made by San Marino to overcome difficulties in human resources and to complete in a timely fashion the large amount of the work required for the review process. San Marino had had an open exchange with other States, had presented the measures it had taken to promote and protect human rights, had responded in a timely manner to the questions raised and had accepted most of the recommendations it had received. China was hopeful that San Marino would attach importance to the implementation of the recommendations received, in particular those on protecting vulnerable groups in the country. It recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

593. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of San Marino, no other stakeholders made statements.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

594. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 74 recommendations received, San Marino had supported 55 recommendations and noted 19.

595. The delegation of San Marino thanked all the delegations that had made statements. In response to the recommendations made by the Council of Europe, San Marino had already signed the Istanbul Convention and a study was currently being carried out in view of its ratification. With regard to the recommendation of the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance on reviewing legislation on residence and work permits for foreign health-care workers, a draft law had been prepared and submitted to Parliament. San Marino stressed that, although its second review had ended, there was still much to do to implement the 55 accepted recommendations in the following four years. It thanked the President of the Human Rights Council, the secretariat and the troika (Burkina Faso, Chile and China), with whom it had worked closely during the review.

Kazakhstan

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

(a) The national report submitted by Kazakhstan in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/KAZ/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/KAZ/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/KAZ/3).

597. At its 39th meeting, on 19 March 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Kazakhstan (see sect. C below).

598. The outcome of the review of Kazakhstan comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/28/10), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/28/10/Add.1).

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

599. The delegation of Kazakhstan underlined the significance of the universal periodic review in comprehensively monitoring the fulfilment of human rights and freedoms by Member States.

600. The international community recognized that Kazakhstan had sustainable human rights mechanisms and traditions, which had been achieved through its democratic and economic reforms. The Government would continue to work in the same vein and the universal periodic review would facilitate the targeted and sustained efforts. The results of such efforts would become the basis for the development of the second national plan of action on human rights.

601. The delegation summarized the State's position on the 194 recommendations that had been made during the review. Kazakhstan had initially accepted 143 recommendations, 47 of which it considered to be already implemented and 96 of which it considered to be in the process of implementation. Kazakhstan could not support the remaining 51 recommendations and the Government had provided in written form explanations for its position on those recommendations.

602. Bearing in mind the recent legislative initiatives, including the adoption of the new Criminal Code in January 2015, Kazakhstan had reconsidered its position on recommendation 126.27 on the exclusion by the judiciary of evidence obtained through torture. That recommendation, which had not initially been supported during the session of the Working Group, had now been accepted and was considered to be implemented.

603. Kazakhstan would continue to improve its legislation in several areas relating to some of the recommendations that it had not supported, including through the gradual

abolition of the death penalty, improvements in remuneration for work and in migration policies, and the further humanization of criminal legislation. With regard to the ratification of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, Kazakhstan would continue to study that issue.

604. The delegation provided information on positive trends with regard to the follow-up on the implementation of the recommendations since the interactive dialogue in 2014. Kazakhstan had ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in February 2015. Subsequently, Parliament had been considering adopting draft amendments that would be necessary to bring it into line with the Convention.

605. The Government would continue to combat the root causes and consequences of corruption within the framework of its anti-corruption strategy, which had been adopted in January 2015. Legislative measures had been initiated to ensure the effective participation of civil society in decision-making processes. For example, a decision had been made to draft a law on public access to information and legal amendments in order to broaden forms of State support for non-governmental organizations.

606. The new Criminal Code had made it possible for Kazakhstan to strengthen the guarantee of the right to a fair trial and to make improvements in criminal investigations and punishments. Parliament had been considering a new civil procedural code and a new law on arbitration, which were aimed at strengthening guarantees of justice and extrajudicial mechanisms for settling civil disputes.

607. A State policy on youth had been adopted in order to promote the active participation of youth in decision-making and public life. The Government would continue to implement its policy aimed at strengthening family values and ensuring the rights of mothers and children. A decision had been made to create the position of ombudsman on the rights of the child.

608. The Government intended to implement the recommendations made during the review. Economic and social progress would enable the fulfilment of the set objectives. Kazakhstan had been successful in substantially reducing unemployment, increasing the prosperity of its population, increasing life expectancy to over 70 years, substantially reducing the level of poverty, and increasing literacy to almost 100 per cent. The Government would continue its work in the area of the human dimension and the rule of law.

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

609. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Kazakhstan, 18 delegations made statements.

610. Pakistan was pleased that Kazakhstan had accepted the majority of the recommendations made during the review. It referred to the constructive engagement of the State with the human rights mechanism and the measures it had taken to strengthen its cooperation with OHCHR.

611. The Russian Federation noted with satisfaction that Kazakhstan had accepted numerous recommendations, including those made by the Russian Federation. It referred to the readiness of Kazakhstan to strengthen the protection and promotion of human rights and to continue to improve its national human rights protection system.

612. Sri Lanka appreciated the progress Kazakhstan had made in the area of social and economic development. It encouraged the State to continue its efforts to prevent and eliminate child labour, and to protect the rights of children and ensure their well-being.

613. Tajikistan referred to the efforts made by Kazakhstan to fulfil its international obligations and its readiness to cooperate with international human rights mechanisms. It also referred to the guarantees provided by Kazakhstan relating to sustainable development and the protection of the health of mothers and children, the improvements in the pension and education systems, and the reduction in the poverty level. Tajikistan was pleased with the progress achieved in the relations among various inter-ethnic and interreligious groups.

614. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland remained concerned that the Criminal Code did not adequately address the balance of powers between prosecutors and defence. Better resourcing at the office of the ombudsman and the commissioner for human rights would help in the drafting and implementation of the new national plan of action on human rights.

615. The United States of America commended Kazakhstan for having established a national preventative mechanism. It was concerned about the fact that the State had not accepted the recommendations on protecting space for dissent, including by decriminalizing libel and minimizing fines for the media, and on modifying or repealing the trade union law, which restricted freedom of association. It encouraged Kazakhstan to reconsider its decision and to accept those recommendations. It also urged the State to prevent or mitigate the potential negative impact of newly adopted laws that might further restrict activities of civil society and the enjoyment of freedoms.

616. Uzbekistan noted with satisfaction that Kazakhstan had accepted the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Uzbekistan on strengthening the national human rights protection system and making further efforts to combat trafficking in persons. The implementation of the recommendations accepted would further promote the protection of human rights and freedoms in Kazakhstan.

617. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela noted with appreciation the commitment of Kazakhstan to protect human rights and the progress made in that area. It recognized the efforts made by Kazakhstan to implement the recommendations accepted during its first review.

618. Afghanistan commended Kazakhstan for having accepted a large number of recommendations. It noted with appreciation the State's commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights and to improve the access of the population to public services.

619. Belarus pointed out that Kazakhstan had accepted the majority of the recommendations, thereby confirming its commitment to continue the consolidation of the national capacity to promote and protect human rights. It was confident that the implementation of the recommendations received during its second review would enable Kazakhstan to improve its human rights protection system.

620. Brunei Darussalam commended Kazakhstan for its commitment to protect and promote human rights and for its efforts to ensure sustainable economic development. It was pleased that Kazakhstan had accepted more than half of the recommendations made during its review.

621. China was pleased that Kazakhstan had accepted most of the recommendations, including those made by China on religious and ethnic tolerance and the rights of children. China commended Kazakhstan for its efforts to maintain harmony and tolerance among different religious and ethnic groups.

622. Cuba noted with appreciation the efforts made by Kazakhstan to combat long-term unemployment, especially among young persons, and to protect the environment, the increased budget allocations for education and the effective protection of the rights of persons with disabilities. It thanked Kazakhstan for having accepted the recommendations made by Cuba on the implementation of programmes relating to employment and education.

623. Ethiopia commended Kazakhstan for having accepted a large number of recommendations. It noted with satisfaction the commitment of Kazakhstan to the protection of human rights.

624. The Islamic Republic of Iran commended Kazakhstan for the progress it had made in implementing the recommendations from its first review. It noted with appreciation the national plan on the protection of the rights of persons with disabilities, the progress achieved in combating trafficking in persons and the establishment of a national preventive mechanism.

625. Kuwait was pleased with the efforts made by Kazakhstan to implement the recommendations made during its first review and the progress achieved in that respect. It

highlighted the adoption of strategies on building democracy and the rule of law, and on the protection of human rights and freedoms.

626. Malaysia noted with appreciation the efforts made by Kazakhstan to strengthen its legislative and institutional framework, and its progress in the advancement of the rights of women and children and in combating human trafficking. It was pleased that Kazakhstan had accepted the recommendations made by Malaysia on strengthening the national human rights institution and on advancing the rights of women.

627. Sierra Leone referred to the acceptance by Kazakhstan of many recommendations. It encouraged the State to consider ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families and the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

628. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Kazakhstan, eight other stakeholders made statements.

629. Lawyers for Lawyers, the Law Society of England and Wales and Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada called upon Kazakhstan to speed up the effective implementation of the recommendations accepted on strengthening the independence of the judiciary and the role of lawyers. They regretted that Kazakhstan had not supported the recommendations, including recommendation 126.46, on ensuring that human rights defenders, including lawyers, could freely practise their activities without fear of reprisals. They called upon Kazakhstan to accept recommendation 126.46 and to ensure that forced psychiatric detention met international standards.

630. Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship pointed out that the Criminal Code of 2015 placed undue restrictions on freedom of expression, provided for excessive custodial penalties for defamation and prescribed imprisonment for insulting the President. The Criminal Code also created the new offence of “dissemination of false information” and contained overly broad limitations on incitement to hatred and illegitimate restrictions on the freedom of peaceful assembly. Those provisions should be reformed. The claim made by Kazakhstan that the recommendation on ceasing the practice of closing or blocking opposition publications and online sources had already been implemented did not reflect reality. Kazakhstan should be held to international standards under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

631. Human Rights Watch pointed out that the review of Kazakhstan had been held against the backdrop of a serious decline in its rights record, with authorities having cracked down on free speech and peaceful dissent, imprisoning government critics and tightening controls over freedom of association, religion and assembly. Regrettably, Kazakhstan had rejected many recommendations on changing the legislation that restricted civil and political rights. Human Rights Watch was troubled by the State's assertion that the recommendations accepted had already been implemented or were in the process of implementation, as that did not reflect the reality on the ground. For example, Kazakhstan had claimed that authorities engaged in thorough and impartial investigations into all allegations of torture, yet impunity for torture remained the norm.

632. Amnesty International encouraged Kazakhstan to fully implement all the recommendations that it maintained had already been implemented, along with the 96 recommendations that it considered to be in the process of implementation. It urged Kazakhstan to strengthen safeguards against torture, including by implementing the relevant recommendations. Referring to recent attacks on the rights to freedom of expression, association and assembly, it noted with regret that Kazakhstan had rejected more than half of the recommendations concerning those freedoms. It urged the State to reconsider its position and to decriminalize defamation and remove excessive restrictions on peaceful assembly. Although Kazakhstan had accepted some recommendations on the death penalty, Amnesty International regretted that it had rejected recommendations on ratifying the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

633. United Nations Watch was concerned about the human rights situation in Kazakhstan, particularly the detention of opposition leaders and restrictions on the media and civil society. It noted with regret that Kazakhstan had rejected important recommendations relating to, inter alia, freedom of expression, assembly, religion and association, and the promotion of gender equality. It called upon Kazakhstan to allow the media and civil society to operate freely and to take steps to promote gender equality.

634. The British Humanist Association noted with regret the refusal by Kazakhstan to review its legislation on freedom of assembly, religion or belief and expression. Non-traditional and minority groups suffered as a result of a lack of definition in religious laws, and the new Criminal Code could be used against any speech that threatened the status quo. It urged Kazakhstan to, inter alia, adhere to its verbalized approval of the Rabat Plan of Action on the prohibition of advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence, through domestic implementation and to reconsider its refusal to review domestic legislation.

635. The World Evangelical Alliance stated that the meaningful participation of civil society in the national consultation process remained a challenge owing to a climate of fear, impacting religious minorities, who were often labelled as “sects” and subjected to close surveillance. The mandatory registration system, under which those who participated in religious activities outside a registered community were punished, was contrary to international human rights law and set standards that were difficult for small communities to reach. It did not share the position of the Government when it had stated that recommendations 124.21 and 124.23 had already been implemented. It asked Kazakhstan to reconsider its position on recommendations 126.21, 126.28, 126.33 and 126.34, which the State had not supported.

636. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l’homme pointed out that Kazakhstan had continued its cooperation with the human rights mechanisms of the United Nations since its first universal periodic review. It encouraged Kazakhstan to implement the recommendations of the second review, which would result in quantitative and qualitative changes in the human rights situation. It was pleased that it had launched interfaith and inter-ethnic dialogues. It was concerned, however, by restrictions on political parties, human rights defenders, the media and trade unions. It called upon Kazakhstan to remove all obstacles relating to the right to peaceful assembly and freedom of expression, and to ratify the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

637. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 194 recommendations received, Kazakhstan had supported 144 recommendations and noted 50.

638. The delegation thanked the non-governmental organizations for their recommendations. It reiterated, however, that any improvements in legislation must be considered in view of existing practices, and that a law could be viable only if it was consistent with those practices. Therefore, Kazakhstan would consider those recommendations based on its practices and would discuss them only if they complied with its national interests and State strategic programmes.

639. Kazakhstan had already ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and would submit its first report to the Human Rights Committee in 2016.

640. With regard to the balance of power between prosecutors and defence lawyers, Kazakhstan had been undertaking judicial reforms in order to strengthen the role of lawyers; the new criminal laws that had come into force in January 2015 were aimed at doing so. Therefore, the delegation called upon non-governmental organizations to study the legislation carefully.

641. Kazakhstan would continue to participate in the universal periodic review, with the involvement of non-governmental organizations and the relevant authorities. The

Government's efforts had been aimed at establishing long-term partnerships with non-governmental and international organizations.

642. Working groups on democracy, justice, the rule of law and the law-making process had been established within the "Dialogue Platform on Human Dimension", and the participation of non-governmental organizations and the relevant authorities was ensured through the work of those working groups. Therefore, all of the suggestions made during the adoption of the outcome of the review would be discussed by those working groups.

643. Kazakhstan was committed to continue open and transparent dialogue with special procedure mandate holders, which it had shown by issuing a standing invitation to mandate holders in 2009.

644. In conclusion, the delegation confirmed the Government's commitment to strengthening the justice system and upholding the rule of law, and to modernizing institutions with a view to guaranteeing the human rights and freedoms and prosperity of its citizens.

Angola

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

(a) The national report submitted by Angola in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/AGO/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/AGO/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/AGO/3).

646. At its 39th meeting, on 19 March 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Angola (see sect. C below).

647. The outcome of the review of Angola comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/28/11), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/28/11/Add.1).

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

648. The delegation, headed by the Minister for Justice and Human Rights, stated that, of the 226 recommendations received during the review, 192 had enjoyed the support of Angola and 34 recommendations had been noted. The recommendations were valuable and constructive and would reinforce the national mechanisms for the promotion and protection of human rights. Most of the recommendations had already been implemented through many ongoing government programmes.

649. With regard to the 34 recommendations that had been noted, the delegation stated that, first, with regard to the establishment of a national human rights institution in accordance with the Paris Principles, Angola was of the view that the office of the ombudsman was the national institution for human rights, with duties, responsibilities and a constitutional framework in compliance with the Paris Principles.

650. Second, with regard to the issuing of a standing invitation to all special rapporteurs, Angola was committed to reinforcing its cooperation with international human rights mechanisms. In the last few years, the Government had invited the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief and the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention. Also, two former United Nations High Commissioners for Human Rights had visited Angola. The Government intended to

extend invitations to the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants and the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context.

651. Third, the Government was considering joining the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative partnership. On 22 December 2014, the President of Angola had signed an executive order creating a working group to evaluate that possibility.

652. Fourth, the Government was evaluating its obligations for the ratification of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. Nevertheless, the rights protected under that Convention would be considered under the ongoing judicial reforms.

653. Fifth, the ratification of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court was still under consideration. As a member of the African Union, Angola supported the position of the African Union on the International Criminal Court.

654. Lastly, with regard to the decriminalization of defamation and related offences, the Government was of the view that freedom of expression was a fundamental right conferred under article 40 of the Constitution of Angola, media laws and international legal instruments ratified by Angola, such as the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The restriction provided under article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights required offenders (including journalists) to face charges in criminal proceedings for defamation, slander or similar offences, in accordance with items 3 and 4 of article 40 of the Constitution and articles 407 and 410 of the Criminal Code, in addition to the possibility of disciplinary and civil proceedings. The purpose of the limitation imposed by the law was to protect the individual interests of offended citizens and was not primarily directed at violating or restricting the right to freedom of expression, as in many other countries.

655. Over the next four years, the Government would continue to pay special attention to the 34 recommendations it had noted.

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

656. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Angola, 16 delegations made statements.¹¹

657. China commended Angola for its constructive participation in the review process and for its detailed presentation. It welcomed the positive response by the State to the recommendations received, and it was particularly pleased that it had accepted most of the recommendations, including those made by China. Such efforts would provide a solid basis for the Angolan people to enjoy all rights and for Angola to promote economic and social development.

658. Côte d'Ivoire thanked Angola for the attention it had paid to the recommendations it had received. It encouraged Angola to consolidate efforts to guarantee freedom of expression and space for civil society, along with efforts on gender equality and protection for children. It invited the Government to continue to cooperate with the international community.

659. Cuba congratulated Angola on the measures it had taken to advance the rights of the child, the right to education, human rights education, the right to health and sustainable development, and to combat poverty. It thanked Angola for having accepted the recommendations Cuba had made on the national development strategy "Angola 2025" and the fight against poverty.

¹¹ The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted, if available, on the extranet of the Human Rights Council at <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/28thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

660. Djibouti welcomed the Government's commitment to strengthening and protecting human rights. It encouraged Angola to continue its efforts to accomplish progress and fully achieve human rights in the country.

661. Equatorial Guinea referred to the considerable progress made by Angola at the normative and institutional levels since the adoption of the new Constitution. It welcomed in particular the efforts made by the Government to achieve the Millennium Development Goals and the measures it had taken to implement the recommendations received during its first review. It also commended Angola for the initiatives it had adopted to strengthen the domestic legal system for the protection of human rights, and in particular the national development strategy "Angola 2025".

662. Ethiopia commended Angola for having accepted a significant number of recommendations, including those it had made to improve the conditions of women in rural areas and to further work on improving the judicial system by providing capacity-building assistance and training in the field of human rights. It also commended Angola for its achievements in, inter alia, protecting women and children, fighting corruption, protecting freedom of expression, advancing gender equality, and providing education and housing, noting the mechanisms adopted by Angola to achieve those objectives.

663. Gabon welcomed the commitment of Angola to implement the recommendations accepted during its second review, and it was pleased that the State had accepted the recommendations Gabon had made. It noted with satisfaction that Angola had made numerous efforts to promote and protect human rights, particularly by adopting a number of legislative and administrative measures to fight against corruption and human trafficking.

664. Ghana stated that the implementation of the recommendations received by Angola during its review would strengthen its development agenda. It urged the State to redouble its efforts to ratify or accede to the various international human rights instruments to which it had undertaken to become a party, and to implement them through its institutionalized structures. It encouraged Angola to avail itself of the support of OHCHR and to request the relevant assistance from the international community.

665. Kuwait welcomed the efforts made by Angola to implement the recommendations it had accepted during its review. It commended Angola for its commitment to the protection and promotion of human rights as a standing characteristic of the national policy framework. It also commended the State for its efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goals in accordance with its national plan for 2013–2017 and to create conditions conducive to development and to improving the distribution of wealth.

666. The Lao People's Democratic Republic thanked Angola for its comprehensive presentation and noted with appreciation its acceptance of a large number of recommendations from the previous review and the steps it had taken to implement them. It commended Angola for its efforts to strengthen the national system for the promotion and protection of human rights and welcomed the progress it had made in combating violence against women and children, poverty and corruption, and in promoting gender equality and the rights of persons with disabilities.

667. Norway thanked Angola for its positive engagement with the universal periodic review process. It commended the State for having created an interministerial committee to consider partnership in the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative, as a follow-up to a recommendation made by Norway. During the review, Norway also made recommendations on freedom of the press, the working environment for civil society and the fight against child mortality. It looked forward to the State's fruitful cooperation in the follow-up to the recommendations and to the universal periodic review process.

668. Portugal applauded the professionalism and dedication with which Angola had responded to questions and recommendations during its review. It was pleased with the acceptance by Angola of its recommendations, in particular those to ratify the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the recommendations on developing a national plan of action on women, peace and

security, on reinforcing the role of the provedor (ombudsman) and on continuing its efforts to criminalize the corporal punishment of children.

