



General Assembly

Distr.: General
2 November 2020

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Thirty-seventh session
26 February–23 March 2018
Agenda item 1
Organizational and procedural matters

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

Vice-President and Rapporteur: Marta **Maurás** (Chile)



Contents

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
Part One: Resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-seventh session	5
I. Resolutions.....	5
II. Decisions	7
Part Two: Summary of proceedings.....	8
I. Organizational and procedural matters.....	8
A. Opening and duration of the session.....	8
B. Attendance	8
C. High-level segment.....	8
D. General segment	11
E. Agenda and programme of work	12
F. Organization of work	12
G. Meetings and documentation	13
H. Visits.....	13
I. Urgent debate on the situation of Eastern Ghouta in the Syrian Arab Republic	14
J. Selection and appointment of mandate holders	15
K. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	15
L. Adoption of the report on the session	18
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.....	19
A. Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.....	19
B. Reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General.....	20
III. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development.....	22
A. Panel discussions	22
B. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders	26
C. Interactive dialogue with special representatives of the Secretary-General.....	34
D. Open-ended intergovernmental working group on transnational corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights	36
E. General debate on agenda item 3	36
F. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	38
IV. Human rights situations that require the Council's attention	53
A. Panel discussions	53
B. Enhanced interactive dialogue on the human rights situation in Eritrea	53
C. Interactive dialogue with the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic	54
D. Interactive dialogue with the Commission on Human Rights in South Sudan	55
E. Interactive dialogue with the Commission of Inquiry on Burundi.....	55
F. Oral update by the independent international fact-finding mission on Myanmar.....	56
G. Interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders	56

H.	Discussion of the report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran	57
I.	General debate on agenda item 4	58
J.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	60
V.	Human rights bodies and mechanisms	65
A.	Forum on Minority Issues	65
B.	Social Forum.....	65
C.	Special procedure mandate holders	65
D.	General debate on agenda item 5	65
VI.	Universal periodic review	67
A.	Consideration of the universal periodic review outcomes	67
B.	General debate on agenda item 6	132
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	133
VII.	Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories	135
A.	Interactive dialogue with the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories since 1967	135
B.	Reports of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General	135
C.	General debate on agenda item 7	136
D.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	136
VIII.	Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action	140
	General debate on agenda item 8	140
IX.	Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action.....	142
A.	Debate on promoting tolerance, inclusion, unity and respect for diversity in the context of combating racial discrimination	142
B.	General debate on agenda item 9	143
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	144
X.	Technical assistance and capacity-building.....	145
A.	High-level interactive dialogue on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic	145
B.	Enhanced interactive dialogue on the situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.....	145
C.	Interactive dialogue on the situation of human rights in Libya.....	146
D.	Interactive dialogue on cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights.....	146
E.	Interactive dialogue with a special procedure mandate holder	147
F.	General debate on agenda item 10.....	147
G.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	149

Annexes

I.	Attendance.....	151
II.	Agenda	157
III.	Documents issued for the thirty-seventh session.....	158
IV.	Special procedure mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-seventh session	188

Part One

Resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-seventh session

I. Resolutions

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
37/1	The deteriorating situation of human rights in Eastern Ghouta, in the Syrian Arab Republic	5 March 2018
37/2	The right to privacy in the digital age	22 March 2018
37/3	Integrity of the judicial system	22 March 2018
37/4	Adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and the right to non-discrimination in this context	22 March 2018
37/5	Mandate of the Independent Expert on the enjoyment of human rights by persons with albinism	22 March 2018
37/6	The role of good governance in the promotion and protection of human rights	22 March 2018
37/7	Promoting human rights and the Sustainable Development Goals through transparent, accountable and efficient public services delivery	22 March 2018
37/8	Human rights and the environment	22 March 2018
37/9	Freedom of religion or belief	22 March 2018
37/10	The right to food	22 March 2018
37/11	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	22 March 2018
37/12	Mandate of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights	22 March 2018
37/13	Question of the realization in all countries of economic, social and cultural rights	22 March 2018
37/14	Rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities	22 March 2018
37/15	High-level intersessional discussion celebrating the centenary of Nelson Mandela	22 March 2018
37/16	Right to work	22 March 2018
37/17	Cultural rights and the protection of cultural heritage	22 March 2018
37/18	Promoting human rights through sport and the Olympic ideal	23 March 2018
37/19	The negative impact of corruption on the right to be free from torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment	23 March 2019
37/20	Rights of the child: protection of the rights of the child in humanitarian situations	23 March 2018

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
37/21	Human rights and unilateral coercive measures	23 March 2018
37/22	Equality and non-discrimination of persons with disabilities and the right of persons with disabilities to access to justice	23 March 2018
37/23	Promoting mutually beneficial cooperation in the field of human rights	23 March 2018
37/24	Promotion and protection of human rights and the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development	23 March 2018
37/25	The need for an integrated approach to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development for the full realization of human rights, focusing holistically on the means of implementation	23 March 2018
37/26	Prevention of genocide	23 March 2018
37/27	Terrorism and human rights	23 March 2018
37/28	Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea	23 March 2018
37/29	The human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic	23 March 2018
37/30	Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran	23 March 2018
37/31	Situation of human rights in South Sudan	23 March 2018
37/32	Situation of human rights in Myanmar	23 March 2018
37/33	Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan	23 March 2018
37/34	Right of the Palestinian people to self-determination	23 March 2018
37/35	Human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem	23 March 2018
37/36	Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan	23 March 2018
37/37	Ensuring accountability and justice for all violations of international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem	23 March 2018
37/38	Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping and stigmatization of, and discrimination, incitement to violence against, persons based on religion or belief	23 March 2018
37/39	Technical assistance and capacity-building for Mali in the field of human rights	23 March 2018
37/40	Cooperation with Georgia	23 March 2018
37/41	Technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in Libya	23 March 2018
37/42	Contribution to the implementation of the joint commitment to effectively addressing and countering the world drug problem with regard to human rights	23 March 2018

II. Decisions

<i>Decision</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
37/101	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Czechia	15 March 2018
37/102	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Argentina	15 March 2018
37/103	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Gabon	15 March 2018
37/104	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Ghana	15 March 2018
37/105	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Peru	15 March 2018
37/106	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Guatemala	15 March 2018
37/107	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Switzerland	15 March 2018
37/108	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Republic of Korea	15 March 2018
37/109	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Benin	19 March 2018
37/110	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Pakistan	19 March 2018
37/111	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Zambia	19 March 2018
37/112	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Japan	19 March 2018
37/113	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Ukraine	19 March 2018
37/114	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Sri Lanka	19 March 2018

Part Two

Summary of proceedings

I. Organizational and procedural matters

A. Opening and duration of the session

1. The Human Rights Council held its thirty-seventh session at the United Nations Office at Geneva from 26 February to 23 March 2018. The President of the Council opened the session.
2. At the 1st meeting, on 26 February 2018, the Secretary-General, the President of the General Assembly, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, and the Federal Councillor and Head of the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Ignazio Cassis, addressed the plenary.
3. At the 24th meeting, on 8 March 2018, the Human Rights Council observed International Women's Day. At the same meeting, the representative of Finland (also on behalf of Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and the Sovereign Military Hospitaller Order of St. John of Jerusalem, of Rhodes and of Malta) made a statement.
4. 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 on the thirty-seventh session was held on 12 February 2018.
5. The thirty-seventh session consisted of 56 meetings over 19 days (see para. 31 below).

B. Attendance

6. 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, as well as 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

7. At its 1st and 2nd, and 4th to 8th meetings, from 26 to 28 February 2018, the Human Rights Council held a high-level segment, during which 94 dignitaries addressed the Council in plenary session, including 4 heads of state, 1 vice-president, 7 deputy prime ministers, 44 ministers, 31 other dignitaries and 7 representatives of observer organizations.
8. 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 26 February 2018: President of Austria, Alexander van der Bellen; President of Mozambique, Filipe Jacinto Nyusi; Chairman of the Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Dragan Čović; Governor General of the Commonwealth of Australia, Peter Cosgrove; Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Qatar,

Sheikh Mohammed bin Abdulrahman bin Jassim Al Thani; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Norway, Ine Eriksen Søreide; Minister for External Relations of Angola, Manuel Domingos Augusto; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iceland, Gudlaugur Thór Thórdarson; Minister for Justice of Uzbekistan, Ruslanbek Davletov; Vice-Minister for Political and Multilateral Affairs of Brazil, Fernando Simas Magalhães; Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation of Portugal, Teresa Ribeiro.

(b) At the 2nd meeting, on the same day: Chief Executive and Chair of the Council of Ministers of the Government of Afghanistan, Abdullah Abdullah; Vice-Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Georgia, Mikheil Janelidze; First Vice-President of South Sudan, Taban Deng Gai; Minister for Justice of Iraq, Haidar al-Zamily; Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea, Kang Kyung-wha; Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Jorge Arreaza; Minister for Foreign Affairs and Senegalese Abroad of Senegal, Sidiki Kaba; President of the International Committee of the Red Cross, Peter Maurer; Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade of Hungary, Péter Szijjártó; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Liechtenstein, Aurelia Frick; Minister for Foreign Affairs and for Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation of the Netherlands, Sigrid Kaag; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Anders Samuelsen; Minister for Foreign Affairs and Human Mobility of Ecuador, Maria Fernanda Espinosa Garcés; Minister for Human Rights of Yemen, Mohammed Mohsen Mohammed Askar; Foreign Secretary of Nepal, Shankar Das Bairagi; Secretary for Human Rights and Cultural Pluralism of Argentina, Claudio Bernardo Avruj.

(c) At the 4th meeting, on 27 February 2018: Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Slovenia, Karl Erjavec; Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign and European Affairs of Croatia, Marija Pejčinović Burić; Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Czechia, Martin Stropnický; Minister for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation of Spain, Alfonso María Dastis Quecedo; Minister of State for Human Rights of Morocco, Mostapha Ramid; Minister for Education of Maldives, Aishath Shiham; Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, Alan Peter S. Cayetano; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Azerbaijan, Elmar Mammadyarov; Minister for International Cooperation of Myanmar, Kyaw Tin; Minister for Justice, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs of Zimbabwe, Ziyambi Ziyambi; Deputy Minister for International Relations and Cooperation of South Africa, Luwellyn Landers; Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Tariq Mahmood Ahmad; State Secretary of the Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs of Slovakia, Ivan Korčok; Undersecretary for Multilateral Affairs and Human Rights of Mexico, Miguel Ruiz Cabañas; Secretary-General of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, Yousef A. al-Othaimeen; State Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ethiopia, Hirut Zemene Kassa; Assistant Minister for Human Rights and International Law of the United Arab Emirates, Ahmed Abdulrahman al-Jarman; Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Lithuania, Darius Skusevičius; Commissioner for Political Affairs of the African Union, Minata Samate Cessouma.

(d) At the 5th meeting, on the same day: Third Vice-Prime Minister of Equatorial Guinea, Charged with Human Rights, Alfonso Nsue Mokuy; Deputy Attorney General of Lesotho, Tsebang Putsoane; Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade Promotion of Malta, Carmelo Abela; Minister for the Bulgarian Presidency of the Council of the European Union, Lilyana Pavlova; Minister for Justice of Luxembourg, Félix Braz; Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs and Worship of Costa Rica, Alejandro Solano Ortiz; State Secretary at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Viktor Dimovski; Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine, Sergiy Kyslytsya; Commissioner for Human Rights and Humanitarian Action of Mauritania, Cheikh Tourad Ould Abdel Malick; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Canada, Chrystia Freeland; Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan, Yerzhan Ashikbayev; Minister of State for the Diaspora and International Development of Ireland, Ciarán Cannon; Director of Human Rights of the Ministry of Foreign Relations of Chile, Hernán Quezada; Secretary-General of the Commonwealth, Patricia Scotland; Director of the International Organizations Division, Political Department, of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Estonia, Karmen Laus.

(e) At the 6th meeting, on the same day: Minister for Foreign Affairs of Armenia, Edward Nalbandian; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, Sameh Hassan Shokry Selim;

Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sweden, Margot Wallström; Minister for Human Rights of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Marie Ange Mushobekwa; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nigeria, Geoffrey Onyeama; Minister for Justice of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Seyyed Alireza Avaei; Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Algeria, Noureddine Ayadi; Federal Government Commissioner for Human Rights Policy and Humanitarian Aid of Germany, Bärbel Kofler; Vice-Minister for Multilateral Affairs and Cooperation of Panama, María Luisa Navarro; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Saudi Arabia, Adel Ahmed al-Jubeir; European Union Special Representative for Human Rights, Stavros Lambrinidis; Parliamentary Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, Manabu Horii; Secretary-General of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, Martin Chungong.

(f) At the 7th meeting, on 28 February 2018: Minister for Foreign Affairs of Andorra, Maria Ubach; Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Sergey Lavrov; Minister for Foreign Affairs and European Integration of the Republic of Moldova, Tudor Ulianoschi; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Monaco, Gilles Tonelli; Minister for Foreign Affairs of the State of Palestine, Riad Malki; Minister for Foreign Affairs, Cooperation and Congolese Nationals Abroad of the Congo, Jean-Claude Gakosso; Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Belgium, Didier Reynders; Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Romania, George Ciamba; Undersecretary of State for Foreign and Security Policy of Finland, Anne Sipiläinen; Assistant Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bahrain, Abdulla Faisal al-Doseri; Minister for Relations with Constitutional Institutions, Civil Society and Human Rights of Tunisia, Mehdi Ben Gharbia; Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mongolia, Battsetseg Batmunkh; Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of the State of Libya, Mohamed T.H. Siala; Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Turkey, Ahmet Yildiz; Vice-Minister for Europe and Foreign Affairs of Albania, Artemisa Dralo; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Thailand, Don Pramudwinai.

(g) At the 8th meeting, on the same day: member of the Senate Committees of Pakistan on Foreign Affairs, Law and Justice, Ayesha Raza Farooq; Director General of the International Development Law Organization, Irene Khan; Acting Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of International Organization Affairs of the United States of America, Mary Catherine Phee.

High-level panel discussion on human rights mainstreaming

9. At its 3rd meeting, on 26 February 2018, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 16/21, a high-level panel discussion to interact with heads of governing bodies and secretariats of United Nations agencies within their respective mandates on specific human rights themes with the objective of promoting the mainstreaming of human rights throughout the United Nations system, with a focus on “promotion and protection of human rights in the light of the universal periodic review mechanism: challenges and opportunities”.

10. The President of the General Assembly, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Deputy Secretary-General of the United Nations (by video message) made opening statements for the panel. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights moderated the discussion.

11. At the 3rd meeting, on 26 February 2018, the following panellists made statements: Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (by video message); Chair of the Development Assistance Committee at the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Charlotte Petri Gornitzka (by audio message); Minister for Foreign Affairs and Human Mobility of Ecuador, María Fernanda Espinosa Garcés; former United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Mary Robinson. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

12. During the ensuing panel discussion for the first speaking slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola, Brazil (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries), Indonesia¹ (also on behalf of Australia, Mexico, the Republic of Korea and Turkey), Portugal¹ (also on behalf of Angola, Australia, the Bahamas, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, Georgia, Haiti, Italy, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, Seychelles, Slovenia, Sweden, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tunisia and Uruguay), South Africa, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Estonia (also on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway and Sweden), Israel, Lesotho;

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

(d) Observer for national human rights institutions: Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Centre catholique international de Genève (also on behalf of Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, Caritas Internationalis, the Catholic International Education Office, the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, Edmund Rice International, Fondazione Marista per la Solidarietà Internazionale, International Federation of ACAT, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development, International Movement of Apostolate in the Independent Social Milieus, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, VIVAT International and the World Evangelical Alliance), International Lesbian and Gay Association.

13. During the discussion for the second speaking slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: China, Iraq, Nepal, Tunisia, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Botswana, France, Greece, Honduras, Morocco, Sierra Leone;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Friends World Committee for Consultation, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

14. Also at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

D. General segment

15. At the 8th meeting, on 28 February 2018, 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 (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries), China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Cyprus, France, Greece, India, Israel, Italy, Oman, Serbia, Syrian Arab Republic, Viet Nam;

(c) Observers for an intergovernmental organization: Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf;

(d) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: UNDP;

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

(e) Observer for national human rights institutions: Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (by video message);

(f) Invited members of civil society: Khadija Ismayilova (by video message), Gofran Sawalha, Jeanne Sarson, Nicholas Opiyo, Rosette B. Adera.

16. At the same meeting, the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Chile, Cyprus, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, Pakistan, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Arab Emirates (also on behalf of Bahrain, Egypt and Saudi Arabia) and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

E. Agenda and programme of work

18. At the 1st meeting, on 26 February 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted the agenda and programme of work of the thirty-seventh session.

F. Organization of work

19. At the 1st meeting, on 26 February 2018, the Human Rights Council decided to reduce the duration of panel discussions from three to two hours and to allocate a maximum of one hour of that time to opening statements and panellists. This urgent and extraordinary measure took immediate effect and will be applied to all panel discussions to be held in 2018, beginning with the current session.

20. At the same meeting, the President referred to the introduction of a web-based online system for inscription of the lists of speakers for all general debates, and individual and clustered interactive dialogues at the thirty-seventh session of the Human Rights Council. He also referred to the modalities and schedule of the online inscription that had been launched on 21 February 2018.

21. Also at the same meeting, in relation to the draft programme of work, the Human Rights Council decided to hold a discussion on the report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, the late Asma Jahangir, on 12 March 2018, in place of the interactive dialogue scheduled for that day. The report was submitted to the Council in accordance with resolution 34/23, together with the comments provided by the country concerned. The report was transmitted to the Council by the Chair of the Coordination Committee, who took note of the comments made by the delegations during the discussion (see chap. IV, sect. H).

22. At the 3rd meeting, on the same day, the President outlined the speaking time limits for the panel discussions, which would be two minutes for States members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.

23. At the 8th meeting, on 28 February 2018, the President outlined the speaking time limits for the interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders under agenda item 3, which would be two minutes for States members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.

24. At the same meeting, the President outlined, pursuant to the practice introduced at the twenty-seventh session of the Human Rights Council, the speaking time limits for the clustered interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders under agenda item 3. 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 preliminary lists of speakers would be available following the electronic registration, the secretariat would calculate the estimated time needed to complete the clustered interactive

dialogue with the mandate holders. Should the total duration of a given interactive dialogue be 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 would be 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. Should this measure be deemed insufficient to ensure that the total duration not exceed four hours, the speaking time limits would be further reduced, with a minimum of 1 minute and 30 seconds per speaker.

25. At the 13th meeting, on 2 March 2018, the President outlined the speaking time limits for the urgent debate on the situation of Eastern Ghouta in the Syrian Arab Republic, which would be 2 minutes and 30 seconds for States members of the Human Rights Council and 1 minute and 30 seconds for observer States and other observers.

26. At the 25th meeting, on 8 March 2018, the President outlined the speaking time limits for the general debates, which would be 2 minutes and 30 seconds for States members of the Human Rights Council and 1 minute and 30 seconds for observer States and other observers.

27. At the 28th meeting, on 12 March 2018, the President outlined the speaking time limits for the individual interactive dialogues on item 4, with special procedure mandate holders, which would be two minutes for States members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.

28. At the same meeting, the President outlined the speaking time limits for the discussion on the report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, which would be two minutes for States members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.

29. At the 30th meeting, on 12 March 2018, the President outlined the speaking time limits for the enhanced interactive dialogues on item 4 with special procedure mandate holders, which would be two minutes for States members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.

30. At the 37th meeting, on 15 March 2018, the President outlined the speaking time limits for the consideration of the outcomes of the universal periodic review under agenda item 6, which would be 20 minutes for the State concerned to present its views; where appropriate, 2 minutes for the national human rights institution with A status of the State concerned; up to 20 minutes for States members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and United Nations agencies to express their views on the outcome of the review, with varying speaking times according to the number of speakers in accordance with the speaking time limits set out in the appendix to the annex to Council resolution 16/21, and up to 20 minutes for stakeholders with a speaking time of 2 minutes each to make general comments on the outcome of the review.

G. Meetings and documentation

31. The Human Rights Council held 56 fully serviced meetings during its thirty-seventh session.²

32. The list of the resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council is contained in part one of the present report.

H. Visits

33. At the 18th meeting, on 5 March 2018, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cameroon, Lejeune Mbella Mbella, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

² The proceedings of the thirty-seventh session of the Human Rights Council can be followed through the archived webcasts of the Human Rights Council sessions at <http://webtv.un.org>.

34. At the 49th meeting, on 21 March 2018, the Minister for Justice of New Zealand, Andrew Little, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

I. Urgent debate on the situation of Eastern Ghouta in the Syrian Arab Republic

35. At the 13th meeting, on 2 March 2018, the President of the Human Rights Council announced that, on 1 March 2018, he had received a request from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to convene an urgent debate on the situation of Eastern Ghouta in the Syrian Arab Republic.

36. At the same meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made a statement to introduce the proposal.

37. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Australia, China, Cuba, South Africa, the United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), made statements on the holding of the urgent debate. The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

38. At the same meeting, at the request of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, a recorded vote was taken on the proposal to hold the urgent debate. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

China, Cuba, Iraq, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Abstaining:

Angola, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Philippines, Tunisia

39. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council decided by 25 votes to 4, with 8 abstentions, to hold the urgent debate at its 15th meeting, on 2 March 2018.³

40. At the same meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote. The representative of the Russian Federation made a general comment.

41. At its 15th meeting, on 2 March 2018, the Human Rights Council held an urgent debate on the situation of Eastern Ghouta in the Syrian Arab Republic.

42. At the same meeting, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement for the urgent debate.

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

44. During the ensuing discussion, at the same meeting, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria⁴ (on behalf of the European Union), Chile, China, Cuba, Egypt, Germany, Iraq, Japan, Mexico, Nepal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

³ The delegations of Afghanistan, Burundi, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, South Africa and Togo did not cast a vote.

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

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Canada, Costa Rica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Sweden (also on behalf of Kuwait), Turkey, Uruguay;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Association of World Citizens, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Human Rights Watch, International Commission of Jurists, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Union of Arab Jurists, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

J. Selection and appointment of mandate holders

45. At its 56th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the Human Rights Council appointed, pursuant to Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21 and its decision 6/102, nine special procedure mandate holders (see annex IV).

K. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

The deteriorating situation of human rights in Eastern Ghouta, in the Syrian Arab Republic

46. At the 15th meeting, on 2 March 2018, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.1, sponsored by the United Kingdom and co-sponsored by Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Lithuania, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Sweden and the United States of America. Subsequently, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

47. At the same meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland orally revised the draft resolution.

48. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced amendments A/HRC/37/L.2, A/HRC/37/L.3, A/HRC/37/L.4, A/HRC/37/L.5 to draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.1 as orally revised. The representative of South Africa introduced amendments A/HRC/37/L.6, A/HRC/37/L.7, A/HRC/37/L.8 and A/HRC/37/L.9 to draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.1 as orally revised.

49. Amendments A/HRC/37/L.2, A/HRC/37/L.3, A/HRC/37/L.4 and A/HRC/37/L.5 were sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. Amendments A/HRC/37/L.6, A/HRC/37/L.7, A/HRC/37/L.8 and A/HRC/37/L.9 were sponsored by South Africa.

50. At the 15th meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made a statement on the proposed amendments to the draft resolution as orally revised.

51. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a general comment on the draft resolution as orally revised and on the proposed amendments.

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

53. 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 the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for

Human Rights (OHCHR) made a statement on the budgetary implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

54. At the 16th meeting, on 5 March 2018, South Africa withdrew amendments A/HRC/37/L.5, A/HRC/37/L.6, A/HRC/37/L.7, A/HRC/37/L.8 and A/HRC/37/L.9 to the draft resolution as orally revised.

55. At the same meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland orally revised the draft resolution.

56. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made a general comment on the draft resolution as orally revised and on the proposed amendments.

57. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council took action on amendments A/HRC/37/L.2, A/HRC/37/L.3, A/HRC/37/L.4 and A/HRC/37/L.5 (see also paras. 58–69 below).

58. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Germany, Mexico and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/37/L.2. The representative of Brazil sought clarification on the text of the amendment to the draft resolution under consideration.

59. At the same meeting, at the request of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/37/L.2. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Brazil, Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Iraq, Pakistan, Tunisia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Chile, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, United Arab Emirates

60. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/37/L.2 by 19 votes to 10, with 17 abstentions.⁵

61. At the 16th meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/37/L.3.

62. 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/37/L.3. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Brazil, Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Iraq, Pakistan, Tunisia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Chile, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

⁵ The delegation of Kenya did not cast a vote.

Afghanistan, Angola, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, United Arab Emirates

63. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/37/L.3 by 19 votes to 9, with 18 abstentions.⁵

64. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/37/L.4.

65. Also 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/37/L.4. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Iraq, Pakistan, Panama, Tunisia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, United Arab Emirates

66. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/37/L.4 by 20 votes to 9, with 17 abstentions.⁵

67. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Belgium made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/37/L.5.

68. At the same meeting, at the request of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/37/L.5. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, Tunisia

69. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/37/L.5 by 23 votes to 4, with 19 abstentions.⁵

70. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council took action on the draft resolution as orally revised.

71. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Australia, Egypt, Iraq, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Tunisia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

72. At the same meeting, at the request of the representatives of China and Cuba, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as orally revised. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Abstaining:

Angola, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, South Africa

73. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.1 as orally revised by 29 votes to 4, with 14 abstentions (resolution 37/1).

74. At the same meeting, the representatives of France, the Russian Federation and the Syrian Arab Republic made statements as observer States on the adopted resolution.

L. Adoption of the report of the session

75. At the 56th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representatives of the Netherlands (also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Ghana, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, the Niger, Norway, Poland, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Zambia) and the Russian Federation made statements as observer States on the adopted resolutions.

76. At the same meeting, the Vice-President and Rapporteur of the Human Rights Council made a statement on the draft report of the Council on its thirty-seventh session.

77. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted ad referendum the draft report (A/HRC/37/2) and entrusted the Rapporteur with its finalization.

78. At the same meeting, the following made statements on the session:

(a) Representative of a State member of the Human Rights Council: Brazil;

(b) Representative of an observer State: Canada;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Service for Human Rights, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme.

79. 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

80. At the 22nd meeting, on 7 March 2018, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement on his annual report (A/HRC/37/3).

81. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 24th and 25th meetings, on 8 March 2018, the following made statements and asked the High Commissioner questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Afghanistan, Angola, Australia, Australia (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Angola, Chile, Mexico, Peru, Senegal, Slovakia, Spain and Ukraine), Belgium, Brazil, Chile, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iraq, Japan, Jordan⁶ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Kenya, Mexico, Morocco⁶ (also on behalf of Bahrain, Burundi, the Central African Republic, the Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Guinea, Jordan, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal and the United Arab Emirates), Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Peru (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Mexico, Panama and Paraguay), Peru (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay and Uruguay), Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda (also on behalf of Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Timor-Leste⁶ (also on behalf of Algeria, Angola, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, South Africa, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zimbabwe), Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine and the United States of America), United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Armenia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Costa Rica, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Maldives, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Niger, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Zambia;

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

(d) Observer for the Sovereign Military Hospitaller Order of St. John of Jerusalem, of Rhodes and of Malta;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Association internationale pour l'égalité des femmes,

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

Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Human Rights Watch, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (also on behalf of Centre pour les droits civils et politiques, Child Rights Connect, the Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Disability Alliance, International Women's Rights Action Watch Asia Pacific and the World Organization against Torture), International Service for Human Rights.

82. At the 25th meeting, on 8 March 2018, the High Commissioner answered questions and made comments and his concluding remarks.

83. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Burundi, China, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gabon, India, Maldives, Morocco, Pakistan, the Philippines and Turkmenistan made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

84. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria and Morocco made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

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

85. At the 25th meeting, on 8 March 2018, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights presented the thematic reports prepared by the High Commissioner, OHCHR and the Secretary-General under agenda items 2 and 3.

86. At the same meeting, on the same day, and at the 26th meeting, on 9 March 2018, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on the thematic reports under agenda items 2 and 3, presented by the Deputy High Commissioner (see chap. III, sect. E).

87. At the 44th meeting, on 20 March 2018, the Deputy High Commissioner presented the reports prepared by the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General under agenda items 2 and 7.

88. At the 46th meeting, on 20 March 2018, the Chief of the Human Rights Council and Treaty Mechanisms Division of OHCHR presented the report of the High Commissioner under agenda items 2 and 9.

89. At the 47th meeting, on 20 March 2018, and at the 48th meeting, on 21 March, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights presented the reports of the High Commissioner under items 2 and 10 (see chap. X, sects. B and C).

90. At the 49th meeting, on 21 March 2018, the Deputy High Commissioner presented the report of the High Commissioner under items 2 and 10 (see chap. X, sect. D).

91. At the 50th meeting, on the same day, the Deputy High Commissioner introduced the country-specific reports submitted by the Secretary-General and the High Commissioner under agenda item 2 (A/HRC/37/3/Add.1–3, A/HRC/37/22, A/HRC/37/23 and A/HRC/37/24).

92. At the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence, Pablo de Greiff, made a statement.

93. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Burundi, Colombia, Cyprus, Guatemala, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of) and Sri Lanka made statements as the States concerned.

94. During the ensuing general debate, at the 50th meeting, on 21 March 2018, and at the 51st meeting, on 22 March, the following made statements and asked the Deputy High Commissioner questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria⁶ (on behalf of the European Union), Georgia, Germany, New Zealand⁶ (also on behalf of Albania, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Marshall Islands, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland,

Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America), Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (also on behalf of Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America), United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Canada, Denmark, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Turkey, United Republic of Tanzania;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action contre la faim, Advocates for Human Rights, American Association of Jurists (also on behalf of France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International-Lawyers.Org and Liberation), Amnesty International, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association culturelle des tamouls en France, Association d'entraide médicale Guinée, Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association of World Citizens, Association pour les victimes du monde, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Association Thendral, Center for Organisation Research and Education, Centre Europe-tiers monde, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Colombian Commission of Jurists, Conseil de jeunesse pluriculturelle, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Corporación para la Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos – Reiniciar, Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers, FIAN International, Franciscans International, Fundación Latinoamericana por los Derechos Humanos y el Desarrollo Social, Human Rights Watch, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Catholic Child Bureau, International Commission of Jurists, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International-Lawyers.Org, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of the Colombian Commission of Jurists), Le pont, Liberation, Lutheran World Federation, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Oidhaco, Bureau international des droits humains – action Colombie, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Peace Brigades International Switzerland, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Réseau international des droits humains, Swiss Catholic Lenten Fund (also on behalf of the Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries), Tamil Uzhagam, Tournier la page, United Nations Watch, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, VAAGDHARA, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization, World Organization against Torture.

95. At the 50th meeting, the representatives of Cambodia, Cyprus and Turkey made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

97. At the 51st meeting, the representatives of Bahrain, Cuba, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of) and Israel made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

A. Panel discussions

High-level panel discussion on the seventieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

98. At the 9th meeting, on 28 February 2018, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 35/1, a high-level panel discussion to mark the seventieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action.

99. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Director of the Department for Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation and Commissioner for Human Rights, Democracy and Rule of Law, Anatoly Victorov, made opening statements for the panel. The President of the Human Rights Council moderated the discussion for the panel.

100. At the 9th meeting, the following panellists made statements: Special Representative for the Austrian Chairmanship of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe for 2017, and former Special Representative and Ambassador for the World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna, Christian Strohal; 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; member of the Human Rights Committee and former Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, Christof Heyns; Senior Adviser at the Women Political Leaders Global Network and former member of the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Şafak Pavvey. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

101. During the ensuing panel discussion for the first speaking slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia (also on behalf of Canada, Iceland, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Norway and Switzerland), Belgium (also on behalf of Luxembourg and the Netherlands), Canada⁶ (on behalf of States members and observers of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Chile (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay), China (also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Egypt, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe), Indonesia⁶ (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations), Jordan⁶ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Mexico (also on behalf of Colombia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Indonesia, Jordan, New Zealand and Norway), Republic of Korea (also on behalf of Australia, Indonesia, Mexico and Turkey), South Africa;

(b) Representative of an observer State: Denmark (also on behalf of Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway and Sweden);

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

(d) Observer for national human rights institutions: Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (by video message);

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Service for Human Rights.

102. At the end of the first speaking slot, also at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

103. During the discussion for the second speaking slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Brazil, Egypt, Ethiopia, Nepal (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Haiti, Mozambique, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, South Sudan and Yemen), Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Botswana, Israel, Poland, Viet Nam;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Human Rights Watch.

104. Also at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

Annual full-day meeting on the rights of the child

105. At its 16th meeting, on 5 March 2018, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 34/16, its annual full-day meeting on the rights of the child. The meeting was focused on the theme “Protecting the rights of the child in humanitarian situations”. The meeting was divided into two panel discussions: the first panel discussion was held at the 16th meeting; the second panel discussion was held at the 18th meeting, on the same day.

106. The topic of the first panel discussion was “How can we meet children’s needs and rights in humanitarian situations? Practices and lessons from different levels”. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative of the European Union to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Carl Hallergard, moderated the discussion for the panel.

107. At the 16th meeting, the following panellists made statements: Director of International Law and Policy at the International Committee of the Red Cross, Helen Durham; Director of the Geneva Office of Emergency Programmes at UNICEF, Sikander Khan; National Director of Plan International Colombia, Alejandro Gamboa; Director of the Geneva Office of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), Monica Ferro. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

108. During the ensuing panel discussion for the first speaking slot 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: Australia (also on behalf of Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Cyprus, Czechia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Zambia), Jordan⁶ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Norway⁶ (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Georgia, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Uruguay, Yemen, Zambia and the State of Palestine), Qatar, Senegal (on behalf of States members and observers of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Slovenia, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bulgaria, Ireland, Latvia (also on behalf of Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Lithuania, Norway and Sweden);

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Conselho Indigenista Missionário, Plan International, Save the Children International (also on behalf of Child Rights Connect, Defence for Children International, Foundation ECPAT International, the Geneva Infant Feeding Association, the International Catholic Child Bureau, International Movement ATD Fourth World, International Social Service, Plan International, Stichting War Child and the Women's World Summit Foundation).

109. At the end of the first speaking slot, also at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

110. During the discussion for the second speaking slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Belgium, Brazil, Georgia, Mexico, Mongolia, Philippines, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: India, Israel, Italy, Portugal, Holy See;

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

111. Also at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

112. The topic of the second panel discussion was "How can States and the international community be more accountable to children in humanitarian situations?". The Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Uruguay to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Ricardo González Arenas, moderated the discussion for the panel.

113. At the 18th meeting, on 5 March 2018, the following panellists made statements: member of the Committee on the Rights of the Child, Gehad Madi; Head of the Monitoring and Reporting Team at the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, Nicolas Gérard; Global Lead for Disaster Management at World Vision International, Justin Byworth; Deputy Director of the Division of International Protection at the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Shahrzad Tadjbakhsh. The Human Rights Council divided the second panel discussion into two slots, both held at the 18th meeting.

114. During the first speaking slot 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: Chile, Kenya, Mexico, Nepal, Spain, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Azerbaijan, France, Jordan, Uruguay;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Center for Reproductive Rights, European Union of Public Relations, International Human Rights Association of American Minorities.

115. At the end of the first speaking slot of the second panel discussion, also at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

116. During the second speaking slot 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: Afghanistan, Angola, Australia, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Iraq, Switzerland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Honduras, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Regional Agricultural Credit Association, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Association of World Citizens.

117. Also at the same meeting, the panellists of the second panel discussion answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

Annual interactive debate on the rights of persons with disabilities

118. At its 23rd meeting, on 7 March 2018, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to resolution 31/6, 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 13 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities on access to justice.

119. The Deputy High Commissioner made an opening statement for the panel. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council chaired the panel discussion.

120. At the 23rd meeting, the following panellists made statements: Special Envoy of the Secretary-General on Disability and Accessibility, María Soledad Cisternas; Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities, Catalina Devandas Aguilar; Chair of the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Theresia Degener; representative of the African Disability Forum and the International Disability Alliance, Oumarou Siddo Nouhou; Executive Vice-President of Comité Español de Representantes de Personas con Discapacidad (CERMI) Women's Foundation and Vice-President of the European Disability Forum, Ana Peláez Narváez. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

121. During the ensuing panel discussion for the first speaking slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Egypt, Jordan⁷ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Mexico, Mexico (also on behalf of Australia, Indonesia, the Republic of Korea and Turkey), Pakistan, Singapore⁷ (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations), Timor-Leste⁷ (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries), Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), United Arab Emirates, United States of America;

(b) Representative of an observer State: Finland (also on behalf of Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden);

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

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Australian Human Rights Commission (by video message);

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Center for Reproductive Rights, Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims.

122. At the end of the first speaking slot, also at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

123. During the discussion for the second speaking slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Ecuador, Iraq, Slovenia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Azerbaijan, Greece, India, Israel, Namibia, New Zealand, Paraguay;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development (also on behalf of Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco), Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture.

124. Also at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

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

B. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders

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

125. At the 8th meeting, on 28 February 2018, 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 reports (A/HRC/37/53 and Add.1).

126. At the same meeting, the representative of Chile made a statement as the State concerned.

127. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 10th meeting, on 1 March 2018, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Germany, Iraq, Pakistan, Philippines, South Africa, Spain, Togo (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Argentina, Bahrain, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Finland, France, Honduras, India, Malaysia, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Paraguay, Saudi Arabia, State of Palestine;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Association of World Citizens, Caritas Internationalis, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Human Rights Now, Pan African Union for Science and Technology, United Schools International, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

128. At the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her 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

129. At the 8th meeting, on 28 February 2018, 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, presented his reports (A/HRC/37/54 and Add.1–3).

130. At the same meeting, the representatives of Panama, Switzerland and Tunisia made statements as the States concerned.

131. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 10th meeting, on 1 March 2018, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Iraq, Pakistan, South Africa, Togo (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Greece, Honduras, Kuwait, Malaysia, Morocco, Namibia, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Holy See;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Center for Economic and Social Rights, Conectas Direitos Humanos (also on behalf of Instituto de Estudos Socioeconomicos and Oxfam Brasil), International Bar Association, International Human Rights Association of American Minorities.

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

133. At the 12th meeting, on 1 March 2018, the representative of Brazil made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders

134. At the 10th meeting, on 1 March 2018, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, Michel Forst, presented his reports (A/HRC/37/51 and Add.1–3).

135. At the same meeting, the representatives of Australia and Mexico made statements as the States concerned.

136. Also at the same meeting, the national human rights institutions Australian Human Rights Commission and National Human Rights Commission of Mexico made statements (by video messages).

137. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 11th meeting, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Afghanistan, Austria⁷ (also on behalf of Liechtenstein, Slovenia and Switzerland), Belgium, Brazil, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Georgia, Germany, Iraq, Pakistan, Spain, Togo, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, Honduras, Ireland, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Russian Federation, Singapore, Uganda;

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

(d) Observer for national human rights institutions: Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (by video message);

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Conectas Direitos Humanos, Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland, Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, Human Rights Law Centre, International Commission of Jurists (also on behalf of the International Bar Association and Union internationale des avocats), International Federation of ACAT, International Service for Human Rights, Swiss Catholic Lenten Fund, World Organization against Torture.

138. At the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

139. At the 12th meeting, on 1 March 2018, the representative of China made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

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

140. At the 11th meeting, on 1 March 2018, the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, Nils Melzer, presented his reports (A/HRC/37/50 and Add.1).

141. At the same meeting, the representative of Turkey made a statement as the State concerned.

142. 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: Afghanistan, Australia, China, Cuba, Egypt, Germany, Iraq, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Switzerland, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Canada, Czechia, Denmark, France, Honduras, Ireland, Maldives, Montenegro, Portugal, Thailand;

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

(d) Observer for national human rights institutions: Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Association for the Prevention of Torture, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Conectas Direitos Humanos, Defence for Children International, International Federation of ACAT, Swiss Catholic Lenten Fund, World Organization against Torture.

143. At the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

144. At the 12th meeting, on 1 March 2018, the representative of Brazil made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism

145. At the 12th meeting, on 1 March 2018, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, Fionnuala Ní Aoláin, presented her report (A/HRC/37/52).

146. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, on the same day, and at the 13th meeting, on 2 March 2018, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Belgium, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Egypt, Iraq, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Spain, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Djibouti, France, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Myanmar, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, Canners International Permanent Committee, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Ensemble contre la peine de mort, International Human Rights Association of American Minorities, Iraqi Development Organization, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

147. At the 12th and 13th meeting, on 1 March 2018, and at the 13th meeting, on 2 March, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights

148. At the 12th meeting, on 1 March 2018, the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, Karima Bennoune, presented her reports (A/HRC/37/55 and Add.1).

149. At the same meeting, the representative of Serbia made a statement as the State concerned.

150. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, on the same day, and at the 13th meeting, on 2 March 2018, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Georgia, Iraq, Jordan⁷ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Pakistan, Peru, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Djibouti, France, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Malaysia, Morocco, Norway, Russian Federation, Holy See;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas, Association of World Citizens, International Human Rights Association of American Minorities, International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (also on behalf of the Catholic International Education Office), Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

151. At the 12th meeting, on 1 March 2018, and at the 13th meeting, on 2 March, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief

152. At the 13th meeting, on 2 March 2018, the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, Ahmed Shaheed, presented his reports (A/HRC/37/49 and Add.1–2).

153. At the same meeting, the representatives of Albania and Uzbekistan made statements as the States concerned.

154. Also at the same meeting, the national human rights institution Office of the People's Advocate of Albania made a statement (by video message).

155. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, on the same day, and at the 14th meeting, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola, Australia, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Hungary, Iraq, Mexico, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Switzerland, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Canada, Denmark, Eritrea, France, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Libya, Myanmar, Netherlands, Norway, Russian Federation, Sudan, Holy See, State of Palestine;

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

(d) Observer for the Sovereign Military Hospitaller Order of St. John of Jerusalem, of Rhodes and of Malta;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alliance Defending Freedom, Alsalam Foundation, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, British Humanist Association, Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, Minority Rights Group, World Evangelical Alliance.

156. At the 14th meeting, on 2 March 2018, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

157. At the 14th meeting, on 2 March 2018, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence, Pablo de Greiff, and the Special Adviser of the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide, Adama Dieng, presented

their joint study on the contribution of transitional justice to the prevention of gross violations and abuses of human rights and serious violations of international humanitarian law, including genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, and their recurrence (A/HRC/37/65).

158. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, on the same day, and at the 17th meeting, on 5 March, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur and the Special Adviser of the Secretary-General questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Argentina⁷ (also on behalf of Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay), Australia, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Iraq, Netherlands⁷ (also on behalf of the European Union, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Peru, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Sudan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay), Switzerland, Togo (also on behalf of the Group of African States), United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, France, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Paraguay, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Uruguay;

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

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

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

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Association internationale pour l'égalité des femmes, Association of World Citizens, Center for Global Nonkilling, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, International Commission of Jurists, International Human Rights Association of American Minorities.

159. At the 14th meeting, on 2 March 2018, and at the 17th meeting, on 5 March, the Special Rapporteur and the Special Adviser of the Secretary-General answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

160. At the 17th meeting, the representative of Nepal made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

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

161. At the 17th meeting, on 5 March 2018, the Special Rapporteur on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment, John H. Knox, presented his reports (A/HRC/37/58 and Add.1–2).

162. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mongolia and Uruguay made statements as the States concerned.

163. 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, Costa Rica⁷ (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Panama, Peru and Uruguay), Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Georgia, Jordan⁷ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Nepal, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, Slovenia, Switzerland, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Costa Rica, France, Gabon, Greece, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Maldives, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (also on behalf of Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas and Haiti), Sudan, State of Palestine;

(c) Observers for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: Economic Commission for Europe, United Nations Environment Programme;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Chant du guépard dans le désert, Earthjustice, Friends World Committee for Consultation, Human Rights Watch (also on behalf of Amnesty International, the Center for International Environmental Law and Earthjustice), Indian Council of South America, Make Mothers Matter, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Terre des hommes fédération internationale.

164. At the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the right to food

165. At the 17th meeting, on 5 March 2018, the Special Rapporteur on the right to food, Hilal Elver, presented her reports (A/HRC/37/61 and Add.1).

166. 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: China, Cuba, Iraq, Jordan⁷ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Senegal, Switzerland, Togo (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burkina Faso, Djibouti, France, Gabon, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Sudan, Turkey, Viet Nam;

(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: Asian Legal Resource Centre, FIAN International, Franciscans International (also on behalf of Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers, Genève pour les droits de l'homme: formation internationale and VIVAT International), Indian Council of South America, International Human Rights Association of American Minorities, World Barua Organization.

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

168. At the same meeting, the representative of Indonesia made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

Special Rapporteur on the right to privacy

169. At the 19th meeting, on 6 March 2018, the Special Rapporteur on the right to privacy, Joe Cannataci, presented his report (A/HRC/37/62).

170. 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: Australia, Brazil (also on behalf of Austria, Germany, Liechtenstein and Mexico), China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Iraq, Japan, Pakistan, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), France, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Morocco, Paraguay, Russian Federation;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Asian Legal Resource Centre, Association for Progressive Communications, Iraqi Development Organization, Privacy International.

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

Special Rapporteur on the sale and sexual exploitation of children, including child prostitution, child pornography and other child sexual abuse material

172. At the 19th meeting, on 6 March 2018, the Special Rapporteur on the sale and sexual exploitation of children, including child prostitution, child pornography and other child sexual abuse material, Maud de Boer-Buquicchio, presented her reports (A/HRC/37/60 and Add.1).

173. At the same meeting, the representative of the Dominican Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

174. 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: Australia, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Iraq, Mexico, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, South Africa, Togo (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Greece, Honduras, India, Ireland, Israel, Paraguay, Russian Federation, Sudan, Thailand;

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

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

(e) Observer for the Sovereign Military Hospitaller Order of St. John of Jerusalem, of Rhodes and of Malta;

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alliance Defending Freedom, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Association of World Citizens, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Edmund Rice International, the International Catholic Child Bureau, the International Movement of Apostolate in the Independent Social Milieus, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, La manif pour tous, Make Mothers Matter and the World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations), Center for Reproductive Rights (also on behalf of Child Rights Connect and the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues), European Centre for Law and Justice, Human Rights Advocates, Human Rights Now, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Jossour forum des femmes marocaines, Kham Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture.

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

Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities

176. At the 21st meeting, on 6 March 2018, the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities, Catalina Devandas-Aguilar, presented her reports (A/HRC/37/56 and Add.1–2).

177. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Kazakhstan made statements as the States concerned.

178. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 21st meeting, at the same meeting, and at the 23rd meeting, on 7 March, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Afghanistan, Angola, Australia, Brazil, Chile, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Hungary, Jordan⁸ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Kenya, Mexico (also on behalf of Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica and Uruguay), Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Republic of Korea, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Togo (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Benin, Burkina Faso, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Fiji, Finland, France, Greece, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Maldives, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Russian Federation, Singapore, Sudan, Thailand, Viet Nam, State of Palestine;

(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: Action Canada for Population and Development, Alsalam Foundation, Association of World Citizens, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development (also on behalf of Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco), Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Plan International, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, VAAGDHARA, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization.

179. At the 23rd meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

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

180. At the 21st meeting, on 6 March 2018, the Independent Expert on the enjoyment of human rights by persons with albinism, Ikponwosa Ero, presented her reports (A/HRC/37/57 and Add.1).

181. At the same meeting, the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania made a statement as the State concerned.

182. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 21st meeting, on the same day, and at the 23rd meeting, on 7 March, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Brazil, Cuba, Egypt, Kenya, Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal, South Africa, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Benin, Djibouti, Fiji, Israel, Portugal, Sierra Leone, Somalia;

(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: Association pour l'intégration et le développement durable au Burundi, International Bar Association, Lutheran World Federation, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme.

183. At the 23rd meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

⁸ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

184. At the 21st meeting, on 6 March 2018, the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Israel and the Russian Federation made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

Special Rapporteur on minority issues

185. At the 36th meeting, on 14 March 2018, the Special Rapporteur on minority issues, Fernand de Varennes, presented his report (A/HRC/37/66).

186. 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: Afghanistan, Brazil (also on behalf of Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Indonesia, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Slovakia, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Zambia), China, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Georgia, Hungary, Iraq, Mexico, Nepal, Pakistan, Senegal, Slovenia, Switzerland, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, Ukraine, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Austria, Greece, Montenegro, Myanmar, Romania, Russian Federation, Sudan;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (on behalf of the Catholic International Education Office), Minority Rights Group, World Council of Arameans (Syriacs) (on behalf of Roads of Success), World Jewish Congress.

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

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

Special Representative of the Secretary-General on violence against children

188. At the 20th meeting, on 6 March 2018, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on violence against children, Marta Santos Pais, presented her report (A/HRC/37/48).

189. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 20th meeting, on the same day, and at the 22nd meeting, on 7 March 2018, the following made statements and asked the Special Representative questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola, Australia, Belgium, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Georgia, Germany, Iraq, Jordan⁸ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal, Slovenia, South Africa, Switzerland, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Botswana, Djibouti, Estonia, France, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Italy, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malaysia, Maldives, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Norway, Portugal, Russian Federation, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Uruguay;

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

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

(e) Observer for the Sovereign Military Hospitaller Order of St. John of Jerusalem, of Rhodes and of Malta;

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims, Foundation ECPAT International (also on behalf of Child Rights Connect, the International Catholic Child Bureau and Stichting War Child), Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Make Mothers Matter, Terre des hommes fédération internationale (also on behalf of Defence for Children International, Foundation ECPAT International and Plan International), Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Organization against Torture.

190. At the 20th and 22nd meetings, the Special Representative answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

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

191. At the 20th meeting, on 6 March 2018, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, Virginia Gamba, presented her report (A/HRC/37/47).

192. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 20th meeting, on the same day, and at the 22nd meeting, on 7 March 2018, the following made statements and asked the Special Representative questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina⁸ (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Uruguay, Yemen, Zambia and the State of Palestine), Australia, Belgium, Belgium (also on behalf of Australia, Austria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Estonia, France, Germany, Guatemala, Hungary, Italy, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Morocco, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay), China, Croatia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Georgia, Germany, Iraq, Jordan⁸ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Botswana, Canada, Colombia, Djibouti, Estonia, France, Italy, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Morocco, Myanmar, Portugal, Russian Federation, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Uruguay, 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 Sovereign Military Hospitaller Order of St. John of Jerusalem, of Rhodes and of Malta;

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Khwei Foundation, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, Association of World Citizens, Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims, Defence for Children International, Foundation ECPAT International (also on behalf of Child Rights Connect, Human Rights Now, the International Catholic Child Bureau and Stichting War Child),

Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Plan International, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Organization against Torture.

193. At the 20th and 22nd meetings, the Special Representative answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

194. At the 23rd meeting, on 7 March 2018, the representatives of Armenia and Azerbaijan made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

D. Open-ended intergovernmental working group on transnational corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights

196. At the 25th meeting, on 8 March 2018, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 26/9, the Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative of Ecuador to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Victor Arturo Cabrera Hidalgo, on behalf of the Chair-Rapporteur of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on transnational corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights, with the mandate of elaborating an international legally binding instrument, presented the report on the working group's third session, held from 23 to 27 October 2017 (A/HRC/37/67).