669. The Russian Federation thanked Angola for its written presentation, which had provided details on its position on the recommendations that it had received. It welcomed the acceptance of the majority of the recommendations, including those it had made, which demonstrated the continuing work by the Government to promote and protect human rights and its readiness to continue to cooperate with the international monitoring mechanism. It recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report.

670. Sierra Leone was pleased that Angola had fully supported the recommendations it had made. It referred to the State's positive response to the recommendation on creating a human rights institution in compliance with the Paris Principles and commended it for that step forward. It urged Angola to consider creating a viable environment that would enable the issuing of a standing invitation to the special procedures. It wished Angola success in the implementation of the recommendations accepted.

671. South Africa congratulated Angola on its successful review and on the acceptance of a large number of recommendations, which was testimony to the State's commitment to human rights. Angola had embarked on a new era with the adoption of a new Constitution, establishing a democratic State based on the rule of law. South Africa welcomed the establishment of a national plan for development and the efforts to create conditions to enable growth and social progress.

672. Sri Lanka appreciated the constructive spirit in which Angola had engaged in the review process and was pleased that it had accepted the recommendations made by Sri Lanka. It welcomed the commitment by Angola to human rights, which it had shown through such measures as the adoption of a new Constitution. It would be useful if Angola would obtain assistance from the international community with regard to the challenges faced at the end of a protracted civil war.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

673. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Angola, four other stakeholders made statements.

674. The East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project referred to the acceptance by Angola of many of the recommendations on operating space for human rights defenders and civil society. However, there was a considerable disconnect between those commitments and the situation in the country, as dissenting voices, human rights defenders and journalists came under routine attack. Angola must allow human rights defenders and journalists to work safely and without reprisals.

675. Amnesty International called upon Angola to implement the recommendations accepted. It was disappointed that Angola had rejected 34 recommendations, including some calling on the Government to refrain from using criminal defamation laws to restrict freedom of expression. It was concerned that the authorities did not allow demonstrations to take place. During demonstrations, police had arbitrarily arrested and detained demonstrators. It urged Angola to allow peaceful demonstrations to take place and to refrain from using excessive force against peaceful demonstrators.

676. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme referred to the measures taken by Angola to promote and protect human rights. It regretted, however, the lack of hospitality by the State regarding migrant Africans despite the contribution by their countries to the independence of Angola. It deplored the cruel and inhuman treatment of children accused of witchcraft. It was concerned about sexual violence and sexual inequality, and was alarmed by the treatment of migrants by security forces. It urged Angola to create an environment favourable for civil society and freedom of the press, and to allow peaceful demonstrations. Attention should be given to the rights of religious minorities. Measures should be taken to combat impunity of agents of the State and to ensure that victims had access to justice.

677. The Lutheran World Federation stated that the national reconstruction programme for the building of new social, economic and cultural infrastructure was not compatible

with the fundamental right to housing. Thousands of families had been evicted from their homes and relocated to areas with inadequate living conditions. Those who spoke out against that injustice and defended the rights of the victims faced repeated threats.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

678. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, of the 226 recommendations received, Angola had accepted 192 recommendations and noted 34.

679. The delegation thanked Member States and civil society for their comments. Angola had taken a constructive approach to the universal periodic review, as shown by the recommendations it had accepted. Further, the recommendations that it had noted were under consideration by the Government. The Government was working with OHCHR and the Human Rights Council to implement the recommendations.

680. Freedom of expression was guaranteed in the Constitution, and its regulation was consistent with the relevant international human rights instruments. The good name and reputation of all citizens were also legally protected. The judicial institutions were the only institutions that may determine, based on complaints from individuals, whether cases of defamation, slander or libel should be prosecuted. There was a separation of powers in Angola and the judiciary was entirely independent.

681. There were no restrictions on freedom of assembly or on the right to hold demonstrations. Demonstrations were held on a regular basis. Where demonstrations resulted in violence, the law and order institutions were responsible for the protection of all citizens from such violence.

682. Cases involving the excessive use of force by law enforcement officers were subject to investigation and, where appropriate, punishment. There had been cases in which the excessive use of force by law enforcement officers had been duly prosecuted.

683. In recent years, Angola had accepted thousands of immigrants. The country was stable and peaceful, and was developing economically and socially. Those circumstances attracted many immigrants, who were processed in accordance with the law. There was often dialogue between Angola and States whose nationals had been received. There were situations of illegal immigration practices that had led to such criminal activities as money laundering and human trafficking, and the Government had established an interministerial task force to identify and stop those criminal activities. Those matters were generally dealt with promptly in accordance with the law and in full compliance with all human rights obligations.

Islamic Republic of Iran

684. The review of the Islamic Republic of Iran was held on 31 October 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by the Islamic Republic of Iran in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/IRN/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/IRN/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/IRN/3).

685. At its 39th meeting, on 19 March 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the Islamic Republic of Iran (see sect. C below).

686. The outcome of the review of the Islamic Republic of Iran comprises the reports of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/28/12 and Corr.1), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the

plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/28/12/Add.1).

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

687. The Islamic Republic of Iran emphasized that, inspired by its religious democracy founded on Islamic values and principles, it strongly believed in human rights and respect for human dignity, and was firmly committed to the promotion and protection of human rights.

688. Encouraged by the rich experiences gained from the implementation of the recommendations accepted during its first review, the Islamic Republic of Iran had participated in its second review with a constructive approach and a much greater willingness to embrace the recommendations it had received.

689. The Government had considered all of the 291 recommendations received with great attention and interest, conveying them to the relevant institutions for extensive consultations with stakeholders, including civil society and non-governmental organizations.

690. The Islamic Republic of Iran had supported 189 recommendations either in their entirety or partially. Like other States, it was unable to fully support some of the recommendations owing to restrictions imposed by national legislation and the State's international obligations.

691. In addition to its full and constructive engagement with the universal periodic review mechanism, it had cooperated extensively with other United Nations bodies working in the field of human rights. Between 2010 and 2013, it had submitted periodic reports to the relative treaty bodies, so to the Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination in 2010, the Committee on Civil and Political Rights in 2011, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in 2013, the Committee on the Rights of the Child in 2013 and the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in 2013, which was its first periodic report relating to that Convention.

692. The State had initiated a new round of interaction with OHCHR and presented proposals and projects to expand cooperation in a mutually agreed framework. Furthermore, it had invited the High Commissioner to visit the State. It had also extended an invitation to a thematic special procedure mandate holder to visit the State in 2015, and intended to invite another one soon.

693. The Islamic Republic of Iran had responded adequately to communications from special procedures, based on a policy to respond to all the relevant communications as part of its responsive engagement and cooperation with international mechanisms.

694. In spite of its principled position, the State had also held several rounds of discussions with the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran in Geneva and in New York, and had responded to the issues raised in his communications.

695. All citizens of the Islamic Republic of Iran, both men and women, equally enjoyed the protection of the law and all human rights.

696. With respect to the status of women and their rights, the State had achieved a great deal since the victory of the Islamic Revolution in 1979. For instance, close to half of university students were women, as were more than 75,000 university instructors and faculty members. Furthermore, more than 31,000 women worked as administrative or executive personnel at universities.

697. Regarding freedom of expression and opinion, the Constitution enshrined freedom of the media, and the press law also guaranteed such freedoms. There were currently 6,100 publications registered. The news agencies, specialized news agencies and news websites currently operating produced more than 400 publications. The distribution of more than 30 per cent of publications was local, and 1,000 publications were published in different provinces, mostly in local languages or dialects. Over the past year, 130 publications with women as chief editors had been published in various fields.

698. Regarding political participation, article 26 of the Constitution permitted the formation of parties, societies, political and professional associations, and religious societies. There were more than 230 political parties with different orientations, 400 professional associations and trade unions, and 60 societies of religious minorities. Article 27 of the Constitution stipulated that public gatherings and marches may be freely held, provided that arms were not carried. More than 17,000 community-based organizations had received permits to operate in areas such as human rights, social rights, charitable endeavours, the environment and animal rights. High-ranking officials were elected, directly or indirectly, by voting by the people. Over the past 35 years, 32 elections had been held to choose presidents, members of the assembly of experts, and representatives of Parliament and city and rural councils.

699. The Islamic Republic of Iran confirmed its determination to build a society underpinned by its national and religious values while continuing to adhere to its international obligations. It called upon all States to continue their efforts to strengthen the universal periodic review mechanism.

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

700. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Islamic Republic of Iran, 17 delegations made statements.¹¹

701. Nicaragua thanked the Islamic Republic of Iran for having submitted its addendum to the report of the Working Group. It congratulated the State on having accepted the majority of the recommendations and on its commitments at the national and international levels to promote and protect human rights. It highlighted the fact that the universal periodic review was the space in which, in a constructive fashion, dialogue and cooperation between States demonstrating political will should be maintained. Nicaragua did not support initiatives that promoted politicized and disproportionate resolutions against such States as the Islamic Republic of Iran, which did not contribute to dialogue.

702. Oman stated that the State's measures, laws and regulations were an embodiment of the commitment of the Islamic Republic of Iran to promote and protect human rights in line with international human rights standards.

703. Pakistan appreciated the cooperation of the Islamic Republic of Iran with the human rights machinery, including the Human Rights Council and the universal periodic review mechanism. It believed that the review mechanism, based on interactive dialogue and the full involvement of the State concerned, was the most constructive and non-politicized mechanism of engagement. Pakistan commended the State for its decision to accept the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Pakistan on the rights of women and children and access to health services.

704. The Philippines recognized the State's significant achievements in meeting the Millennium Development Goals. It encouraged the Government to build on the progress it had made to pursue programmes to better promote, protect and fulfil the human rights of women and children. It was pleased with the introduction of human rights education, and encouraged the Government to consider taking further initiatives to build the capacity of law enforcement personnel and social service providers in promoting and protecting the human rights of the most vulnerable members of society.

705. The Russian Federation welcomed the measures taken by the Islamic Republic of Iran on the humanization of criminal legislation, combating violence against women and supporting the institution of the family in the country. It greatly appreciated the State's interaction with treaty bodies and its openness to dialogue within the context of the universal periodic review.

706. Sierra Leone pointed out that the Islamic Republic of Iran had not responded to the recommendation on abolishing the death penalty. It was hopeful that it could be addressed shortly, and that the State would consider declaring a moratorium on the death penalty. It commended the State for its five-year development plan and wished for its successful outcome.

707. Sri Lanka encouraged the Islamic Republic of Iran to move forward in fulfilling its commitments to promote and protect human rights. It commended the State for its invitation to the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to visit the country, and for its efforts to promote economic, social and cultural rights. It encouraged the State to continue to take positive steps to promote access to education by girls and to increase women's participation in political, public and professional spheres.

708. The Sudan commended the Islamic Republic of Iran for having accepted a large number of the recommendations, including the two made by the Sudan.

709. Tajikistan recognized that the universal periodic review was a useful tool in cooperation with and the consolidation of civil society in order to improve the human rights situation in the country. The Islamic Republic of Iran had shown its commitment to implement its international obligations to protect human rights. Tajikistan also recognized the legislative measures taken to promote the economic, social and cultural rights of citizens. It commended the State for its efforts to combat terrorism and drug trafficking, and its intention to take the appropriate measures to further improve the human rights situation in the country.

710. Turkmenistan was pleased with the active cooperation of the Islamic Republic of Iran with different human rights monitoring mechanisms of the United Nations, such as the Human Rights Council and the treaties bodies.

711. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland was concerned that the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran had rejected one of the recommendations it had made and had accepted only part of the other. It was particularly concerned about the increase in executions during the past year and the executions of juvenile offenders. It was also concerned about the continued discrimination against minority religious groups, and the harassment and persecution of journalists and human rights defenders. It recommended that the Government invite the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran to review the human rights situation in the country.

712. While welcoming the release of certain human rights and civil rights activists, the United States of America was deeply concerned about the large number of activists and other prisoners of conscience who were still imprisoned. It urged the State to respect fair trial guarantees in accordance with its international obligations and commitments and pursuant to the rights enshrined in its Constitution. It renewed its call upon the State to end the harassment and persecution of journalists and to show its commitment to freedom of expression, to uphold its religious freedom commitments and obligations, and to release those imprisoned for their religious beliefs. It was disappointed that the State had not addressed the issue of allowing the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran to visit the country and guaranteeing him access to the appropriate officials, facilities and prisoners.

713. Uzbekistan commended the Islamic Republic of Iran for having adopted most of the recommendations, including those made by Uzbekistan. It believed that the implementation of the recommendations accepted would help to strengthen the national human rights protection system. Uzbekistan wished the Islamic Republic of Iran success in its further efforts to promote and protect human rights.

714. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela expressed its satisfaction with the efforts made by the Islamic Republic of Iran to achieve the Millennium Development Goals, most of which had been achieved before 2015. The imposition of unilateral coercive sanctions was contrary to international law and the most basic rights of the Iranian people. It referred to the seriousness and commitment with which the State had addressed both that issue and its second review, noting that the universal periodic review was the most important mechanism of the Human Rights Council.

715. Afghanistan was pleased that the Islamic Republic of Iran had accepted its recommendation on protecting refugee rights in compliance with internationally recognized norms and standards. It also appreciated the fact that the State was hosting Afghan refugees.

716. Algeria referred to the renewed commitment of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the universal periodic review mechanism and its acceptance of a large number of

recommendations. It commended the State for having accepted the two recommendations made by Algeria on the development of an environment favouring an autonomous civil society and the promotion and protection of the rights of women and children. It encouraged the Islamic Republic of Iran to pursue efforts to promote and protect human rights.

717. Armenia was pleased that national minorities, including Armenian minorities, continued to exercise their cultural and religious rights freely. It was also pleased that the Islamic Republic of Iran had accepted its recommendation on continuing its policies and initiatives aimed at promoting dialogue, cooperation and tolerance between the different cultures and religions of the national minorities. It appreciated the fact that the State had accepted its recommendation on expanding and promoting human rights education and training programmes.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

718. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Islamic Republic of Iran, 10 other stakeholders made statements.

719. In a joint statement, Lawyers for Lawyers underlined the fact that all lawyers were fully entitled to the right to a fair trial, as provided for in human rights treaties. It congratulated President Rouhani for having stated that “a lawyer should be immune from any prosecution for carrying out its professional duty”. It drew attention to the draft law, currently under review in the country, that provided rules for lawyers. It recommended that the draft law be carefully examined in relation to the provisions of the basic principles of the United Nations and modified accordingly.

720. The Baha’i International Community stated that Baha’is remained deprived of the most basic rights to which an Iranian citizen was entitled, let alone the right to profess their own religion. It remained hopeful, however, that the Government would choose to show high regard for the universal periodic review. There were numerous injustices and discrimination perpetrated against Baha’is, and if the Government were truly committed to stand by its words, it could begin by taking relatively easy steps, such as allowing Baha’i students unrestrained access to higher education.

721. Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik regretted that the Islamic Republic of Iran had refused to accept the recommendations on ratifying the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty, and to ban capital punishment. It reiterated its concerns from the first review of the State about political executions, public executions and juvenile executions. It was also concerned about violations of freedom of expression, peaceful assembly, and religion and belief, and discrimination against women, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons, and ethnic and religious minorities.

722. Iman Ali’s Popular Students Relief Society pointed out that many displaced persons and refugees had been deprived of their rights. The Bureau of Alien and Foreign Immigrant Affairs, in cooperation with United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations, had played a positive role in alleviating the problem. Owing to international sanctions and inflation, the economic situation of middle- and lower-income families had deteriorated and, as a result, various forms of child labour and exploitation had intensified. It was concerned about the high rate of drug addiction, which caused numerous social problems, such as domestic violence and trafficking.

723. The International Lesbian and Gay Association emphasized the fourfold increase in the number of recommendations relating to lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender rights since the State’s first review, and was gravely concerned about the ongoing violations of the rights of Iranian lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons. Individuals had been arrested, harassed and persecuted for speaking publicly about homosexuality or bisexuality, and the Government had banned the publication of those issues in the media. Despite repeated requests by various United Nations human rights mechanisms, the Government

had so far refused to acknowledge the human rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender community members.

724. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues was concerned about the deteriorating human rights situation witnessed over the previous one and a half years, and particularly about the repression of basic freedoms, discrimination against women and ethnic and religious minorities, and the denial of due process for prisoners of conscience, including journalists and human rights defenders. It was also concerned about the increasing number of executions and the death penalty, which continued to be used against religious and ethnic minorities, political dissidents and juvenile offenders, and about the threats against and arbitrary arrests of those who spoke out for human rights. In addition, the State continued to refuse to cooperate with special procedures, including the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran.

725. Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship welcomed the recommendations on the death penalty. It also welcomed the recommendations relating to guaranteeing freedom of speech, and emphasized the need to stop arrests, prosecutions and sanctions of individuals for expressing views and opinions. It drew attention to the fact that more than 30 journalists remained in prison, and to the continued harassment and arrest of human rights defenders. It called upon States to increase efforts to hold the Islamic Republic of Iran accountable and urged it to show, through real reform, its commitment to protect freedom of expression.

726. The Prevention Association of Social Harms highlighted a number of factors the international community needed to consider with regard to the contribution to the promotion and protection of human rights in different countries, namely universality, an impartial approach to the assessment of human rights situations, the avoidance of politicizing human rights issues and the application of a problem-solving approach based on negotiation and dialogue.

727. In a joint statement, the Women’s Human Rights International Association drew attention to the troublingly large number of executions that had been carried out in the country the past year, including those of political prisoners and juveniles. Even though blinding, amputations, flogging and stoning were prohibited by international law, such barbaric acts were carried out by the Islamic Republic of Iran. It was also concerned about the situation of women, and brought attention to the fact that a wave of acid attacks had been carried out against women who had not fully obeyed the dress code.

728. Advocates for Human Rights referred to the alarming situation with regard to the use of the death penalty in the Islamic Republic of Iran. Most of those executed had been convicted of such charges as drug-related offences, and not the most serious crimes, and several peaceful activists had been executed after convictions for such vague charges as “corruption on earth”. It further referred to reports of torture, forced confessions and a lack of access to counsel in capital cases. In addition, it was concerned about juvenile executions.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

729. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, of 291 recommendations received, the Islamic Republic of Iran had supported 130 recommendations and noted 161.

730. With regard to the death penalty and the recommendations on its abolition, the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran stressed that there was no global consensus on the abolition of the death penalty and the State had no legal obligation to abolish it. The death penalty strictly defined by law was applied for the most serious crimes, including large-scale drug trafficking that was carried out in conjunction with terrorist activities.

731. Regarding freedom of religion and the issue of minorities, the per capita space for worship and the performance of religious rituals for religious minorities was twice the size of that for Muslims. There were more than 250 Christians churches. Moreover, their religious sites were renovated and repaired through public funds.

732. Article 64 of the Constitution stipulated that Zoroastrians and Jews would each elect one representative, while Assyrian and Chaldean Christians would jointly elect one

representative, and Christians would elect three representatives. Hence, they had guaranteed seats.

733. Regarding journalists, the Islamic Republic of Iran emphasized that its society was based on legitimate freedoms. In cases where an offence was committed, everyone was treated equally before the law regardless of employment status. It categorically rejected all allegations concerning the mistreatment of members of the press and the media. It also stressed that there were no political prisoners or prisoners of conscience in the country.

734. The Islamic Republic of Iran concluded by stating that the country itself had also been the victim of human rights violations from the very beginning of the Islamic Revolution. Despite all of the atrocities, its firm resolve to promote human rights had not been shaken. As a result of acts of terrorism, about 17,000 innocent human beings had been assassinated. More than 200,000 people had been martyred and 700,000 wounded in the eight-year war that had been imposed on the country, including 13,000 who had been martyred owing to the use of chemical weapons and 100,000 who had been wounded in that way. More than 4,000 law enforcement officers had been killed in the fight against drug trafficking. Moreover, widespread violations of the rights of the Iranian people, which were a result of the application of inhuman and illegal sanctions, were another example of the measures that had been used against the country.

735. While being firmly committed to its international human rights obligations, the Islamic Republic of Iran was prepared to share its experiences and lessons learned with other countries.

Iraq

736. The review of Iraq was held on 3 November 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Iraq in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/IRQ/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/IRQ/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/IRQ/3).

737. At its 41st meeting, on 19 March 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Iraq (see sect. C below).

738. The outcome of the review of Iraq comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/28/14), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/28/14/Add.1).

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

739. The delegation appreciated the interest that the Human Rights Council had shown in the report on Iraq. The Government of Iraq had paid special attention to the recommendations it had received during its second review. In its Decree 107 of 2015, the Council of Ministers had approved the majority of the recommendations, and asserted that the implementation of those recommendations was part of the national action plan on human rights for 2013–2017. The purpose of that plan was to improve the human rights situation and to integrate human rights into the general policy of the State. The plan was a tool that ensured sound management and good governance. It also strengthened the rule of law, promoted tolerance, harmony and respect for cultural, religious and national diversity, promoted national cohesion, education, health and decent housing, and outlined social service programmes. It included measures on access to justice and raising awareness about

human rights principles within the Government and in the wider community. According to the plan, they could be achieved by encouraging organizations and citizens to play a more active role in promoting human rights and in protecting and promoting the rights of women, children, minorities and vulnerable groups. The State was taking measures to mobilize domestic and international resources through technical cooperation programmes with partners.