E. General debate on agenda item 3

197. At its 25th meeting, on 8 March 2018, and at its 26th and 27th meetings, on 9 March, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on the thematic reports under agenda items 2 and 3, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria⁸ (on behalf of the European Union), China, Colombia⁸ (also on behalf of Brazil, Mozambique, Portugal and Thailand), Cuba, Cyprus⁸ (also on behalf of Argentina, Ethiopia, Greece, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Mali, Poland, Serbia and Switzerland), Ecuador (by video message), Egypt, Ghana⁸ (also on behalf of Chile, Denmark, Indonesia and Morocco), Mexico, Mexico (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Honduras, Nepal, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, San Marino, Turkey and Uruguay), Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, Turkmenistan⁸ (also on behalf of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan), Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Greece, Guyana, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jordan, Libya, Maldives, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, Norway, Russian Federation, Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, State of Palestine;

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

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa culture internationale, African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, African Regional Agricultural Credit Association, Agence internationale pour le développement, Al-Khoei Foundation, Alliance Creative Community Project, Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Asian-Eurasian Human Rights Forum, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas, Association d'entraide médicale Guinée, Association for Progressive Communications (also on behalf of Article 19: International Centre against Censorship and Privacy International), Association internationale pour l'égalité des femmes, Association of World Citizens,

Association pour les victimes du monde, Association pour l'intégration et le développement durable au Burundi, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, Auspice Stella, Badil Resource Centre for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, British Humanist Association, Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace, Canners International Permanent Committee, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, Center for International Environmental Law, Centre Europe-tiers monde, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Chant du guépard dans le désert, Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims, Child Foundation, China Society for Human Rights Studies, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Colombian Commission of Jurists, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Conectas Direitos Humanos, Conseil de jeunesse pluriculturelle, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Corporate Accountability International, European Centre for Law and Justice, European Union of Public Relations, Family Health Association of Iran, FIAN International (also on behalf of Corporate Accountability International, the Geneva Infant Feeding Association, the Global Policy Forum and the Society for International Development), France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Franciscans International (also on behalf of Caritas Internationalis and CIDSE), Friends of the Earth International, Fundación Latinoamericana por los Derechos Humanos y el Desarrollo Social, Fundación Vida – Grupo Ecológico Verde, Global Action on Aging (also on behalf of the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations), Graduate Women International, Human Rights Advocates, Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights Law Centre, Il Cenacolo, Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, Indian Council of South America, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", Institute for Policy Studies, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Career Support Association, International Commission of Jurists, International Educational Development, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Human Rights Association of American Minorities, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International-Lawyers.Org, International Muslim Women's Union, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Organization of Employers, International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of Amnesty International), International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Iraqi Development Organization, Islamic Women's Institute of Iran, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, Japanese Workers Committee for Human Rights, Jossour forum des femmes marocaines, Kham Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Ma'arij Foundation for Peace and Development, Make Mothers Matter, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Nouveaux droits de l'homme, Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Pan African Union for Science and Technology, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Peace Brigades International Switzerland, Prahar, Presse emblème campagne, Prevention Association of Social Harms, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Réseau international des droits humains, Save a Child's Heart in Memory of Dr. Ami Cohen, Sikh Human Rights Group, Society for Threatened Peoples, Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of the Environment, Tourner la page, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, United Schools International, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, VAAGDHARA, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Villages Unis, VIVAT International, Women's Human Rights International Association, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (also on behalf of the Association for Women's Rights in Development, the Center for International Environmental Law, FIAN International, Friends of the Earth International, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, the International Service for Human Rights and International Women's Rights Action Watch Asia Pacific), World Environment and Resources Council, World Evangelical Alliance, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress.

198. At the 27th meeting, on 9 March 2017, the representatives of Brazil, China, India and Pakistan made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

F. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

The right to privacy in the digital age

199. At the 53rd meeting, on 22 March 2018, the representative of Germany introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.10, sponsored by Austria, Brazil, Germany, Liechtenstein and Mexico, and co-sponsored by Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Ecuador, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kenya, Latvia, Lithuania, Maldives, Malta, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Ukraine, the United States of America, Uruguay and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, the United States of America withdrew co-sponsorship of the draft resolution. Subsequently, Argentina, Armenia, Benin, Botswana, the Congo, Costa Rica, Djibouti, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mali, Norway, Panama, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Timor-Leste and Togo joined the sponsors.

200. At the same meeting, the representative of Slovakia, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, made a general comment on the draft resolution.

201. 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.

202. At the 53rd meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 37/2).

Integrity of the judicial system

203. At the 53rd meeting, on 22 March 2018, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.11/Rev.1, sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Belarus, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, the Dominican Republic, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Nicaragua, the Philippines, Serbia, Sierra Leone and Tajikistan joined the sponsors.

204. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a general comment on the draft resolution.

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

206. At the 53rd meeting, the representative of Slovakia, 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 in relation to the draft resolution.

207. 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:

Angola, Brazil, Burundi, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mexico, Nepal, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, South Africa, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Georgia, United States of America

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Germany, Hungary, Iraq, Japan, Mongolia, Nigeria, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Togo, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

208. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 23 votes to 2, with 22 abstentions (resolution 37/3).

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

209. At the 53rd meeting, on 22 March 2018, the representative of Germany introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.12, sponsored by Brazil, Finland, Germany and Namibia, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Angola, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, France, Georgia, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine and Uruguay. Subsequently, Algeria, Belarus, Benin, the Congo, Costa Rica, Czechia, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Greece, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Norway, Panama, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, Slovenia and Switzerland 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 53rd meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

212. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 37/4).

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

213. At the 53rd meeting, on 22 March 2018, the representative of Togo, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.13, sponsored by Togo, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Cyprus, France, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Andorra, Austria, Azerbaijan, Croatia, Czechia, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Hungary, Japan, Lithuania, Malta, Montenegro, Norway, Panama and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

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

215. At the 53rd meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

216. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 37/5).

The role of good governance in the promotion and protection of human rights

217. At the 53rd meeting, on 22 March 2018, the representative of Poland introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.15, sponsored by Australia, Chile, Poland, the Republic of Korea and South Africa, and co-sponsored by Albania, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova,

Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay. Subsequently, Argentina, Brazil, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Fiji, Guatemala, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Kazakhstan, Maldives, Mongolia, Nepal, Norway, Panama, Qatar, Sri Lanka, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States) and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors.

218. 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.

219. At the 53rd meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 37/6).

Promoting human rights and the Sustainable Development Goals through transparent, accountable and efficient public services delivery

220. At the 53rd meeting, on 22 March 2018, the representatives of Azerbaijan and Kenya introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.16, sponsored by Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kenya, Thailand and Turkey, and co-sponsored by Afghanistan, Chile, Ecuador, Maldives, Nepal, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Turkey and Uruguay. Subsequently, Australia, the Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Dominican Republic, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Mongolia, Pakistan, Panama, Qatar, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uzbekistan joined the sponsors.

221. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

222. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 37/7).

Human rights and the environment

223. At the 53rd meeting, on 22 March 2018, the representatives of Costa Rica and Switzerland introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.19, sponsored by Costa Rica, Maldives, Morocco, Slovenia and Switzerland, and co-sponsored by Andorra, Angola, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, the Netherlands, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, Uruguay and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Algeria, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, the Congo, Czechia, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Gabon, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Madagascar, Nepal, the Niger, Norway, Panama, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sweden and Tunisia joined the sponsors.

224. 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.

225. At the 53rd meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

226. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 37/8).

Freedom of religion or belief

227. At the 53rd meeting, on 22 March 2018, the representative of Bulgaria, on behalf of States members of the European Union, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.20, sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg,

Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Angola, Armenia, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Chile, Georgia, Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay and the United States of America. Subsequently, Argentina, Brazil, Costa Rica, Guatemala, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka and Thailand joined the sponsors.

228. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 37/9).

The right to food

229. At the 53rd meeting, on 22 March 2018, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.21, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Algeria, Angola, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Egypt, Eritrea, Haiti, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cyprus, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Japan, Jordan (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) Malaysia, Maldives, Monaco, Nepal, the Niger, the Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand and Viet Nam joined the sponsors.

230. At the same meeting, the representative of Switzerland made a general comment on the draft resolution.

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

232. 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:

Afghanistan, Angola, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Burundi, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iraq, Japan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

United States of America

233. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 46 votes to 1, with no abstentions (resolution 37/10).

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

234. At the 53rd meeting, on 22 March 2018, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.22, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Egypt, Eritrea, the Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Angola, Belarus, Botswana, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Greece, Indonesia, Jordan (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), the Niger, the Philippines, Senegal, South Africa, Uruguay and Viet Nam joined the sponsors.

235. At the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

236. Also 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:

Angola, Burundi, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Mexico, Panama, Peru

237. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 27 votes to 16, with 4 abstentions (resolution 37/11).

Mandate of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights

238. At the 53rd meeting, on 22 March 2018, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.23, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Algeria, Angola, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, China, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Spain, the Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Botswana, Canada, Cyprus, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Indonesia, Italy, Jordan (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Malaysia, Maldives, Pakistan, Panama, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand and Viet Nam joined the sponsors.

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

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

241. At the 53rd meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

242. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 37/12).

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

243. At the 53rd meeting, on 22 March 2018, the representative of Portugal introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.24, sponsored by Portugal and co-sponsored by Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Haiti, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Benin, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czechia, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Greece, Honduras, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Lithuania, Mongolia, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Uruguay and Viet Nam joined the sponsors.

244. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution. In its statement, the representative of the United States disassociated the respective member State from the consensus on the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

245. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 37/13).

Rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities

246. At the 53rd meeting, on 22 March 2018, the representative of Austria introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.25, sponsored by Austria, Mexico and Slovenia, and co-sponsored by Armenia, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Romania, the Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Spain, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay. Subsequently, Benin, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Estonia, Greece, Guatemala, Japan, Lithuania, Panama, the Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Switzerland and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia joined the sponsors.

247. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 37/14).

High-level intersessional discussion celebrating the centenary of Nelson Mandela

248. At the 53rd meeting, on 22 March 2018, the representative of Togo, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.26, sponsored by Togo, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay. Subsequently, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Costa Rica, Fiji, Hungary, Indonesia, Japan, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Nepal, Norway, Pakistan, Romania, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Ukraine and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

249. At the same meeting, the representatives of Belgium, Slovakia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and South Africa made general comments on the draft resolution.

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 53rd meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 37/15).

Right to work

252. At the 53rd meeting, on 22 March 2018, the representatives of Egypt and Greece introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.28, sponsored by Egypt, Greece, Indonesia, Mexico and Romania, and co-sponsored by Afghanistan, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Pakistan, Paraguay, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, the Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Yemen and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Australia, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Canada, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, Guatemala, Italy, Maldives, Panama, Poland, San Marino, Sri Lanka, Turkey and Viet Nam joined the sponsors.

253. 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.

254. At the 53rd meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 37/16).

Cultural rights and the protection of cultural heritage

255. At the 53rd meeting, on 22 March 2018, the representative of Cyprus introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.30, sponsored by Argentina, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Greece, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Mali, Poland, Serbia and Switzerland, and co-sponsored by Afghanistan, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Honduras, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine and the United States of America. Subsequently, Albania, Angola, Austria, Azerbaijan, Benin, Botswana, Burundi, Canada, Colombia, the Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Japan, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Mongolia, the Netherlands, the Niger, Pakistan, Panama, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tunisia and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

256. At the same meeting, the representatives of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America made general comments on the draft resolution.

257. 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.

258. At the 53rd meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 37/17).

Promoting human rights through sport and the Olympic ideal

259. At the 54th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representative of Greece introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.31, sponsored by Brazil, China, the Congo, Cyprus, Greece, Japan, Lebanon, Morocco, the Republic of Korea and the Russian Federation, and co-sponsored by Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, France, Germany, Haiti, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, the Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the Sudan, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, the United States of America and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Argentina, Armenia, Bahrain, Belarus, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Costa Rica, Cuba, Djibouti, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, Gabon, Guatemala, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Panama, Portugal, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Thailand, the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

260. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a general comment on the draft resolution.

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 54th meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 37/18).

The negative impact of corruption on the right to be free from torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment

263. At the 54th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representative of Denmark introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.32, sponsored by Denmark and co-sponsored by Andorra,

Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay. Subsequently, the Philippines withdrew its co-sponsorship of the draft resolution. Subsequently, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Benin, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Guatemala, Japan, Panama, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Senegal, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Tunisia joined the sponsors.

264. At the same meeting, the representatives of Belgium, Egypt, Slovakia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments on the draft resolution.

265. 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.

266. At the 54th meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 37/19).

Rights of the child: protection of the rights of the child in humanitarian situations

267. At the 54th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representatives of Bulgaria, on behalf of States members of the European Union, and Uruguay, on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.33, sponsored by Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, 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 Andorra, Angola, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey and Ukraine. Subsequently, Albania, Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Benin, Botswana, Canada, Egypt, Guatemala, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Norway, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

268. At the same meeting, the representative of Bulgaria, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, orally revised the draft resolution.

269. 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.

270. At the 54th meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised. In its statement, the representative of the United States disassociated the respective member State from the consensus on the eleventh preambular paragraph and paragraph 7 of the draft resolution as orally revised.

271. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 37/20).

Human rights and unilateral coercive measures

272. At the 54th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.34, sponsored by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, on behalf of

the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. Subsequently, Togo, on behalf of the Group of African States, joined the sponsors.

273. At the same meeting, the representative of Cuba made a general comment on the draft resolution.

274. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Australia, Brazil, Mexico, Slovakia (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 in relation to the draft resolution.

275. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Slovakia, 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:

Angola, Burundi, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Brazil, Mexico

276. The Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 28 votes to 15, with 3 abstentions (resolution 37/21).⁹

Equality and non-discrimination of persons with disabilities and the right of persons with disabilities to access to justice

277. At the 54th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representative of Mexico, also on behalf of New Zealand, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.35, sponsored by Mexico and New Zealand, and co-sponsored by Argentina, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Monaco, Montenegro, Paraguay, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechia, Egypt, Greece, Guatemala, Indonesia, Japan, Nepal, the Netherlands, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors.

278. At the same meeting, the representative of Mexico orally revised the draft resolution.

279. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Egypt and Hungary made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

280. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 37/22).

Promoting mutually beneficial cooperation in the field of human rights

281. At the 54th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representative of China introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.36, sponsored by China and co-sponsored by Angola, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, Cambodia, Cuba, Egypt, Eritrea, Maldives, Morocco, Myanmar, Pakistan, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the United

⁹ The delegation of Panama did not cast a vote.

Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zimbabwe. Subsequently, Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Benin, the Congo, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Indonesia, Libya, Malaysia, Mozambique, Namibia, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, the Sudan and Yemen joined the sponsors.

282. At the same meeting, the President of the Human Rights Council announced that the draft resolution had been orally revised.

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

284. At the same meeting, the representatives of Australia, Japan, Mexico, Mongolia, the Republic of Korea, Slovakia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

285. 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:

Angola, Brazil, Burundi, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Peru, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

286. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised by 28 votes to 1, with 17 abstentions (resolution 37/23).¹⁰

Promotion and protection of human rights and the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

287. At the 54th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representatives of Chile and Denmark introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.37, sponsored by Azerbaijan, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, Luxembourg, Portugal, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Thailand and Uruguay, and co-sponsored by Albania, Angola, Australia, Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kenya, Lithuania, Madagascar, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Paraguay, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Togo, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, the Congo, Costa Rica, Czechia, the Dominican Republic, Estonia, Gabon, Georgia, Greece, Haiti, Indonesia, Japan, Latvia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mongolia, Mozambique, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Romania, Slovenia, South Sudan, Timor-Leste, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates and Zambia joined the sponsors.

288. 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.

289. At the 54th meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

¹⁰ The delegation of Tunisia did not cast a vote.

290. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 37/24).

The need for an integrated approach to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development for the full realization of human rights, focusing holistically on the means of implementation

291. At the 54th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representative of South Africa introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.42, sponsored by Algeria, Cuba, Pakistan and South Africa, and co-sponsored by Angola, Azerbaijan and Maldives. Subsequently, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Mongolia, Nepal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam joined the sponsors.

292. At the same meeting, the representative of South Africa orally revised the draft resolution.

293. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Slovakia, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, made a general comment on the draft resolution as orally revised.

294. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised. In its statement, the representative of the United States disassociated the respective member State from the consensus on the ninth preambular paragraph and paragraph 4 of the draft resolution as orally revised.

295. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 37/25).

Prevention of genocide

296. At the 54th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representative of Armenia introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.44, sponsored by Armenia and co-sponsored by Australia, Cyprus, France, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Malta, the Netherlands, Paraguay, Serbia, Slovenia, Ukraine, the United State of America and Uruguay. Subsequently, the United States of America withdrew its co-sponsorship of the draft resolution. Subsequently, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mali, Mexico, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Uganda, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Zambia joined the sponsors.

297. At the same meeting, the President of the Human Rights Council announced that the draft resolution had been orally revised.

298. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Australia, Belgium, Chile, Cuba, Germany, Panama, Rwanda, Slovakia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), the United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

299. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Cuba, a separate recorded vote was taken on the twenty-second preambular paragraph and paragraph 16 of the draft resolution as orally revised. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

Burundi, Cuba, Egypt, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Iraq, Kenya, Nigeria, Philippines, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, Tunisia

300. Also at the same meeting, Human Rights Council retained the twenty-second preambular paragraph and paragraph 16 of the draft resolution as orally revised by 24 votes to 8, with 15 abstentions.

301. 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.

302. At the 54th meeting, the representatives of Cuba, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, the United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised. In its statement, the representative of Cuba disassociated the respective member State from the consensus on the twenty-second preambular paragraph and paragraphs 16 and 24 of the draft resolution as orally revised. In their statements, the representatives of Pakistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) disassociated their respective member States from the consensus on the twenty-second preambular paragraph and paragraph 16 of the draft resolution as orally revised. In its statement, the representative of Kyrgyzstan disassociated the respective member State from the consensus on the eleventh and twenty-second preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 16 and 24 of the draft resolution as orally revised.

303. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 37/26).

304. At the 56th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representative of Egypt made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote and general comments on all of the draft proposals adopted under agenda item 3. In its statement, the representative of Egypt disassociated the respective member State from the consensus on the twenty-second preambular paragraph and paragraphs 16 of the draft resolution as orally revised.

Terrorism and human rights

305. At the 54th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representatives of Egypt and Mexico introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.50/Rev.1, sponsored by Egypt and Mexico, and co-sponsored by Algeria, Andorra, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Morocco, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Paraguay, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the United Arab Emirates and Uruguay. Subsequently, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechia, Estonia, France, Georgia, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Jordan (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Latvia, Lithuania, Montenegro, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Switzerland, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

306. At the same meeting, the representative of South Africa introduced amendment A/HRC/37/L.63 to the draft resolution.

307. Amendment A/HRC/37/L.63 was sponsored by South Africa.

308. At the 54th meeting, the representatives of Egypt, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and Slovakia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made general comments on the draft resolution and on the proposed amendment.

309. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council took action on amendment A/HRC/37/L.63 to the draft resolution.

310. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Mexico made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/37/L.63.

311. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/37/L.63. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Cuba, Ecuador, Kenya, Pakistan, Qatar, South Africa

Against:

Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Chile, Croatia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Mexico, Nepal, Panama, Peru, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Angola, Brazil, Burundi, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Iraq, Mongolia, Nigeria, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Togo, Tunisia

312. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/37/L.63 by 26 votes to 6, with 14 abstentions.¹¹

313. At the 54th meeting, the representatives of South Africa and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

314. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 37/27).

Contribution to the implementation of the joint commitment to effectively addressing and countering the world drug problem with regard to human rights

315. At the 56th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representatives of Colombia and Switzerland introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.41, sponsored by Albania, Brazil, Colombia, Greece, Guatemala, Mexico, Paraguay, Portugal, Switzerland and Uruguay, and co-sponsored by Australia, Cyprus, Ecuador, France, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Republic of Moldova, Spain and Turkey. Subsequently, Angola, Argentina, the Bahamas, Benin, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Finland, Germany, Guyana, Hungary, Italy, Panama, Sierra Leone, Thailand and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

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

317. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Cuba introduced amendment A/HRC/37/L.58 to the draft resolution as orally revised.

318. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced amendment A/HRC/37/L.59 to the draft resolution as orally revised.

319. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Philippines introduced amendment A/HRC/37/L.61 to the draft resolution as orally revised.

320. At the same meeting, the representative of Egypt introduced amendment A/HRC/37/L.62 to the draft resolution as orally revised.

321. Amendment A/HRC/37/L.58 was sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Egypt, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Singapore and Viet Nam joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/37/L.59 was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Cuba, Egypt, Pakistan, the Philippines and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Indonesia and Iran (Islamic Republic of) joined the sponsors.

¹¹ The delegation of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela did not cast a vote.

Amendment A/HRC/37/L.61 was sponsored by the Philippines and co-sponsored by Cuba, Egypt, Pakistan, the Russian Federation and South Africa. Subsequently, Cambodia, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, Singapore, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/37/L.62 was sponsored by Egypt and co-sponsored by Cuba, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the United Arab Emirates. Subsequently, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Singapore and Viet Nam joined the sponsors.

322. At the 56th meeting, the Russian Federation withdrew amendment A/HRC/37/L.59 to the draft resolution as orally revised.

323. At the same meeting, the representative of Australia made a general comment on the draft resolution as orally revised and on the proposed amendments.

324. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council took action on amendment A/HRC/37/L.58 to the draft resolution as orally revised.

325. At the same meeting, the representative of Mexico made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/37/L.58.

326. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/37/L.58. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Iraq, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Mexico, Panama, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Japan, Mongolia, Nepal, Peru, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Senegal, Togo, United States of America

327. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted amendment A/HRC/37/L.58 by 17 votes to 15, with 15 abstentions.

328. At the 56th meeting, the Human Rights Council took action on amendment A/HRC/37/L.61 to the draft resolution as orally revised and amended.

329. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/37/L.61.

330. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/37/L.61. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Egypt, Iraq, Kenya, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Kyrgyzstan, Mexico, Panama, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Japan, Mongolia, Nepal, Peru, Rwanda, Senegal, Togo, United States of America

331. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/37/L.61 by 18 votes to 15, with 14 abstentions.

332. At the 56th meeting, the Human Rights Council took action on amendment A/HRC/37/L.62 to the draft resolution as orally revised and amended.

333. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico, Panama and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/37/L.62.

334. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/37/L.62. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Iraq, Kenya, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Croatia, Ecuador, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Kyrgyzstan, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Japan, Mongolia, Nepal, Qatar, Rwanda, Senegal, Togo, United States of America

335. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment A/HRC/37/L.62 by 20 votes to 15, with 12 abstentions.

336. 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.

337. At the 56th meeting, the representatives of Egypt (also on behalf of Cuba, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa and the United Arab Emirates), Mexico, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.41 as orally revised and amended.

338. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Egypt, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as orally revised and amended. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Angola, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Croatia, Ecuador, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Panama, Peru, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Egypt, Iraq, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, Qatar, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, Tunisia

339. Also as the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised and amended by 26 votes to 10, with 11 abstentions (resolution 37/42).

340. At the 56th meeting, the representatives of Australia, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote after the vote and general comments on all of the draft proposals adopted under agenda item 3. In its statement, the representative of Australia disassociated the respective member State from the new fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution as orally revised and amended by amendment A/HRC/37/L.62.

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

A. Panel discussions

High-level panel discussion on violations of the human rights of children in the Syrian Arab Republic

341. At its 31st meeting, on 13 March 2018, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 36/20, a high-level panel discussion on violations of the human rights of children in the Syrian Arab Republic.

342. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights and the United Nations Regional Humanitarian Coordinator for the Syria Crisis, Panos Moutziz, made opening statements for the panel. The foreign correspondent in Geneva for Svenska Dagbladet, Gunilla von Hall, moderated the discussion for the panel.

343. At the 31st meeting, the following panellists made statements: Founding Member of Hurras Network (Syrian Child Protection Network), Alaa Zaza; Director of Children of One World, Haysam Osman; Founding Member of Urnammu for Justice and Human Rights, Ibrahim Alkasem. The Human Rights Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

344. During the ensuing panel discussion for the first speaking slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Belgium, Croatia (also on behalf of Austria and Slovenia), Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Switzerland, 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);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Estonia, France, Iceland (also on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden), Ireland, Israel;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, United Nations Watch.

345. At the end of the first speaking slot, at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

346. During the discussion for the second speaking slot, also at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Maldives;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", International Human Rights Association of American Minorities.

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

B. Enhanced interactive dialogue on the human rights situation in Eritrea

348. At its 30th meeting, on 12 March 2018, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 35/35, an enhanced interactive dialogue on the human rights situation in Eritrea.

349. At the same meeting, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the enhanced interactive dialogue, on behalf of the High Commissioner.

350. Also at the same meeting, the following made statements: Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea, Sheila B. Keetharuth; representative of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, Remy Nogy Lumbu; representative of the Information Forum for Eritrea, Veronica Almedom; public health specialist, Pamela DeLargy.

351. During the ensuing discussion, at the same meeting, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, China, Cuba, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Djibouti, France, Greece, Ireland, Norway, Sudan;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Center for Global Nonkilling, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Human Rights Watch, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, United Nations Watch.

352. Also at the same meeting, the presenters answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

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

353. At the 32nd meeting, on 13 March 2018, the Chair of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic, Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro, presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 34/26, the report of the Commission (A/HRC/37/72).

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

355. 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: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, China, Croatia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Germany, Hungary, Iraq, Japan, Mexico, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Bahrain, Belarus, Canada, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Maldives, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Human Rights Watch, Roads of Success, United Nations Watch, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, World Council of Arameans (Syriacs).

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

357. Also at the same meeting, the Chair and members of the Commission answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

D. Interactive dialogue with the Commission on Human Rights in South Sudan

358. At the 33rd meeting, on 13 March 2018, the Chair of the Commission for Human Rights in South Sudan, Yasmin Sooka, presented the report of the Commission (A/HRC/37/71).