740. Iraq had received 229 recommendations during its second review and had established a national committee to consider the recommendations and to take appropriate action thereon.

741. The committee had held several meetings and had met with a number of civil society organizations and human rights defenders to adopt a common vision on the implementation of the 175 recommendations that the Government had accepted. The Government had been unable to accept the remaining 54 recommendations because of the political and social conditions prevailing in the country. The vast majority of the recommendations accepted were already part of a government programme of action, which included ensuring accountability at all levels, adopting performance indicators for the legislative, executive and judicial powers, upholding the principle of the separation of powers, preventing executive institutions from using political influence to achieve political or personal gains, empowering national human rights institutions, restricting the use of arms by the State in accordance with the Constitution, ensuring that security forces performed their duties in protecting all citizens, expanding the coverage of social security and pension systems, cooperating and coordinating with the Council of Representatives in the areas of legislation and oversight, and committing to the basic principles of the agreement between the political parties of the unity Government.

742. Iraq had not accepted 54 recommendations because of the complex and difficult political and security situation caused by terrorist attacks by Daesh and its control of a number of regions and governorates in Iraq. That situation drew on the resources of the State institutions involved in the fight against terrorism.

743. Iraq maintained its sovereign right to adopt a legal system that was in line with its international obligations. It needed more time to enact the required legislation than what had been stipulated in the recommendations that it had not accepted.

744. The Government of Iraq would, however, reconsider the recommendations that it had not accepted before the review of the next report.

745. Iraq had submitted all of its periodic reports to the different treaty bodies, such as the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, and the Committee on the Rights of the Child and the first and second optional protocols thereto, in 2014. In 2015, Iraq would submit its periodic reports in connection with the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

746. Iraq had been fighting Daesh terrorism since the previous June and had been able to retake parts of Iraqi territory from Daesh. Daesh had committed barbaric crimes that could amount to genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes in the form of massacres and mass executions of prisoners and unarmed prisoner soldiers, clergies, and children and women who had rejected their ideology. Daesh had committed enforced displacement crimes against Yazidis and other ethnic minorities and executed people indiscriminately. It had tortured and sexually abused women and children and practised forced marriage. It had also demolished shrines and places of worship and cultural heritage sites, including damaging the archaeological cities of Nimrod and Al-Hadar. The delegation informed the Human Rights Council about the Speicher massacre.

747. All Iraqis were united in the fight against terrorism, and were determined to stop the expansion of Daesh and to liberate large areas that had fallen under its control in the provinces of Diyala, Kirkuk and Salah al-Din. That required the Government to adopt an

emergency action plan to address terrorist crimes and to meet the needs of internally displaced persons in particular.

748. The conditions that Iraq had faced, before and after 2003, were unprecedented in terms of insecurity and political and social instability, and had a lasting impact on children.

749. The delegation described some of the State's laws, including one on human trafficking. A national strategy to combat violence against women and a strategy for the advancement of women had been adopted. A national action plan for the implementation of Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) on women, peace and security had also been adopted. With regard to the political empowerment of women, measures had been taken to increase, through a quota system, the number of women in politics. Iraq had made remarkable progress in the advancement of women through the adoption of several national strategies, public policies and programmes, including a poverty alleviation strategy, a national development plan for the years 2010–2013 and 2014–2017, a national action plan on human rights, and a strategy to fight violence against women in Iraq and Kurdistan. It had also implemented a series of women's programmes, including one on gender-sensitive budgets for five ministerial sectors, which had been supported by the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-WOMEN), opened legal aid offices in collaboration with the United Nations Development Programme, created family protection units supported by the United Nations Population Fund and established a women's development fund.

750. The Government was interested in the legislative aspect of the protection of human rights in general, including the rights of women. That interest had been demonstrated through the adoption of several laws, including Act No. 28 of 2012 on combating human trafficking and Act No. 38 of 2013 on the care of persons with disabilities and special needs.

751. Terrorist attacks in Iraq had caused the displacement of approximately 2.6 million persons in various governorates. The Government had allocated funds and emergency aid in coordination with the United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq and other relevant international organizations, such as the World Health Organization to provide health services, especially for women, children and persons with disabilities.

752. In conclusion, the State was fully committed to international human rights mechanisms, and called upon the international community to provide Iraq with the assistance necessary to fight against terrorism and to defend its people, land and cultural heritage. The delegation also requested technical assistance to help the State to promote and protect the human rights of all its citizens.

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

753. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Iraq, 17 delegations made statements.¹²

754. The United Arab Emirates was pleased that Iraq had accepted the majority of the recommendations. The delegation had presented a comprehensive overview that reflected the political will of the Government and the new impetus for human rights and the advancement of the country, and had set up a working group to follow up on the implementation of the recommendations accepted, despite the difficult circumstances the State faced. The United Arab Emirates trusted the ability of the Government despite the current challenges.

755. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland welcomed the acceptance by Iraq of 175 recommendations and the commitment of the Prime Minister to hold accountable those responsible for human rights abuses. It was a vital commitment, if it was translated into action. It urged Iraq to improve its justice system in order to ensure the

¹² The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted, if available, on the extranet of the Human Rights Council at <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/28thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

equitable treatment of all people. The ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment was important in order to increase respect for human rights within the police and security forces. It strongly encouraged the abolition of the death penalty.

756. The United States of America was concerned about the dire human rights situation in Iraq and underlined the obligations of the Government of Iraq to protect human rights and to uphold the rule of law. It welcomed the Prime Minister's "zero tolerance" policy on human rights abuses. It reiterated its recommendation that Iraq direct resources and political capital to the implementation of its national action plan on women, peace and security. It further encouraged the Government to continue to pursue political and legislative reforms, including its efforts to amend its anti-terrorism law. It urged Iraq to strengthen its command and control mechanisms over the military and other security forces, and to eliminate the presence of militia and other non-governmental armed groups.

757. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela stated that the situation in Iraq was very complex and directly linked to the illegal military invasion in 2003, which was the genesis of the violence that had taken the lives of hundreds of thousands of persons in the country. The international community should give Iraq the genuine support it required to overcome the spiral of violence. Iraq needed to strengthen its national capacity in the area of human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights, and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela encouraged it to continue to advance towards an urgently needed sustainable, peaceful solution to the crisis with safeguards for its territory and with the assistance and international solidarity it required.

758. Yemen appreciated the detailed presentation given by the Government on the efforts it had made in the area of human rights. Despite the challenges and difficulties faced by Iraq, the Government had adopted measures to deal with those challenges, including the measures taken to improve security conditions and to confront terrorism in order to achieve security and stability in moving towards democracy and development. It commended Iraq for having accepted a large number of recommendations in the area of achieving stability.

759. Afghanistan thanked Iraq for its update on the situation of human rights. It commended the State's commitment to human rights despite the immense security challenges. Afghanistan welcomed the establishment of the High Commission for Human Rights and encouraged Iraq to ensure its independence in accordance with the Paris Principles. It trusted that, in the coming years, Iraq would further increase its efforts to implement the recommendations accepted.

760. Algeria congratulated Iraq for its efforts in the field of human rights and for its achievements. It commended Iraq for having supported the majority of the recommendations and especially the recommendation made by Algeria on development plans and programmes, particularly on infrastructure and health services. The acceptance of a large number of recommendations reflected the importance that Iraq attached to the promotion of human rights. It understood that it had been difficult to accept some recommendations owing to the current difficult security conditions.

761. Belgium was shocked by the attacks by Daesh on civilians and by the deteriorating human rights situation reported, while expressing its solidarity with the Iraqi people. It welcomed the acceptance by Iraq of its two recommendations on inviting the Special Rapporteur on minority issues and on controlling hate speech against ethnic and religious groups and taking the measures necessary to combat it and to prosecute perpetrators. Belgium regretted that Iraq had not supported the recommendations on ratifying the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and on adopting a moratorium on the death penalty. It reiterated that, despite security issues, the death penalty was not appropriate and it called for its abolishment. It urged Iraq to ratify the Rome Statute as an appropriate way to avoid impunity for crimes against humanity.

762. Burkina Faso congratulated Iraq on the presentation of its second report for the universal periodic review. It underlined the fact that the review of Iraq had shown its willingness to improve the human rights situation in the country, and it congratulated the State on the recommendations accepted. Furthermore, it wished Iraq success in implementing the recommendations.

763. China recognized the efforts made by Iraq to overcome domestic difficulties, along with its active and constructive participation in the universal periodic review. It was pleased that Iraq had accepted most of the recommendations, including its own recommendations on continuing to combat terrorism resolutely in order to ensure that the Iraqi people enjoyed their rights in safety, and on promoting political dialogue and national reconciliation to create the conditions for economic development and to promote the economic, social and cultural rights of its people. China wished for a return to peace and stability through national reconciliation, sustainable social and economic development, and continuous progress on the human rights course.

764. Cuba reiterated its acknowledgement of the advances made by Iraq in the implementation of the 135 recommendations accepted. It highlighted the efforts of the State to overcome the situation into which it had been forced owing to interests that were unrelated to the promotion and protection of the human rights of the Iraqi people. Iraq should continue the defence of its sovereignty and integrity without external interference.

765. Djibouti welcomed the efforts made by Iraq to promote and protect human rights despite the difficult situation it faced. It encouraged Iraq to continue its efforts to strengthen and promote human rights, particularly with respect to vulnerable people.

766. Egypt congratulated Iraq on having accepted 76 per cent of the recommendations, including those made by Egypt, which reflected the State's commitment to protect and promote human rights. It welcomed the decision by Iraq to form a national working group to implement the recommendations from its review and those of the treaty bodies. Despite the difficult conditions in the country, the Government had been able to create a number of human rights institutions, including a national human rights institution, and to adopt a number of related laws. The fact that Iraq was hosting more than 2 million Syrian refugees was evidence of its commitment to human rights. Egypt called upon the international community to continue to support Iraq in upholding human rights.

767. India commended Iraq for the receptive and constructive manner in which it had participated in the review process. It was encouraged by the fact that Iraq had accepted as many as 175 recommendations, including all three of the recommendations made by India. It believed that Iraq had gained much from its participation in the review and that it would continue its efforts to implement in the coming years the recommendations it had accepted.

768. The Islamic Republic of Iran was pleased that Iraq had accepted the majority of the recommendations, including those it had made. It commended Iraq for its efforts to promote and protect human rights, while condemning the terrorist and Takfiri extremist activities that had led to human rights violations. It commended the State for having adopted a national strategy to combat violence against women and several laws on human trafficking, and for having established the High Commission for Human Rights.

769. Ireland was pleased that Iraq had accepted its recommendation on protecting the security and rights of persons belonging to minorities, bringing to justice those who violated their rights and ensuring the proportional representation of all minorities in governance and in decision-making bodies. It encouraged Iraq to submit a midterm report on its implementation of the recommendations accepted. It regretted, however, that its other recommendation on the removal of article 128 from the Penal Code, as a step towards the permanent removal from it of honourable motives as a mitigating excuse, had not been accepted. It urged Iraq to consider making further advances in that area and to take action on violence against women in the name of "honour".

770. Jordan welcomed the valuable information that had been presented following the universal periodic review. Iraq had accepted 175 recommendations, including those made by Jordan, out of a total of 229 recommendations. That reflected the commitment of Iraq to promote and protect all human rights despite the difficult situation in the country.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

771. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Iraq, seven other stakeholders made statements.

772. Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik regretted that the addendum to the report of the Working Group had been issued only in Arabic and just before the session of the universal periodic review, which made the review more difficult. It regretted that Iraq had not supported certain fundamental recommendations, such as those on ratifying the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and on the withdrawal of the Jafaari law on child marriage. It was concerned about the situation of Iranian refugees and pilgrims in Iraq, and emphasized the importance of following up on the status of women and children in conflict regions. It expected that the torture of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons would be stopped promptly.

773. Minority Rights Group referred to the ongoing armed conflict that exposed millions of civilians to serious human rights violations, and to the issue of ethnic and religious minorities. It welcomed the commitment of Iraq to strengthen the legal protection of minorities, to combat discrimination and to improve the human rights situation of internally displaced persons. It regretted, however, that the Government of Iraq had rejected the recommendations on acceding to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, as that would have shown the State's commitment to conform to international law.

774. The Women's Human Rights International Association and International Educational Development were concerned about the lack of available information regarding any investigation into the massacre that occurred on 1 September 2013 at Camp Ashraf and the attack that later took place at Camp Liberty. The investigations appeared to fall short with regard to the basic standards and principles of independence and impartiality. A letter had been sent from three mandate holders to the Government of Iraq on 6 August 2014 referring to the lack of a proper investigation, with no reply. They called upon the Human Rights Council to support the mandate holders and initiate a full investigation.

775. The Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies drew the attention of the Human Rights Council to the unprecedented suffering of ethnic and religious minorities in Iraq. It was gravely concerned about the systematic targeting of minorities by ISIL in acts that were tantamount to grave international crimes. It reminded the Government of its responsibility to protect minorities and to protect the human rights of all citizens. Atrocities were continuing against the Yazidis, while the Government did little to address those violations, to make efforts to amend legislation to protect minorities, or to ensure that serious investigations were conducted to achieve justice for victims. Eighty-five per cent of Yazidis had been displaced and thousands had been killed, 1,500 children had been trained at the hands of Daesh, and 5,000 women had been kidnapped and sold into slavery, while those freed had not received rehabilitation.

776. Amnesty International remained concerned about past and present human rights abuses that were carried out with impunity. It urged the State to address the problems of thousands of internally displaced persons and to rein in Shia militias, holding them accountable for the abuses they committed, including abductions and killings of Sunni civilian men. It urged Iraq to act on the recommendations that called for the elimination of the militias and other armed groups fighting alongside government forces. It referred to a pattern of extrajudicial executions by government forces, and urged the State to act on recommendations concerning air strikes against ISIS-controlled areas, which had killed and injured dozens of civilians, and to respect international humanitarian and human rights law during military operations. It called upon Iraq to stop the use of torture, as it was also used to extract confessions leading in some cases to the sentencing to death of individuals in grossly unfair trials, and urged the State to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and to establish a moratorium on the death penalty.

777. Human Rights Now condemned the grave human rights violations committed by ISIL, and at the same time was concerned about the widespread and systematic violations committed by the Government and its security forces against its own citizens. It considered that the lack of rule of law and the discriminative attacks and prevailing human rights violations committed by the Government and the security forces significantly contributed to a chain of retaliations. It urged Iraq to take measures to stop the unlawful attacks, protect civilians during conflict, conduct investigations of past human rights violations and ratify

the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. It recommended that the Human Rights Council appoint a special rapporteur on Iraq under agenda item 4.

778. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme referred to the sociopolitical instability in the country that was a result of the occupation by terrorist extremist groups, and its main concern was how to bring Iraq out of that spiral of violence. It called upon Iraq to give more attention to protecting children, women and religious minorities, and to repeal Jafaari law and capital punishment. It encouraged the State to continue its efforts to combat corruption and illiteracy in rural areas. It called upon the international community to help Iraq to regain its sovereignty.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

779. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 229 recommendations received, Iraq had supported 175 recommendations and noted 54.

780. The delegation concluded by thanking the Human Rights Council and all of the delegations for their statements and welcomed the support and the readiness to assist expressed in most statements, particularly those by non-governmental organizations. Iraq was willing to consider all of the allegations of human rights violations with a view to addressing them. It denied the existence of Jafaari law in the State.

Madagascar

781. The review of Madagascar was held on 3 November 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Madagascar in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/MDG/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/MDG/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/MDG/3).

782. At its 41st meeting, on 19 March 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Madagascar (see sect. C below).

783. The outcome of the review of Madagascar comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/28/13), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/28/13/Add.1).

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

784. Madagascar stated that, during the course of the interactive dialogue, it had received 160 recommendations, of which it had accepted 139 and postponed 21. The postponed recommendations were relating to the accession of Madagascar to legal instruments to which it was not yet a party, the modification of public buildings with infrastructure adapted to persons with disabilities, and the promotion and protection of freedom of expression and freedom of the press. Replies and the final position of Madagascar on those recommendations were given in the addendum to the report of the Working Group.

785. Madagascar stated that, after having submitted its report in November 2014, measures had been immediately adopted upon the return of the delegation to the country. During the celebration to commemorate the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, on 10 December 2014, a meeting to consider the recommendations, those accepted and not accepted, had been organized with members of the Government, representatives of Parliament and of civil society, and technical and financial partners.

786. During that meeting, a draft had been prepared for the implementation of the recommendations. Legislative and institutional measures had been adopted. Those measures included Act No. 2014-040 of 20 January 2015 to combat human trafficking, which encompassed all forms of trafficking, both national and transnational, including sex trafficking, domestic work, begging, modern slavery, organ trafficking, forced marriage and illegal adoption. Madagascar could also try its nationals abroad for crimes involving trafficking.

787. The State had established an independent national human rights commission through the adoption of a decree of 3 February 2015 stipulating the rules of procedure. After the election of its members, that body would begin its activities in line with the Paris Principles. It would receive complaints of violations of human rights and have the competence to undertake visits to any place of detention. The delegation also referred to the establishment of a national bureau to combat human trafficking under a decree adopted on 3 March 2015. The challenge would be to translate the establishment of those institutions into practice.

788. Regarding the recommendation that Madagascar adopt a national plan of action to combat trafficking, such a plan had been adopted on 6 March 2015. It comprised strategies, namely prevention, protection, criminal prosecution and cooperation, in compliance with General Assembly resolution 64/293 on the United Nations Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons.

789. With the support of OHCHR and for the purpose of implementing the recommendations made in the context of the universal periodic review and by treaty bodies and the special procedures, a national plan had been drafted and would be adopted shortly. The plan included actions for implementation with performance indicators and a timetable for 2015–2018 to enable Madagascar to submit its third national report to the Human Rights Council in the context of its review.

790. Madagascar underlined the fact that the challenges were to implement as many recommendations as possible and to submit an interim report in 2016 and the third report in 2018. To that end, Madagascar intended to maintain or step up dialogue and cooperation with all human rights mechanisms. Lastly, Madagascar called upon technical and financial partners to work with it in implementing all the recommendations.

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

791. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Madagascar, 16 delegations made statements.

792. Ethiopia commended Madagascar for having constructively engaged with the Human Rights Council and for having accepted a significant number of recommendations. It also commended the State for having established a national agency to coordinate microfinance aimed at supporting women by providing training, maternal and family planning, children's education and the management of income-generation activities. It encouraged Madagascar to strengthen its national human rights mechanisms to implement the recommendations accepted. Ethiopia also called upon United Nations human rights mechanisms, special funds and programmes to provide Madagascar with technical assistance and capacity-building at its request and on the basis of its priorities.

793. Gabon welcomed the commitment of Madagascar to implement the recommendations that it had accepted during its second review, including those made by Gabon. It recognized that, despite a major political crisis, significant measures had been taken to promote and protect human rights in Madagascar, particularly measures to combat child labour and to help street children with the support of ILO and UNICEF. Gabon encouraged the State to continue its efforts to implement the recommendations accepted and called upon the international community to support it in that endeavour.

794. Kuwait appreciated the efforts made by Madagascar to implement the recommendations accepted during its review and the tangible progress it had made since the review to fulfil its international commitments in the field of human rights. It commended Madagascar for the successful presidential and legislative elections that it had recently held

and for the establishment of the independent national human rights commission, which was in line with the Paris Principles to guarantee fundamental freedoms. Kuwait congratulated Madagascar on having taken effective steps to reform the prison system in order to move from one based on the principle of punishment to one based on rehabilitation, and that was done through the regulation of workers in penal establishments.

795. Libya valued the progress and achievements of Madagascar in the area of human rights. It thanked Madagascar for having accepted most of the recommendations from various States, which reflected its commitment to cooperating with the universal periodic review.

796. Mali commended the openness and spirit of dialogue with which Madagascar had participated in the universal periodic review. In the same spirit, Madagascar had accepted many of the recommendations made, including those on improving living conditions of the population and promoting the rights of women and children. Mali congratulated Madagascar particularly on the ratification of many international legal instruments, including the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrants Workers and Members of Their Families. It called upon the international community to continue to support Madagascar in implementing the recommendations accepted in order to strengthen the promotion and protection of human rights in the country.

797. Sierra Leone noted with satisfaction that Madagascar had accepted its recommendations. It was confident that it would take the steps necessary to implement the recommendations accepted. It applauded the State for its constructive and transparent participation in the universal periodic review and for its numerous efforts to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms.

798. South Africa congratulated Madagascar on its successful review and its acceptance of a large number of recommendations, including those made by South Africa. It welcomed the strides the State had taken, including its recent efforts to ensure food security and to implement social infrastructure and development projects, particularly those relating to the right to health. It recognized that Madagascar had faced a serious political crisis that had reduced its ability to fulfil its obligations under the Covenants to which it was a party and to achieve the Millennium Development Goals. South Africa would continue to support Madagascar in the context of its inclusive national reconciliation process and encouraged the international community to support Madagascar in its development path, including with Southern African Development Community partners. It encouraged Madagascar to continue its efforts to tackle the constraints and challenges it faced.

799. The Sudan was pleased that Madagascar had accepted 139 recommendations and thanked it for having accepted the two recommendations made by the Sudan.

800. Togo welcomed the importance that Madagascar had placed on the universal periodic review process and its acceptance of almost all of the recommendations. It called upon the international community to support Madagascar in implementing the recommendations it had accepted.

801. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela appreciated the efforts made by Madagascar to fulfil its obligations, notably through the creation of the independent national human rights commission and its continued efforts to comply with the Paris Principles. It congratulated the State on the advances it had made despite the issues it had encountered. It encouraged the State, with international support, to strengthen social policies to improve the living conditions of its citizens.

802. Algeria congratulated Madagascar on its acceptance of over 150 recommendations, including the recommendations made by Algeria to continue its reforms of the judicial and penitentiary systems and the fight against the sexual exploitation of children. It encouraged the State to continue its efforts to promote and protect human rights and wished it success in the implementation of the recommendations accepted.

803. Botswana referred to the efforts made by Madagascar to uphold the rule of law and democracy, and applauded the State for the peaceful and free presidential election held in 2014. It commended Madagascar for having adopted an anti-trafficking bill, which provided a platform for the arrest and prosecution of persons involved in trafficking, and

encouraged the State to enact the bill into law. It also encouraged Madagascar to finalize the national plan of action to combat gender-based violence. Botswana applauded Madagascar for its continued cooperation and engagement with the special procedures over the past three years. It appreciated the efforts made by Madagascar to reduce the duration of pretrial detention. The reform of the prison system, including the adoption of a bill that provided for alternative measures to detention, was also appreciated.

804. China commended Madagascar for its constructive participation in the universal periodic review and its decision to accept most of the recommendations made, including the recommendation made by China. Madagascar had committed to continuing its efforts to reduce unemployment and poverty, and had stressed the protection and promotion of the economic, social and cultural rights of its people. The State was developing special economic zones, industrial parks and communication infrastructure in order to increase its development capacity, which China believed would provide a solid basis for comprehensive progress in the human rights cause in Madagascar.

805. Côte d'Ivoire thanked Madagascar for the attention it had paid to the recommendations made during the review. It supported all of the efforts made by the State to comply with its international commitments and to ensure the well-being of its people. It encouraged Madagascar to consolidate all of the measures it had taken to combat trafficking, torture and ill-treatment, and corruption, and to ensure the protection of women and children against abuse. It welcomed the reforms undertaken in the judicial and penitentiary systems. Côte d'Ivoire called upon the international community to continue its cooperation with Madagascar and to provide the State with the technical assistance it required.

806. Cuba was encouraged by the way in which Madagascar had worked to overcome the crisis, which had led to the better enjoyment of human rights by its population. Cuba thanked Madagascar for having accepted the recommendations it had made during its review. It emphasized the efforts made by Madagascar to combat poverty, which had increased as a result of the crisis. Cuba reiterated its call for the international community and the United Nations system to continue to cooperate with Madagascar.

807. Djibouti welcomed the measures taken by Madagascar to restore civil and political rights. It encouraged the State to continue to combat poverty and to protect vulnerable groups in its population.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

808. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Madagascar, six other stakeholders made statements.

809. In a joint statement, Franciscans International, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES International and Apprentis d'Auteuil welcomed the acceptance by Madagascar of a significant number of recommendations made during its review. They especially appreciated the State's acceptance of recommendations on providing free education for all, and particularly its commitment to address the issue of children who had dropped out of school during the political crisis. They strongly encouraged Madagascar to move forward and implement those recommendations. They were concerned about the protection of children in street situations, and called upon Madagascar to develop a coherent and efficient child protection system. They welcomed the intention of Madagascar to improve its civil registration service while pointing out the existing disparity between rural and urban areas, and the lower registration rates among the poorest households.

810. Action Canada for Population and Development commended Madagascar for having accepted the recommendations that called for the adoption of a national plan of action to combat sexual and gender-based violence, that criminalized marital rape and that strengthened laws and their implementation on trafficking in persons. It applauded the acceptance by Madagascar of the recommendations on preventing such harmful practices as early forced marriage. Nevertheless, it requested that Madagascar take a number of additional actions to fully achieve the right to health and the right to life of women,

including by providing access to sexual and reproductive health information services. It urged Madagascar to consider systematizing and making compulsory the implementation of comprehensive sexual education programmes, for all ages, with a focus on how to avoid unwanted pregnancy.

811. Centre Europe-Tiers Monde – Europe-Third World Centre stated that the commitments made by Madagascar during its review included the guarantee of freedom of opinion and expression. According to its information, that basic right continued to be violated in Madagascar, where the 80 radio stations that had been forcibly closed by the transitional Government five years earlier were not yet authorized to broadcast. In addition, journalists were threatened and even murdered. It voiced its concern about the cases of summary executions and collective punishment during military operations conducted in southern Madagascar against cattle raiders. More than a thousand people had reportedly been killed in that region since 2012, while others had fled as a result of the terror exerted by security forces. Lastly, it called upon Madagascar to consider inviting the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions to investigate violations committed by law enforcement agencies and armed groups, and illicit arms trafficking.

812. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme congratulated Madagascar on the smooth organization of legislative and presidential elections, and its commitment to combat corruption, which was poisoning the judicial system, the administration and the political class. It also commended the State for the invitation it had extended to the special procedures and for the updating of its periodic reports to the treaty bodies. It was concerned, however, about poor detention conditions, prison overcrowding and the cruel and inhuman treatment of prisoners. It called upon Madagascar to combat gender violence, child prostitution, sex tourism, trafficking in persons and violence committed by law enforcement agencies. It invited Madagascar to undertake courageous reforms in order to systematically eradicate certain harmful traditional practices that undermined human rights. Lastly, it encouraged Madagascar to make efforts to reduce extreme poverty, illiteracy and the destruction of flora and fauna.

813. Hope International stated that most of the recommendations accepted by Madagascar were on civil and political rights, while very few were on economic, social and cultural rights, which were the State's major problem, and only one recommendation concerned an adequate standard of living. The State suffered from natural disasters and had moved from experiencing malnutrition to famine, which was ravaging the southern part of the country and could impact the capital, where the growing number of internally displaced persons and homeless were unable to receive basic supplies because roads and bridges had been damaged owing to heavy rains and cyclones.

814. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom commended Madagascar for its participation in the universal periodic review. It was concerned about human insecurity and the extrajudicial executions committed by the police since 2012, particularly in southern areas rich in mineral resources. The Government had committed massacres in that region through operations Tandroka and Coup d'arrêt. Since 2012, the two operations had resulted in 1,100 victims, according to the press and the national gendarmerie. Security forces had enjoyed impunity in the commission of those crimes. It requested the opening of a credible and independent inquiry into the abuses committed by the security forces during the two operations. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom encouraged Madagascar to allow the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions to investigate the situation, to send a standing invitation to all mandate holders of the Human Rights Council and to take the measures necessary to ensure human security.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

815. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 160 recommendations received, Madagascar had supported 159 recommendations and noted one.

816. The delegation of Madagascar noticed during the interactive dialogue that there was a climate of objectivity, which was conducive to transparency and advancing the application of measures inherent to improving the human rights situation on the ground in

Madagascar. The observations, requests for clarification and comments made by States and non-governmental organizations had been recorded. Madagascar had been able to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the country in promoting and protecting human rights.

817. The delegation reaffirmed the total openness of Madagascar to taking up the challenge to pursue its policies and programmes in the area of human rights, in particular by implementing the recommendations made by various human rights mechanisms. It underlined the fact that progress had certainly been made or initiated, but that much remained to be done.

818. Madagascar had made an effort to implement all of the recommendations. However, technical and financial support by partners would help to improve the general human rights situation and thus contribute to development since it was said that, without development, there could be no promotion and protection of human rights but without the latter, there could be no sustainable development.

Slovenia

819. The review of Slovenia was held on 4 November 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Slovenia in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/SVN/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/SVN/2 and Corr.1);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/SVN/3).

820. At its 41st meeting, on 19 March 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Slovenia (see sect. C below).

821. The outcome of the review of Slovenia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/28/15), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/28/15/Add.1).

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

822. The delegation of Slovenia thanked the members of the troika for their work in support of the review and all the delegations for their constructive engagement. It attached great importance to the universal periodic review process, which was an important mechanism that helped to strengthen the promotion and protection of human rights at the national level.

823. The delegation of Slovenia then proceeded to explain the State's position on the recommendations made during its review.

824. All of the recommendations had been carefully examined by a working group comprising members of all the government ministries, who had then proposed responses for consideration by the Government. The Cabinet of Ministers then made the final decision regarding the State's official response.

825. The review and the recommendations received had been discussed by the competent bodies of the National Assembly (the commission for petitions, human rights and equal opportunities, and the committee on foreign policy) and with the human rights ombudsperson. The Government had also informed civil society organizations about the review and the recommendations received. To ensure full transparency, the documentation relating to the review of Slovenia had been translated into Slovenian and made available on the website of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

826. The delegation then provided additional information on certain topics addressed during the review.

827. With regard to gender equality and women's rights, at the beginning of February, Slovenia had ratified the Istanbul Convention.

828. The Government was preparing a new national plan on equal opportunities for women and men for 2015–2020, which included additional measures to tackle gender inequalities in Slovenia from different perspectives, such as economic independence, work–family balance, gender stereotypes, social inclusion, health, participation in decision-making, violence against women, and foreign policy and development cooperation.

829. The issue of trafficking in persons was very important to Slovenia as a country of origin, transit and final destination, although the numbers recorded were relatively small. In January, a new comprehensive strategy to combat trafficking in persons – a biannual action plan – had been adopted by the Government. The action plan included provisions that would contribute to the implementation of the recommendations on trafficking received during the review.

830. There were approximately 10,000 Roma living in Slovenia and measures to address their needs were included in many sectoral policies and laws. Slovenia recognized that members of the Roma community sometimes found themselves in an underprivileged position and may be more exposed to discrimination, and confirmed that steps were being taken to address that situation.

831. The Government was preparing a new national programme of measures for Roma for the period 2016–2021, taking into account the recommendations received on that topic. Representatives of the Roma community were included in the preparation of the programme of measures.

832. Equality was a constitutional right in Slovenia. Measures to combat discrimination were included in various national policies and in legislation. The Government was committed to strengthening equality protection mechanisms and was currently considering different options in that regard.

833. Regarding lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons, the National Assembly had adopted amendments to the law on marriage and family relations, which granted equal status to same-sex and heterosexual unions.

834. The delegation provided information about how Slovenia intended to proceed in monitoring the implementation of the recommendations accepted.

835. The interdepartmental working group that had already been active in the preparatory phase of the universal periodic review process and in the assessment of the recommendations received would also monitor the progress made with regard to the implementation of the recommendations. Regular reporting on the implementation of the recommendations would also be made to the interdepartmental commission on human rights, which was the national body that coordinated the State's reporting to international human rights mechanisms. Both bodies would regularly report to the Government.

836. Furthermore, Slovenia would once again be preparing a voluntary midterm report on the implementation of the recommendations.

837. Lastly, the delegation reiterated that Slovenia fully supported the universal periodic review process. The unique peer-review mechanism was instrumental in strengthening respect for and the promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms at all levels. As a candidate for membership in the Human Rights Council for the period 2016–2018, Slovenia pledged to work for the advancement of human rights in international human rights forums, including through its active engagement in the universal periodic review.

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

838. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Slovenia, eight delegations made statements.

839. Sierra Leone thanked Slovenia for its informative update and stated that, although it had received several recommendations, Slovenia had still not accepted any of the recommendations made by Sierra Leone or any other delegation during its second review. It was commendable that Slovenia had set up robust legal and institutional frameworks to address human rights. It encouraged the State to intensify its efforts to combat all forms of violence against women and children.

840. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela stated that it had made recommendations to Slovenia, among others, on intensifying its efforts to combat stigmatization and discrimination against ethnic minorities, in particular the Roma population and migrants. It was pleased that the Government had accepted most of the recommendations and highlighted its willingness to continue cooperating with the Government of Slovenia in the framework of the Human Rights Council to improve the human rights situation.

841. China commended Slovenia for its constructive participation in the universal periodic review, its comprehensive and positive response to the recommendations, and its decision to accept the majority of the recommendations. It appreciated the State's acceptance of the recommendations made by China on continuing to strengthen the protection of persons with disabilities in order to fundamentally improve their living conditions through such measures as increasing employment opportunities, and to increase input into education for Roma and other minority groups.

842. Côte d'Ivoire supported all of the steps taken by the Government of Slovenia to meet its international obligations and encouraged the State to continue its efforts to promote gender equality and to fight violence against women, to mitigate the impact of austerity measures on the most vulnerable population, to prevent trafficking in persons, and to combat all forms of racial, ethnic and religious discrimination. It called upon the State to continue its cooperation with the international community.

843. The Council of Europe stated that the discrimination against and the social exclusion of Roma was a challenge Slovenia faced. It acknowledged the impressive achievements of the State in improving that situation, while it remained deeply concerned about the socioeconomic conditions of many Roma. Discrimination against national minorities was another challenge, as prejudices and stereotypes against persons belonging to the "new national communities" and the German-speaking community were persistent. Corruption was another challenge, and the Council of Europe invited the Government to ensure a better implementation of the corruption prevention legal framework. It welcomed the measures that had already been taken to address those challenges and congratulated Slovenia on the ratification of the Istanbul Convention and the Convention on the Protection of Children against Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse.

844. Cuba highlighted the advances and achievements of Slovenia in human rights, while it remained concerned about the effects of the economic crisis on the economic and social rights of the population. In that regard, it thanked Slovenia for having accepted the two recommendations made by Cuba, which it considered to be already implemented or in process of implementation.

845. The Islamic Republic of Iran referred to the decision by the Government of Slovenia to accept the recommendations it had made on preventing racial discrimination and racist attacks, particularly against Roma, on preventing ethnically motivated crimes and on preventing and addressing all forms of violence against women and children. It had made recommendations on preventing discrimination against children belonging to national minorities, especially Roma children, and to ensure equal opportunities in access to quality education, to combat trafficking in persons and to provide victims of trafficking with protection.

846. Kuwait thanked Slovenia for its comprehensive presentation on its position, the steps it had taken to implement the recommendations and the progress it had made since its previous review. It welcomed the steps taken to keep up with its reporting obligations to treaty bodies and the steps it had taken in the context of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Slovenia had taken steps to strengthen its institutional framework on human rights and to protect social rights, thereby reducing poverty and upholding fundamental rights and freedoms.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

847. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Slovenia, one other stakeholder made a statement.

848. Amnesty International welcomed the acceptance by Slovenia of numerous recommendations on the human rights of Roma and urged it to implement them without delay, including those considered to be already implemented. It called upon Slovenia to take immediate and concrete measures to combat all forms of discrimination against Roma and to ensure their equal enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights. It welcomed a recent parliamentary committee decision directing the Government to prepare a strategic framework to improve the situation of Roma; that framework should be developed through a truly inclusive, gender-sensitive and participatory process. It urged the Government to change its approach and to invite all relevant stakeholders to engage in the drafting process. It also urged Slovenia to guarantee the right to adequate housing and called upon it to implement the recommendations on the rights of Roma children.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

849. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 163 recommendations received, Slovenia had supported 142 recommendations and noted 21.

850. The delegation of Slovenia thanked all the speakers for their comments and stated that it had taken due note of them and would convey them to the Government for its consideration.

851. The Government of Slovenia was committed to implementing the recommendations it had accepted. Some measures had already been taken in that regard, and Slovenia was committed to taking further concrete steps.

852. The delegation was looking forward to the next review of Slovenia and hoped for the continuation of fruitful and constructive dialogue.

Egypt

853. The review of Egypt was held on 5 November 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Egypt in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/EGY/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/EGY/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/EGY/3).

854. At its 42nd meeting, on 20 March 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Egypt (see sect. C below).

855. The outcome of the review of Egypt comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/28/16), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/28/16/Add.1).

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

856. The head of the delegation of Egypt reiterated his appreciation for the universal periodic review as a valuable mechanism in the development of human rights around the world, characterized by universality, non-selectivity and objectivity, and based on interactive and constructive dialogue. Egypt had contributed positively to the development

of that mechanism, especially through the drafting and adoption of Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21 and other decisions.

857. The examination by the Working Group of the human rights situation in Egypt had resulted in 300 recommendations, which had been addressed at the national level through an institutional process initiated by Cabinet decision No. 37 of 2015, creating a permanent national committee for human rights. That committee, which comprised different national stakeholders, had studied and decided upon a position in response to the above-mentioned recommendations. It also had the task of proposing policies and measures for the implementation of and follow-up on the recommendations accepted. The committee was currently chaired by the Minister for Transitional Justice, a position created after the revolution of 25 January, and comprised various other ministries and stakeholders.

858. The committee had held a significant number of meetings and lengthy consultations with several relevant Egyptian stakeholders, including the national council for human rights, the national council for women, the national council for motherhood and childhood, and the national council for people with disabilities, and representatives of other civil society organizations, with a view to hearing the visions and proposals of those entities on the recommendations received by Egypt during its review. Among other tangible results, it had been agreed that regular meetings between the Government and civil society would be held to discuss human rights issues.

859. Egypt had submitted to the secretariat an addendum to the report of the Working Group clearly describing its position on all 300 recommendations. The acceptance of the recommendations, whether fully or partially, was in the light of the State's commitment to, and was based on, the provisions of the new Constitution of Egypt, which had been approved in a referendum in January 2014, and its international obligations in the field of human rights.

860. A number of recommendations had already been implemented, including those on the establishment of a national human rights institution in accordance with the Paris Principles. The national council for human rights had been working for many years independently and efficiently, and enjoyed "A status" by the International Coordinating Committee of National Human Rights Institutions.

861. The partial support of a recommendation meant that part of the recommendation had been accepted or its goal had been accepted, while Egypt did not agree with the time frame or the proposed method of implementation. Several recommendations included more than one topic within the same recommendation, thus making the task of the national committee particularly difficult. After consulting with the secretariat, Egypt had provided further information in a letter explaining in detail which parts of each partially accepted recommendations had enjoyed the support of Egypt and which parts had been noted.

862. The decision not to support some recommendations, which had been applied to a very limited number, may have been made because a recommendation was in contradiction with the provisions of the Constitution – for example, it was stated in the Constitution that Islamic sharia law was the main source of legislation – or because a recommendation was contrary to the framework of international law or international human rights law, such as the recommendations calling for the abolition of the death penalty, an issue that Egypt had explained at length during the session of the Working Group.

863. Ultimately, Egypt had fully supported 224 recommendations and partially supported 23.

864. With regard to the accession by Egypt to international human rights treaties and the withdrawal of reservations to conventions that Egypt had already ratified, the Government was committed to review the legislation governing citizens' rights in line with the Constitution. It was currently reviewing its reservations to articles 2 and 16 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women in the context of the new Constitution and in conformity with Islamic sharia law.

865. With regard to the recommendations relating to institutional and legislative frameworks, the Government's position was based on its promotion and protection of human rights through the prosecution of any person responsible for violating human rights

or for attacking any citizen during the legitimate exercise of their rights. The right to dignity was one of the most important rights guaranteed by the Constitution, which was reflected in the acceptance by Egypt of all the recommendations relating to the crime of torture.

866. Egypt had accepted all the recommendations concerning the rights of women and children in the belief that all of them deserved full protection, and had attached great importance to criminalizing all forms of violence against women, marginalized groups, including women and children with disabilities and the poor, and to protecting the family as the basic unit of society, a topic on which Egypt had presented an initiative in the context of the work of the Human Rights Council.

867. With regard to the recommendations on cooperation with international human rights mechanisms, Egypt reiterated its wish to strengthen cooperation with those mechanisms, including the Human Rights Council and the special procedures. It had already extended invitations to a number of mandate holders to visit the country.

868. Regarding procedures and safeguards of the judicial system and transitional justice, Egypt had addressed the recommendations in line with its commitment to provide guarantees to a fair trial and equality through the Constitution and the Criminal Procedure Code to all citizens without discrimination, as explained in detail in the addendum to the report of the Working Group and in the above-mentioned letter to the secretariat.