359. At the same meeting, the representative of South Sudan made a statement as the State concerned.

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, China, Germany, Kenya, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Algeria, Botswana, Denmark, France, Ireland, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sudan;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Human Rights Watch, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme.

361. At the same meeting, the representative of South Sudan made final remarks as the State concerned.

362. Also at the same meeting, the Chair of the Commission and a member of the Commission, Andrew Clapham, answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

E. Interactive dialogue with the Commission of Inquiry on Burundi

363. At the 33rd meeting, on 13 March 2018, the members of the Commission of Inquiry on Burundi, Doudou Diène, Françoise Hampson and Lucy Asuagbor, gave, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 36/19, an oral briefing.

364. At the same meeting, the representative of Burundi made a statement as the State concerned.

365. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, also at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the members of the Commission of Inquiry questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Belgium, China, Germany, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Czechia, Denmark, France, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Lithuania, Myanmar, Netherlands, Norway, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Human Rights Watch, International Federation of ACAT (also on behalf of TRIAL: Track Impunity Always and the World Organization against Torture), International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Service for Human Rights.

366. At the same meeting, the members of the Commission of Inquiry answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

F. Oral update by the independent international fact-finding mission on Myanmar

367. At its 29th meeting, on 12 March 2018, the Human Rights Council heard an oral update of the Chair of the independent international fact-finding mission on Myanmar, Marzuki Darusman, and members of the fact-finding mission, Radhika Coomaraswamy and Christopher Dominic Sidoti.

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

369. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 29th and 30th meetings, on 12 March 2018, the following made statements and asked the Chair of the fact-finding mission questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, China, Croatia, Germany, Iraq, Japan, Mexico, Philippines (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations), Qatar, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Canada, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Russian Federation, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Viet Nam;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Child Foundation, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, Human Rights Now, Human Rights Watch, International Commission of Jurists, International Educational Development, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Ma'arij Foundation for Peace and Development, Plan International, Presse emblème campagne.

370. At the 30th meeting, on 12 March 2018, the representative of Myanmar made final remarks as the State concerned.

371. At the same meeting, the Chair and members of the fact-finding mission answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

G. Interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders

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

372. At the 28th meeting, on 12 March 2018, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Tomás Ojea Quintana, presented his report (A/HRC/37/69).

373. 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: Australia, China, Cuba, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belarus, Czechia, Estonia, France, Greece, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Liechtenstein, Myanmar, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Russian Federation, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, Human Rights Watch, Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”, International Bar Association, People for Successful Corean Reunification, United Nations Watch.

374. 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

375. At the 29th meeting, on 12 March 2018, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, Yanghee Lee, presented her report (A/HRC/37/70).

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

377. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 29th and 30th meetings, on 12 March 2018, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, China, Croatia, Germany, Iraq, Japan, Mexico, Philippines (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations), Qatar, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Canada, Czechia, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Russian Federation, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Viet Nam;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Child Foundation, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, Human Rights Now, Human Rights Watch, International Commission of Jurists, International Educational Development, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Ma’arif Foundation for Peace and Development, Plan International, Presse emblème campagne.

378. At the 30th meeting, the representative of Myanmar made final remarks as the State concerned.

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

H. Discussion of the report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

380. At its 28th meeting, on 12 March 2018, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to the Council decision made at its opening meeting, on 26 February 2018, and in accordance with Council resolution 34/23, a discussion of the report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, the late Asma Jahangir (A/HRC/37/68). The report was presented by the Chair of the Coordination Committee of Special Procedures.

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

382. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 28th and 29th meetings, on 12 March 2018, the following made statements and asked the Chair of the Coordination Committee questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Belgium, China, Cuba, Germany, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Belarus, Canada, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, France, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, New Zealand, Norway, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Baha'i International Community, Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims, Ensemble contre la peine de mort (also on behalf of the International Federation of Journalists), Family Health Association of Iran, Minority Rights Group, Prevention Association of Social Harms, Women's Human Rights International Association (also on behalf of France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand).

383. At the 29th meeting, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran made final remarks as the State concerned.

384. At the 30th meeting, the representative of Israel made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

I. General debate on agenda item 4

385. At the 34th meeting, on 14 March 2018, the Deputy High Commissioner presented oral updates on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the situation of human rights in Eritrea.

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

387. At its 34th and 35th meetings, on 14 March 2018, 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: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria¹² (also on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Liechtenstein and Montenegro), China, Cuba, Ecuador, Georgia, Germany, Japan, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Peru, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, United States of America (also on behalf of Albania, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Djibouti, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, the Republic of Moldova, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Yemen), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Azerbaijan, Belarus, Cambodia, Canada, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Eritrea, Finland, France, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Russian Federation;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: ABC Tamil Oli, Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, African

¹² Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, Africa culture internationale, African Development Association, African Regional Agricultural Credit Association, Agence internationale pour le développement, Agir ensemble pour les droits de l'homme, Alliance Creative Community Project, Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Asian Legal Resource Centre, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association culturelle des Tamouls en France, Association d'entraide médicale Guinée, Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association Dunenyo, Association for the Protection of Women and Children's Rights, Association of World Citizens, Association pour les victimes du monde, Association pour l'intégration et le développement durable au Burundi, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Baha'i International Community, British Humanist Association, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace, Canners International Permanent Committee, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, Center for Organisation Research and Education, Centre Europe-tiers monde (also on behalf of FIAN International, Friends of the Earth International, the Institute for Policy Studies, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers and the International Trade Union Confederation), Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Chant du guépard dans le désert, Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims, Child Foundation, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Conseil de jeunesse pluriculturelle, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Conselho Indigenista Missionário, "Coup de pousse" Chaîne de l'espoir Nord-Sud, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, European Centre for Law and Justice, European Union of Public Relations, Family Health Association of Iran, France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Franciscans International (also on behalf of Amnesty International, the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, the International Service for Human Rights and the World Organization against Torture), Fundación Latinoamericana por los Derechos Humanos y el Desarrollo Social, Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, Human Rights Council of Australia, Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights Law Centre, Human Rights League of the Horn of Africa, Human Rights Now, Human Rights Watch, Human Security Initiative Organization, Il Cenacolo, Indian Council of Education, Indian Council of South America, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Bar Association, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Career Support Association, International Commission of Jurists, International Educational Development, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Federation for the Protection of the Rights of Ethnic, Religious, Linguistic and Other Minorities, International Federation of Journalists, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Human Rights Association of American Minorities, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Institute for Non-aligned Studies, International-Lawyers.Org, International Lesbian and Gay Association, International Muslim Women's Union, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Service for Human Rights, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Iraqi Development Organization, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association (also on behalf of International-Lawyers.Org), Japanese Workers Committee for Human Rights, Jossour forum des femmes marocaines, Jssor Youth Organization, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Le pont, Liberation, Ma'arjij Foundation for Peace and Development, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Minority Rights Group, Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Pan African Union for Science and Technology, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Peace Brigades International Switzerland, People for Successful Corean Reunification, Prahar, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Society for Threatened Peoples, Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of the Environment, Solidarité Suisse-Guinée, Syrian Center for Media and Freedom of Expression, Tamil Uzhagam, Terre des hommes federation internationale,

Tourner la page, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, United Schools International, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, VAAGDHARA, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Villages Unis, VIVAT International (also on behalf of Franciscans International), Women's Human Rights International Association, World Barua Organization, World Environment and Resources Council, World Evangelical Alliance, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress, World Organization against Torture.

388. At the 35th meeting, the representatives of Bahrain, Belarus, Brazil, China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Japan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Thailand, Turkey, Turkmenistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

J. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

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

389. At the 55th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representatives of Bulgaria (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and Japan introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.29, sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Chile, Georgia, Iceland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine and the United States of America. Subsequently, Argentina, Benin, Botswana, Costa Rica, Honduras, Maldives, the Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), New Zealand, Palau, Papua New Guinea and San Marino joined the sponsors.

390. 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.

391. At the 55th meeting, the representatives of China, Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution. In their statements, the representatives of China, Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) disassociated their respective member States from the consensus on the draft resolution.

392. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 37/28).

393. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Kyrgyzstan made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote and general comments on all of the draft proposals adopted under agenda item 4. In its statement, the representative of Kyrgyzstan disassociated the respective member State from the consensus on paragraph 9 of the resolution.

The human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic

394. At the 55th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representatives of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Qatar introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.38, 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 Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine. Subsequently, Austria, Costa Rica, Georgia, Japan, Norway, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Slovenia and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

395. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced amendment A/HRC/37/L.60 to the draft resolution.

396. The amendment was sponsored by the Russian Federation.

397. At the 55th meeting, the representatives of Australia, Belgium, Iraq, Slovakia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Switzerland, the United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments on the draft resolution and on the proposed amendment.

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

399. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council took action on the amendment to the draft resolution.

400. At the same meeting, the representative of Australia made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the amendment.

401. Also 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 amendment. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Egypt, Iraq, Philippines, Tunisia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Togo, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa

402. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected the amendment by 25 votes to 8, with 14 abstentions.

403. 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.

404. At the 55th meeting, the representatives of Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Mexico (also on behalf of Brazil, Panama and Peru), Pakistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

405. 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:

Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Togo, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Abstaining:

Angola, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Senegal, South Africa, Tunisia

406. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 27 votes to 4, with 16 abstentions (resolution 37/29).

Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

407. At the 55th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representative of Sweden introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.39, 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, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Australia withdrew co-sponsorship of the draft resolution. Subsequently, Australia, Costa Rica and Portugal joined the sponsors.

408. At the same meeting, the representatives of Pakistan and Slovakia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made general comments on the draft resolution.

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

410. 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.

411. At the 55th meeting, the representatives of Australia, Brazil, Cuba, Mexico and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

412. 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:

Australia, Belgium, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Iraq, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Brazil, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Georgia, Kenya, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, Tunisia

413. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 21 votes to 7, with 19 abstentions (resolution 37/30).

Situation of human rights in South Sudan

414. At the 55th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representative of the United States of America introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.40, sponsored by Albania, Paraguay, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, and co-sponsored by Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland,

Romania, San Marino, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland. Subsequently, Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Czechia, Estonia, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, New Zealand, Portugal, Slovakia, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States) and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

415. At the same meeting, the representative of South Sudan made a statement as the State concerned.

416. 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.

417. At the 55th meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 37/31).

418. At the same meeting, the representative of Egypt made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote and general comments on all of the draft proposals adopted under agenda item 4. In its statement, the representative of Egypt disassociated the respective member State from the consensus on paragraphs 15 and 16bis of the resolution.

Situation of human rights in Myanmar

419. At the 55th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representative of Bulgaria, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.43, sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Maldives, Monaco, Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine and the United States of America. Subsequently, Argentina, Australia, Costa Rica, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), the Republic of Korea, San Marino and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

420. At the same meeting, the representative of Australia made a general comment on the draft resolution.

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

422. 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.

423. At the 55th meeting, the representatives of China, Japan and the Philippines made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

424. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of China, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Egypt, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iraq, Kyrgyzstan, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Philippines, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Abstaining:

Angola, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Japan, Kenya, Mongolia, Nepal, Senegal, South Africa

425. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 32 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions (resolution 37/32).

426. At the same meeting, the representatives of Egypt, Kyrgyzstan and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote after the vote and general comments on all of the draft proposals adopted under agenda item 4.

V. Human rights bodies and mechanisms

A. Forum on Minority Issues

427. At the 36th meeting, on 14 March 2018, the Special Rapporteur on minority issues, Fernand de Varennes, presented the recommendations adopted by the Forum on Minority Issues at its tenth session, convened on 30 November and 1 December 2017 with the theme “Minority youth: towards inclusive and diverse societies” (A/HRC/37/73).

B. Social Forum

428. At the 36th meeting, on 14 March 2018, the Co-Chairs of the Social Forum held in 2017, Permanent Representative of Brazil to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Maria Nazareth Farani Azevêdo, and Permanent Representative of Belarus to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Yury Ambrazevich, presented the report reflecting the conclusions and recommendations of the Social Forum, held from 2 to 4 October, which was focused on the promotion and protection of human rights in the context of the HIV epidemic and other communicable diseases and epidemics (A/HRC/37/74).

C. Special procedure mandate holders

429. At the 36th meeting, on 14 March 2018, the Chair of the Coordination Committee of Special Procedures, Catalina Devandas Aguilar, presented the report on the twenty-fourth annual meeting of special rapporteurs and 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 27 to 30 June 2017 (A/HRC/37/37 and Add.1) and the communications report of the special procedures (A/HRC/37/80 and Corr.1).

D. General debate on agenda item 5

430. At its 36th meeting, on 14 March 2018, and at its 37th and 39th meetings, on 15 March, 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: Australia (also on behalf of Indonesia, Mexico, the Republic of Korea and Turkey), Brazil, Bulgaria¹³ (on behalf of the European Union), China, Cuba, Indonesia¹³ (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations), Mexico, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Portugal¹³ (also on behalf of Angola, Australia, the Bahamas, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, Georgia, Haiti, Italy, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, Seychelles, Slovenia, Sweden, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tunisia and Uruguay), Qatar, South Africa, Ukraine, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Austria, Azerbaijan, Ireland, Maldives, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action of Human Movement, Africa culture internationale, African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, Alliance Creative Community Project, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International (also on behalf of the International Service for Human Rights), Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Association Bharathi

¹³ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association culturelle des tamouls en France, Association d'entraide médicale Guinée, Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association for the Protection of Women and Children's Rights, Association of World Citizens, Association pour l'intégration et le développement durable au Burundi, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Association Thendral, Canners International Permanent Committee, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, Center for Organisation Research and Education, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Coordination des associations et des particuliers pour la liberté de conscience, Drepavie, European Union of Public Relations, Indian Council of South America, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Federation of Journalists, International Human Rights Association of American Minorities, International-Lawyers.Org, International Muslim Women's Union, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Service for Human Rights, Iraqi Development Organization, Japanese Workers Committee for Human Rights, Jssor Youth Organization, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Le pont, Liberation, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Nouveaux droits de l'homme, Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Pan African Union for Science and Technology, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Prahar, Réseau international des droits humains (also on behalf of Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers and Peace Brigades International Switzerland), Servas International, Solidarité Suisse-Guinée, United Schools International, VAAGDHARA, World Barua Organization, World Environment and Resources Council, World Muslim Congress.

431. At the 39th meeting, the representatives of China and the Philippines made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

VI. Universal periodic review

432. 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 twenty-eighth session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, held from 6 to 17 November 2017.

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

A. Consideration of the universal periodic review outcomes

434. In accordance with paragraph 14 of President's statement PRST/8/1, the following section contains a summary of the views expressed on the outcomes by States under review, member and observer States of the Human Rights Council, as well as general comments made by other relevant stakeholders before the adoption of the outcome by the Council in plenary session. The statements of the delegations or other stakeholders that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted, if available, on the extranet of the Council.¹⁴

Czechia

435. The review of Czechia was held on 6 November 2017 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 Czechia in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/CZE/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/CZE/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/CZE/3).

436. At its 37th meeting, on 15 March 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Czechia (see sect. C below).

437. The outcome of the review of Czechia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/37/4), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/37/4/Add.1).

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

438. The delegation of Czechia, led by the Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Czechia to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Jan Kára, expressed gratitude to all those States that had made recommendations and comments and was encouraged by the interest taken by fellow States from all regions of the world in the human rights efforts of Czechia. Czechia took the universal periodic review process seriously, and all recommendations and comments had been closely examined by the relevant ministries. Furthermore, the Office of

¹⁴ See <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/39thSession/Pages/default.aspx>.

the Government and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had hosted an interministerial round table with civil society representatives to examine the recommendations and discuss possible future steps for their implementation.

439. Czechia had accepted 178 out of the 201 recommendations received. Among the recommendations accepted were those pertaining to issues mentioned by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Czechia had accepted all of the recommendations aimed at eradicating discrimination against the Roma and it was committed to working hard to address that issue, in line with the Roma Integration Strategy 2015–2020. The amendment to the Education Act, in force from 2016, provided for the inclusive education of all pupils and was aimed at integrating all children, including Roma children with social disadvantages, into the mainstream education system.

440. Forced sterilizations were a matter of the past, and current procedures were done in compliance with the patient's free and informed consent to medical treatment and contained multiple safeguards that made enforced, non-consensual sterilizations impossible. Victims of enforced sterilizations could seek redress and compensation through a court action. The delegation clarified that the surgical castration of a sex offender was legally possible only if other treatment options had failed or could not be applied and was subject to the free and informed written consent of the patient. Surgical castrations of prisoners and detainees were prohibited in Czechia. A detailed reasoning for the State's positions on the recommendations, in particular the recommendations that had been noted, was set out in the addendum to the report of the Working Group.

441. During the three cycles of the universal periodic review, Czechia had accepted 365 out of the total of 399 recommendations. Czechia was well aware that the universal periodic review was a continuous process whose most important part unfolded outside of the Human Rights Council. The State was committed to going beyond words and striving for the effective implementation of the 178 recommendations accepted in the present cycle and the recommendations from past cycles that had only been partially implemented. Czechia invited both States and non-State actors to follow its implementation efforts closely. It had committed to briefing the Council in March 2019 on the early implementation of several of the recommendations it had accepted and it would submit a midterm implementation report in 2020. Czechia also highlighted the voluntary human rights pledges it had made in connection with its candidature for the Council for the term 2019–2021.

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

442. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Czechia, 10 delegations made statements.

443. Sierra Leone noted the statement by Czechia that, under its national criminal legislation, it was a crime to incite hate against a group of persons. It looked forward to hearing about progress with respect to the Government's newly established campaign against hate violence. It expressed its disappointment that Czechia did not intend to end the obligation of detainees who were in the territory illegally to pay the costs of their detention. It also noted that the possibility of detaining and deporting minors was not completely excluded. Sierra Leone encouraged Czechia to ensure that its strict detention and return policy always fully complied with international humanitarian laws, including the principle of non-refoulement.

444. Afghanistan expressed appreciation for the acceptance of its recommendation to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography. It wished Czechia success in the implementation of recommendations accepted.

445. Bahrain welcomed the positive approach taken by Czechia through its announcement to launch a new campaign against hate violence and to step up efforts to thoroughly investigate and prosecute racist and hate crimes. The implementation of the current crime prevention strategy was key, as it demonstrated a proactive approach in addressing problems. It urged Czechia to look for effective strategies and solutions to streamline work with the

Ombudsman and other bodies to ensure the most efficient protection for victims of discrimination.

446. Egypt recalled that it had made five recommendations to, among others, revise the Criminal Code so that it included all crimes of incitement to violence, discrimination and racist insults; to address the large wage gap between men and women; to provide the necessary protection to asylum seekers, guarantee their access to legal aid and facilitate family reunification; and to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. Egypt expressed hope that Czechia would view its recommendations positively.

447. Estonia welcomed the positive approach taken by Czechia in having accepted most of the 201 recommendations received during its review. It commended the Government for its commitment to continue to strengthen gender equality, the empowerment of women and the rights of persons with disabilities, including by having accepted the recommendations to ratify the relevant international instruments. Estonia regretted that Czechia had not accepted the recommendations to prohibit all forms of corporal punishment of children in all settings, but it noted positively that the State had accepted the recommendations to further consider that topic.

448. Honduras welcomed the fact that Czechia had accepted the recommendation to adopt comprehensive legislation for the protection of persons in vulnerable situations, such as children, women, refugees and the Roma population. It expressed hope that Czechia would reconsider its position regarding the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

449. The Islamic Republic of Iran noted that it had made five recommendations to Czechia and that one of those had been accepted. It expressed the hope that that recommendation, relating to the revision of the Criminal Code to include offences of incitement to violence and discrimination, public insults of a racist nature and public expressions with a racist aim, would be fully implemented. It encouraged Czechia to make further efforts in the areas of discrimination, intolerance and violence against migrants, the Roma community and Muslims, the situation at migrant detention and reception centres, and insufficient access to the social housing system.

450. The Philippines congratulated Czechia on having supported a large number of the recommendations received during the interactive dialogue, including the four made by the Philippines. It noted the ongoing discussion on the possible accreditation of its Public Defender of Rights (Ombudsman) to be the country's national human right institution. It expressed the hope that that process would be facilitated by the Government to ensure full compliance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles). It supported the adoption of the report of the Working Group.

451. The Russian Federation welcomed the acceptance by Czechia of its recommendations. It looked forward to government action to address its concerns and to ensure that long-standing problems were addressed, such as the rights of minorities, discrimination against persons with disabilities and prison conditions. Particular attention should be paid to conditions in temporary refugee camps.

452. Albania welcomed the ratification by Czechia of almost all of its international human rights treaties, as well as its commitment to ratify the optional protocols to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Albania expressed satisfaction about the acceptance by Czechia of the recommendations it had made to combat racial, Islamophobic and xenophobic stereotypes, and to adopt a law on the rights of patients and to organize the training of personnel involved in the supervision of reproductive health services in order to preserve the fundamental rights of women and girls.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

453. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Czechia, one other stakeholder made a statement.

454. Coordination des associations et des particuliers pour la liberté de conscience noted that a religious minority was undergoing trial in unacceptable conditions. The evidence had been gathered by persons who were opposed to that religious minority. It was concerned that Czechia had refused to listen to requests for that minority to be treated fairly, as any other religious group in the country.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

455. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 201 recommendations received, 178 had enjoyed the support of Czechia, and 23 had been noted.

456. In its concluding remarks, the delegation reiterated the commitment of Czechia to the universal periodic review process and its gratitude to member States and other stakeholders that had contributed to its third review cycle.

Argentina

457. The review of Argentina was held on 6 November 2017 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 Argentina in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/ARG/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/ARG/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/ARG/3).

458. At its 37th meeting, on 15 March 2017, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Argentina (see sect. C below).

459. The outcome of the review of Argentina comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/37/5), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/37/5/Add.1).

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

460. The delegation, led by the Permanent Representative of Argentina to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Hector Marcelo Cima, expressed satisfaction about having had the opportunity to participate in an open and constructive dialogue with member and observer States of the Human Rights Council regarding the human rights situation in Argentina.

461. In Argentina, human rights were a fundamental component of public policies, and the universal periodic review had proven to be a valuable tool to strengthen national protection systems. The delegation highlighted the fact that the State's submission of midterm reports during the two previous review cycles demonstrated its commitment to implement the recommendations received and it hoped that such practice would continue during the current review cycle.

462. The 188 recommendations received by Argentina during the current cycle had been analysed in detail by the competent authorities and 175 of them had been accepted and 13 had been noted. Information about the State's position on the recommendations received was included in the addendum to the report of the Working Group. Argentina had also submitted three annexes: one by the National Institute against Discrimination, Xenophobia and Racism on national policies in the area of discrimination; a second one focusing on the rights of women and children; and a third one by the executive secretary of the federal council of

human rights containing information on the progress made in a number of jurisdictions of the country.

463. With regard to the voluntary commitments made by Argentina during its second universal periodic review, the delegation stressed the fact that Argentina, as a federal State, had continued to reinforce the national system for periodic reporting; supported the strengthening of subregional, regional and international human rights protection mechanisms; promoted the application of the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules) in both the federal and provincial penitentiary systems; and undertaken reforms aimed at guaranteeing the full exercise of the right of access to information. For the third cycle, Argentina had assumed voluntary commitments in several areas, including in the strengthening of national and provincial human rights institutions; the continuation of the State policy on achieving truth, justice and memory; the adoption of development policies with a human rights focus; the achievement of better standards of transparency, access to information, and the production of public data and statistics; the prevention of and fight against institutional violence; and the training of security forces and prison staff.

464. Since the adoption of the report of the Working Group in November 2017, there had been some progress in the implementation of the voluntary commitments assumed. Argentina had launched a national human rights action plan for the period 2017–2020, which defined government priorities in the field of human rights in accordance with the Sustainable Development Goals and the recommendations from the universal periodic review, treaty bodies and special procedure mandate holders. Given the federal nature of the State of Argentina, the Government planned to sign agreements with all provinces in order to fulfil the objectives of the plan throughout the national territory.

465. Argentina had also advanced in the implementation of the national preventive mechanism for the prevention of torture, by having completed the appointment of its members and having established local mechanisms for the prevention of torture in eight provinces. Lastly, the delegation emphasized the fact that the President of the Republic had promoted a wide and open debate to be held in Parliament on the decriminalization of abortion and the universalization of sexual education.

466. To conclude, the delegation thanked all the States that had taken the floor during the universal periodic review of Argentina and had made recommendations, as well as OHCHR and the troika for their work.

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

467. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Argentina, 13 delegations made statements.

468. Brazil commended Argentina for its commitment to an open and constructive dialogue on the situation of human rights in the country. It welcomed the launch of the national human rights action plan and encouraged Argentina to implement the universal periodic review recommendations together with the plan. It also welcomed the establishment of the national registry on femicides and the reduction in the maternal mortality rate. It encouraged Argentina to develop a protocol for action aimed at ensuring the protection of the human rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons in detention.

469. Chile welcomed the acceptance by Argentina of the majority of the recommendations received, including the three recommendations made by Chile to harmonize federal, provincial and local legislation with the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, to cooperate with special procedure mandate holders on cases of enforced disappearances, and to strengthen the national council on women. It also welcomed the State's commitment to implement the national action plan for the prevention and eradication of violence against, and assistance for, women for 2017–2019, as well as other policies and laws in that area.

470. China acknowledged the constructive participation of Argentina in the universal periodic review and it thanked the State for having accepted its recommendations. It

encouraged Argentina to take more active measures to promote economic and social development, improve people's living standards, enhance the public health system, promote gender equality and combat violence against women.

471. Egypt thanked Argentina for the information the State had provided. It highly valued the acceptance by Argentina of the majority of the recommendations received. It urged Argentina to continue and to strengthen its cooperation with the relevant treaty bodies.