869. The Government had shown great openness in addressing the recommendations on strengthening the protection of and respect for civil and political rights, especially with respect to those relating to the preparation of a new law on non-governmental organizations and those relating to the right to peaceful assembly, the right to freedom of opinion and expression, freedom of religion, and the prohibition of discrimination in all its forms, while confirming that civil society was a key partner of the Government in strengthening those rights.

870. Egypt had accepted all the recommendations on developing human rights education and training, combating trafficking and illegal migration, and economic, social and cultural rights.

871. Egypt had also accepted all six recommendations on the fight against terrorism, in line with article 237 of the Constitution, thereby ensuring, inter alia, the disbursement of compensation to victims of terrorism.

872. The fact that Egypt had accepted a large number of recommendations was proof of its cooperation with the universal periodic review process, and its openness to the different views expressed during the review. More importantly, it reflected the priority given to the protection and promotion of human rights in the political vision of the State.

873. Since its review, Egypt had continued to work diligently on the revision of its laws and legislation, particularly through the work of the supreme committee on legislative reform. It also continued to work on the implementation of operational policies and programmes, many of which were concerned with the economic and social rights that had priority in the current phase. The next phase would show a significant momentum with the forthcoming election of the new House of Representatives.

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

874. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Egypt, 16 delegations made statements.¹³

875. Belarus stated that the careful consideration that the Government of Egypt had given to the recommendations testified to the close attention the State paid to the defence and

¹³ The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted, if available, on the extranet of the Human Rights Council at <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/28thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

protection of human rights. Egypt had accepted a significant number of recommendations, including those made by Belarus. It welcomed the State's constructive approach to cooperation within the framework of the universal periodic review to strengthen national capacity and to broaden international cooperation on human rights.

876. Belgium welcomed the commitments of Egypt within the framework of the universal periodic review process and encouraged the State to implement the recommendations. It recognized the necessity to combat terrorism but highlighted the fact that maintaining order should be carried out in compliance with the international human rights norms that Egypt had accepted by becoming a party to the relevant conventions. It was pleased that Egypt had accepted its four recommendations.

877. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela highlighted the open cooperation of Egypt with the universal periodic review mechanism. It underlined the State's successful plans in expanding social services and programmes for the protection of the population. It acknowledged the significant efforts made by Egypt to comply with its human rights obligations and appreciated the Government's commitment to achieve that objective.

878. Botswana welcomed the amendments made to the Constitution, which now reflected the State's commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights. It noted with appreciation that Egypt had accepted the majority of the recommendations received and had taken measures to implement them. It commended the State for its initiatives to promote the equality of women and encouraged Egypt to continue to step up such efforts.

879. Brunei Darussalam appreciated the commitment of Egypt to implement policies to ensure the fundamental rights and freedoms of its people. It particularly welcomed its initiatives to eradicate illiteracy and its efforts to empower women. Egypt had accepted a significant number of the recommendations. It recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report.

880. Burkina Faso was pleased that it had been able to participate in the interactive dialogue with Egypt and that it had contributed by addressing the recommendations on improving the human rights situation in the country. It was grateful to Egypt for having accepted the three recommendations it had made. It called upon the Human Rights Council to adopt the report of Egypt.

881. China appreciated the constructive engagement of Egypt with the universal periodic review. It was pleased that Egypt had accepted its recommendations on continuing to empower women in public life and on further promoting human rights education and training for law enforcement agents. Egypt had made progress in the areas of employment, policies on women, protecting children with disabilities and migrants.

882. Côte d'Ivoire commended Egypt for the interest it had shown in the recommendations received. Their implementation would contribute to the strengthening of measures to ensure the full enjoyment of all rights in the country. It encouraged Egypt to continue its efforts to ensure the rule of law and to consolidate social development, public security and the protection of vulnerable groups.

883. Cuba thanked Egypt for having accepted the three recommendations it had made relating to corruption, the economic empowerment of women and religious tolerance. The implementation of those and the other recommendations accepted would help the State to continue to improve its human rights situation. It believed that Egypt would be able to address the complex situations and changes faced in recent years.

884. Saudi Arabia thanked Egypt for the information it had provided, notably that it had accepted most of the recommendations received, including those made by Saudi Arabia. Egypt had endured a difficult period over the past few years but that had not prevented it from cooperating more closely with the international community in the area of human rights.

885. El Salvador congratulated Egypt on having accepted many of the recommendations it had received during its second review. It hoped that, with the announcement of upcoming parliamentary elections, the State would consolidate its democracy. It urged Egypt to

continue to work and cooperate with civil society, the special procedures and OHCHR in the promotion and protection of the human rights of all Egyptians.

886. Ethiopia appreciated the constructive and principled engagement of Egypt with the Human Rights Council and its acceptance of a significant number of the recommendations from its second review. It thanked Egypt for having accepted all of its recommendations. It was pleased with the development by the State of strong implementation mechanisms.

887. Gabon welcomed the adoption of the new Constitution, which included a chapter on human rights. The Constitution addressed issues relating to the right to strike and eliminated certain restrictions on the freedom of belief. Gabon welcomed such initiatives as the adoption of more stringent sanctions for violence against women and the establishment of health insurance for families headed by women and young children.

888. Germany was pleased that Egypt had accepted many of the recommendations from its second review. With regard to the recommendations Germany had made, it appreciated the commitment by Egypt to step up the protection of women's rights. The unfettered protection of freedom of association was necessary for the development of a society's full potential and it regretted that the State had not accepted the recommendation on reintroducing a moratorium on the death penalty.

889. Ghana commended Egypt for its dedication to the universal periodic review process despite the major political and social changes that had occurred and expressed solidarity with the people of Egypt. It welcomed the progressive changes introduced through the Constitution of 2014, and called upon the State to consider the recommendations from the review favourably, and upon OHCHR and the international community to assist Egypt in the achievement of its human rights goals.

890. Greece welcomed the acceptance by Egypt of many of the recommendations received and expressed confidence that the Government would take all the measures necessary to implement them swiftly. It was pleased that its recommendations had been accepted, particularly those on increasing women's representation in Parliament and on strengthening efforts to combat illegal migration. It appreciated the State's stabilizing role in the Middle East and North Africa.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

891. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Egypt, 11 other stakeholders made statements.¹³

892. The President of the national council for human rights was pleased with the human rights policies of the Government of Egypt and called upon it to repeal all laws that may restrict fundamental freedoms. The national council would take responsibility for the implementation of recommendations from the review within the scope of its mandate. It urged the Government to amend the law on demonstrations, to adopt new legislation on the right to assembly, to establish a commission for equality and non-discrimination, to strengthen its efforts to fight terrorism, to establish an independent mechanism to undertake prison visits, a task that could be fulfilled by the national council, to invite special rapporteurs to visit Egypt, and, together with OHCHR, to take the measures necessary to establish a regional OHCHR office in Cairo. The region needed peace and international cooperation to combat terrorism, especially regarding the protection of the rights of Palestinians.

893. The Center for Economic and Social Rights commended Egypt for the constitutional protection of economic and social rights and for having supported the recommendations on those issues, but it was concerned by the gap between its commitments and the reality on the ground. More than a quarter of the population lived in poverty, and harsh austerity measures disproportionately impacted the most vulnerable groups of society. It called upon the State to prioritize rights-based socioeconomic reforms and upon the Human Rights Council to be vigilant with regard to the full range of rights in Egypt.

894. The International Service for Human Rights, the Association for Progressive Communications and the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development were concerned that the violence, intimidation and harassment faced by women human rights defenders had

intensified. In particular, they referred to recommendations 166.177 to 166.184 on the compliance of Egypt with its international obligations to ensure fair, equitable and independent judicial procedures. They called upon the Government to ensure prompt and independent investigations to identify the perpetrators of killings during peaceful protests and to hold them to account.

895. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues stated that several Egyptian human rights organizations had not participated in the review of Egypt for fear of reprisals upon their return to the country. The claim that no one had been punished for their opinion or political affiliation was baseless. Thousands of political prisoners had been sentenced to lengthy prison sentences in mass trials marred by irregularities. Laws criminalizing violence against women contained significant gaps; in particular, the definition of rape was inadequate and there was an absence of provisions criminalizing domestic violence.

896. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland and the International Lesbian and Gay Association were concerned about the continuous human rights violations of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer community in Egypt. The State had no explicit law criminalizing homosexuality, but used debauchery, prostitution and blasphemy laws against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer persons, who were also tortured and sexually violated by the police while in detention. Since October 2013, more than 200 transgender persons had been arrested.

897. The Egyptian Organization for Human Rights stated that the acceptance by Egypt of a large number of recommendations was a positive step and that the Constitution of 2014 incorporated provisions for economic, social and civil rights. However, policies and strategies must be implemented in consultation with stakeholders, particularly women and human rights organizations. In order to do so, the laws relating to the rights to association and public assembly needed to be amended.

898. The East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project expressed its solidarity with the many Egyptian non-governmental organizations, civil society members, human rights defenders and journalists who had borne the brunt of a clampdown on the rights to freedom of expression, association and assembly. They welcomed the recommendation of Tunisia to guarantee an environment conducive to the work of journalists, human rights defenders and civil society organizations, and the call from the United States of America to release those detained solely for exercising their right to freedom of expression.

899. The Arab Organization for Human Rights was pleased with the positive steps taken by Egypt to realize the legitimate aspirations of the Egyptian people, especially the adoption of the Constitution of 2014, which was largely in line with international standards. Despite the challenges it faced, especially the growing number of terrorist acts, Egypt should lift the restrictions relating to the work of civil society and achieve democratization through, inter alia, the implementation of human rights.

900. Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship stated that no high-level official responsible for the killing of protestors had been held accountable and that several States Members of the Human Rights Council had recommended the repeal of the protest law. At least 10 journalists remained in prison. New and extreme pressures, including changes to the Penal Code criminalizing the receipt of foreign funds, were exerted on civil society organizations. Member States should take proactive measures to ensure that Egypt fulfilled the commitments it had made during its review.

901. The Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies stated that violations of the rights to peaceful assembly and association were on the rise and the majority of assemblies were met with the excessive use of force. On 24 January 2014, activists had been attacked by the police, resulting in the killing of a woman human rights defender. Thousands of individuals had been in prison since July 2013 for having protested against government policies. More than 100 detainees had been killed as a result of torture in detention facilities over the past two years, with little investigation into those crimes.

902. Human Rights Watch stated that, since the universal periodic review of Egypt, the Government had perpetrated more human rights violations, and its response to the recommendations made during its review offered little hope of progress. Egypt had noted the recommendations on releasing those detained for politically motivated reasons; in fact, authorities had arrested at least 41,000 persons since July 2013, in most cases solely for being members of the Muslim Brotherhood, or secular or leftist activists. The Government had not provided a full account of the number of people arrested, convicted and sentenced. Many of those who had challenged the protest law had been imprisoned and others had been killed.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

903. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 300 recommendations received, Egypt had supported 224 recommendations and noted 53. The State had provided additional information on the remaining 23 recommendations, clearly indicating which part of each recommendation had been supported and which part had been noted.

904. The delegation of Egypt extended its sincere thanks to all the participants in the dialogue and to the President of the national council for human rights, whose independence was guaranteed and appreciated. The delegation had heard both positive criticism and statements that were not well grounded. For instance, the complaints of some non-governmental organizations on the legal procedures followed in the case of the activist Shaaïmaa el-Sabajh and allegations of impunity relating to killings during mass gatherings were unfounded.

905. The January and June revolutions had shaped the road map for the future, though more time was needed to consolidate achievements. The greater part of the road ahead had been covered through the adoption of the new Constitution in 2014, which included unprecedented provisions for the protection of civil and economic rights and freedoms. The new Constitution would also play a key role in linking the vision of transitional justice with reform policies. The recommendations accepted would be implemented though an ambitious plan, led by the national council for human rights, which would see the participation of all stakeholders. There was great optimism in a future with prosperity and equality in Egypt, as manifested in the emblematic success of the recent economic conference, held in Sharm el-Sheikh.

Bosnia and Herzegovina

906. The review of Bosnia and Herzegovina was held on 5 November 2014 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Human Rights Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Bosnia and Herzegovina in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/BIH/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/BIH/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/20/BIH/3).

907. At its 42nd meeting, on 20 March 2015, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Bosnia and Herzegovina (see sect. C below).

908. The outcome of the review of Bosnia and Herzegovina comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/28/17), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, and its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group.

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

909. The delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina stated that its cooperation with the Human Rights Council had always been constructive and fruitful. That had been reflected in its efforts to fulfil its reporting obligations under various United Nations human rights treaties in a timely manner by successfully presenting its reports and by noting and accepting the recommendations and instructions aimed at making further progress.

910. Bosnia and Herzegovina looked forward to further increasing its cooperation with the Human Rights Council and fulfilling its human rights commitments. It had paid particular attention to its obligations deriving from the universal periodic review mechanism. It considered it to be a positive, innovative mechanism with true potential to improve human rights on the ground. The conclusions and recommendations of the Working Group provided an impetus for the relevant authorities to further increase their cooperation with the United Nations bodies dealing with human rights.

911. Bosnia and Herzegovina thanked all the delegations that had actively participated in the interactive dialogue, had recognized the efforts of the State since its first review, and had made valuable recommendations and observations in order to improve the State's human rights record.

912. Bosnia and Herzegovina had experienced a prolonged interim period under a caretaker Council of Ministers since the elections held in October 2014. The new Council of Ministers was expected to be fully operational within a few days of the current meeting. The new authorities would therefore need more time to continue to examine thoroughly the 167 recommendations received during the State's review, all of which were being considered. From a procedural perspective, Bosnia and Herzegovina would soon be in a position to provide specific views on each recommendation and would do so no later than the June session of the Human Rights Council. It also had no doubt that everything that fell within the framework of its accepted international obligations and the constitutional arrangement of the State would be considered positively.

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

913. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Bosnia and Herzegovina, nine delegations made statements.

914. Malaysia appreciated the commitment and transparency of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the State's forthcoming engagement in the universal periodic review process. It was pleased with the State's responses during the session of the Working Group, particularly with its efforts to strengthen its legal and constitutional framework on human rights. It lauded the State for the adoption of the new law on social protection, which had led to an improvement in the status of the most vulnerable population groups.

915. As a member of the troika for the review of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sierra Leone commended the State for its cooperation and openness in the review process. However, Bosnia and Herzegovina had yet to provide its responses to the recommendations and it called upon the State to consider all the recommendations it had received, including the recommendations from Sierra Leone, as soon as the situation permitted. Sierra Leone also encouraged Bosnia and Herzegovina to continue to work to improve the human rights situation in the country and it looked forward to the continued positive engagement of the State in the review process.

916. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland recognized the steps taken by Bosnia and Herzegovina to implement some recommendations from its first review and called for the implementation of all previously accepted recommendations and those that it would accept from the present cycle. It was concerned about the increased attacks on journalists, the independence of the media and the recent adoption of a law on public order in the Republika Srpska. It called for the urgent adoption of legislation to enable the establishment of and provide adequate resourcing for its national preventive mechanism under the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel,

Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and urged the State to adopt an anti-discrimination action plan.

917. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela acknowledged the commitment of Bosnia and Herzegovina to human rights. It highlighted the State's accession to several international instruments, including the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and its efforts to adjust its legal framework on the prevention of gender violence, including domestic violence, and the protection of victims. It commended the State for its efforts to implement the recommendations it had previously accepted.

918. China commended Bosnia and Herzegovina for its constructive engagement with the universal periodic review and its consideration of the recommendations it had received. It appreciated the State's consideration of its recommendations on the promotion and protection of the rights of vulnerable groups, so that it would be able to enjoy increased and equal opportunities of development. It wished Bosnia and Herzegovina greater success in the comprehensive advancement of human rights and endorsed the approval by the Human Rights Council of the outcome of the review of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

919. The Council of Europe was particularly concerned by the social exclusion and marginalization of and discrimination against Roma. More measures needed to be taken to harmonize legislation concerning the criminalization of offences of corruption and to strengthen the internal control of the mechanisms of political parties. Access to justice and effective domestic remedies and adequate, effective and proportionate reparations needed to be ensured for victims of wartime atrocities. It noted with satisfaction the ratification of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, the adoption of the anti-discrimination law at the State level and the completion of the restructuring of the ombudsman institution.

920. Kuwait thanked Bosnia and Herzegovina for the comprehensive information it had provided on its efforts to implement the recommendations accepted and on developments in the area of human rights. It welcomed its efforts to promote and protect human rights in such areas as health, the rights of children and the rights of women, and to accede to several international instruments, including the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

921. Latvia commended Bosnia and Herzegovina for its commitment to and constructive participation in its second review. It recognized the State's progress in promoting gender equality, including by signing and ratifying a number of international instruments that addressed the prohibition of violence against women and domestic violence. It also referred to the elaboration by the State of a strategy for preventing and combating domestic violence. Latvia encouraged Bosnia and Herzegovina to take further steps to ensure freedom of speech and freedom of access to information both offline and online.

922. Libya welcomed the commitment of Bosnia and Herzegovina to and active participation in the universal periodic review process. It commended the State for the transparency and openness it had shown and for its serious consideration of the recommendations, which reflected the State's commitment to further improving the human rights situation in the country. Libya recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the outcome report on Bosnia and Herzegovina.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

923. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Bosnia and Herzegovina, seven other stakeholders made statements.¹³

924. The ombudsman institution of Bosnia and Herzegovina highlighted several areas that required urgent attention. Many strategic documents relating to particular human rights issues had been elaborated, but there was no comprehensive document to guide all public authorities. The reform of the ombudsman institution needed to be completed, in accordance with the recommendations of the European Commission for Democracy through Law (Venice Commission), and sufficient resources allocated to it, as did the process of making the ombudsman the national preventive mechanism. Twenty years after the war, many victims had not been recognized; it was now a critical moment to resolve

their situation. Conditions for doing so included the adoption of a law on torture victims and the creation of measures for reparation. All obstacles preventing access to information and freedom of the media needed to be removed. The implementation of an anti-discrimination law would guarantee the protection of all vulnerable groups, and the participation of women needed to be increased.

925. The Human Rights House Foundation noted the political circumstances under which Bosnia and Herzegovina had been reviewed, but stated that civil society had participated in the hope that the resulting commitments would bring change. It was concerned that, despite the protests of February 2014, the necessary reforms had not been made. Discrimination on all grounds was one of the main issues, and ethnic minorities, particularly Roma, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons, and persons with disabilities, were especially discriminated against. As recommended in the review, the State and entity governments must join forces to take further steps to implement the decision of the European Court of Human Rights on the case of *Sejdić and Finci v. Bosnia and Herzegovina*. The State should also accept the recommendations on ending segregation in schools based on ethnicity.

926. Minority Rights Group stated that the political marginalization of non-constituent citizens entrenched in the Constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina left minority groups with limited decision-making power. National minorities and de facto minority communities, including minority returnees in the entities, were excluded from having representation in several forums, the tripartite Presidency and the House of Peoples of the Parliamentary Assembly. Local laws and constitutions extended special privileges to constituent peoples in the government and public institutions. It therefore urged the State to accept the recommendations relating to those concerns, including the recommendations on implementing the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights on both *Sejdić and Finci v. Bosnia and Herzegovina* and *Zornić v. Bosnia and Herzegovina*, and stressed the importance of the effective participation of minority groups in consultation processes.

927. Save the Children International was concerned that violence against children remained hidden and called upon Bosnia and Herzegovina to implement the recommendations on that issue, in particular by defining strategies and plans for the protection of children from violence, abuse and exploitation on the Internet and from viewing harmful content. One recommendation had called for increased efforts to guarantee children's rights, particularly in the field of social protection and education. It also called upon the Government to adopt nationwide strategies to de-institutionalize childcare and reallocate funding to alternative family-based care, and to ensure the development of services and capacity-building for childcare professionals so as to adequately support vulnerable parents and children.

928. Amnesty International stated that, despite the positive steps taken by Bosnia and Herzegovina to increase the resources available for the prosecution of war crimes, the authorities needed to ensure that the backlog of cases was reduced and to launch new investigations and prosecutions. It was concerned that survivors of the sexual violence committed during the conflict continued to face obstacles in accessing their rights and many remained stigmatized and ostracized; compensation had not been awarded, even where courts had established that a war crime involving sexual violence had been committed. It called upon the Government to ensure that victims of war crimes of sexual violence had effective access to reparation and to appropriate health-care and rehabilitation services and to protection from discrimination, regardless of where they lived in the country. It also called for adequate witness protection services.

929. Action Canada for Population and Development was disappointed that Bosnia and Herzegovina had not indicated which recommendations it would act upon, but welcomed its detailed responses to questions on sexual orientation and gender identity. Despite the existence of laws on gender equality and the prohibition of discrimination, people were regularly discriminated against and faced violence because of their sexual orientation and/or gender identity. It urged the State to harmonize the existing laws with the law on the prohibition of discrimination so as to remove loopholes, to include a clause in both of the above-mentioned laws referring specifically to gender identity, to develop a national plan based on those two laws and include specific provisions to ensure equality and non-discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation or gender identity.

930. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom regretted that Bosnia and Herzegovina had postponed its statement on the recommendations and urged the State to accept and implement all the recommendations promptly, in particular the recommendation by France concerning reparation and compensation for victims of torture. Two decades after the war, a law on victims of torture had still not been adopted despite numerous attempts to do so and recommendations from treaty bodies and the universal periodic review. A clear definition of victims of torture was needed as the multiple definitions in use created fragmentation and a lack of clarity; singling out victims of rape as belonging to a different category led to discrimination and failed to recognize that rape was a form of torture.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

931. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information received, Bosnia and Herzegovina had noted all of the 167 recommendations. He appreciated the expressed commitment of Bosnia and Herzegovina to return with additional information no later than June 2015.

932. In its concluding remarks, the delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina thanked all the delegations for the constructive interactive dialogue. It also thanked the delegations for their comments made during the adoption of the outcome. Those comments had been taken as positive and would provide a constructive impetus to the work of the Council of Ministers, which was expected to be sworn in in a week's time. The delegation also expected that Bosnia and Herzegovina would be able to come to the June session with comprehensive and detailed responses to all the questions and recommendations that had been presented in the session of November 2014.

933. The delegation also wished to thank the entire international community for having been engaged with Bosnia and Herzegovina in the two decades since the war and for having assisted the country at all levels in its real and profound transformation so the State could make good progress in achieving full respect for human rights.

934. The delegation thanked the members of the troika (Sierra Leone, Republic of Korea and Russian Federation) for their excellent engagement, which had helped the review process go smoothly.

B. General debate on agenda item 6

935. At its 43rd meeting, on 20 March 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 6, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Bahrain¹⁴ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), China (also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bhutan, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Myanmar, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe), India, Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), Morocco, Paraguay (also on behalf of Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, the Netherlands, Panama, Peru, Poland, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay), United Kingdom of Great Britain and

¹⁴ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Northern Ireland (also on behalf of Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, the Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, the Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Libya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, the Netherlands, Poland, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, South Sudan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia and Yemen);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Czech Republic, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Philippines, Serbia, Turkey;

(c) Observer for a national human rights institution: Australian Human Rights Commission (by video message);

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Advocates for Human Rights, African Technology Development Link, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Assyrian Universal Alliance Americas Chapter, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, Center for Reproductive Rights, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Human Rights Law Centre, Indian Council of South America, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Catholic Child Bureau, International Service for Human Rights, Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, United Nations Watch, United Schools International, UPR Info (also on behalf of Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Edmund Rice International Limited, Franciscans International, the International Federation of ACATs – Action by Christians for the Abolition of Torture, the International Lesbian and Gay Association, Plan International, Save the Children International, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and World Vision International), Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Environment and Resources Council, World Jewish Congress.

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Italy

936. At its 37th meeting, on 18 March 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 28/101 without a vote.

El Salvador

937. At its 37th meeting, on 18 March 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 28/102 without a vote.

Plurinational State of Bolivia

938. At its 38th meeting, on 18 March 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 28/103 without a vote.

Fiji

939. At its 38th meeting, on 18 March 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 28/104 without a vote.

San Marino

940. At its 38th meeting, on 18 March 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 28/105 without a vote.

Kazakhstan

941. At its 39th meeting, on 19 March 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 28/106 without a vote.

Angola

942. At its 39th meeting, on 19 March 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 28/107 without a vote.

Islamic Republic of Iran

943. At its 39th meeting, on 19 March 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 28/108 without a vote.

Iraq

944. At its 41st meeting, on 19 March 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 28/109 without a vote.

Madagascar

945. At its 41st meeting, on 19 March 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 28/110 without a vote.

Slovenia

946. At its 41st meeting, on 19 March 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 28/111 without a vote.

Egypt

947. At its 42nd meeting, on 20 March 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 28/112 without a vote.

Bosnia and Herzegovina

948. At its 42nd meeting, on 20 March 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 28/113 without a vote.

Gambia

949. At its 54th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 28/114 without a vote.

VII. Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories

A. Oral update by the independent international commission of inquiry to investigate all violations of international humanitarian law and international human rights law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, particularly in the occupied Gaza Strip, in the context of the military operations conducted since 13 June 2014

950. At the 45th meeting, on 23 March 2015, the Chair of the independent international commission of inquiry to investigate all violations of international humanitarian law and international human rights law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, particularly in the occupied Gaza Strip, in the context of the military operations conducted since 13 June 2014, Mary McGowan Davis, presented an oral update (see paras. 37–40 above).

B. Interactive dialogue with the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967

951. At the 45th meeting, on 23 March 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967, Makarim Wibisono, presented his report (A/HRC/28/78).

952. At the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made a statement as the State concerned.

953. Also at the same meeting, the Independent Commission for Human Rights of the State of Palestine made a statement.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States with the exception of Cameroon), Bahrain¹⁵ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Cuba, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mauritania, Niger, Oman, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Adalah – The Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel (also on behalf of Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man, the Al Mezan Center for Human Rights and Defence for Children International), American Association of Jurists, Amuta for NGO Responsibility, Defence for Children International (also on behalf of Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man and Adalah – The Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel), International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, United Nations Watch, World Jewish Congress.

955. At the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made final remarks as the State concerned.

¹⁵ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

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

C. Reports of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General

957. At the 45th meeting, on 23 March 2015, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights introduced the reports of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the implementation of Human Rights Council resolutions S-9/1 and S-12/1 (A/HRC/28/80 and Add.1). Pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 25/28, the Deputy High Commissioner also presented the reports of the High Commissioner (A/HRC/28/43 and Corr.1) on the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report of the independent fact-finding mission on the implications of the Israeli settlements on the civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights of the Palestinian people throughout the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem (A/HRC/22/63), and the report of the Secretary-General on the Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan (A/HRC/28/44). The Deputy High Commissioner also introduced the reports of the Secretary-General on the human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem (A/HRC/28/45), pursuant to Council resolution 25/29, and on the matter of human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan (A/HRC/28/46), pursuant to Council resolution 25/31.

D. General debate on agenda item 7

958. At its 45th and 46th meetings, on 23 March 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 7, during which the following made statements:

(a) The representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and the State of Palestine, as the States concerned;

(b) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States with the exception of Cameroon), Bahrain¹⁵ (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Bangladesh, China, Cuba, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)¹⁵ (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries), Ireland, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(c) Representatives of observer States: Chile, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Nicaragua, Oman, Senegal, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Uruguay, Yemen;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man, Al Mezan Center for Human Rights, Amuta for NGO Responsibility, Arab Organization for Human Rights, BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches, Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations (also on behalf of B'nai B'rith), European Union of Jewish Students, Human Rights Watch, Institute for Women's Studies and Research, International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Federation of Journalists, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Norwegian Refugee Council, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Presse Emblème Campagne, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, World Jewish Congress.

E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan

959. At the 57th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.3, sponsored by Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation with the exception of Albania) and co-sponsored by Bahrain (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Cuba, Nicaragua and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Namibia and Zimbabwe joined the sponsors.

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

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

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

In favour:

Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Botswana, Estonia, France, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Montenegro, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

963. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.3 by 29 votes to 1, with 17 abstentions (resolution 28/24).

Right of the Palestinian people to self-determination

964. At the 57th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.32, sponsored by Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) and co-sponsored by Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States with the exception of Cameroon), Bahrain (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Nicaragua, Switzerland and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, Norway, Portugal, San Marino, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden joined the sponsors.

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

966. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made a statement as the State concerned.

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

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Germany, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Ghana

968. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.32 by 45 votes to 1, with 1 abstention¹⁶ (resolution 28/25).

969. At the same meeting, the representative of Argentina made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan

970. At the 57th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.33, sponsored by Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) and co-sponsored by Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States with the exception of Cameroon), Bahrain (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Nicaragua and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Croatia, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

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

972. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made a statement as the State concerned.

973. At the same meeting, the representatives of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and Paraguay made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

¹⁶ The representative of Ghana subsequently stated that there had been an error in the delegation's vote and that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Paraguay

975. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.33 by 45 votes to 1, with 1 abstention (resolution 28/26).

Human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem

976. At the 57th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.34, sponsored by Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) and co-sponsored by Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States with the exception of Cameroon), Bahrain (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Nicaragua and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Denmark, Ecuador, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, Portugal, Slovenia and Sweden joined the sponsors.

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

978. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made a statement as the State concerned.

979. At the same meeting, the representative of Paraguay made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Botswana, Paraguay, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

981. The Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.34 by 43 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions¹⁷ (resolution 28/27).

¹⁷ The representative of Ghana subsequently stated that there had been an error in the delegation's vote and that it had intended to abstain.

VIII. Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

A. General debate on agenda item 8

982. At its 46th and 47th meetings, on 23 March 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 8, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of Angola, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Namibia, Nicaragua, South Africa, Timor-Leste, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zimbabwe), Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), China (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, the Comoros, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, the Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, the Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Swaziland, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe and the State of Palestine), Germany (also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Ireland, Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), Morocco (also on behalf of the Central African Republic, the Comoros, Guinea and Senegal), Netherlands, Pakistan (on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Poland¹⁸ (also on behalf of Chile, Ethiopia, Indonesia and Italy), Russian Federation, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Burkina Faso, Comoros, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Senegal, Sudan;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Advocates for Human Rights, African Development Association, Agence internationale pour le développement, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Association of World Citizens, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme, Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Human Rights Watch (also on behalf of CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, the International

¹⁸ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Federation for Human Rights Leagues, the International Service for Human Rights and the World Organisation Against Torture), Indian Council of South America, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Muslim Women's Union, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco (also on behalf of the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES, Salesian Missions and Volontariato Internazionale per lo Sviluppo), Liberation, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale, Presse Emblème Campagne, United Nations Watch, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization, World Muslim Congress.

B. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Contribution of the Human Rights Council to the special session of the General Assembly on the world drug problem of 2016

983. At the 58th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of Colombia¹⁸ (also on behalf of Albania, Brazil, Greece, Guatemala, Mexico, Norway, Paraguay, Switzerland and Uruguay) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.22, sponsored by Albania, Brazil, Colombia, Greece, Guatemala, Mexico, Norway, Paraguay, Switzerland and Uruguay, and co-sponsored by Argentina, Australia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Chile, Cyprus, Georgia, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Panama, Portugal, Romania, Sweden, Timor-Leste and Turkey. Subsequently, Andorra, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Costa Rica, Croatia, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Haiti, Israel, Lithuania, Montenegro, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Slovenia, Spain and Thailand joined the sponsors.

984. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation made general comments on the draft resolution.

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

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

987. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.22 without a vote (resolution 28/28).

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

A. Debate on the state of racial discrimination worldwide

988. At the 44th meeting, on 20 March 2015, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 69/162, a debate on the state of racial discrimination worldwide, on the occasion of the commemoration of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

989. The Director of the Research and Right to Development Division at OHCHR made an opening statement for the debate.

990. At the same meeting, the keynote speakers Christiane Taubira, Doudou Diène, Johanna Kool-Blokland and Ali Moussa Iyé made statements. The Council divided the debate into two parts.

991. During the ensuing discussion for the first part, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the keynote speakers questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Brazil, Ecuador¹⁸ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ghana, Morocco, Portugal;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of);

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Indian Council of South America, United Nations Watch, World Jewish Congress.

992. At the end of the first part, at the same meeting, the keynote speakers answered questions and made comments.

993. During the discussion for the second part, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the keynote speakers questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, Cuba, Gabon, Germany, Latvia, Namibia, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Chile, Costa Rica, Greece, Slovenia, Thailand;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Assyrian Universal Alliance Americas Chapter, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, US Human Rights Network.

994. At the same meeting, the keynote speakers answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

B. General debate on agenda item 9

995. At the 47th meeting, on 23 March 2015, the Chair-Rapporteur of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Elaboration of Complementary Standards to strengthen and update international instruments against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance in all their aspects, Abdul Samad Minty, presented the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on its sixth session (A/HRC/28/81), held from 7 to 17 October 2014.

996. At the 47th meeting, on 23 March 2015, and the 48th meeting, on 24 March 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 9, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Bahrain¹⁸ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, India, Ireland, Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), Morocco, Pakistan (also on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Egypt, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Poland, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Advocates for Human Rights, Agence internationale pour le développement, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amuta for NGO Responsibility, Arab Commission for Human Rights (also on behalf the BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights), Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme, European Union of Jewish Students, International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Muslim Women's Union, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Liberation, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Prevention Association of Social Harms, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of Environment, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress.

997. At the 47th meeting, on 23 March 2015, the representative of Lithuania made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping and stigmatization of, and discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against, persons based on religion or belief

998. At the 58th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.4, sponsored by Pakistan on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation. Subsequently, Angola, Australia, Cabo Verde, Colombia, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

999. At the same meeting, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, orally revised the draft resolution.

1000. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Indonesia, Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and Sierra Leone made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

1001. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution as orally revised. The Chief of Programme Support and Management Services of OHCHR made a statement on the budgetary implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

1002. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.4 as orally revised without a vote (resolution 28/29).

X. Technical assistance and capacity-building

A. Panel discussions

Panel discussion on the issue of national policies and human rights

1003. At its 40th meeting, on 19 March 2015, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to resolution 27/26, a panel discussion on the issue of national policies and human rights, with a particular focus on the findings of OHCHR in its report (A/HRC/27/41), identifying challenges, further developments and good practices in mainstreaming human rights in national policies and programmes.

1004. The Chief of the Americas, Europe and Central Asia Branch of the Field Operations and Technical Cooperation Division at OHCHR made an opening statement for the panel discussion. The Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Lithuania to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Rytis Paulauskas, moderated the panel discussion.

1005. At the same meeting, the panellists Héctor Cárdenas, Pabel Muñoz, Dalila Aliane, Vitit Muntarbhorn and Giuseppe Nesi made statements. The Council divided the panel discussion into two parts.

1006. During the ensuing panel discussion for the first part, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, the Philippines, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Ecuador¹⁹ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), India, Indonesia, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Burkina Faso, Peru, Republic of Moldova;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Service for Human Rights, Korea Center for United Nations Human Rights Policy.

1007. At the end of the first part, at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

1008. During the discussion for the second part, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, China, Congo, Estonia, France, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Colombia, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Thailand;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

¹⁹ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

1009. At the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

Annual thematic panel discussion on technical cooperation in the promotion and protection of human rights

1010. At the 51st meeting, on 25 March 2015, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to resolution 27/20, its annual thematic panel discussion on technical cooperation in the promotion and protection of human rights, with a focus on the theme of technical cooperation to support inclusive and participatory development and poverty eradication at the national level. The panel discussion was focused on the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (A/HRC/28/42).

1011. The Director of the Field Operations and Technical Cooperation Division of OHCHR made an opening statement for the panel discussion. The Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Thailand to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Thani Thongphakdi, moderated the panel discussion.

1012. At the same meeting, the panellists José Manuel Fresno García, Ali bin Samikh al Marri, Jyoti Sanghera and Esther Mwaura-Muiru made statements. The Council divided the panel discussion into two parts.

1013. During the ensuing panel discussion for the first part, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Bahrain¹⁹ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Ecuador¹⁹ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), India, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, Sierra Leone, United States of America;

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

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Advocates for Human Rights, European Disability Forum.

1014. At the end of the first part, at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

1015. During the discussion for the second part, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, China, Cuba, France, Indonesia, Maldives, Paraguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Democratic Republic of the Congo, Libya, Norway, Sudan;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Association of World Citizens, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

1016. At the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

B. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders

Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic

1017. At the 48th meeting, on 24 March 2015, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic, Marie-Thérèse Keita Bocoum, presented an oral update.

1018. At the same meeting, the representative of the Central African Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

1019. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), China, Congo, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Morocco, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Luxembourg, Norway, Senegal, Sudan, Switzerland, Togo;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Femmes Afrique Solidarité, International Federation of Journalists, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Save the Children International, United Nations Watch, World Evangelical Alliance (also on behalf of Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities)).

1020. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Independent Expert on capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights

1021. At the 48th meeting, on 24 March 2015, the Independent Expert on capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights, Mohammed Ayat, presented an oral update.

1022. At the same meeting, the representative of Côte d'Ivoire made a statement as the State concerned.

1023. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), China, Congo, France, Gabon, Ghana, Morocco, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belgium, Egypt, Mauritania, Senegal, Sudan, Togo;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Franciscans International, International Catholic Child Bureau, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Service for Human Rights.

1024. At the same meeting, the representative of Côte d'Ivoire made final remarks as the State concerned.

1025. Also at the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Haiti

1026. At the 49th meeting, on 24 March 2015, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Haiti, Gustavo Gallón, presented his report (A/HRC/28/82).

1027. At the same meeting, the representative of Haiti made a statement as the State concerned.

1028. Also at the same meeting, the Office for the Protection of Citizens of Haiti made a statement (by video message).

1029. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador¹⁹ (also on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), France, Ireland, Morocco, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Canada, Chile, Mali, Norway, Senegal, Togo;

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

(d) Observer for a non-governmental organization: United Nations Watch.

1030. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Mali

1031. At the 50th meeting, on 24 March 2015, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Mali, Suliman Baldo, presented his reports (A/HRC/28/83 and Corr.1).

1032. At the same meeting, the Minister for Justice of Mali, M. Mahamadou Diarra, made a statement as the State concerned.

1033. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), China, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Belgium, Denmark, Egypt, Mauritania, Norway, Senegal, Sudan, Togo;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Espace Afrique International, Femmes Afrique Solidarité, Friedrich Naumann Foundation, Human Rights Watch, International Catholic Child Bureau, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme.

1034. At the same meeting, the representative of Mali made final remarks as the State concerned.

1035. Also at the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

C. General debate on agenda item 10

1036. At the 53rd meeting, on 25 March 2015, the Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights presented the country-specific reports of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General submitted under agenda item 10 (A/HRC/28/48, A/HRC/28/49, A/HRC/28/50, A/HRC/28/51 and A/HRC/28/53).

1037. At the same meeting, the representatives of Afghanistan, Guinea, Libya and South Sudan made statements as the States concerned.

1038. During the ensuing general debate, at the same meeting, and at the 54th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the following made statements and asked the Deputy High Commissioner questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Canada¹⁹ (also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America), China, Egypt¹⁹ (also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zimbabwe), Ethiopia (on behalf of the Intergovernmental Authority for Development), France, Ireland, Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Maldives, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Egypt, Georgia, Italy, Senegal, Sudan, Thailand, Ukraine;

(c) Observer for a national human rights institution: Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission (by video message);

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Advocates for Human Rights, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Human Rights Watch, International Catholic Child Bureau, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés, United Nations Watch, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

1039. At the 54th meeting, on 26 March 2015, the representatives of Bahrain, the Russian Federation, Thailand and the Holy See made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in Libya

1040. At the 58th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution *A/HRC/28/L.7/Rev.1*, sponsored by Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by Australia, Bahrain (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Spain and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

1041. At the same meeting, the representatives of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and the Russian Federation made general comments on the draft resolution.

1042. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Libya made a statement as the State concerned.

1043. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution.

1044. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution *A/HRC/28/L.7/Rev.1* without a vote (resolution 28/30).

Technical assistance and capacity-building for Mali in the field of human rights

1045. At the 58th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.9, sponsored by Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by Bahrain (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Monaco, the Netherlands, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Thailand and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Australia, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Georgia, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Lithuania, Malta, Montenegro, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey joined the sponsors.

1046. At the same meeting, the representative of Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, orally revised the draft resolution.

1047. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Latvia, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

1048. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

1049. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.9 as orally revised without a vote (resolution 28/31).

1050. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Gabon, on behalf of member and observer States of the International Organization of la Francophonie, made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Technical assistance and capacity-building in strengthening human rights in Iraq in the light of the abuses committed by Daesh and associated terrorist groups

1051. At the 58th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of Iraq¹⁹ (also on behalf of Bulgaria, Canada, Germany, Greece, France, Hungary, Italy, Lebanon and Luxembourg) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.29, sponsored by Iraq and co-sponsored by Bulgaria, Canada, Germany, Greece, France, Hungary, Italy, Lebanon and Luxembourg. Subsequently, Algeria, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Georgia, Japan, Maldives, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

1052. At the same meeting, the representative of Iraq (also on behalf of Bulgaria, Canada, Germany, Greece, France, Hungary, Italy, Lebanon and Luxembourg) orally revised the draft resolution.

1053. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of France, Latvia (on behalf of the States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

1054. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

1055. At the same meeting, the representative of Brazil made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

1056. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.29 as orally revised without a vote (resolution 28/32).

Strengthening of technical cooperation and consultative services in Guinea

1057. At the 58th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the representative of Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.31/Rev.1, sponsored by Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by Bulgaria, Cyprus, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Slovakia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Haiti, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

1058. At the same meeting, the representative of Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, orally revised the draft resolution.