472. Ghana noted the creation of the national human rights action plan and encouraged Argentina to continue its efforts to implement the plan. It welcomed the priority given by Argentina to the promotion and protection of the human rights of indigenous communities and it was confident that Argentina would continue its State policy aimed at achieving truth, justice and memory of the human rights violations perpetrated during the military dictatorship.

473. Honduras commended Argentina for its commitment to strengthen the State's capacities to prevent torture. It regretted that Argentina had not accepted the recommendations made by Honduras to establish an ombudsman for the protection of the rights of children and to adopt a comprehensive policy to combat discrimination against women, indigenous peoples and Afrodescendants. It hoped that Argentina would re-examine its position in the future.

474. The Islamic Republic of Iran was concerned about the continuation of the xenophobia, Islamophobia and stigmatizing discourse expressed by officials and politicians. It noted that Argentina had accepted the three recommendations made by the Islamic Republic of Iran and it looked forward for their implementation.

475. Madagascar welcomed the determination of Argentina to build a country without xenophobia, discrimination or racism. It also welcomed the signing of cooperation agreements with the provinces to promote good practices in the field of human rights at the municipal level and it encouraged Argentina to continue to consolidate the rule of law and respect for human rights in the country.

476. The Philippines congratulated Argentina for having supported a large number of the recommendations it had received during the interactive dialogue, in particular those on issues of importance to the Philippines, such as women and children. It supported the commitment of Argentina to continue to work on the promotion and protection of the human rights of its people.

477. Sierra Leone noted that Argentina had supported a large majority of the 188 recommendations received, including the recommendations made by Sierra Leone to address cultural discrimination against Afrodescendants and indigenous peoples, to criminalize xenophobic discourse by public officials and politicians, and to combat trafficking in persons. In that regard, Sierra Leone welcomed the establishment of a federal council to combat trafficking in persons and the national rescue programme to provide assistance to victims of trafficking.

478. Albania welcomed the new measures taken by Argentina to implement the national human rights action plan, which addressed many of the recommendations made by the international human rights mechanisms, including the universal periodic review. Albania also welcomed the fact that Argentina had accepted the majority of the recommendations it had received, including the two recommendations made by Albania to implement alternative measures to detention in order to reduce prison overcrowding and to adopt a new anti-discrimination law with explicit reference to sexual orientation and gender identity.

479. Algeria welcomed the steps taken by Argentina to promote and protect the human rights of its population. It also welcomed the State's acceptance of most of the recommendations it had received, including those made by Algeria to ensure equal access to all rights by all, in particular by people of African descent and indigenous peoples, and to fight against the negative effects of economic activities of companies on the environment and biodiversity.

480. Armenia appreciated the positive engagement of Argentina with the Human Rights Council in the universal periodic review process and it noted that Argentina had accepted a

significant number of recommendations, including those made by Armenia. It commended Argentina for its commitment to the protection of human rights and particularly for its contribution to the prevention of genocide and crimes against humanity at the international level.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

481. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Argentina, eight other stakeholders made statements.

482. Edmund Rice International, in a joint statement with VIVAT International, stated that it valued the commitment of Argentina to appoint an ombudsman for children and adolescents, and it recommended that the appointment be made as soon as possible. It regretted that the high standards for the protection of children foreseen by the legislation adopted in 2016 were not reflected in reality due to, inter alia, various political, budgetary and operational reasons. It noted that, as a result, vital services in that area were often carried out by civil, social and religious organizations, and it recommended that Argentina, working with civil society, provide an integrated approach to child victims. It also recommended that Argentina develop and implement an effective complaint process to report abuse, and that national, provincial and municipal authorities approve the necessary budgetary measures.

483. Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, in a joint statement with the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development, welcomed the acceptance by Argentina of all the recommendations relating to the right to education, in particular the recommendation aimed at increasing educational infrastructure in the poorest areas. Nevertheless, it noted the lack of bilingual education for indigenous children, and it regretted the lowering of the minimum age of criminal responsibility and the increase of penalties in the juvenile penal system. It further reported the use of force against children of the Wichi and Mapuche communities during recent police operations. It called upon Argentina to strengthen the action plan for 2016–2018, especially regarding bilingual teaching, to increase the minimum age for criminal liability, to improve alternative punishment measures for children and to punish the use of force against children by the police.

484. Action Canada for Population and Development noted that Argentina had received several recommendations relating to sexual rights, which highlighted the State's failure to comply with its human rights obligations. It regretted that no recommendation had been made regarding the violation of the sexual rights of persons with disabilities, and it was concerned that Argentina had not accepted the recommendations relating to arbitrary detention and to the decriminalization of abortion in all circumstances. It called upon Argentina to take a number of measures, including to adopt a law guaranteeing legal, safe and free abortion; to eliminate arbitrary detentions of the trans population; to ensure that persons with disabilities could freely exercise their sexuality; to adopt legislation against discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation; and to urgently implement throughout the country legislation on sexual education, sexual and reproductive health, and discrimination against women.

485. Amnesty International regretted that Argentina had not accepted 13 important recommendations, including those aimed at guaranteeing the right to consultation of indigenous people. It noted a substantial increase in forestry and extractive projects located in traditional indigenous lands and it welcomed the acceptance of a recommendation to implement the demarcation of indigenous lands. It also valued the Government's announcement of the forthcoming debate on the decriminalization of abortion in the National Congress, but it regretted that Argentina had not accepted all the recommendations to decriminalize abortion. It further welcomed the fact that Argentina had accepted recommendations to guarantee freedom of association and assembly and to ensure the use of proportionate force by the police. Lastly, it regretted that Argentina had rejected a recommendation to ensure that the current migration legislation did not limit the human rights of migrants.

486. Human Right Watch noted that, in Argentina, abortion was illegal except in the case of rape or when the life or health of the woman was at risk. However, it noted that, also in those cases, women had often been criminally prosecuted and faced difficulties in accessing reproductive health services. It welcomed the speech of the President of the Republic and the

willingness to include abortion as an issue to be dealt with by the National Congress in 2018. It encouraged a genuine debate to decriminalize abortion in all circumstances and called upon Argentina to accept the universal periodic review recommendations in that area.

487. The American Association of Jurists denounced the repression of the popular protests on 14 December 2017 and the criminalization of protestors, which were aimed at preventing the exercise of the right to petition to the authorities and at imposing by force unpopular measures prejudicial to the majority of the population. It stressed that, in violation of the principle of the progressive realization of economic and social rights, the Government had sent to the National Congress a bill that further reduced the pensions of millions of retirees, and it further noted that the project on labour reform involved the elimination of decades old workers' rights. Lastly, it was concerned about the President of the Republic's public support for a police officer in a case of murder, which had been considered as undue interference in the work of the judiciary.

488. International-Lawyers.Org recognized the efforts of Argentina to address concerns regarding freedom of expression, but it noted that, on occasion, Argentina had failed to observe its human rights obligations, and it encouraged the State to guarantee the rights of its citizens to participate in public demonstrations. It was concerned by the use of excessive force by the police during mass demonstrations and by the arbitrary detention of protestors based solely on their participation in public demonstrations. International-Lawyers.Org called upon Argentina to guarantee the freedoms of peaceful assembly and association, opinion and expression. It further urged Argentina to ensure that the use of force by the police during demonstrations was proportionate and in line with the law.

489. Auspice Stella noted the endemic violation of human rights of indigenous people in Argentina. In particular, it denounced the cases of disappearances of Mapuche people that had not been investigated and whose perpetrators had not been prosecuted. It regretted that the Government had not taken reparatory measures to facilitate the reunion of Mapuche families that had been broken up and dispersed since the military "desert campaign" 130 years ago. It further expressed concerns about the denial of the right of indigenous peoples to live on their ancestral land, which had been sold to multinational companies instead of being returned to the indigenous communities, as established by the International Labour Organization Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169). It also noted the violent repression of indigenous people by the police and the criminalization of the peaceful struggle of the Mapuche people.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

490. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 188 recommendations received, 175 had enjoyed the support of Argentina, and 13 had been noted.

491. The delegation welcomed the comments received and stated that they would be duly analysed and transmitted to the relevant authorities. However, it expressed its complete disagreement with the comments suggesting the existence in Argentina of Islamophobia and the harassment of people of African descent.

492. With regard to the comments made on the issue of abortion, the delegation reiterated that, on the initiative of the President of the Republic, the debate on that issue in the National Congress was about to begin. It also stressed that Argentina had led the process of adopting the resolutions on human rights, sexual orientation and gender identity at the Human Rights Council.

493. The delegation concluded by emphasizing that, as pointed out by both the President and the Vice-President of Republic before the United Nations General Assembly, in Argentina the promotion of gender equality was a State policy and was part of the 100 priority objectives of the Government.

Gabon

494. The review of Gabon was held on 7 November 2017 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 Gabon in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/GAB/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/GAB/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/GAB/3).

495. At its 37th meeting, on 15 March 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Gabon (see sect. C below).

496. The outcome of the review of Gabon comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/37/6), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/37/6/Add.1).

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

497. The delegation, led by the Minister for Justice of Gabon, Edgard Anicet Mboumbou Miyakou, and the director of prison administration and the protection of human rights, A. Inès Laurenda Hadonou, praised the universal periodic review for the constructive spirit of the interactive dialogue between 73 countries and Gabon, which had accepted most of the recommendations made during the review in November 2017.

498. Regarding the ratification of international instruments, Gabon was a party to the majority of international human rights treaties. The process of the ratification of other treaties was under way.

499. In terms of policy, the new Constitution had been adopted. The major changes included the creation of the higher court of justice, the specialized criminal court, a reduction in the number of senators, the promotion of equal access of women and men to electoral mandates and political responsibilities, and the reorganization of the Constitutional Court.

500. A number of draft laws were being adopted by the Council of Ministers, including a draft law on elections. Those bills had resulted from the recommendations received during a political dialogue on electoral reforms, with a view to improving the conditions for organizing political elections. There was other draft legislation on the distribution of seats per province, department and municipality; draft legislation on the election of deputies to the National Assembly; draft legislation amending certain provisions for the election of the President of the Republic; and draft legislation on the distribution of senators' seats.

501. The issue of the employment of young people had also been addressed during the session of the Economic, Social and Environmental Council that had taken place on 20 February 2018. The Council was looking for ways and opportunities to generate the dynamic creation of jobs for young people to ensure sustainable economic and social stability in the country.

502. With regard to the prevention of torture, there had been progress in the implementation of the road map to establish the national preventive mechanism for the prevention of torture. A draft law had been modified after important exchanges with the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the Association for the Prevention of Torture. The law should be adopted by Parliament in the coming months.

503. Concerning progress in the administration of justice, the delegation highlighted the law on the organization of justice, the new Criminal Code and the new Criminal Procedure Code.

504. On the rights of the child, in the second quarter of 2018, the Government would produce an integrated national strategy document for child protection, followed by a national action plan. The realization of those two documents would allow governmental and non-governmental actors to merge their actions with a view to implementing an efficient and effective public policy on childhood in Gabon.

505. A training workshop on the prevention of and fight against trafficking in persons and the smuggling of migrants had been organized for police officers, magistrates working with minors, personnel working in reception centres and civil society organizations working on that subject.

506. On freedom of expression, the Council of Ministers had adopted a draft law on the establishment and organization of the high authority for communication.

507. The report of Gabon demonstrated the State's commitment to gradually improve its legal framework and its actions. Also, the report would increasingly allow for the effective implementation of human rights at the national level. Gabon would continue to expand the application of the provisions of the different treaties, while supporting any initiative aimed at strengthening them.

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

508. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Gabon, 12 delegations made statements.

509. Cuba recognized the work done by Gabon to implement the recommendations received in the previous cycle of the universal periodic review. It was confident that Gabon would continue to do the same to implement the more than 120 recommendations accepted in the State's current review, including those made by Cuba. It encouraged Gabon to continue its actions for the protection of children, which would be strengthened through the approval of the Children's Code, as recommended by Cuba during its review.

510. Egypt stated that Gabon had taken positive measures to improve the human rights situation in many sectors of the country, including the review of the National Human Rights Commission to ensure that it was pursuant to the Paris Principles. There was also a bill to establish a national preventive mechanism against torture, and training had been provided to law enforcement personnel, and that went hand in hand with efforts to guarantee the rights to health and education, among others. Egypt welcomed the fact that Gabon had accepted its recommendation to combat trafficking in children.

511. Ethiopia appreciated the fact that Gabon had engaged constructively with the Human Rights Council and had accepted a significant number of recommendations, including those made by Ethiopia, which were aimed at continuing the implementation of a road map with a view to putting in place a national preventive mechanism against torture, and at enhancing women's economic empowerment, particularly in income-generating activities.

512. Ghana commended Gabon for having amended its Civil and Criminal Codes with a view to better addressing domestic and marital violence, particularly through the introduction of provisions in the Criminal Code to define and punish marital sexual assault. Ghana noted with appreciation that amendments to the law on the establishment and organization of the National Human Rights Commission in order to bring it into compliance with the Paris Principles was before Parliament. Ghana urged the Government to pass the law at the earliest convenience and to take the steps necessary to implement the provisions of the law.

513. Honduras acknowledged the commitment and constructive spirit of Gabon and was pleased that the State had supported the recommendations to adopt legislation that combated discrimination and guaranteed equal opportunities. Honduras congratulated Gabon on its commitment to adopt legislation that was in line with the Sustainable Development Goals, ending harmful practices on girls, such as early and forced marriage and female genital mutilation. It was satisfied with the commitment of Gabon to ratify the Convention on Protection of Children and Cooperation in respect of Intercountry Adoption.

514. Kenya stated that the acceptance by Gabon of many recommendations demonstrated the State's long-standing commitment to the implementation of the recommendations received. Kenya commended Gabon for the work it had undertaken to combat poverty. The national health insurance and social protection fund covered the costs of health, water and electricity and paid benefits to low-income families. Kenya encouraged Gabon to continue to implement the remaining recommendations.

515. Libya welcomed the steps taken by Gabon and the fact that Gabon had accepted a large number of recommendations made during the universal periodic review, which demonstrated the State's commitment to the universal periodic review process and its efforts to improve human rights.

516. Madagascar welcomed the actions taken by the Government of Gabon, particularly in the fight against school dropout rates, and in the covering of health, water and electricity costs by the national health insurance and social protection fund. It noted with satisfaction the amendment of the Civil Code in inheritance matters and the empowerment of women. Madagascar encouraged Gabon to continue efforts to make the promotion and protection of human rights more effective in the country.

517. Pakistan commended the Government of Gabon for having accepted the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Pakistan. It wished Gabon every success in the implementation of the recommendations accepted.

518. The Philippines congratulated the Government of Gabon on having supported many of the recommendations received during the interactive dialogue, particularly those relating to the rights of children and women. The Philippines looked forward to the approval by Parliament of the Children's Code, which was aimed at preventing violence against children. The Philippines appreciated the State's commitment to continue to work on the promotion and protection of the human rights of its people.

519. Senegal welcomed the decision by Gabon to accept 143 of 166 recommendations received during its review, including those made by Senegal, which reflected the State's commitment to better promote and defend human rights in line with its international commitments.

520. Morocco commended Gabon for having taken many legislative and institutional measures and initiatives, and for the efforts it had made to implement the recommendations accepted in the second cycle. Morocco also appreciated the attention given to the protection of the rights of the child through, inter alia, the adoption of the Children's Code and the project to set up a national participative and permanent coordinating body. Morocco noted with satisfaction the State's commitment to the fight against torture, as reflected in the adoption of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

521. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Gabon, six other stakeholders made statements.

522. The International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development, in a joint statement with Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, welcomed efforts to protect the rights of the child in collaboration with local civil society organizations and United Nations organs. It congratulated Gabon on the acceptance of the recommendation contained in paragraph 118.22 to adopt the Children's Code and called upon Gabon to fully implement it. It regretted the high cost of tuition, which increased school dropout. It noted the acceptance of the recommendations contained in paragraphs 118.119 and 118.125. It encouraged the Government to take the measures necessary to ensure that education was free and of high quality. It welcomed the existence of the entrepreneurship programme and called upon Gabon to double its efforts to find alternatives to combat the high unemployment rate of young people, to foster integration in the workplace and to reduce poverty.

523. Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale welcomed the creation of legal assistance offices for women and

encouraged Gabon to increase its efforts for women's representation in public life. It welcomed the creation of youth courts and the adoption of a national reproductive health strategy. It congratulated Gabon on the establishment of a national health development plan, on having increased resources for the medical assistance fund, on the adoption of a national strategy for gender equality, and on having created awareness about the situation of the lack of birth certificates. It was concerned by the observations of the Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the Committee on the Rights of the Child.

524. United Nations Watch was concerned by the precarious situation of human rights in Gabon. It regretted arbitrary and politically motivated arrests. It called for an investigation into the arbitrary arrest of demonstrators during the elections in 2016. It noted several examples of the arrest of political opposition members and dissidents, and beatings and travel bans. Many of the dissidents faced harsh conditions in the severely overcrowded prisons in the country. Gabon had made constitutional changes to put the executive power in the hands of the President, and there were attempts to suppress the political opposition. United Nations Watch called upon Gabon to proceed with fair and transparent elections and to hold responsible the perpetrators of human rights violations.

525. Africa culture internationale congratulated Gabon on its substantial progress in having maintained stable and favourable conditions, and on the development of legal, health and education infrastructures. It noted the realization of several projects in collaboration with UNICEF and other international organizations. It encouraged Gabon to continue the cooperation programme for 2012–2016 between Gabon and UNFPA, the reintegration of vulnerable girls, and the establishment of revenue-generating activities to empower women and girls.

526. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme noted the efforts made by Gabon, including the ratification of the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the abolition of the death penalty, the adoption of legislation on minority rights and the ratification of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, as well as legislation on equal rights for women in the workplace. It further noted restrictions on the enjoyment of the rights to freedom of expression and assembly, and cases of the disappearance of dissidents and opposition sympathizers during elections in 2016, and it called upon Gabon to impartially investigate those instances. It also called upon Gabon to strengthen efforts to combat corruption, rape, sexual violence, ritual crimes and prison overcrowding.

527. International-Lawyers.Org commended Gabon for its efforts to improve the freedom and independence of the press through the new Communications Code, which had decriminalized some offences foreseen in the legislation on the press. However, it was concerned about the vagueness of the Communications Code with regard to certain provisions that restricted freedom of expression, including those prohibiting Gabonese nationals from working for local media outlets outside of the country. Additionally, there had been reports of the arrest and harassment of journalists. International-Lawyers.Org called upon Gabon to ensure the full exercise of the right of freedom of expression and to take the steps necessary to create a safe environment for journalists. It recognized reforms made by Gabon to improve living conditions and to reduce prison overcrowding. However, it urged the State to implement further measures to end inhuman prison conditions and limit the use of pretrial detention.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

528. The Vice-President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 166 recommendations received, 143 had enjoyed the support of Gabon, and 23 had been noted.

529. The delegation of Gabon thanked the delegations that had supported the adoption of the report and it stated that Gabon had made important efforts to promote human rights, particularly concerning the right to health, the fight against poverty, and the protection of the rights of children and women. Those proved the State's engagement in improving the living conditions of its citizens.

530. Lastly, the delegation stated that there were no human rights violations in Gabon, that there were no political prisoners and that no journalist was in prison. In Gabon, there were only prisoners who had violated the provisions of the law. Investigations were carried out in accordance with the law, and if no guilt was proven, prisoners were released. Regarding the demonstrations that had taken place on 31 August 2016, no one had been sentenced to prison in connection with that event.

Ghana

531. The review of Ghana was held on 7 November 2017 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 Ghana in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/GHA/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/GHA/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/GHA/3).

532. At its 38th meeting, on 15 March 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Ghana (see sect. C below).

533. The outcome of the review of Ghana comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/37/7), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/37/7/Add.1).

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

534. The head of the delegation, the Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Ghana to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Ramses Joseph Cleland, stated that he was honoured to address the Human Rights Council on the occasion of the consideration of the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Ghana. The review of Ghana had been held on 7 November 2017 and the delegation had been led by the Attorney General and Minister for Justice, Gloria Afua Akuffo.

535. The list of questions prepared in advance by Belgium, Brazil, Czechia, Germany, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had been much welcomed by the delegation of Ghana.

536. Ghana also appreciated the interactive dialogue, through which some 98 delegations had made interventions. A total of 200 recommendations out of 241 recommendations, made during the interactive dialogue, had enjoyed the support of Ghana. Those recommendations, together with the remaining 41 recommendations postponed for further consideration, had been adopted during the review on 10 November 2017.

537. After careful consultations on the pending 41 recommendations, Ghana had decided that 12 of those recommendations should enjoy the State's support, namely the recommendations contained in paragraphs 147.3, 147.4, 147.6, 147.7, 147.11, 147.14, 147.18, 147.21, 147.23, 147.24, 147.28 and 147.41. That brought the total number of recommendations accepted by Ghana to 212. The recommendations contained in paragraphs 147.1, 147.5, 147.8–147.10, 147.12, 147.13, 147.15–147.17, 147.19, 147.20, 147.22, 147.25–147.27, 147.29–147.32 and 147.34–147.40 had been noted.

538. Ghana had partially accepted the recommendations contained in paragraphs 147.2 and 147.33 and it wished to clarify its position on the recommendation contained in paragraph

147.2. Ghana had accepted the first part of the recommendation contained in paragraph 147.2, which read “continue strengthening the application of the discrimination complaint system, which protects the rights of people because of their sexual orientation and gender identity”, as it was consistent with the measures being instituted by the Government to protect the rights of all persons within its territory from discrimination of any kind, including discrimination based on their sexual orientation and gender identity.

539. The second part of the recommendation contained in paragraph 147.2, which read “and ensure that the education system guidelines prevent discrimination against students”, had been noted by Ghana because it limited the scope of the Government’s efforts to fight discrimination at all levels to adjust the education system.

540. The explanation of the position of Ghana on the recommendation contained in paragraph 147.33 was given in document A/HRC/37/7/Add.1.

541. The advance questions received by the delegation of Ghana had been dealt with during the interactive dialogue in November 2017, and Ghana appreciated the constructive spirit in which the recommendations had been made. The recommendations covered many areas of human rights, including children’s rights, the rights of persons belonging to the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex community, mental health, and harmful traditional practices, among others. Ghana also appreciated the solidarity, encouragement and support from States to continue to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms in the coming years.

542. The delegation informed the Human Rights Council that, regarding the many recommendations received relating to the affirmative action bill, after the review of Ghana in November 2017, the ministry of gender, children and social protection of Ghana had initiated a series of initiatives to push for the quick passage of the affirmative action bill in order to further advance the course of women’s empowerment and gender equality. A campaign dubbed “HeForShe” had been recently launched to sensitize the male child to appreciate and support the girl child in all endeavors to enable the former to act as ambassadors to achieve that goal.

543. The Office of the Special Prosecutor, established by the Government in the last quarter of 2017 to strengthen the fight against corruption, had become functional at the beginning of March 2018. As part of the Government’s effort to promote the full enjoyment of economic and social rights and to eradicate poverty in the country, the Office of the Special Prosecutor, now operational, was expected to investigate cases of corruption involving political and public officials and to prosecute all persons found culpable.

544. During the review of Ghana in November 2017, the State had acknowledged the valuable contributions of civil society organizations in the country, which had helped to strengthen its young democracy and the promotion and protection of human rights. Ghana looked forward to hearing interventions from representatives of non-governmental organizations with an open mind, as well as additional interventions from State delegations.

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

545. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Ghana, 13 delegations made statements.

546. Ethiopia expressed its appreciation to Ghana for having accepted many of the recommendations made during the third cycle of the universal periodic review, including the recommendations made by Ethiopia that were aimed at intensifying the implementation of the coordinated initiative to end early, forced and child marriage and to continue to implement its project aimed at eliminating trafficking in children and child labour in fishing communities. Ethiopia supported the adoption of the report of the Working Group on Ghana.

547. Gabon welcomed the measures taken to stop corporal punishment and other forms of violence against children, in their families and in schools. Gabon urged the Human Rights Council to adopt the report on Ghana.

548. Honduras acknowledged the recommendations supported by Ghana, and especially the State's commitment to ratify the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty. Honduras regretted that Ghana had not accepted the recommendation to commit to the decriminalization of consensual sexual relations between persons of the same sex and to put an end to discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons.

549. Kenya recognized the long-standing commitment of Ghana to implement human rights and fundamental freedoms, and it applauded the State for the peaceful, transparent and inclusive elections in December 2016, which had served as an example for most of the African continent. Kenya supported the adoption by the Human Rights Council of the universal periodic review report on Ghana.

550. Lesotho noted the vital national legislative framework put in place and the ratification of some of the core international human rights treaties, and it appreciated the social protection initiatives that had contributed to relieving the people from the morass of poverty. However, Lesotho also noticed some of the hurdles with which Ghana continued to contend and as such it called upon the international community to extend to Ghana the requisite support.

551. Libya commended Ghana for the efforts made in having accepted the majority of the recommendations, and it highlighted the determination that the State had shown in having implemented them. Libya encouraged the Human Rights Council to adopt the universal periodic review report on Ghana.

552. Madagascar welcomed the actions taken by the Government of Ghana to elaborate a child and family protection policy in order to end corporal punishment and all other forms of violence inflicted on children, whether at home or in schools. Madagascar invited the Human Rights Council to adopt the universal periodic review report on Ghana.

553. Pakistan commended the Government of Ghana for having accepted the majority of the recommendations made during the session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, including its own, and it requested the Human Rights Council to adopt the universal periodic review report on Ghana by consensus.

554. The Philippines encouraged the Government of Ghana to approve the national gender equality bill, which promoted women's participation in decision-making and politics. The Philippines supported the adoption by the Human Rights Council of the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Ghana and it called upon all member States to do the same.

555. Senegal welcomed the institutional legislative measures taken by Ghana to better promote the rights of women and children and those with a view to eradicating corruption. Senegal encouraged Ghana to pursue its efforts and called upon the Human Rights Council to adopt the universal periodic review report on Ghana.