1059. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Latvia, on behalf of the States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

1060. At the same meeting, the representative of Guinea made a statement as the State concerned.

1061. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.31/Rev.1 as orally revised without a vote (resolution 28/33).

1062. At the same meeting, the representative of Gabon, on behalf of member and observer States of the International Organization of la Francophonie, made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Situation of human rights in Haiti

1063. At the 58th meeting, on 27 March 2015, the President of the Human Rights Council introduced draft President's statement A/HRC/28/L.37.

1064. At the same meeting, the representative of Haiti made a statement as the State concerned.

1065. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft President's statement.

1066. At the same meeting, the representative of France (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru, the United States of America and Uruguay) made general comments on the draft President's statement.

1067. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft President's statement A/HRC/28/L.37 (PRST 28/3).

1068. At the same meeting, the representative of Gabon, on behalf of member and observer States of the International Organization of la Francophonie, made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Annex I

Attendance

Members

Albania	Ghana	Qatar
Algeria	India	Republic of Korea
Argentina	Indonesia	Russian Federation
Bangladesh	Ireland	Saudi Arabia
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Japan	Sierra Leone
Botswana	Kazakhstan	South Africa
Brazil	Kenya	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
China	Latvia	United Arab Emirates
Congo	Maldives	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Côte d'Ivoire	Mexico	United States of America
Cuba	Montenegro	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
El Salvador	Morocco	Viet Nam
Estonia	Namibia	
Ethiopia	Netherlands	
France	Nigeria	
Gabon	Pakistan	
Germany	Paraguay	
	Portugal	

States Members of the United Nations represented by observers

Afghanistan	Democratic	Israel
Andorra	People's	Italy
Angola	Republic of	Jamaica
Armenia	Korea	Jordan
Australia	Democratic	Kiribati
Austria	Republic of	Kuwait
Azerbaijan	the Congo	Lao People's Democratic Republic
Bahamas	Denmark	Lebanon
Bahrain	Djibouti	Lesotho
Belarus	Dominican	Libya
Belgium	Republic	Liechtenstein
Benin	Ecuador	Lithuania
Bhutan	Equatorial	Luxembourg
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Guinea	Madagascar
Brunei Darussalam	Egypt	Malaysia
Bulgaria	Eritrea	Mali
Burkina Faso	Fiji	Malta
Burundi	Finland	Mauritania
Cambodia	Georgia	Mauritius
Cameroon	Greece	Monaco
Canada	Guatemala	Mongolia
Chad	Guinea	Mozambique
Chile	Haiti	Myanmar
Colombia	Honduras	Nepal
Comoros	Hungary	New Zealand
Costa Rica	Iceland	Nicaragua
Croatia	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Niger
Cyprus	Iraq	Norway
Czech Republic		

Oman	Slovenia	Tunisia
Panama	Somalia	Turkey
Peru	South Sudan	Turkmenistan
Philippines	Spain	Tuvalu
Poland	Sri Lanka	Uganda
Republic of Moldova	Sudan	Ukraine
Romania	Sweden	Uruguay
Rwanda	Switzerland	Uzbekistan
Saint Kitts and Nevis	Syrian Arab	Yemen
San Marino	Republic	Zambia
Senegal	Tajikistan	Zimbabwe
Serbia	Thailand	
Singapore	Timor-Leste	
Slovakia	Togo	

Non-Member States represented by observers

Holy See
State of Palestine

United Nations

Joint United Nations Programme on
HIV/AIDS
Office of the United Nations High
Commissioner for Refugees
United Nations International Children's
Emergency Fund

United Nations Development Programme
– Bosnia and Herzegovina
United Nations Environment Programme
United Nations Population Fund

Specialized agencies and related organizations

Food and Agriculture Organization of the
United Nations
International Organization for Migration

International Telecommunication Union
World Health Organization
World Intellectual Property Organization

Intergovernmental organizations

African Union
Commonwealth Secretariat
Council of Europe
European Union
International Development Law
Organization

International Federation of Red Cross
and Red Crescent Societies
International Organization of la
Francophonie
Organization of Islamic Cooperation
South Centre

Other entities

International Committee of the Red Cross
Sovereign Military Order of Malta

National human rights institutions, international coordinating committees and regional groups of national institutions

Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission
 Australian Human Rights Commission
 Canadian Human Rights Commission
 Commission nationale des droits de l'homme de Mauritanie
 Commission nationale consultative des droits de l'homme – France
 Conseil national des droits de l'homme Maroc
 Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain (joint video statement)
 German Institute for Human Rights
 Human Rights Commission of Malaysia
 Human Rights Commission of Malawi
 Human Rights Commissioner (Ombudsman) of Azerbaijan
 Independent Commission for Human Rights of the State of Palestine
 Institute of Human Rights Ombudsmen of Bosnia and Herzegovina

International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights
 National Centre for Human Rights – Jordan
 National Council for Human Rights – Egypt
 National Human Rights Commission of Nigeria
 National Human Rights Commission of the Republic of Korea
 Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission
 Office for the Protection of Citizens – Haiti
 Procuraduría para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos de El Salvador
 Procuraduría de los Derechos Humanos de Guatemala
 Scottish Human Rights Commission
 Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights

Non-governmental organizations

Action Canada for Population and Development
 Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs
 ADALAH – Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel
 Advocates for Human Rights
 Africa Culture Internationale
 African Association of Education for Development
 African-American Society for Humanitarian Aid and Development
 African Development Association
 African Technical Association
 African Technology Development Link
 Agence internationale pour le développement
 Al Mezan Centre for Human Rights
 Al-Hakim Foundation
 Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man
 Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement
 Al-khoei Foundation

Alliance Defending Freedom
 All-Russian Public Organization “Russian Public Institute of Electoral Law”
 All-Russian Social Fund, “The Russian Children Foundation”
 Alsalam Foundation
 Alulbayt Foundation
 Al-Zubair Charity Foundation
 American Association of Jurists
 American Civil Liberties Union
 Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc.
 Amman Center for Human Rights Studies
 Amnesty International
 Amuta for NGO Responsibility
 Arab Commission for Human Rights
 Arab NGO Network for Development
 Arab Organization for Human Rights
 Arab Penal Reform Organization
 Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship
 Asian-Eurasian Human Rights Forum
 Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development

Asian Legal Resource Centre
 Association des jeunes pour l'agriculture
 du Mali
 Association démocratique des femmes du
 Maroc
 Association Dunenyó
 Association Fonds d'aide internationale
 au développement
 Association for Defending Victims of
 Terrorism
 Association for the Prevention of Torture
 Association for Progressive
 Communications (APC)
 Association mauritanienne pour la
 promotion du droit
 Association of World Citizens
 Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni
 XXIII
 Assyrian Aid Society Iraq
 AUA Americas Chapter Inc.
 Auspice Stella
 Badil Resource Center for Palestinian
 Residency and Resource Rights
 Baha'i International Community
 Bischöfliches Hilfswerk Misereor e.V.
 B'nai B'rith
 British Humanist Association
 Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies
 Canners International Permanent
 Committee
 Caritas Internationalis (International
 Confederation of Catholic Charities)
 Center for Global Nonkilling
 Center for Inquiry
 Center for International Environmental
 Law (CIEL)
 Center for Reproductive Rights, Inc.
 Centre Europe-Tiers Monde – Europe-Third
 World Centre
 Center for Economic and Social Rights
 Centre for Environmental and
 Management Studies
 Centre for Human Rights and Peace
 Advocacy
 Centre for International Sustainable
 Development Law
 Centre indépendant de recherches et
 d'initiatives pour le dialogue
 Centre pour les droits civils et politiques
 centre CCPR
 Centrist Democratic International
 Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales
 (CELS) Asociación Civil
 Charitable Institute for Protecting Social
 Victims
 Child Development Foundation
 Child Helpline International
 China Society for Human Rights Studies
 (CSHRS)
 CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen
 Participation
 Colombian Commission of Jurists
 Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y
 Promoción de los Derechos Humanos,
 Asociación Civil
 Commission africaine des promoteurs de
 la santé et des droits de l'homme
 Commission of the Churches on
 International Affairs of the World
 Council of Churches
 Commission to Study the Organization of
 Peace
 Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative
 Company of the Daughters of Charity of
 St. Vincent de Paul
 Conseil de jeunesse pluriculturelle (COJEP)
 Conectas Direitos Humanos
 Congregation of our Lady of Charity of the
 Good Shepherd
 Congregations of St. Joseph
 Coordinating Board of Jewish
 Organizations
 Defence for Children International
 Development Innovations and Networks
 Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order
 of Preachers
 Down Syndrome International
 Drepavie
 Earthjustice
 East and Horn of Africa Human Rights
 Defenders Project
 Eastern Sudan Women Development
 Organization
 Ecumenical Federation of
 Constantinopolitans
 Edmund Rice International Limited
 Egyptian Organization for Human Rights
 Equitas centre international d'éducation aux
 droits humains
 Espace Afrique International
 European Centre for Law and Justice,
 Centre européen pour le droit, la justice
 et les droits de l'homme
 European Disability Forum
 European Union of Jewish Students
 European Union of Public Relations
 Family Health International
 Family Planning Association, I.R.Iran
 Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y
 Promoción de los Derechos Humanos
 Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigen
 tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit
 COC Nederland
 Federation of American Women's Clubs
 Overseas (FAWCO)

Femmes Afrique Solidarité
 Foodfirst Information and Action Network (FIAN)
 Foundation ECPAT International (End Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and Trafficking in Children for Sexual Purposes)
 Foundation for GAIA
 Fondation pour l'étude des relations internationales et du développement
 Fondation pour un Centre pour le Développement Socio-Eco-Nomique
 France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand
 Franciscans International
 Friedrich Ebert Foundation
 Friedrich Naumann Foundation
 Friends of the Earth International
 Friends World Committee for Consultation
 Geneva for Human Rights – Global Training
 Geneva Infant Feeding Association
 Global Hope Network International
 Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
 Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant
 Habitat International Coalition
 Hawa Society for Women
 Helios Life Association
 Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights
 Himalayan Research and Cultural Foundation
 Human Rights Advocates, Inc.
 Human Rights Association for Community Development in Assiut
 Human Rights House Foundation
 Human Rights Law Centre
 Human Rights Now
 Human Rights Watch
 Humanist Institute for Co-operation with Developing Countries
 IDPC Consortium
 Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society
 Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society
 Indian Council of South America (CISA)
 Indian Law Resource Centre
 Initiatives of Change International
 Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'homme – IIPJDH
 Institute for Planetary Synthesis
 Institute for Women's Studies and Research
 International Association for Democracy in Africa
 International Association for the Defence of Religious Liberty – Association internationale pour la défense de la liberté
 International Association for Religious Freedom
 International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL)
 International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists
 International Association of Schools of Social Work
 International Bar Association
 International Bridges to Justice, Inc.
 International Buddhist Relief Organisation
 International Catholic Child Bureau
 International Catholic Migration Commission
 International Committee for the Indians of the Americas (Incomindios Switzerland)
 International Educational Development, Inc.
 International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (FIDH)
 International Federation of ACATs – Action by Christians for the Abolition of Torture
 International Federation of Journalists
 International Fellowship of Reconciliation
 International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission
 International Humanist and Ethical Union
 International Indian Treaty Council
 International Institute for Child Protection
 International Institute for Non-Aligned Studies
 International Lesbian and Gay Association
 International Longevity Center Global Alliance, Ltd.
 International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR)
 International Movement ATD Fourth World
 International Movement for Fraternal Union among Races and Peoples
 International Muslim Women's Union
 International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
 International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (OIDELE)
 International Partnership for Human Rights
 International Peace Bureau
 International Publishers Association
 International Service for Human Rights
 International Studies Association
 International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES
 International Women Bond
 International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations

Iranian Elite Research Center
 Islamic Human Rights Commission
 Islamic Women's Institute of Iran
 Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice
 delle Salesiane di Don Bosco
 Japanese Workers' Committee for
 Human Rights
 Jossour Forum des Femmes Marocaines
 Jubilee Campaign
 Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims
 of Torture
 Korea Center for United Nations Human
 Rights Policy
 La Brique
 Latter-Day Saint Charities
 Lawyers for Lawyers
 Le Collectif des Femmes Africaines du
 Hainaut
 Liberal International (World Liberal Union)
 Liberation
 Lutheran World Federation
 Maarij Foundation for Peace and
 Development
 Maryam Ghasemi Educational Charity
 Institute
 Mbororo Social and Cultural Development
 Association
 Migrants Rights International (MRI)
 MINBYUN – Lawyers for a Democratic
 Society
 Minority Rights Group
 Movement for the Protection of African
 Child (MOPOTAC)
 Myochikai (Arigatou Foundation)
 Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational
 and Transparty
 Nord-Sud XXI
 Norwegian Refugee Council
 ONG Hope International
 Open Society Institute
 Organization for Defending Victims of
 Violence
 Organisation internationale pour les pays
 les moins avancés (OIPMA)
 Organisation marocaine des droits humains
 Organisation pour la communication en
 Afrique et de promotion de la coopération
 économique internationale
 OCAPROCE Internationale
 Palestinian Centre for Human Rights
 Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation
 Pax Romana (International Catholic
 Movement for Intellectual and Cultural
 Affairs and International Movement of
 Catholic Students)
 Peace Brigades International Switzerland
 Penal Reform International
 People for Successful Corean Reunification
 Permanent Assembly for Human Rights
 Plan International, Inc.
 Presse Emblème Campagne
 Prevention Association of Social Harms
 (PASH)
 Rencontre africain pour la défense des
 droits de l'homme
 Reporters Sans Frontières International –
 Reporters without Borders International
 Réseau International des Droits Humains
 (RIDH)
 Russian Peace Foundation
 Save the Children International
 Schweizerische Arbeitsgemeinschaft
 der Jugendverbände
 Servas International
 Social Service Agency of the Protestant
 Church in Germany
 Society for Development and Community
 Empowerment
 Society for Threatened Peoples
 Society of Iranian Women Advocating
 Sustainable Development of Environment
 Society Studies Centre (MADA ssc)
 Soka Gakkai International
 Stichting Justitia et Pax Nederland
 Sudan Council of Voluntary Agencies
 Syriac Universal Alliance, Fédération
 syriaque internationale
 Terre des Hommes Fédération
 Internationale
 Union de l'action féminine
 Union of Arab Jurists
 United Nations Association of Great Britain
 and Northern Ireland (UNA-UK)
 United Nations Watch
 United Schools International
 UPR Info
 US Human Rights Network Inc.
 Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitic
 Victorious Youths Movement
 Village Suisse ONG
 VIVAT International
 Women's Federation for World Peace
 International
 Women's Human Rights International
 Association
 Women's International League for Peace
 and Freedom
 Women's World Summit Foundation
 Working Women Association
 World Association for the School as an
 Instrument of Peace
 World Barua Organization
 World Environment and Resources Council
 (WERC)
 World Evangelical Alliance

World Federation of United Nations
Associations
World Jewish Congress
World Muslim Congress
World Organization against Torture
World Resources Institute
World Vision International
World Young Women's Christian
Association
Worldwide Organization for Women

Annex II

Agenda

- Item 1. Organizational and procedural matters.
- Item 2. Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General.
- Item 3. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development.
- Item 4. Human rights situations that require the Council's attention.
- Item 5. Human rights bodies and mechanisms.
- Item 6. Universal periodic review.
- Item 7. Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories.
- Item 8. Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action.
- Item 9. Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action.
- Item 10. Technical assistance and capacity-building.

Annex III

[English, French and Spanish only]

Documents issued for the twenty-eighth session

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/28/1	1	Annotations to the agenda for the twenty-eighth session of the Human Rights Council: note by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/28/1/Corr.1	1	Corrigendum
A/HRC/28/2	1	Report of the Human Rights Council on its twenty-eighth session
A/HRC/28/3	2	Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/3/Add.1	2	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the activities of his office in Guatemala
A/HRC/28/3/Add.2	2	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the activities of his office in the Plurinational State of Bolivia
A/HRC/28/3/Add.3	2	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the situation of human rights in Colombia
A/HRC/28/4	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Italy
A/HRC/28/4/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/28/5	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on El Salvador
A/HRC/28/5/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/28/6	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on the Gambia
A/HRC/28/6/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/28/7	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on the Plurinational State of Bolivia
A/HRC/28/7/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/28/8	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Fiji
A/HRC/28/8/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/28/9	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on San Marino
A/HRC/28/9/Add.1	6	Addendum

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/28/10	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Kazakhstan
A/HRC/28/10/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/28/11	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Angola
A/HRC/28/11/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/28/12	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on the Islamic Republic of Iran
A/HRC/28/12/Corr.1	6	Corrigendum
A/HRC/28/12/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/28/13	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Madagascar
A/HRC/28/13/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/28/14	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Iraq
A/HRC/28/14/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/28/15	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Slovenia
A/HRC/28/15/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/28/16	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Egypt
A/HRC/28/16/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/28/17	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Bosnia and Herzegovina
A/HRC/28/18	2	Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the human rights situation in Iraq in the light of abuses committed by the so-called Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant and associated groups
A/HRC/28/19	2	Conclusions and recommendations of special procedures: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/28/20	2	Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the question of human rights in Cyprus: note by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/28/21	2	Report of the Secretary-General on measures taken to implement resolution 9/8 and obstacles to its implementation, including recommendations for further improving the effectiveness, harmonization and reform of the treaty body system: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/28/22	2	Follow-up review of the management and administration of the Office of the United

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights: report of the Joint Inspection Unit – Note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/28/22/Add.1	2	Follow-up review of management and administration of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/28/23	2	Promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka - Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/28/24	2	Special Fund established by the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment: note by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/28/25	2	United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture: note by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/28/26	2	Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran: – report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/28/27	2, 3	Rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/28	2, 3	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism
A/HRC/28/29	2, 3	Panel discussion on the protection of the human rights of persons deprived of their liberty: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/30	2, 3	Summary report on the outcome of the Human Rights Council panel discussion on the role of prevention in the promotion and protection of human rights: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/31	2, 3	Workshop on regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/32	2, 3	Summary of the discussions held during the expert consultation on the administration of justice through military tribunals and the role of the integral judicial system in combating human rights violations: report of the United Nations High Commissioner of Human Rights

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/28/33	2, 3	Towards better investment in the rights of the child: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/34	2, 3	Summary of the panel discussion on accelerating global efforts to end violence against children: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/35	2, 3	Report of the Secretary-General on the question of the realization in all countries of economic, social and cultural rights
A/HRC/28/36	2, 3	Summary of panel discussion on history teaching and memorialization processes: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/37	2, 3	Thematic study on the right of persons with disabilities to live independently and be included in the community: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/38	2, 3	Summary of the Human Rights Council interactive panel discussion of experts on the use of remotely piloted aircraft or armed drones in compliance with international law: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/39	2, 3	Summary of the Human Rights Council panel discussion on the right to privacy in the digital age: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/40	2, 3	Summary of the Human Rights Council panel discussion on the protection of the family: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/40/Corr.1	2, 3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/28/40/Corr.2	2, 3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/28/41	2, 5	Report on the twenty-first annual meeting of special rapporteurs/representatives, independent experts and working groups of the special procedures of the Human Rights Council, including updated information on the special procedures: note by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/42	2, 10	Technical assistance to support inclusive and participatory development and poverty reduction at the national level: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/43	2, 7	Implementation of the recommendations contained in the report of the independent international fact-finding mission on the

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		implications of Israeli settlements on the civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights of the Palestinian people throughout the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem (A/HRC/22/63); report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/43/Corr.1	2, 7	Corrigendum
A/HRC/28/44	2, 7	Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the Occupied Syrian Golan: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/28/45	2, 7	Human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/28/46	2, 7	Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/28/47	2, 9	Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping, stigmatization of, and discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against, persons based on religion or belief: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/48	2, 10	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the situation of human rights in Afghanistan and on the achievements of technical assistance in the field of human rights in 2014
A/HRC/28/49	2, 10	Human rights situation in South Sudan: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/50	2, 10	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the situation of human rights in Guinea
A/HRC/28/51	2, 10	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the situation of human rights in Libya and on related technical support and capacity-building needs
A/HRC/28/52	2, 3	Report of the Secretary-General on missing persons: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/28/53	2, 10	Panel discussion on the human rights situation in South Sudan: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/54	3	Annual report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, Leila Zerrougui
A/HRC/28/55	3	Annual Report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/28/56	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, Maud de Boer-Buquicchio
A/HRC/28/56/Add.1	3	Follow-up visit to Honduras
A/HRC/28/57	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, Farida Shaheed: copyright policy and the right to science and culture
A/HRC/28/57/Add.1	3	Visit to Viet Nam (18–29 November 2013)
A/HRC/28/57/Add.2	3	Viet Nam's Comments to the Unedited Copy of the Report of the Special Rapporteur in the Field of Cultural Rights: visit to Viet Nam (18–29 November 2013)
A/HRC/28/58	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities, Catalina Devandas-Aguilar
A/HRC/28/59	3	Report of the Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights, Juan Pablo Bohoslavsky: report on financial complicity: lending to States engaged in gross human rights violations
A/HRC/28/59/Add.1	3	Mission to Iceland (8–15 December 2014)
A/HRC/28/60	3	Illicit financial flows, human rights and the post-2015 development agenda - Interim study by the Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights, Juan Pablo Bohoslavsky
A/HRC/28/60/Corr.1	3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/28/61	3	Report of the Independent Expert on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment, John H. Knox: compilation of good practices
A/HRC/28/61/Add.1	3	Mission to France
A/HRC/28/61/Add.2	3	Visite en France: commentaires de l'état sur le rapport de l'expert indépendant
A/HRC/28/62	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context, Leilani Farha
A/HRC/28/63	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, Michel Forst