556. Sierra Leone commended Ghana for its recent strategies to provide all children with free compulsory universal basic education, as well as the establishment of the policy on justice for children to protect children's rights within the justice system. Sierra Leone also encouraged Ghana to consider establishing policies and initiatives that effectively addressed any incidents of stigmatization or discrimination faced by persons with albinism. It recommended that the universal periodic review report on Ghana be adopted.

557. South Africa appreciated the acceptance by Ghana of its recommendations to implement the outcomes of the constitutional review, to complete a national human rights plan aligned with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and to take steps towards the abolition of the death penalty. Furthermore, South Africa encouraged Ghana to continue to increase women's participation in decision-making and politics, to counter the stigmatization of people living with HIV/AIDS, and to prioritize social protection interventions to address poverty and vulnerability.

558. The Sudan welcomed the efforts to increase access to and improve quality education, reduce poverty and promote overall socioeconomic development. It noted with satisfaction that Ghana had accepted the majority of the recommendations received during the review

process and it recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the universal periodic review outcome report on Ghana.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

559. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Ghana, eight other stakeholders made statements.

560. Defence for Children International welcomed the Government's commitment to enhance the protection of children's rights through legislation, policies and national strategies, and it encouraged the Government to continue to work in partnership with civil society organizations and to ensure the effective implementation of child rights and child protection programmes at all levels of implementation. Furthermore, it urged the Government to reinforce its awareness-raising and education programmes that were aimed at preventing traditional harmful practices, such as child marriage and the resurgences of female genital mutilation.

561. Edmund Rice International valued the commitment of Ghana to improve its standard of compulsory education. However, to ensure that all students benefited equally from free education, the Government should invest more in public schools to improve the standard of infrastructure and teaching. It recommended that Ghana take the steps necessary to further motivate teachers, such as through the provision of additional training and accommodation assistance, especially for those working in schools in rural areas. It also recommended that Ghana regulate the tuition and supplementary fees charged by all schools and so create equal opportunities for families from all socioeconomic areas.

562. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland commended Ghana for having accepted the most general recommendations on violence and discrimination against Ghanaians based on sexual orientation and gender identity. However, more concrete recommendations on sexual orientation and gender identity had been noted, causing a continuation of grave concern about the equal application of human rights to all in Ghana, and the direct safety and well-being of lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans Ghanaians, who faced frequent discrimination and violence, and there was no equal access to housing, health care, education and labour. Same-sex relations remain criminalized. COC Nederland urged Ghana to effectively implement resolution 275 of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, which required all African States to take positive steps to end violence and discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity.

563. The Swedish Association for Sexuality Education was concerned about the stigma and rigid attitudes towards gender roles as barriers hindering gender equality, the protection of women and sexual minorities, and opportunities for young people. It called upon the Government of Ghana to buttress the ongoing work to adopt and implement the guidelines on comprehensive reproductive health education as part of the school curricula and to ensure the right to access sexual and reproductive health across the national territory without discrimination.

564. Action Canada for Population and Development stated that Ghana had made strides in responding to particular forms of violence and discrimination against women and girls, including by having passed laws that criminalized female genital mutilation, intimate partner violence and rape, and by having established mechanisms and specialized units tasked with responding to various forms of gender-based violence. However, slow and incomplete investigations of cases generated a climate of impunity and a lack of redress for survivors of violence. Action Canada for Population and Development noted with concern that once again Ghana had not accepted the recommendations to repeal laws and policies that criminalized and discriminated against persons on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity and expression, or to implement education programmes to reduce homophobia.

565. Human Rights Watch stated that, despite important progress, conditions in psychiatric hospitals and prayer camps had not significantly improved since it had documented a range of abuses in 2012. Psychiatric hospitals remained overcrowded and unsanitary. Persons with real or perceived psychosocial disabilities continued to live in psychiatric hospitals and prayer camps against their will and with little to no possibility of challenging their confinement. Human Rights Watch called upon Ghana to enforce the ban on chaining and

other forms of inhumane and degrading treatment through the effective monitoring of psychiatric facilities and prayer camps by establishing a mental health review tribunal and visiting committees.

566. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme highlighted the progress made by Ghana regarding democratization: Ghana served as a model of democracy in West Africa, as well as an example for the rest of Africa. Progress had also been made with some initiatives aimed at protecting the rights of children and women, including by addressing forced marriage and gender-based discrimination. It called upon the Government of Ghana to enhance its efforts in the campaign to stop traditional practices affecting women in rural areas and to take action by implementing laws to that end. Lastly, it encouraged Ghana to promote human rights education in all spheres of society and to continue its efforts to strengthen democracy in the country.

567. The International Humanist and Ethical Union stated that violence and discrimination were common in Ghana, as well as human rights abuses such as domestic violence, female genital mutilation, child labour and child sacrifice. Persons with albinism were marginalized. The International Humanist and Ethical Union was disappointed that the universal periodic review recommendations on sexual orientation and gender identity and the protection of persons with albinism had been noted by Ghana.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

568. The Vice-President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 241 recommendations received, 212 had enjoyed the support of Ghana, and 27 had been noted. Additional clarification had been provided on another two recommendations.

569. The delegation stated that the third cycle of the universal periodic review had provided Ghana with the opportunity to reassess the progress made so far on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the country. Ghana remained committed to engaging all the relevant stakeholders that were willing to assist with the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review. Moreover, in November 2017, the Office of the Attorney General had completed the process of establishing and hosting an inter-agency coordinating committee on human rights as a dedicated national mechanism for the implementation of, reporting on and follow-up to the universal periodic review and treaty body recommendations, which would be inaugurated by the Attorney General and Minister for Justice by the end of March 2018.

Peru

570. The review of Peru was held on 8 November 2017 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 Peru in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/PER/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/PER/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/PER/3).

571. At its 38th meeting, on 15 March 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Peru (see sect. C below).

572. The outcome of the review of Peru comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/37/8), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session

to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/37/8/Add.1).

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

573. The delegation, led by the Permanent Representative of Peru to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Claudio Julio de la Puente Ribeyro, noted that, after a broad and careful assessment involving all the sectors concerned, Peru had decided to accept the vast majority of the recommendations, 177 out of a total of 182. That response reflected the commitment of Peru to the promotion and protection of human rights and to the United Nations system, as well as the seriousness with which Peru had assumed its responsibilities as a member of the Human Rights Council. That response was also a reaffirmation of the openness of Peru towards the recommendations.

574. Peru was convinced that its acceptance of the recommendations would be extremely useful in reviewing and implementing public policies, resulting in an improvement in the situation for Peruvians and for all those living in the country.

575. Noting that there were areas in which the country should improve, Peru believed that any objective analysis of the human rights situation in the country would lead to the conclusion that there had been a consistent improvement as a result of the strong commitment of successive democratic Governments, combined with the active participation of civil society.

576. The recommendations received and accepted were related to those areas where it was necessary to allocate more resources from, and redouble the efforts of, the State. The delegation then made comments on the recommendations that had been noted by the country.

577. On the selection of the candidates for United Nations treaty bodies, Peru followed strict merit-based criteria, which had brought recognition of the work of the current Peruvian members of different committees.

578. Regarding the recommendations relating to the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights, it had been specified that those commitments could be freely adopted by companies, regardless of whether the State in whose territory they operated had adopted them.

579. The recommendation contained in paragraph 111.102 to “decriminalize abortion in all circumstances and ensure that women and girls can access safe and legal abortion” had been noted because the term “in all circumstances” was incompatible with the international standards on the subject.

580. Regarding the recommendations on the ratification of the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Peru considered that the country was in line with what had been suggested, since Peru had maintained a de facto moratorium on the application of the death penalty. The last execution had taken place in 1979, so although the death penalty had not been formally abolished, a policy of non-application had been maintained.

581. On 1 February 2018, the country had approved its third national human rights action plan (2018–2021). It was a multisectoral strategic tool aimed at ensuring the management of human rights public policies, at achieving educational and cultural change in favour of human rights and at promoting regulatory changes in order to adapt the legal system to international human rights standards.

582. The action plan addressed several of the recommendations received in the third cycle, including those relating to groups that required special protection. Furthermore, the implementation of international standards on business and human rights had been incorporated as a new guideline, having established the commitment to adopt in 2019 a national action plan on business and human rights, which would promote the progressive implementation of the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. The action plan had crosscutting policies in order to promote a culture of peace, the protection of the human rights of all citizens and guiding principles for sectoral public policies.

583. The action plan gave special attention to 13 groups that required special protection, among them the Afrodescendent population; girls, boys and adolescents; people deprived of liberty; victims of terrorism; women; and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. All of those groups had been the subject of various recommendations and comments during the universal periodic review. Several delegations and civil society organizations had recognized the positive attitude of Peru in having accepted those recommendations.

584. In 2017, Peru had approved the new national plan against trafficking in persons, which had established the participation of the actors involved in addressing that problem. The plan was articulated in three areas: (a) institutional governance, prevention and awareness; (b) attention, protection and reintegration; and (c) control and prosecution of the crime.

585. The delegation referred to other normative developments, such as the increase in the penalties for the crime of enforced disappearance; the modification of the penalties for torture; the establishment of the crime of forced labour; and the establishment of norms aimed at combating femicide. In other areas, since 2015, there has been a national policy to mainstream the intercultural approach for the benefit of those populations, which prioritized access to health, education and justice.

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 Peru, 11 delegations made statements.

587. UNICEF welcomed the recent progress towards the realization of child rights in Peru, such as Legislative Decree No. 1297 on the protection of children without parental care, Legislative Decree No. 1348 on the Adolescent Criminal Justice Code and Law No. 30403 on prohibiting corporal and humiliating punishment. It expressed concern that child victims of violence, exploitation and family abandonment were not yet receiving adequate protection. The strengthening of specialized protection services, full access to specialized justice and the greater development of alternative family-based care were necessary.

588. Algeria welcomed the significant progress made by Peru in the protection and promotion of human rights, particularly regarding achievements in the fight against discrimination, torture, forced labour and the protection of women, and the steps taken to ratify a number of international human rights instruments. Algeria welcomed the State's cooperation with the universal periodic review mechanism and its acceptance of most of the recommendations received, including those of Algeria on the protection of domestic workers and the improvement of living standards, especially in rural areas.

589. Brazil welcomed the efforts made by Peru to advance in the promotion and protection of human rights. It congratulated Peru on the designation of an institution in charge of the national preventive mechanism for the prevention of torture, for progress in respecting the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons, and the promotion of economic and social rights. Brazil encouraged Peru to continue to advance in the realization of human rights through the implementation of the universal periodic review recommendations it had accepted. It reiterated its willingness to continue the dialogue with Peru on human rights issues, bilaterally, regionally and globally.

590. Chile congratulated Peru on the approval of its third national human rights action plan (2018–2021). It noted that the plan had incorporated several of the recommendations received in the third universal periodic review cycle, including those relating to some of the main problems of the groups in need of special protection. Chile commended Peru for the implementation of international standards on business and human rights and the commitment expressed to have a national action plan on business and human rights in 2019. Chile welcomed the willingness of Peru to promote and ratify international human rights treaties.

591. China commended Peru for its constructive dialogue during the entire universal periodic review process. It thanked the State for having accepted the recommendations made by China. It hoped that Peru continued to promote economic and social development, poverty reduction actions, and improve living standards and education. China encouraged Peru to

continue its efforts to reach a gender balance and eliminate all forms of violence against women.

592. Egypt welcomed the participation of Peru in its third universal periodic review cycle. It thanked the State for its presentation, in which the country had provided an extensive update on the main actions aimed at promoting and protecting human rights in Peru. Egypt welcomed the acceptance by Peru of a large number of the recommendations received during the interactive dialogue, and it appreciated the State's constructive spirit of cooperation with the Human Rights Council. Egypt noted the efforts of Peru to promote human rights in the country and in particular to cooperate with the treaty bodies.

593. Haiti thanked Peru for having accepted the three recommendations it had made, and in particular the recommendation contained in paragraph 111.178 relating to the Afro-Peruvian peoples. The acceptance of that recommendation would generate greater progress for those peoples. Haiti noted positively the adoption of the third national human rights action plan (2018–2021), which incorporated a number of recommendations received during the three universal periodic review cycles. Haiti encouraged Peru to put in place in 2019 the announced national action plan on business and human rights.

594. Honduras welcomed the delegation of Peru and commended the State for the commitment, transparency and constructive spirit shown during the universal periodic review process. Honduras hoped that Peru would support the recommendations it had made relating to the prevention of violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and hate crimes. It hoped that Peru would commit itself to developing education programmes for the prevention of child labour. Honduras reiterated its support for Peru and its willingness to cooperate with the State in the area of human rights.

595. Sierra Leone noted that Peru had adopted its third national human rights action plan (2018–2021) and that the State intended to adopt in 2019 a national action plan on business and human rights. It noted positively that Peru would be using those two tools to more effectively promote and implement human rights norms and protect fundamental freedoms nationally. Sierra Leone encouraged Peru to consider establishing initiatives to disaggregate the negative impacts of environmental degradation and to ensure that asylum seekers had equal access to universal health-care services.

596. The Philippines congratulated Peru on having supported a large number of the recommendations received during the interactive dialogue, including the one recommendation made by the Philippines. It appreciated the constructive engagement of Peru in the universal periodic review process and the State's unwavering commitment to continue to work on the promotion and protection of the human rights of its people, especially in the areas of women, children and migrants, among others.

597. UNFPA stated that Peru had shown significant progress in terms of women's human rights. Those advances were a clear expression of the State's commitment to the population and development agenda contained in the Cairo Programme of Action and the Montevideo Consensus on Population and Development. It noted the challenges that girls and women had to face in relation to the exercise of their rights to sexual and reproductive health and the right to live free of violence. UNFPA was concerned about the problem of teenage pregnancy in Peru and noted the need to continue to generate disaggregated data on some populations.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

598. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Peru, eight other stakeholders made statements.

599. The Center for Reproductive Rights noted that, in Peru, a pregnancy could be legally interrupted only in order to save the life of the woman or to avoid serious and permanent damage to her health, also known as "therapeutic abortion", and it therefore regretted that Peru had only taken note of the recommendation to decriminalize abortion in all instances. The Center for Reproductive Rights stated that a pending lawsuit before the Constitutional Court could potentially ban therapeutic abortion, preventing all women and girls seeking abortions under the current law from doing so, and it was worried that those developments

were happening in a wider context of a backlash against women's sexual and reproductive rights in Peru.

600. Edmund Rice International valued the fact that Peru had laws and regulations that prohibited the use of physical and humiliating punishment of children. However, the Government had inadequate capacity to carry out the effective enforcement of the law due to the lack of resources and the lack of expertise and skills of institutions to ensure the fulfilment of the law on the protection of the rights of children against any type of violence. Therefore, Edmund Rice International encouraged Peru to guarantee the effective enforcement of Law No. 30403 by encouraging the application of multisectoral policies across all agencies.

601. The International Commission of Jurists regretted that the investigation and punishment of those responsible for serious human rights violations had not received the attention deserved and that, in contrast, the fight against impunity had taken several steps back when a pardon had been granted to former President Alberto Fujimori. It reminded Peru that one of the recommendations that it had accepted referred to investigations and reparations for thousands of women who had suffered from forced sterilization under the Fujimori Government and that granting President Fujimori a pardon would exonerate him from investigations and sanctions. In that regard, the International Commission of Jurists urged Peru to execute the recommendations of the international community with respect to international standards, which prohibited impunity for grave human rights violations.

602. The International Service for Human Rights stated that granting a pardon to former President Alberto Fujimori highlighted the limited progress Peru had made in the field of justice, and it referred to the assassination of human rights defender Napoleon Tarrillo in December 2017, stating that, in the middle of that political crisis, human rights defenders had become more vulnerable. It therefore encouraged the Government of Peru to stop the use of pardons, which affected the rule of law and the legitimacy of the democracy of the State; to facilitate the process for access to justice; and to develop and implement a protection policy for human rights defenders with concrete and urgent measures to reduce the risks faced for the work they did.

603. Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco commended Peru for having increased the budget for education by more than 50 per cent, thus decreasing the rural education gap and establishing more medical care programmes. It noted, however, that indigenous children still suffered from funding distribution disparity and discrimination in the exercise of their rights to education and health. It therefore encouraged Peru to allocate more funding for the education of indigenous children and to develop an inclusive intercultural curriculum; to continue its efforts to identify special measures to ensure their rights to education and health care; and to provide preventive programmes to address violence against indigenous women and increase support services for survivors.

604. Amnesty International regretted that, in December 2017, President Pedro Pablo Kuczynski had granted a pardon to former President Alberto Fujimori, who had been sentenced to prison for crimes against humanity, and it noted that that act had serious consequences for the right to truth, justice and reparations of victims. However, it welcomed the decision of the national criminal court of Peru not to apply a presidential grace but to continue the proceedings brought against the former president. It urged Peru to implement emergency health plans in indigenous communities affected by water contamination and to repeal all legislation that criminalized abortion.

605. Centro de Promoción y Defensa de los Derechos Sexuales y Reproductivos welcomed the recommendations accepted relating to the sexual and reproductive rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons, and it recognized the efforts made by Peru to include them for the first time in public policies and to punish violence against them. However, it regretted that the new national human rights plan did not even include the legal protection of non-heterosexual couples or the gender identities of trans people. It was concerned by the context in which the commitments of the State of Peru would be implemented, as the legislative power was the principal opponent to gender equality, sexual and reproductive rights, and equality for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons.

606. The National Coordinator for Human Rights stated that the improper and unjust pardon granted to former President Alberto Fujimori was an act that had taken away the right

to justice and hurt the memory and the dignity of the victims. It noted that that action reaffirmed impunity and it reminded, on the one hand, States and the international community of their obligations to ensure compliance with and respect for judicial sentences, and on the other hand, Peru of its obligations and commitments in terms of human rights. In that regard, it encouraged the Human Rights Council to monitor the implementation by Peru of the recommendations received during the universal periodic review.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

607. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 182 recommendations received, 177 had enjoyed the support of Peru, and 5 had been noted.

608. The delegation expressed its gratitude for the constructive approach of the States and the delegations of civil society who had taken into consideration the advances of Peru, as well as the different challenges.

609. Peru recognized the sensitivity of some issues raised by a few non-governmental organizations, and in that regard the delegation pointed out that the country was respectful of its international commitments and of the provisions set forth in its domestic legal and constitutional order.

610. To the delegations of some countries and civil society organizations that had reiterated their concern about the issue of sexual and reproductive rights, the delegation reiterated the commitment of Peru to continue to work in order to advance in that area. The country had accepted about six recommendations relating to sexual and reproductive rights.

611. Peru was aware that the acceptance of the recommendations was an initial step, and the implementation of those would bring new challenges and mean a positive change on the ground. The delegation stated that, as noted before the Human Rights Council in November, Peru recognized as a political and ethical imperative the need to continue to deepen and improve those efforts to overcome the differences and social gaps that still existed and to continue to consolidate democracy and respect for the rights of all its citizens and of all persons under its jurisdiction.

Guatemala

612. The review of Guatemala was held on 8 November 2017 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 Guatemala in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/GTM/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/GTM/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/GTM/3 and Corr.1).

613. At its 38th meeting, on 15 March 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Guatemala (see sect. C below).

614. The outcome of the review of Guatemala comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/37/9), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/37/9/Add.1).

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

615. The delegation of Guatemala, led by the Presidential Commissioner and Coordinator of the Executive Policy on Human Rights, Jorge Luis Borrayo Reyes, reiterated that, out of 205 recommendations received, 150 had been accepted and 55 had been noted, because either their implementation corresponded exclusively to the competencies of the legislative or judicial organs or they were related to subjects that were still being discussed at the national level and for the moment there was no consensus among the relevant actors.

616. With regard to the recommendations contained in paragraphs 112.1–112.5 and 112.24–112.33 concerning the death penalty, the delegation underscored the fact that the Constitutional Court had decided to leave the application of the death penalty for crimes established in the Criminal Code and to abolish the death penalty for crimes established under the law on drug trafficking.

617. On the recommendations contained in paragraphs 112.6 and 112.7 to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure, a consultation process was ongoing within the relevant institutions.

618. On the recommendations contained in paragraphs 112.8–112.10 to ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, the delegation underscored the fact that that was currently being discussed in Congress, with favourable opinions of several institutions.

619. With regard to the recommendations contained in paragraphs 112.14 and 112.15 relating to the creation of a national search commission for missing persons, its approval process continued before Congress, pending final approval.

620. Regarding the recommendation contained in paragraph 112.23 relating to the criminalization of the diffusion of ideas based on superiority and racial hatred, draft law No. 4539, which provided for reforms to the Criminal Code, including an article on the dissemination of and incitement to racial discrimination, was awaiting final approval by Congress.

621. Regarding the recommendation contained in paragraph 112.13 on the nomination of national candidates for elections to United Nations treaty bodies, the delegation underscored the fact that the State of Guatemala had always proposed candidates based on their abilities, recognition and expertise.

622. Regarding the recommendations contained in paragraphs 112.15–112.20 relating to the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex population, the Constitution recognized that all Guatemalans were free and equal in dignity and rights, so that national institutions were obliged to provide appropriate services to everybody.

623. On the recommendations contained in paragraphs 112.50 and 112.51 relating to access to justice for violations against the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex population, the delegation asserted that the State had made important efforts in terms of prevention, investigation and punishment for violations of the human rights of women and transgender people, as well as on access to justice for the victims of those crimes. However, as they corresponded to the specific competencies of the judicial branch and the public ministry, those recommendations had been noted.

624. Regarding the recommendations contained in paragraphs 112.21 and 112.22 on consultation with indigenous peoples, a priority of the President of the Republic was to ensure the activities that had permitted, in October 2017, the presidents of the three branches of the State to launch the process to develop the “operational guide for the implementation of the consultation of indigenous peoples”, which had been approved in July 2017.

625. On the recommendation contained in paragraph 112.35 relating to human rights defenders, Guatemala reiterated what it had indicated on 14 November 2017, that that did not correspond to the objectivity and impartiality with which the justice system operated.

626. On the recommendations contained in paragraphs 112.36 and 112.38 on the justice system, Guatemala was in the process of reforming the entire justice system.

627. Regarding the recommendation contained in paragraph 112.37 relating to a mechanism for the selection of judges, the delegation asserted that Decree No. 19-2009 on the law on nomination commissions regulated and established objective and concrete mechanisms and procedures regarding the selection of the lists of candidates for positions that exercised public functions.

628. On the recommendations contained in paragraphs 112.39 and 112.40 relating to the International Commission against Impunity in Guatemala, the delegation highlighted the fact that, in accordance with the agreement establishing the Commission, it was not the responsibility of the State to decentralize it. In April 2016, the President had renewed the mandate of the Commission for two more years, with its primary objective to continue the investigation of parallel bodies and clandestine security apparatuses, within the framework of the process of consolidating peace, justice, democracy and strengthening the rule of law.

629. Reiterating the respect and independence of the division of powers, Guatemala had noted the recommendation contained in paragraph 112.41 on accelerating the progress of trials of the perpetrators of acts of genocide and crimes against humanity.

630. Guatemala had taken note of the recommendation contained in paragraph 112.42 relating to poverty, on the grounds that considering the possibility of establishing a basic income to reduce the levels of poverty and inequality did not reflect the actions that the Government was already taking through different public policies.

631. The recommendations contained in paragraphs 112.43–112.46 relating to the issue of reproductive health had been noted because the law against sexual violence, exploitation and trafficking in persons indicated that sexual assault or rape was always an offence when the victim was under 14 years of age or had a cognitive disability, even when there was no physical or psychological violence.

632. With regard to the issue of abortion addressed in the recommendations contained in paragraphs 112.47, 112.52 and 112.55, the Constitution protected life from conception, and the Guatemalan Penal Code recognized “therapeutic abortion” as a non-punishable offence only when it was proven that the aim was to avoid danger to the mother.

633. Regarding the recommendations contained in paragraphs 112.48 and 112.49 relating to public office, draft law No. 5389 had been submitted to Congress for approval, which proposed reforms to the law on elections and political parties and which sought to include indigenous and non-indigenous women, and indigenous and non-indigenous men in an equal manner.

634. With regard to the recommendation contained in paragraph 112.54 on persons with disabilities, the final adoption of draft law No. 5125, which provided the approval of the law on persons with disabilities, was pending final adoption in Congress.

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

635. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Guatemala, 10 delegations made statements.

636. UNFPA expressed concern about remaining challenges. It welcomed its alliance with public institutions and civil society actors to advance sexual and reproductive rights. It underscored, inter alia, the following priorities: the follow-up to public policies, programmes and legislative agenda to advance the agenda of the International Conference on Population and Development; and the strengthening of the Ombudsman’s Office regarding knowledge on sexual and reproductive rights.

637. Algeria congratulated Guatemala on its efforts to promote and protect human rights, especially regarding the fight against racial discrimination and trafficking in persons, the improvement of prison conditions, the protection of children, and the fight against sexual violence and the care of victims. Algeria welcomed the engagement and cooperation of Guatemala and highlighted the fact that both of its recommendations had been supported, one on the treatment of structural causes of poverty in vulnerable communities and the other on the protection of persons in places of detention.

638. Armenia noted with appreciation that Guatemala had accepted both of its recommendations, namely to continue efforts to ensure the promotion of the rights of indigenous peoples and to take further measures to ensure children's access to education, particularly those with disabilities living in remote communities.

639. Brazil noted that Guatemala had not been able to accept the recommendations made by Brazil in the second cycle of the universal periodic review and it invited the State to consider complementary measures to combat racial discrimination and sexual violence. Furthermore, Brazil appreciated the efforts of the State to continue to advance the fulfilment of human rights through the implementation of the universal periodic review recommendations.

640. Chile welcomed the fact that Guatemala had accepted 150 recommendations, two of which had been made by Chile and were relating to the necessity to lift restrictions on the freedom of expression and adopt legal measures for the protection and security of journalists; and to ensure that human rights defenders could carry out their legitimate activities without fear or impediment. Chile encouraged Guatemala to keep working to implement its human rights commitments, including measures to guarantee the protection of the lives, and the physical and psychological integrity of, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons.

641. Egypt welcomed the efforts made by Guatemala in its acceptance of most of the recommendations, which reflected a spirit of cooperation with the Human Rights Council and the mechanism, and reflected the efforts of the Government to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms and the will to persevere in cooperation with the treaty bodies.

642. Haiti thanked the delegation of Guatemala for having taken into account three out of its four recommendations made during the universal periodic review process. Haiti recognized that the Government of Guatemala was leading public policy actions with the aim of reducing the poverty level and inequalities in the country. It regretted that Guatemala had noted the recommendation contained in paragraph 112.42 relating to the universal minimum wage.

643. Honduras congratulated Guatemala on its commitment to include a gender approach in its public policy for coexistence and the elimination of racism and racial discrimination and its implementation plan, and on the allocation of human and financial resources for the national strategy to prevent chronic malnutrition 2016–2010. Honduras expressed hope that Guatemala would adopt the additional measures necessary to guarantee universal access to sexual and reproductive health, especially in rural areas.

644. The Philippines congratulated Guatemala on having supported most of the recommendations made during the interactive dialogue, including the two recommendations made by the Philippines, and it acknowledged the State's adoption of several instruments to address the scourge of trafficking in persons. The Philippines appreciated the commitment of Guatemala to continue to work on the promotion and protection of the human rights of its people, in particular the rights of women and children.

645. Sierra Leone noted the importance that Guatemala placed on bilateral and multilateral cooperation, as well as the strategies it had established to better promote and protect human rights. In that regard, it noted especially the efforts to combat teenage pregnancy through the prevention with education programme 2016–2020, and the prevention and rehabilitation programmes for victims of sexual violence. Sierra Leone encouraged Guatemala to consider ratifying the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance in the near future.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

646. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Guatemala, 11 other stakeholders made statements.

647. The Procuraduría de los Derechos Humanos (human rights procurator) of Guatemala, the national human rights institution, underscored the fact that, when corruption was widespread, people had no access to justice and were prevented from enjoying their human

rights. The work of the International Commission against Impunity in Guatemala and the Attorney General had yielded important results that showed that corruption in Guatemala was grave, systematic and generalized, and had permeated State institutions. Therefore, it was crucial that all branches supported the efforts of the International Commission and the Attorney General, beyond discourse and being consistent with it. It asserted that Guatemala should harmonize its legislation with international standards and it urged the State to carry out a consultation process on a policy for human rights defenders and journalists and adopt a protection mechanism for journalists. It stated that, because of its commitment to fight against corruption and impunity, there had been several attempts to limit the independence of the institution, even by Congress.

648. Plan International recommended that Guatemala, *inter alia*: adopt a specific legislative framework in favour of youth; monitor and implement the national youth policy 2012–2020 with the corresponding budget allocation; implement the universal periodic review recommendations regarding adolescent pregnancies, violence, and sexual and reproductive exploitation; adopt new legislation that eliminated legal barriers and access by youth to HIV tests and modern contraceptive methods; stop the criminalization of defenders of sexual and reproductive rights; avoid the adoption of draft law No. 5272, which promoted discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons; implement a monitoring and evaluation system for the recommendations that included the participation of civil society.

649. The World Organization against Torture stated that in 2017 there had been 483 attacks against human rights defenders, out of which 211 had been against women. It expressed concern about the climate of criminalization. Impunity had risen to 97 per cent in crimes against life, and that hindered the creation of effective protection mechanisms for defenders. It expressed particular concern about the climate of aggression, stigmatization and criminalization promoted by the President of Guatemala, deputies, and some businesses and private agents. It underscored the attempts to impeach the ombudsman in the framework of a campaign against institutions that defended human rights. It noted that the public policy on the protection of human rights defenders had not been implemented.

650. The International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development welcomed the acceptance of the recommendations contained in paragraphs 11.11 and 11.13 on the rights of indigenous peoples. It expressed concern about the situation of children and women in conditions of vulnerability, underscoring the fact that children living in public institutions were often victims of violence and needed more State protection. It was urgent that awareness be raised about the situation of violence against women and to punish those responsible. It recommended that Guatemala, *inter alia*: continue inclusive quality education, especially for indigenous children; take measures to eliminate discrimination against indigenous communities regarding health and housing; and promote gender equality in the public sector and in the labour market, and achieve equal remuneration.

651. Réseau international des droits humains noted that Guatemala had committed in its universal periodic review in 2012 to creating a programme for the protection of journalists, and that promise had been reiterated through the acceptance of the recommendations on the subject in the present universal periodic review. It highlighted the situation of impunity with regard to the killings of journalists, many of which had been allegedly related to the action of organized crime groups in complicity with local authorities. It called upon Guatemala to implement the recommendations accepted, particularly those relating to the creation of a protection programme for journalists. It invited Guatemala to establish a dialogue to elaborate that programme, which should include special protection measures for journalists working in urban areas.

652. Action Canada for Population and Development asserted that, in order to implement the recommendations on gender, sexuality and violence against women, a comprehensive multisectoral approach was needed by all State institutions. In that sense, the explanation given by Guatemala regarding the recommendations noted relating to the distribution of the competencies among the different State branches made impossible the effective realization of relevant rights. It recalled that the recommendations corresponding to the legislative branch, the judiciary or the Attorney General were also part of the obligations of the Guatemalan State. Some of those recommendations were related to the punishment of hate crimes, access to justice and violence against women. It urged Guatemala to consider the

recommendations noted and take actions to implement them, in accordance with its international obligations and its commitment to the universal periodic review.

653. Advocates for Human Rights expressed concern that domestic violence, femicide, and sexual and physical assault against women and other forms of violence against women were serious problems. Guatemalan clients who had fled human rights abuses had reported that the police often failed to respond to calls for help relating to domestic violence. It also noted widespread impunity due to the failure to adequately investigate and prosecute those crimes. Despite steps towards combating violence against women, relevant laws and mechanisms were poorly implemented. It encouraged Guatemala to implement the universal periodic review recommendations on violence against women, collaborating with civil society, strengthening legislation and providing funding and training to implement the law.

654. Amnesty International urged the Government to implement the recommendations relating to protection measures for human rights defenders and to adopt a public policy for their protection. It expressed deep concern about intimidation and attacks against judges and prosecutors, including the head of the International Commission against Impunity in Guatemala, underscoring the risk it entailed for the independence of the judiciary. It regretted the State's rejection of six recommendations on enforced disappearance and it urged the Government to create a national commission on the search for victims of enforced disappearance. It also urged Guatemala to adopt and implement policies to prevent all forms of violence against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons.

655. Peace Brigades International Switzerland underscored the deterioration of security and the closure of space for communities, organizations and indigenous human rights defenders. With regard to the right to prior and informed consent, after having carried out 80 community good-faith consultations whose results had not been taken into account, the Government had elaborated guidelines for consultations with indigenous peoples that would soon be adopted by Congress, without the due participation of indigenous peoples. Peace Brigades International Switzerland supported the recommendations on the need for a holistic protection policy that included preventive elements, root causes and collective measures. It underscored the importance of the recommendations to guarantee the full, prior and meaningful participation of indigenous peoples in all matters that affected their territory, life and rights, and to put an end to the abuse of the penal system against them and the impunity for perpetrators of attacks against them.

656. The Swiss Catholic Lenten Fund stated that in August 2017 the President had initiated a national and international campaign against the work to fight corruption and impunity carried out by the International Commission against Impunity in Guatemala and the Attorney General. It warned about Congress having discussed legal initiatives that would limit the rights of association, peaceful demonstration and freedom of expression of civil society. It underscored the need for truth and justice in relation to the grave crimes committed in the past, including, among others, the case known as "CREONPAZ", which was the largest mass grave exhumed in Latin America, and the reinitiation, for the third time, of the genocide trial against Efraín Ríos Montt and José Rodríguez Sánchez. It recalled the commitment of Guatemala to provide justice and reparation in the case of the 41 girls who had died in a State foster home.

657. The International Humanist and Ethical Union underscored the situation of violence against women, gender-based violence, impunity and trafficking in persons, and the need for the better implementation of the related recommendations. It gave as an example the 41 girls who had burned alive in a State foster home due to gross negligence by authorities. It called upon authorities to urgently strengthen protection measures for human rights defenders and journalists, as they continued to face threats, attacks, stigmatization and criminalization. It noted the reluctant stance of Guatemala regarding penalizing hate crimes based on sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, and called for equal treatment regardless of gender, religion or sexual orientation.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

658. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 205 recommendations received, 150 had enjoyed the support of Guatemala, and 55 had been noted.

659. The delegation highlighted the efforts that Guatemala had made to implement the universal periodic review recommendations. The State wanted to consolidate its rule of law, making clear to the international community that, in Guatemala, no one was above the law. Guatemala struggled to move forward, as it still had a fragile social fabric since the armed conflict, and its effects were not over.

660. The delegation underscored the fact that Guatemala strived to comply with the requirements of the international community. Guatemala had asked donor countries to examine the fate of their resources, as many of them might not have been used correctly. Guatemala had accepted 150 recommendations willingly. The delegation noted that the implementation process was not possible in one year, as progress took longer. The public policy for the protection of human rights defenders was being elaborated and should be agreed upon at the national level, and the State announced consultations on that subject. Guatemala needed all the moral support from States to advance in all of those areas.

Switzerland

661. The review of Switzerland was held on 9 November 2017 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 Switzerland in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/CHE/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/CHE/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/CHE/3).

662. At its 39th meeting, on 15 March 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Switzerland (see sect. C below).

663. The outcome of the review of Switzerland comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/37/12), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/37/12/Add.1).

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

664. The Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Switzerland to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Valentin Zellweger, presented the position of Switzerland on the recommendations received during its third universal periodic review. The delegation indicated that they were particularly satisfied with the fact that the Confederation and the cantons had closely cooperated in the review process. The involvement of the cantons was particularly important in view of their crucial role in the implementation of human rights at the domestic level. The delegation also expressed its gratitude for the contributions of civil society and in particular the non-governmental organization platform.

665. Switzerland had deferred its position on 63 of the 251 recommendations received during the review. With regard to those recommendations, it had accepted 40 and noted 23. The decision to accept or note recommendations had been taken after an in-depth analysis to determine whether Switzerland was in a position to implement them by the next universal

periodic review or it had already taken measures to address them. The domestic consultation process put in place by the Confederation, acting through the Federal Department for Foreign Affairs and the Federal Department for Justice and Police, allowed the views of the cantons to be taken into account in their areas of competence, as well as those of other stakeholders such as non-governmental organizations. The conference of cantonal governments, representing the 26 cantons, had carried out a consultation process with all the cantonal governments and the inter-cantonal forums concerned.

666. The delegation set out in detail the country's position regarding the 63 recommendations that had been left pending. It recalled the established Swiss practice to make commitments at the international level only if such commitments could be honoured. Therefore, Switzerland had not accepted recommendations where there was, at present, clearly no political will for the required measures to be taken. At the same time, Switzerland continued, in an ambitious and decided manner, to improve the human rights situation in the country, which it considered to be good.

667. Concerning the recommendations on the compatibility of popular initiatives with the country's obligations under international human rights law, the delegation indicated that three recommendations requesting Switzerland to ensure an effective and independent mechanism in that regard had been noted. The delegation recalled that popular initiatives must already respect peremptory norms of international law. Moreover, in 2016, Parliament had rejected a draft bill to review the law, with a view to reducing potential conflicts between popular initiatives and international law. The right of citizens to modify the Constitution through initiatives was a fundamental element of Swiss democracy. Switzerland ensured that binding international law was respected during the subsequent process of legislation. The country would thus continue to honour its human rights obligations, addressing potential conflicts between its Constitution and human rights on a case-by-case basis.

668. Recommendations to adopt an action plan on the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons had been noted, as Switzerland considered that it was more effective to support organizations and concrete projects, particularly at the local level. Switzerland continued to protect the human rights of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex community, and training in their human rights was part of the training provided to police and judicial authorities.

669. Switzerland had not accepted several recommendations requesting it to continue efforts to put in place a binding mechanism against abuses committed by corporations with their headquarters in the country. The delegation nonetheless highlighted the importance of that issue and recalled the recent adoption of a national action plan on the implementation of the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. However, the establishment of a legally binding global mechanism was considered too restrictive for the time being.

670. Switzerland had not accepted the recommendations to provide effective legal protection and fair compensation in cases of the violation of rights linked to acts of racial discrimination, and to introduce specific legislation prohibiting discrimination based on gender identity or intersex status. Those recommendations had been noted for several reasons. Switzerland considered that article 261bis of the Criminal Code provided comprehensive legal protection against discrimination. Further, requests to adopt a general law against discrimination were not new and Switzerland had adopted numerous measures in that regard. Moreover, a thorough analysis had established that each ground for discrimination had particular characteristics that required specific responses. The delegation provided information regarding relevant reports and concerning the law on registered partnerships, which offered same-sex couples most of the rights enjoyed by married couples, as well as the law on eliminating disparities affecting persons with disabilities.

671. Concerning the recommendations accepted, the delegation reaffirmed the country's commitment to combat discrimination between men and women. Measures to combat domestic violence continued to be adopted, including through the implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention). Switzerland had also funded specific programmes to promote gender equality and had taken measures to eliminate discrimination based on gender in the social insurance system. Efforts to promote a balanced representation between

men and women in leadership positions continued and the delegation provided examples of measures adopted in that regard.

672. The delegation stated that, in line with the country's humanitarian tradition and conscious that nearly a quarter of its population was of foreign origin, Switzerland made efforts to implement a welcoming immigration policy and to offer good conditions to migrants, as well as a functioning and effective asylum system that provided refugees with the necessary protection.

673. The revised asylum act was aimed at accelerating individual asylum procedures, while ensuring their conformity with the rule of law. As that law was in accordance with the recommendations of the Swiss Refugee Council with regard to unaccompanied minors, Switzerland had accepted recommendations regarding the needs of unaccompanied minors.

674. A national human rights institution in accordance with the Paris Principles did not yet exist in Switzerland. However, steps to create such an institution had been taken and consultations were being carried out on a draft law. However, the final decision rested with the Federal Council and Parliament and was in no way prejudged by the acceptance of the recommendations on that issue.

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

675. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Switzerland, 13 delegations made statements.

676. Viet Nam expressed appreciation for the contribution of Switzerland to international cooperation in the area of human rights. It congratulated the State on having organized human rights dialogues with other countries on the basis of mutual respect, and it commended Switzerland for the fruitful results of the dialogues with Viet Nam in particular. It noted with satisfaction the high number of recommendations accepted by Switzerland.

677. Afghanistan commended Switzerland for its constructive engagement with the universal periodic review. It expressed appreciation for the State's support for the recommendations made by Afghanistan to ensure the full application of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and to ensure minimum reception standards in federal and cantonal reception centres across the country.

678. Albania appreciated the work of the Government on its policy of integration and coexistence. It noted with satisfaction that Switzerland had accepted the majority of the recommendations received during its review, including the recommendation to conduct broad and systematic awareness-raising activities to combat stigmatization, clichés, stereotypes and prejudices faced by non-Swiss nationals.

679. Armenia welcomed the acceptance by Switzerland of most of the recommendations received during the review and its continued commitment to the protection and promotion of human rights internationally.

680. Bahrain commended Switzerland for the large number of recommendations accepted and especially the one to evaluate the success of the cantonal integration programmes for 2014–2017. Switzerland should adopt new laws to ensure that migrants fully enjoyed social and political rights.

681. Egypt encouraged Switzerland to consider positively the five recommendations it had made during the review, including those to protect religious minorities, to take measures to ensure gender equality and to include in legislation the prohibition of all forms of torture, as well as recommendations relating to business and human rights.

682. Haiti commended Switzerland for having accepted the recommendation to increase its development assistance in order to reach 0.7 per cent of gross national product. It regretted that the recommendation to establish a regulatory framework to assess the environmental impact of companies with their headquarters in Switzerland had only been noted.

683. Honduras welcomed the commitment of Switzerland to adopt a new national action plan on trafficking in persons with a gender perspective, as well as a federal gender equality

strategy. It encouraged Switzerland to consider a federal policy and action plan to combat discrimination and violence against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons and to include them in national suicide surveys.

684. The Islamic Republic of Iran welcomed the acceptance by Switzerland of one of the three recommendations it had made, and it hoped to see those recommendations fully implemented. It expressed concern about racist stereotypes made by some political parties and media outlets, and about reports that the Swiss resource centre for human rights would not have an explicit human rights protection mandate.

685. Kenya thanked Switzerland for its constructive engagement during the universal periodic review and it hoped that, among the recommendations it would consider implementing, it would include the recommendation to protect and support the family as the natural and fundamental group unit of society.

686. The Lao People's Democratic Republic commended Switzerland for having supported 160 recommendations during the review. It praised Switzerland for having promoted freedom of expression, having combated domestic violence and having strengthened the rights of vulnerable groups, particularly the rights of the child by having acceded to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure.

687. Gabon congratulated Switzerland on its commitment to implement the recommendations it had accepted during the review. It highlighted the action taken by Switzerland to improve the human rights situation in the country, noting in particular measures to combat trafficking in persons, such as the adoption of a new action plan on the issue. It encouraged Switzerland to continue its efforts to implement the recommendations it had received during its universal periodic review.

688. Madagascar commended Switzerland for the efforts it had made to promote and protect human rights, including through the adoption of the new asylum act and the establishment of a national action plan on trafficking in persons. It noted that the Swiss Citizenship Act, which had come into force in January 2018, still masked discrimination against non-Europeans who had lived and worked for many years in Switzerland within the framework of international relations.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

689. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Switzerland, 10 other stakeholders made statements.

690. The Centre for Global Nonkilling thanked Switzerland for having accepted the recommendations concerning the prevention of suicide. It highlighted the fact that suicide was the second cause of violent death in the world. It expressed the hope that the State's action plan for the prevention of suicide and the implementation of those recommendations would inspire other countries to take action to reduce the number of suicides.

691. The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues stated that, despite equal pay being a constitutional law requirement, women earned 20 per cent less than men in the private sector and 17 per cent less in the public sector. Higher salaries and higher positions systematically favoured men, even in higher education, where female students were the majority. At universities such as one in Geneva, 85 per cent of professors were men and only 15 per cent were women. The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues recommended strengthening the Gender Equality Act and aligning it with the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and taking action to apply without delay the labour law in the Swiss Constitution, prohibiting gender-based discrimination.

692. The International Lesbian and Gay Association stated that Switzerland had received 12 recommendations relating to sexual orientation and gender identity, including 4 trans-specific recommendations. It indicated, however, that Switzerland had noted eight of those recommendations. It regretted the statement of Switzerland during the review that the situation in the country did not endanger the lives of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex individuals, noting that many had lost trans persons to suicide. It welcomed the fact

that Switzerland had expressed its willingness to implement four recommendations relating to sexual orientation and gender identity.

693. The Minnesota Citizens Concerned for Life Education Fund stated that the number of assisted suicides in Switzerland had increased every year since 2008. Many persons who were not terminally ill received assisted suicide and the percentage of non-terminal suicides was growing. Assisted suicide could threaten the right to health by preventing persons from receiving care to which they were entitled, including mental health care and palliative care. It also stated that research had shown that patients generally opted for assisted suicide because of concerns about dependency and reduced autonomy.

694. Action Canada for Population and Development welcomed the acceptance of the recommendations addressing discrimination, including those based on discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. However, it was concerned that Switzerland had not supported numerous recommendations that would have led to comprehensive legislative changes or new legislation to address discrimination. While congratulating the Government on having accepted the recommendations to address gender inequality, it was deeply concerned that Switzerland had not supported the recommendation to adopt legislation allowing for paternity leave. Switzerland was the only country in Europe without statutory paternity or parental leave.

695. Amnesty International noted that Switzerland had accepted several non-binding recommendations to introduce mechanisms to ensure the compatibility of popular initiatives with the State's obligations under international law, but it regretted that Switzerland had not supported any binding commitment in that regard. It also regretted that Switzerland had refused to recognize the justiciability of economic, social and cultural rights, to ratify the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and to include in its criminal law a provision that explicitly prohibited torture. As in the previous review, Switzerland had received numerous recommendations on the issue of discrimination, including recommendations to introduce comprehensive legislation on discrimination, which had been systematically rejected.

696. The Ma'arjij Foundation for Peace and Development congratulated Switzerland on having integrated human rights into the core of its political system. It noted the State's action relating to migration and welcoming refugees, and it noted that integration was a priority for the country. It took note of the launching of the cantonal integration programmes in 2014, which was an important step for the integration of foreign nationals.

697. Africa culture internationale congratulated Switzerland on its substantive progress in maintaining stability in the country through the development of the domestic legal infrastructure. It noted a number of positive reforms in several areas, including engagement with United Nations human rights mechanisms and the ratification of international human rights instruments. It encouraged the Government to give priority to development, gender equality, the protection of migrants, and to combating racism and restrictions on movements of asylum seekers.

698. The World Barua Organization welcomed the action of Switzerland against cultural relativism and the State's advocacy for the universal, interdependent and indivisible character of human rights. It highlighted the State's commitment to strengthen human rights institutions at the global, regional and national levels, particularly by strengthening the Human Rights Council. It also acknowledged the State's support for the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.

699. NGO Coordination post Beijing Switzerland noted that the universal periodic review had depicted the gaps in human rights protection in the Swiss system relatively well. It was pleased to note that the long-standing demand for the coordinated implementation of universal periodic review recommendations had been accepted, as well as recommendations to establish a national human rights institution. Nonetheless, only the non-binding recommendations concerning the introduction of mechanisms to ensure the compatibility of popular initiatives with international human rights conventions had been accepted, while the implementation of an independent mechanism had been rejected. The large number of recommendations concerning discrimination was indicative of remaining gaps. All of the recommendations requiring legal changes had been rejected.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

700. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 251 recommendations received, 160 had enjoyed the support of Switzerland, and 91 had been noted.

701. The delegation noted that the third universal periodic review had been an opportunity to strengthen the debate on human rights at all political levels. The process had been inclusive, which had allowed in-depth discussions on the level of protection and the implementation of human rights in the country. Switzerland was conscious of the fact that the adoption of the report of the Working Group was not the end of the process, which would continue with the implementation of the recommendations accepted.

Republic of Korea

702. The review of the Republic of Korea was held on 9 November 2017 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 Republic of Korea in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/1 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/KOR/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/1 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/KOR/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/1 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/KOR/3).

703. At its 39th meeting, on 15 March 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the Republic of Korea (see sect. C below).

704. The outcome of the review of the Republic of Korea comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/37/11), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/37/11/Add.1).

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

705. The delegation, led by the Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Choi Kyong-Lim, noted with appreciation the valuable contributions of the States Members of the United Nations, including the members of the troika, and of other stakeholders during the universal periodic review of the Republic of Korea, which had been held in November 2017. The delegation reiterated the Government's support for that mechanism and noted that it had provided the international community with an important opportunity to look into the human rights situation of each member State with the aim of addressing the identified challenges and making improvements in the areas of concern. The mechanism had offered an opportunity for the Republic of Korea to renew its strong commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights.

706. During the review, the Government had supported 85 recommendations and noted 3 recommendations out of a total 218 recommendations made by 95 member States. After the review, the Government had held a public hearing with the participation of civil society representatives to exchange opinions on the remaining 130 recommendations. Subsequently, the Government had consulted with the relevant ministries. After thorough and careful deliberation, the Government had decided to support an additional 36 recommendations and to note 94 recommendations. The Government had submitted its final position on those 130 remaining recommendations in written form in February for wider distribution.

707. The delegation provided the Human Rights Council with further clarifications concerning to its position on several recommendations. The Government had supported a large number of recommendations falling into two groups: equality and non-discrimination; and cooperation with international human rights norms and mechanisms. In particular, the Government was planning to accede to the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, after in-depth discussions and legislative efforts had been made to incorporate the Convention into domestic legislation. The Government had been making efforts to prohibit discrimination against and protect the rights of non-citizens.

708. Some recommendations had not enjoyed the support of the Government because they required further examination or because of some existing challenges that the country had been facing. In addition to a number of legislative measures taken to prohibit discrimination, the Government would seek further examination and social consensus on the enactment of a comprehensive anti-discrimination law. Regarding the recommendations on conscientious objection to military service and the right to an alternative service, the delegation highlighted the need for due consideration to the unique security circumstances of the Korean Peninsula and the importance of ensuring equality in the obligation of mandatory military service. The Government would conform to the forthcoming decision of the Constitutional Court relating to a case of penalizing conscientious objection to military service.

709. The issue of the abolition of the death penalty had also required a careful approach as it concerned the principles of criminal law. The Government would decide on the issue of the abolition of the death penalty after having carefully studied the public opinion and legal aspects of the death penalty in relation to the criminal policy.

710. The delegation noted with appreciation other valuable recommendations to promote the participation of women in the political area, to prevent sexual harassment, to improve social conditions for migrant workers and their children, and to consider a human rights-based approach in development projects. The Government would continue to seek ways to strengthen and improve the relevant domestic laws, institutions and procedures in those areas.

711. Following the economic growth and the achievements in democratic governance that had taken place in a relatively short period, the Republic of Korea had made efforts to contribute to the protection and promotion of human rights at the national level and at the international level. The new administration of the Republic of Korea had also placed high importance on the protection of human rights. The so-called “candlelight revolution” of 2017 had led to a new era of democracy in the State. Having in mind all of those achievements, the delegation expressed the willingness of the Government to share its experience with other member States.