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/28/63/Add.1	3	Observations on communications transmitted to Governments and replies received
A/HRC/28/64	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on minority issues, Rita Izsák
A/HRC/28/64/Add.1	3	Mission to Ukraine
A/HRC/28/64/Add.2	3	Mission to Nigeria (17 to 28 February 2014)
A/HRC/28/65	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to food, Hilal Elver – Access to justice and the right to food: the way forward
A/HRC/28/66	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, Heiner Bielefeldt
A/HRC/28/66/Add.1	3	Mission to Kazakhstan
A/HRC/28/66/Add.2	3	Mission to Viet Nam (21 to 31 July 2014)
A/HRC/28/66/Add.3	3	Mission to the Republic of Kazakhstan: Comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, Heiner Bielefeldt
A/HRC/28/66/Add.4	3	Mission to Viet Nam: Comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur
A/HRC/28/67	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, Ben Emmerson: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/28/68	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, Juan E. Méndez
A/HRC/28/68/Add.1	3	Observations on communications transmitted to Governments and replies received
A/HRC/28/68/Add.2	3	Follow-up report: Missions to the Republic of Tajikistan and Tunisia
A/HRC/28/68/Add.3	3	Mission to Mexico
A/HRC/28/68/Add.4	3	Mission to the Gambia
A/HRC/28/69	4	Report of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/28/69/Corr.1	4	Corrigendum
A/HRC/28/70	4	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ahmed Shaheed
A/HRC/28/71	4	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Marzuki Darusman
A/HRC/28/72	4	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar,

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		Yanghee Lee
A/HRC/28/72/Add.1	4	Observations of the Permanent Mission of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar in Geneva on the report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar to the 28th session of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/28/73	3, 5	Final report of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee on the issue of the negative impact of corruption on the enjoyment of human rights
A/HRC/28/74	3, 5	Research-based progress report of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee containing recommendations on mechanisms to assess the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on the enjoyment of human rights and to promote accountability
A/HRC/28/75	3, 5	Report of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee on the study on the situation of human rights of persons living with albinism
A/HRC/28/76	3, 5	Final research-based report of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee on best practices and main challenges in the promotion and protection of human rights in post-disaster and post-conflict situations
A/HRC/28/77	5	Recommendations of the Forum on Minority Issues at its seventh session: Preventing and addressing violence and atrocity crimes targeted against minorities (25 and 26 November 2014)
A/HRC/28/78	7	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967, Makarim Wibisono
A/HRC/28/79	7	Report of the independent international commission of inquiry established pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution S-21/1: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/28/80	2, 7	Implementation of Human Rights Council resolutions S-9/1 and S-12/1: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/80/Add.1	2, 7	The human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory between 12 June and 26 August 2014, including the escalation in hostilities between the State of Israel and Palestinian armed groups in Gaza
A/HRC/28/81	9	Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Elaboration of Complementary Standards on its sixth session

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/28/82	10	Report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Haiti, Gustavo Gallón
A/HRC/28/83	10	Report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Mali, Suliman Baldo
A/HRC/28/83/Corr.1	10	Corrigendum
A/HRC/28/84	10	Report of the Independent Expert on capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights, Mohammed Ayat: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/28/85	3, 4, 7, 9, 10	Communications report of Special Procedures

Documents issued in the limited series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/28/L.1	3	Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights
A/HRC/28/L.2	3	Ensuring use of remotely piloted aircraft or armed drones in counter-terrorism and military operations in accordance with international law, including international human rights and humanitarian law
A/HRC/28/L.3	7	Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan
A/HRC/28/L.4	9	Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping and stigmatization of, and discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against, persons based on religion or belief
A/HRC/28/L.5	3	The right of persons with disabilities to live independently and be included in the community on an equal basis with others
A/HRC/28/L.6	4	The continuing grave deterioration in the human rights and humanitarian situation in the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/28/L.7 and Rev.1	10	Technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in Libya
A/HRC/28/L.8	3	The negative impact of the non-repatriation of funds of illicit origin to the countries of origin on the enjoyment of human rights, and the importance of improving international cooperation
A/HRC/28/L.9	10	Technical assistance and capacity-building for Mali in the field of human rights
A/HRC/28/L.10	3	Independent Expert on the enjoyment of human rights of persons with albinism

Documents issued in the limited series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/28/L.11 and Rev.1	3	Renewal of the mandate of the open-ended intergovernmental working group to consider the possibility of elaborating an international regulatory framework on the regulation, monitoring and oversight of the activities of private military and security companies
A/HRC/28/L.12	3	Freedom of religion or belief
A/HRC/28/L.13	2	Composition of staff of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/L.14	3	The effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights
A/HRC/28/L.15	3	Mandate of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights
A/HRC/28/L.16	3	The right to food
A/HRC/28/L.17	4	Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran
A/HRC/28/L.18	4	Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea
A/HRC/28/L.19	3	Human rights and the environment
A/HRC/28/L.20	3	Question of the realization in all countries of economic, social and cultural rights
A/HRC/28/L.21 and Rev.1	4	Situation of human rights in Myanmar
A/HRC/28/L.22	8	Contribution of the Human Rights Council to the special session of the General Assembly on the world drug problem of 2016
A/HRC/28/L.23	3	Birth registration and the right of everyone to recognition everywhere as a person before the law
A/HRC/28/L.24	3	Human rights, democracy and the rule of law
A/HRC/28/L.25	3	Prevention of genocide
A/HRC/28/L.26	3	Right to work
A/HRC/28/L.27	3	The right to privacy in the digital age
A/HRC/28/L.28	3	Rights of the child: towards better investment in the rights of the child
A/HRC/28/L.29	10	Technical assistance and capacity-building in strengthening human rights in Iraq in the light of the abuses committed by Daesh and associated terrorist groups
A/HRC/28/L.30	3	Effects of terrorism on the enjoyment of human rights
A/HRC/28/L.31 and Rev.1	10	Strengthening of technical cooperation and

Documents issued in the limited series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		consultative services in Guinea
A/HRC/28/L.32	7	Right of the Palestinian people to self-determination
A/HRC/28/L.33	7	Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan
A/HRC/28/L.34	7	Human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem
A/HRC/28/L.36	4	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.6
A/HRC/28/L.37	10	Situation of human rights in Haiti
A/HRC/28/L.38	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.25
A/HRC/28/L.39	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.25
A/HRC/28/L.40	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.25
A/HRC/28/L.41	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.25
A/HRC/28/L.42	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.25
A/HRC/28/L.43	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/28/L.25

Documents issued in the Government series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/28/G/1	2	Note verbale dated 26 December 2014 from the Permanent Mission of Guatemala to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/G/2	4	Letter dated 21 January 2015 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/28/G/3	3, 4	Letter dated 22 January 2015 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/28/G/4	4	Letter dated 4 February 2015 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the

Documents issued in the Government series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/28/G/5	4	Letter dated 5 February 2015 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/28/G/6	9	Note verbale dated 9 February 2015 from the Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/28/G/7	4	Letter dated 23 February 2015 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/28/G/8	7	Note verbale dated 26 February 2015 from the Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/28/G/9	4	Letter dated 26 February 2015 from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/28/G/10	4	Letter dated 26 February 2015 from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/28/G/11	4	Letter dated 20 February 2015 from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/28/G/12	3	Note verbale dated 10 March 2015 by the Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/28/G/13	4	Letter dated 13 March 2015 from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Armenia to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/28/G/14	4	Letter dated 16 March 2015 from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Armenia to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council

Documents issued in the Government series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/28/G/15	2, 3	Note verbale dated 13 March 2015 from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Singapore to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/28/G/16	2	Note verbale dated 20 March 2015 from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Turkey to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/G/17	3	Note verbale dated 26 March 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/28/G/18	9	Note verbale dated 30 March 2015 from the Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/28/G/19	10	Note verbale dated 1 April 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Japan to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/28/NGO/1	3	Written statement submitted by the Himalayan Research and Cultural Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/2	3	Written statement submitted by the Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of Environment, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/3	2	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/4	3	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/5	2	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/6	6	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/7	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/8	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/9	4	Written statement submitted by the Center for Global Nonkilling, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/10	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/11	3	Written statement submitted by the Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement, non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/28/NGO/12	5	Written statement submitted by the Japan Federation of Bar Associations, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/13	5	Joint written statement submitted by the Association for Progressive Communications (APC), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, American Civil Liberties Union, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Article 19 – The International Centre Against Censorship, non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/28/NGO/13/Corr.1	5	Corrigendum
A/HRC/28/NGO/14	3	Written statement submitted by the Foundation of Japanese Honorary Debts, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/28/NGO/15	4	Written statement submitted by the European Centre for Law and Justice, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/16	3	Exposé écrit présenté par le European Centre for Law and Justice, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/28/NGO/17	3	Exposé écrit présenté par le European Centre for Law and Justice, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif special
A/HRC/28/NGO/18	3	Exposé écrit présenté par le European Centre for Law and Justice, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/28/NGO/19	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/20	2	Written statement submitted by the Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/21	2	Written statement submitted by the Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/22	4	Written statement submitted by the Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/23	3	Written statement submitted by Alsalam Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/24	4	Exposición escrita presentada por el Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/28/NGO/25	4	Exposición escrita presentada por el Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/28/NGO/26	3	Exposición escrita presentada por la Permanent Assembly for Human Rights, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/28/NGO/27	3	Exposición escrita presentada por la Permanent Assembly for Human Rights, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/28/NGO/28	3	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/29	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/28/NGO/30	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/31	3	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/32	3	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/33	3	Written statement submitted by the Child Foundation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/34	7	Written statement submitted by the Child Foundation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/35	4	Written statement submitted by the Society Studies Centre (MADA ssc), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/35/Corr.1	3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/28/NGO/36	3	Written statement submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/37	3	Written statement submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights (JKCHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/38	4	Written statement submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights (JKCHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/39	4	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/40	3	Joint written statement submitted by Asociación Española para el Derecho Internacional de los Derechos Humanos, AEDIDH, American Association of Jurists, Arab African American Women's Leadership Council Inc., Association Graines de Paix, Association Mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit, Association pour l'Intégration et le Développement Durable au Burundi, Atheist Alliance International, Bangwe et Dialogue, Centre for Democracy and Development, Cultural Survival, Fondation pour le Dialogue des Civilisations, General Arab Women Federation, Indigenous World Association, Inter-African Committee on Traditional Practices Affecting the Health of

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		Women and Children, International Association of Peace Messenger Cities, International Federation of Women in Legal Careers, International Federation of Women Lawyers, International Institute for Child Protection, International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR), International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Mama Zimbi Foundation, Mothers Legacy Project, Organisation for Gender, Civic Engagement & Youth Development (OGCEYOD), Pax Christi International, International Catholic Peace Movement, Peace Family and Media Association, Shirley Ann Sullivan Educational Foundation, Women Environmental Programme, Women's World Summit Foundation, World Federalist Movement, World for World Organization, Yayasan Pendidikan Indonesia, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Dzeno Association, Institute for Planetary Synthesis, International Educational Development, Inc., International Peace Bureau, International Progress Organization (IPO), International Society for Human Rights, OIKOS - Cooperação e Desenvolvimento, Share The World's Resources (STWR), World Circle of the Consensus: Self-sustaining People, Organizations and Communities (SPOC), non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/28/NGO/41	4	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/42	3	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/43	4	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/44	4	Written statement submitted by the International Educational Development, Inc., a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/28/NGO/45	9	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/46	3	Written statement submitted by the Reporters Sans Frontiers International, a non-governmental organization in special

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/47	3	Written statement submitted by the Reporters Sans Frontiers International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/48	3	Written statement submitted by the Reporters Sans Frontiers International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/49	3	Written statement submitted by the Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/50	3	Written statement submitted by the Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/51	4	Written statement submitted by the People for Successful Corean Reunification, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/52	3	Written statement submitted by the Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/53	3	Written statement submitted by the Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/54	3	Written statement submitted by the Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/55	7	Written statement submitted by the Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/56	4	Written statement submitted by the International Educational Development, Inc., a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/28/NGO/57	7	Written statement submitted by the Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/58	7	Written statement submitted by the Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/59	7	Written statement submitted by the Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/60	3	Joint written statement submitted by the

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		France Libertes: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, American Association of Jurists, Emmaus International Association, Peace Brigades International Switzerland, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/61	3	Joint written statement submitted by the France Libertes: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, American Association of Jurists, Emmaus International Association, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/62	3	Joint written statement submitted by the France Libertes: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Advocates for Human Rights, American Association of Jurists, Cultural Survival, Robert F. Kennedy Center for Justice and Human Rights, Society for Threatened Peoples, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/63	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/64	3	Written statement submitted by the Liberal International (World Liberal Union), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/65	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/66	4	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/67	3	Written statement submitted by the Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/68	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/69	3	Written statement submitted by the Al Zubair Charitable Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/70	3	Joint written statement submitted by the France Libertes: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Cultural Survival, Society for Threatened Peoples, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Survival International Ltd., non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/28/NGO/71	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/28/NGO/72	3	Written statement submitted the Minbyun-Lawyers for a Democratic Society, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/73	4	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/74	10	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/75	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/76	4	Written statement submitted by the Arab NGO Network for Development, non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/28/NGO/77	3	Joint written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, Anti-Slavery International, Minority Rights Group, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/78	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/79	3	Written statement submitted by the Al-Khoei Foundation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/80	3	Written statement submitted by the Eastern Sudan Women Development Organization, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/81	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/82	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/83	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/84	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/85	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/86	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/28/NGO/87	2	Written statement submitted by the Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/88	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/89	5	Written statement submitted by the Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/90	3	Written statement submitted by the Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europe, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/91	3	Joint written statement submitted by the France Libertes: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, American Association of Jurists, Cultural Survival, Emmaus International Association, Stichting Forest Peoples Programme, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/92	3	Written statement submitted by the Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/93	7	Written statement submitted by the BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/94	4	Written statement submitted by the Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/95	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/96	3	Written statement submitted by the Nazra for Feminist Studies, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/97	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/98	3	Joint written statement submitted by the France Libertes: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, American Association of Jurists, Emmaus International Association, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/99	4	Written statement submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/28/NGO/100	2	Written statement submitted by the International Bar Association, non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/101	3	Written statement submitted by the Foundation ECPAT International (End Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and Trafficking in Children for Sexual Purposes), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/102	3	Written statement submitted by the Servas International, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/28/NGO/103	2	Written statement submitted by the AUA Americas Chapter Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/104	4	Written statement submitted by the Article 19 – The International Centre Against Censorship, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/28/NGO/105	3	Written statement submitted by the Social Service Agency of the Protestant Church in Germany, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/106	3	Written statement submitted by the European Centre for Law and Justice, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/107	7	Written statement submitted by the Defence for Children International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/108	8	Written statement submitted by the Asian-Eurasian Human Rights Forum, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/109	8	Exposé écrit présenté par Liberation, organisation non-gouvernementale inscrite sur la liste
A/HRC/28/NGO/110	3	Written statement submitted by the Iranian Elite Research Center, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/111	3	Written statement submitted by the Liberation, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/28/NGO/112	3	Written statement submitted by the British Humanist Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/113	4	Joint written statement submitted by the Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational and Transparty, a non-governmental organization

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		in general consultative status; Women's Human Rights International Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/114	3	Written statement submitted by the Friends World Committee for Consultation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/115	3	Written statement submitted by the Friends World Committee for Consultation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/116	3	Written statement submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/117	3	Written statement submitted by the Friends World Committee for Consultation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/118	4	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/119	3	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/120	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/121	6	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/122	3	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/123	3	Written statement submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/124	4	Written statement submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/125	3	Written statement submitted by the Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'Homme-IIPJDH, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/126	2	Written statement submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/28/NGO/127	3	Written statement submitted by the Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'Homme-IIPJDH, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/128	4	Written statement submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/129	3	Written statement submitted by the AUA Americas Chapter Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/130	9	Written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/131	6	Written statement submitted by the Advocates for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/132	3	Written statement submitted by the ADALAH – Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/133	9	Written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/134	4	Written statement submitted by the International Union of Socialist Youth, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/135	7	Written statement submitted by the Al Mezan Centre for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/136	7	Joint written statement submitted by the ADALAH – Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel, Al Mezan Centre for Human Rights, Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/137	3	Written statement submitted by the Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/138	6	Written statement submitted by the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/139	3	Written statement submitted by the International Association against Torture, a non-governmental organization in special

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/140	3	Written statement submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/141	3	Written statement submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/142	6	Exposé écrit présenté conjointement par Franciscans International, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif général, International Catholic Child Bureau, Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Fondazione Marista per la Solidarietà Internazionale ONLUS, International Association of Charities, organisations non gouvernementales dotées du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/28/NGO/143	4	Written statement submitted by the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/144	3	Written statement submitted by the Friends World Committee for Consultation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/145	4	Written statement submitted by the International Association against Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/146	7	Written statement submitted by the Al-Haq, Law in the service of man, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/147	3	Written statement submitted by the Union of Arab Jurists, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/148	2	Written statement submitted by the Union of Arab Jurists, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/149	3	Written statement submitted by the Union of Arab Jurists, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/150	3	Joint written statement submitted by International Movement ATD Fourth World, Mouvement Mondial des Mères International, New Humanity, non-governmental organizations in general consultative status, Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, Association Graines de Paix, BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		Good Shepherd, Edmund Rice International Limited, Femmes Afrique Solidarité, Foundation for GAIA, International Association of Charities, International Confederation of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, International Federation of Family Associations of Missing Persons from Armed Conflicts, International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR), International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development -VIDES, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, Nonviolent Peaceforce, Pax Christi International, International Catholic Peace Movement, Planetary Association for Clean Energy, Inc., The, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, World for World Organization, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Society for Human Rights, non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/28/NGO/151	4	Written statement submitted by the Women's Human Rights International Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/152	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/153	3	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/154	2	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/155	3	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/156	7	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/157	6	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/158	3	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/159	2	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/160	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/161	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/162	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/163	4	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/164	3	Written statement submitted by the International Association for the Defense of Religious Liberty – Association Internationale Pour La Défense de la Liberté, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/165	2	Exposición escrita presentada por Federation of Cuban Women-Federación de Mujeres Cubanas, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/28/NGO/166	3	Written statement submitted by the International Service for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/167	2	Written statement submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights (JKCHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/168	9	Written statement submitted by the International Association Against Torture, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/169	6	Written statement submitted by the Egyptian Organization for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/170	3	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/28/NGO/171	5	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

Documents issued in the national institutions series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/28/NI/1	6	Written submission by the Australian Human Rights Commission: note by the Secretariat

Documents issued in the national institutions series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/28/NI/2	7	Information presented by the Palestinian Independent Commission for Human Rights: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/28/NI/3	7	Information presented by the Palestinian Independent Commission for Human Rights: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/28/NI/4	7	Information presented by the Palestinian Independent Commission for Human Rights: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/28/NI/5	5	Information presented by the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights of Hungary: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/28/NI/6	6	Information presented by the National Council for Human Rights of Egypt: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/28/NI/7	5	Information presented by the Commissioner for Human Rights (Ombudsman) of the Republic of Azerbaijan: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/28/NI/8	3	Information submitted by the Network of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in the Americas: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/28/NI/8/Corr.1	3	Corrección
A/HRC/28/NI/8/Corr.2	3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/28/NI/9	3	Information submitted by the Network of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in the Americas: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/28/NI/9/Corr.1	3	Corrección
A/HRC/28/NI/9/Corr.2	3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/28/NI/10	3	Information submitted by the Network of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in the Americas: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/28/NI/10/Corr.1	3	Corrección
A/HRC/28/NI/10/Corr.2	3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/28/NI/11	3	Information submitted by the Network of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in the Americas: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/28/NI/11/Corr.1	3	Corrección
A/HRC/28/NI/11/Corr.2	3	Corrigendum

Annex IV

Special procedures mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its twenty-eighth session

Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (member from African States)

Albert Kwokwo Barume (Democratic Republic of the Congo)

Special Rapporteur on the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on the enjoyment of human rights

Idriss Jazairy (Algeria)

Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Cambodia

Rhona Smith (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)

Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises (member from Latin American and Caribbean States)

Dante Pesce (Chile)