712. The Government had pledged to ensure human rights-based policies. The delegation informed the Human Rights Council about the Government’s plan to enhance the status of the National Human Rights Commission by further strengthening its independence and encouraging ministries to implement the recommendations from the Commission.

713. The Government had been developing the third national action plan for the promotion and protection of human rights through extensive consultations with civil society.

714. The delegation expressed its belief that the recommendations received during its third review would assist in ensuring respect for fundamental rights and human dignity. The Government would take into account the concerns and expectations expressed by member States regarding the human rights situation in the Republic of Korea.

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

715. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Republic of Korea, 12 delegations made statements.

716. Egypt had made five recommendations to combat hate speech, to protect foreigners from discrimination, to develop a plan to implement the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. It hoped that the Republic of Korea would take a positive position on those recommendations and would implement them.

717. Honduras noted with satisfaction that the Government had supported recommendations made by Honduras, particularly those to criminalize marital rape and to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. It expressed hope that the Republic of Korea would reconsider its position on recommendations concerning the abolition of the death penalty and the adoption of comprehensive anti-discrimination legislation, including on the grounds of race, sexual orientation and gender identity.

718. The Islamic Republic of Iran was concerned about several human rights issues in the country. It encouraged the Government to carry out a constructive and cooperative engagement with the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. It noted that two out of the three recommendations made by the Islamic Republic of Iran had been supported by the Republic of Korea, and it hoped that they would be implemented.

719. Iraq thanked the Republic of Korea for its participation in the review process and the information provided on the human rights situation in the country. It noted with appreciation that the Government had supported the majority of the recommendations from the universal periodic review, including three recommendations made by Iraq.

720. The Lao People's Democratic Republic commended the Government for its active participation in the work of the Human Rights Council, including the universal periodic review process, and for its engagement with the treaty bodies. It welcomed the State's progress in promoting the rights of vulnerable groups, including women and children, and strengthening the rights to health, education and freedom of expression.

721. The Philippines noted the commitment of the Government to take into account the concerns and expectations of member States regarding the human rights situation, and to consider the ratification of the international treaties to which it had not yet acceded.

722. The Republic of Moldova noted the efforts of the Government to protect and promote human rights at the national and international levels. The Government had supported two recommendations made by the Republic of Moldova to bring the National Human Rights Commission into line with the Paris Principles and to strengthen the Commission's mandate to prevent torture.

723. The Russian Federation expressed its hope that the Republic of Korea would report on the elimination of hate speech and intolerance on the grounds of race and ethnicity in the media and on the Internet in its next periodic review. It expected that the Government would establish an effective mechanism for the identification of victims of trafficking in persons.

724. Sierra Leone commended the Government for its efforts to increase official development assistance and for having established a new immigration policy aimed at protecting the rights and social integration of foreigners. The Government had supported 121 recommendations, including those made by Sierra Leone to address hate speech, to prevent domestic and gender-based violence, and to ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. Sierra Leone encouraged the Republic of Korea to consider ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

725. Sri Lanka noted that the Government had supported 121 recommendations out of 218 recommendations, including 2 made by Sri Lanka to implement a plan on preventing domestic violence and to share its best practices in supporting mine victims. It noted the efforts of the Government to incorporate the recommendations from the universal periodic review into its policies and the proactive role of the Republic of Korea in promoting democratic values and protecting human rights globally.

726. The Sudan commended the Republic of Korea for having acceded to many international human rights instruments, having accepted the right to individual complaints under four treaties and having extended a standing invitation to special procedure mandate holders of the Human Rights Council. The Government had accepted the majority of the recommendations, including the two recommendations made by the Sudan.

727. Albania noted the Government's intention to strengthen its national mechanism on reporting and follow-up to the recommendations from the international human rights bodies,

including the universal periodic review, as well as the role of an advisory group on human rights policies. It noted with satisfaction that the Government had supported the majority of the recommendations made during the review. Albania expected that the Government would carefully consider the recommendations made by Albania relating to article 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the adoption of a comprehensive anti-discrimination law.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

728. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Republic of Korea, 10 other stakeholders made statements.

729. The National Human Rights Commission of the Republic of Korea expressed its belief that the universal periodic review process had provided an opportunity to improve the human rights situation further. The Commission welcomed the fact that the Government had supported 121 recommendations out of 218 recommendations received during the review. However, it was concerned that the remaining recommendations had been noted. The Government should actively pursue the recommendations to ratify the international human rights treaties that had not yet been ratified, to adopt a comprehensive anti-discrimination law and measures to address hate speech, and to decriminalize conscientious objection to military service.

730. The International Fellowship of Reconciliation noted with regret that the Government had felt unable to support the recommendations contained in paragraphs 132.94–132.105, concerning conscientious objection to military service. However, it noted with appreciation the more positive tone of the Government's response than that of similar recommendations in the previous cycle, and the willingness of the Government to conform to the forthcoming decision of the Constitutional Court on that subject. Public opinion polls had demonstrated a more supportive position towards conscientious objection, and there was a growing trend in the unwillingness of the courts to imprison conscientious objectors. The International Fellowship of Reconciliation expressed hope that the Government would accept its obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights to recognize the right of conscientious objection to military service by the time of the midterm review.

731. The Center for Global Nonkilling regretted that the Government had noted the recommendations to provide conscientious objectors to military service with alternative civilian services. It considered that the executive and legislative branches did not need to wait for a constitutional ruling to grant them a status and an alternative service, and that the freedom of conscience should never be impeded by strategic or geopolitical considerations. The rights to life and equality before the law should start with inclusive birth registration, which could be guaranteed only by the country of birth. Therefore, it hoped that the Government would change its policy in that regard.

732. The International Lesbian and Gay Association noted with concern that the Government had not supported any of the 22 recommendations concerning sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression and sex characteristics. Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons faced marginalization and discrimination. The International Lesbian and Gay Association called upon the Government to commit to incremental progress in the protection of the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons and it expressed its readiness to work with the Government in that area.

733. The Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development stated that the Government had noted the recommendations to abolish the death penalty and the law on national security, to adopt a comprehensive anti-discrimination law, to grant civilian alternative service to conscientious objectors, and to improve the human rights of migrant workers and their families, the children of refugees and asylum seekers. It welcomed the Government's support of the recommendations on freedom of expression, assembly and peaceful association, and the Government's commitment to protect human rights defenders and investigate the excessive use of force against them and against trade union representatives. The Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development looked forward to the adoption of a comprehensive strategy to prevent gender-based violence.

734. Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, in a joint statement with the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development, noted with regret that the Government had merely taken note of the recommendations concerning the establishment of a universal birth registration system for all children. It noted with concern that the children of migrant parents were deprived of their right to birth registration. It welcomed the Government's acceptance of the recommendation contained in paragraph 130.75, as corporal punishment was still common in educational settings and in the home. It called upon the Government to establish a universal birth registration system to ensure that all children had access to registration immediately after their birth, regardless of the status of their parents, and to effectively implement the recommendation contained in paragraph 130.75 to prohibit, by law and in practice, the corporal punishment of children in all settings.

735. Amnesty International welcomed the Government's acceptance of the recommendations to improve policing practices to better guarantee the right to freedom of peaceful assembly. It encouraged the national police agency to implement reforms in line with international standards. The Government had not supported the recommendations to provide conscientious objectors with alternative civilian service and to ratify the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to commute all death sentences to terms of imprisonment and to accelerate the full abolition of the death penalty. Amnesty International noted with regret that the Government had not supported many recommendations calling for the protection of the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons.

736. Human Rights Watch noted that the outcome of the universal periodic review of the Republic of Korea reflected the recommendations to protect freedom of expression and assembly and the rights of vulnerable workers, women, foreigners, children, older persons and persons with disabilities. It urged the Government to implement the recommendations supported. It noted with concern that the Government had noted 97 recommendations, which included recommendations to abolish the death penalty and the law on national security, to decriminalize defamation and abortion, to protect the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons, and to repeal article 92-6 of the Military Criminal Code. Human Rights Watch was concerned that a plan on gender equality and national standards on sex education did not include sexual minorities or instruction on methods of contraception.

737. CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizens Participation noted with regret that the Government had not supported several recommendations to promote and protect the rights essential to civic space, particularly those to amend the law on national security to ensure it would not be used arbitrarily to harass and to restrict freedom of expression. The authorities had applied restrictive legislation, including the law on national security, to silence dissenting voices and critics of the Government. CIVICUS urged the Government to consult with civil society in the implementation of the recommendations from the universal periodic review in order to ensure that the law on national security was in line with best practices and international standards in the area of freedom of expression.

738. United Nations Watch noted that the Republic of Korea had provided humanitarian protection and support to over 30,000 defectors who had fled the neighbouring country. Some of them had provided testimonies during a side event to the thirty-seventh session of the Human Rights Council, describing various human rights violations they had faced before fleeing to the Republic of Korea.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

739. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 218 recommendations received, 121 had enjoyed the support of the Republic of Korea, and 97 had been noted.

740. The delegation thanked all of the delegations and civil society organizations for their constructive comments and encouragement. The concerns expressed and the advice offered during the interactive dialogue would assist the Government in achieving higher standards in those areas of human rights.

741. The Republic of Korea had gone through a broad consultation process with the relevant stakeholders from the preparation of the national report to the consideration of its position on the recommendations. That process had helped the Government to examine the current human rights situation and to identify main directions for further improvements.

742. In conclusion, the delegation reassured the Human Rights Council that the Republic of Korea would remain firmly supportive of the universal periodic review mechanism and the joint efforts of the international community in the promotion and protection of human rights worldwide. It expressed its gratitude to the members of the troika and OHCHR for their hard work.

Benin

743. The review of Benin was held on 10 November 2017 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 Benin in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/BEN/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/BEN/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/BEN/3).

744. At its 40th meeting, on 19 March 2017, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Benin (see sect. C below).

745. The outcome of the review of Benin comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/37/10), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/37/10/Add.1).

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

746. The delegation, led by the Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Benin to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Eloi Laourou, expressed the commitment of Benin to the promotion and protection of human rights and public freedoms, which had enabled the country to build an environment that promoted peace, dialogue, tolerance, good economic and social governance, respect for the rights of women, children and vulnerable persons, and gender equality.

747. On the occasion of the presentation of the third universal periodic review national report of Benin, 198 recommendations had been made by 82 delegations, of which 7 had been noted and 191 had been accepted.

748. The delegation stressed the fact that, since then, the country had continued its efforts to implement the recommendations accepted and to promote and protect human rights in various fields. As an illustration, the delegation referred to the five actions listed below.

749. First, the Council of Ministers had adopted Decree No. 2018-043 of 15 February 2018 with a view to commuting the death sentence of 14 persons to life imprisonment, thus having become an abolitionist country.

750. Second, Benin had ratified the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

751. Third, the members of the board of directors and the director general of the prison agency, in charge of prison management, had been appointed.

752. Fourth, anti-corruption and accountability initiatives were being firmly pursued – efforts and commitments that had been valued by Transparency International in its Corruption Perceptions Index for 2017, according to which, between 2016 and 2017, Benin had gained 10 points in the ranking for its achievements in that field.

753. Fifth, efforts were continuing towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals by the year 2030, particularly in the areas of improving living and health conditions, sanitation, nutrition, education, environmental protection and access to water and energy, with far-reaching reforms.

754. The delegation requested the support of OHCHR and the State’s technical and financial partners for the implementation of actions and initiatives in the following areas:

- (a) Development of a national action plan on human rights;
- (b) Support for reforms of the prison system through the construction and equipping of new prisons, the acquisition of prison vans for the transportation of detainees, the installation of solar energy and drilling for water supplies;
- (c) Capacity-building through reporting, prevention and the care of victims of trafficking in persons and the protection of children and women;
- (d) Development of a database on human rights;
- (e) Creation of a central registry of civil status;
- (f) Extension of the special programme on “child-friendly” courts;
- (g) Establishment of insurance for the strengthening of human capacities;
- (h) Human rights education and training.

755. The delegation thanked the Human Rights Council for the attention and interest given to the efforts of Benin in the field of human rights and public freedoms. It expressed the State’s interest in benefiting from the experiences and good practices of other members of the Council, as well as observer States.

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

756. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Benin, 13 delegations made statements.

757. Sierra Leone commended Benin for its recent human rights strategies, particularly the adoption in 2017 of the act on the rights of persons with disabilities and measures to promote compulsory education. It welcomed the efforts to tackle child labour through the draft Criminal Code. Sierra Leone applauded the State’s efforts aimed at implementing all of the recommendations accepted.

758. South Africa appreciated the continued work of Benin on human rights for all. It welcomed the adoption of the Children’s Code, of a national child protection policy and of the Information and Communication Code.

759. The Sudan thanked Benin for its commitment to human rights, which the State showed by having responded positively to recommendations. It welcomed in particular the acceptance of the recommendations on birth registration and birth certificates.

760. Togo commended Benin for the ratification of the Convention on Protection of Children and Cooperation in respect of Intercountry Adoption and the adoption of a national policy on child protection. It applauded the acceptance of the majority of the 198 recommendations. Togo invited the international community to provide technical support in relevant areas identified by Benin.

761. Tunisia applauded the acceptance of a large part of the recommendations, which showed the commitment of Benin to human rights. It welcomed the State’s cooperation with the Human Rights Council mechanisms and the strengthening of national laws in line with international commitments. It saluted the creation of an independent national human rights commission.

762. UNFPA commended Benin for its legal and institutional developments, while it noted constraints to implementing the recommendations relating to the lack of resources and illiteracy. It referred to harmful cultural practices hindering the respect for some rights. UNFPA was committed to providing support for the implementation of the recommendations dealing with the fight against discrimination and violence against women, and with sexual and reproductive health and rights.

763. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela appreciated the efforts of Benin to implement the recommendations accepted in the second cycle review. It applauded the legislative developments relating to human rights made through the adoption of laws in the areas of labour and children's rights. It welcomed the State's acceptance of the majority of the recommendations and its commitment to human rights.

764. Algeria welcomed the efforts to strengthen the legal framework on children's rights, communication and information, elections and the judiciary. It noted the ratification of some international instruments and the creation of institutions to promote human rights, including women's rights, and to fight corruption. It applauded the acceptance of the recommendations to combat discrimination against women and to ensure access to water and sanitation.

765. Angola congratulated Benin on its commitment to human rights through cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and the ratification of various international instruments. It praised the State for its acceptance of a recommendation to combat child labour.

766. Burundi congratulated Benin on the creation of an institution to combat corruption, a national human rights institution and a fund to promote youth employment. It praised the State for having adopted the Children's Code, a national child protection policy and measures to protect women's rights. It also congratulated Benin on having adopted policies to promote economic, social and cultural rights, and in particular access to quality education. Burundi applauded the State for its cooperation with international human rights mechanisms.

767. China appreciated the commitment of Benin to human rights and its engagement with the universal periodic review. It welcomed the efforts to promote sustainable socioeconomic development and to improve the living conditions of its people, including measures on food security and access to medical care.

768. The Congo congratulated Benin on having accepted a large number of recommendations, including those relating to fighting against lynching and to improving the living conditions of vulnerable groups. It appreciated the State's cooperation with human rights mechanisms.

769. Cuba highlighted the commitment of Benin to the universal periodic review, which it showed by having accepted the majority of the recommendations, including the recommendations to improve the living conditions of its people and those on human rights training. Their implementation would improve human rights in the country.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

770. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Benin, seven stakeholders made statements.

771. The World Organization against Torture, in a joint statement with the International Catholic Child Bureau and Franciscans International, was concerned about the lack of measures to implement the Children's Code and about juvenile justice conditions. It urged Benin to improve detention conditions of juveniles, promote the use of alternative measures to imprisonment and adopt a law criminalizing torture.

772. The International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development, in a joint statement with Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, the International Catholic Child Bureau and Franciscans International, urged Benin to adopt the implementing rules of the Children's Code and the new Criminal Code, and to continue raising awareness about the matter of "sorcerer's" children. It referred to the unequal access of boys and girls to education. It recommended establishing a national reporting and follow-up mechanism.

773. Action Canada for Population and Development, in a joint statement with the Sexual Rights Initiative, stressed the high levels of violence and discrimination against women and LGBTIQ persons, and it called upon Benin to address protection and redress gaps, and legally recognize organizations working on sexual rights.

774. Franciscans International, in a joint statement with the International Catholic Child Bureau, welcomed the country's engagement in respect of children's rights but regretted that the recommendation aimed at preventing the infanticide of "sorcerer's" children had only been noted. It recommended accelerating the adoption of the draft Criminal Code and implementing the Children's Code.

775. Amnesty International welcomed the establishment of the national human rights commission and the decision to commute the sentence of 14 men on death row in the prison in Akpro-Misséréfé. It was concerned by the decision of Benin to reject the recommendations aimed at combating arbitrary detention, extrajudicial killings, the disproportional use of force, the suspension of the media, and discrimination against women and "sorcerer's" children. It urged Benin to guarantee freedom of expression and to protect journalists and human rights defenders.

776. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme welcomed positive legal and institutional measures to protect children and women, to fight against corruption and to strengthen the judiciary. It was concerned about shrinking space for civil society, threats against the right to strike, prison overcrowding, the systematic use of pretrial detention, the absence of information about socioeconomic rights and crimes against "sorcerer's" children, and it urged Benin to take measures in that regard.

777. The International Catholic Child Bureau, in a joint statement with Franciscans International, the World Organization against Torture, the International Movement of Apostolate in the Independent Social Milieus, the International Confederation of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul and the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, regretted that the reply of Benin regarding the reasons for not having accepted a recommendation on "sorcerer's" children had referred only to the first part of the recommendation. It urged the State to implement the existing regulations protecting children. It also urged Benin to develop an assessment of the recommendations not yet fully implemented, establish an integrated action plan, and put in place an interministerial committee with civil society participation and an accessible database for following up on the recommendations.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

778. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 198 recommendations received, 191 had enjoyed the support of Benin, and 7 had been noted.

779. The delegation thanked the President of the Human Rights Council, the troika, the delegations and the OHCHR team for having organized the universal periodic review dialogue, which had led to multiple exchanges between Governments, international organizations, civil society and other stakeholders to improve the effective protection of human rights and public freedoms. The acceptance of 191 recommendations out of 198 showed the attention that Benin gave to human rights and public freedoms, as well as to economic and social governance.

780. After its universal periodic review in November 2017, Benin had resumed the task of continuing to take steps to promote and protect human rights, with results obtained in relation to certain recommendations. The country would resolutely pursue those efforts and commitments.

781. The delegation stressed the fact that the recommendations that had not been accepted had not been rejected, but rather noted, and emphasized the fact that the Government would work towards carrying out gradual administrative and institutional activities and reforms to implement those measures.

782. Some recommendations, although noted, were problematic given the sociological environment in Benin.

783. In the case of “sorcerer’s” children, the delegation pointed out that those were isolated practices of rural communities and that the State did not support them. Nevertheless, the State did not yet have all the information necessary to better determine what needed to be done to fight against and repress those practices. The delegation reassured the Human Rights Council that children were not abused in Benin, and that they were protected and considered as the “father of man”. The Government would continue to engage in advocacy and prevention activities with civil society, public institutions, religious institutions and local authorities.

784. On the rights to food, education and health, the delegation stated that the Government had embarked on reform programmes under the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development with the support of the international community.

Pakistan

785. The review of Pakistan was held on 13 November 2017 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 Pakistan in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/PAK/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/PAK/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/PAK/3).

786. At its 41st meeting, on 19 March 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Pakistan (see sect. C below).

787. The outcome of the review of Pakistan comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/37/13), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/37/13/Add.1).

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

788. The delegation, led by the Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Farukh Amil, stated that, out of a total of 289 recommendations that Pakistan had received, 168 had enjoyed its support. Most of them were either being implemented or were in the preparation phase of implementation. The 117 recommendations that had been noted had not been rejected as such, but the due process of consultation on them had not yet been completed. Pakistan would continue deliberations on them and might eventually implement quite a few of them. The remaining four recommendations had been rejected for being factually incorrect and politically motivated.

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

789. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Pakistan, 13 delegations made statements.

790. Ghana commended Pakistan for its commitment to human rights, despite constant threats to the country’s national security and social fabric from terrorists and violent extremists. It welcomed the progress made in implementing the recommendations from the second cycle. It urged Pakistan to continue its efforts to address religious intolerance and hate speech.

791. Greece was concerned by the use of the death penalty and the reports of extrajudicial killings and enforced disappearances. It urged Pakistan to reinstate a moratorium on the use of the death penalty and to protect freedom of speech by taking measures against the intimidation of journalists and ensuring that the perpetrators of violence were brought to justice.

792. Honduras hoped that Pakistan would consider acceding to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and examine the possibility of acceding to the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families so as to strengthen the legal order for the protection of human rights.

793. The Islamic Republic of Iran commended Pakistan for the legal and institutional changes made, such as the establishment of the Ministry of Human Rights, and it encouraged Pakistan to promote the economic and social rights of its people and accelerate efforts towards the full operationalization of the national human rights commission.

794. Iraq thanked Pakistan for having provided an update on the human rights situation in the country and having demonstrated the spirit of cooperation and transparency during the third cycle review. It thanked Pakistan for having accepted the two recommendations made by Iraq.

795. The Philippines appreciated the acceptance of its recommendation to strengthen national and provincial commissions on the status of women. It acknowledged the establishment of the Ministry of Human Rights, provincial human rights departments and human rights committees, as well as the launch of a national action plan for human rights.

796. China welcomed the continuous strengthening of the national human rights mechanism by Pakistan. It hoped that Pakistan would continue to reduce poverty, improve social, economic and sustainable development, and help low income families. It supported the State's human rights development path, which fitted its national circumstances.

797. Saudi Arabia stated that it had paid close attention to the positions of Pakistan on the recommendations and it appreciated the acceptance of 168 of them. It welcomed the laudable concerted efforts of Pakistan to promote human rights at all levels and the willingness to continue to cooperate with human rights mechanisms.

798. Sierra Leone noted the efforts of Pakistan to improve access to quality health services and education through the establishment of the National Health Vision. It was disappointed that none of its three recommendations had enjoyed the support of Pakistan. It encouraged the State to consider acceding to the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and to comprehensively tackle cross-border trafficking and forced marriage.

799. Sri Lanka welcomed the acceptance of its recommendations on the national action plan for human rights, the national human rights policy framework, and maternal and neonatal health services. It encouraged Pakistan to expedite measures to promote and protect human rights, including through engagement with treaty bodies and by strengthening national and provincial human rights mechanisms.

800. The Sudan appreciated the adoption of the Climate Change Act of 2017 and the establishment of the national human rights commission. It was pleased with the acceptance of the majority of the recommendations, including two made by the Sudan, namely to continue to implement the national action plan for human rights and to mainstream human rights in development planning.

801. Tunisia thanked Pakistan for having accepted the majority of the recommendations. It welcomed the measures taken to comprehensively consolidate the human rights system and development plans aimed at achieving the goals of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, thereby promoting the social and economic rights of its people.

802. UNFPA pledged its support towards harmonizing policies and programmes with human rights standards across national and subnational levels, particularly in the area of family planning; strengthening the capacity of the National Commission on the Status of Women, especially in Punjab, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and Sindh provinces; and empowering

young people through life-skills education and advocacy for their protection from harmful practices.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

803. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Pakistan, 10 other stakeholders made statements.

804. The British Humanist Association stated that Pakistan had repeatedly received recommendations to abolish its anti-blasphemy laws. The notion of “blasphemy” had been criticized as inconsistent with normative human rights standards, as set out in the Rabat Plan of Action on the prohibition of advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence. It was used to justify violence against non-religious persons, apostates and religious minorities, who were subjected to arbitrary arrest and extrajudicial killing. It had become a tool by which the State silenced dissent, invoked narrow identity politics, and denied citizens their freedom of expression and freedom of religion or belief. In 2013, the Council of Islamic Ideology had recommended against any softening of the State’s anti-blasphemy laws. The Federal Shariat Court had also stated unequivocally that the death penalty was the only appropriate sentence for those convicted of blasphemy. It urged Pakistan to abolish its anti-blasphemy laws immediately and explicitly condemn all violence provoked by allegations of blasphemy or apostasy.

805. The European Centre for Law and Justice stated that persecution and discrimination against Christians and other minorities were commonplace and that the Government had failed to bring perpetrators to justice. The previous December, gunmen and suicide bombers had attacked a Methodist Church in Quetta. During the same month, a terrorist had attacked a Christian neighbourhood in Chaman. Blasphemy laws were still a major concern. Just in the present month, over 800 Christian families had fled their homes after a Muslim mob had formed to attack them because a young Christian man had been accused of posting blasphemous content on Facebook. Police torture was yet another threat. The previous October, six policemen had beaten a Christian student to death over an argument with some Muslim classmates. In cases of police torture, justice was rarely served. It called upon the United Nations to request that Pakistan protect Christians and other religious minorities and bring the perpetrators of violence to justice.

806. Article 19: International Centre against Censorship stated that broadly defined offences in the Prevention of Electronic Crimes Act and the Pakistan Telecommunications (Reorganization) Act were open to abuse. It remained concerned that journalists, activists and ordinary citizens were being tried by military courts under the Anti-Terrorism Act. More than 20 journalists and media workers had been killed since the previous universal periodic review of Pakistan, and many more had suffered serious attacks, including enforced disappearance, assault, acts of intimidation and judicial harassment. Impunity for all such attacks remained pervasive. Article 19 regretted that Pakistan had only noted several recommendations to ensure the safety of journalists. A draft bill on the safety of journalists contained serious flaws. It asked whether Pakistan would include civil society organizations and the media in initiatives to legislate against attacks on journalists and measures to end impunity for those attacks. The refusal of Pakistan to contemplate amending or repealing blasphemy provisions was deeply regrettable.

807. Action Canada for Population and Development, in a joint statement with the Asian-Pacific Resource and Research Centre for Women, expressed concern about the insufficient attention paid to the sexual and reproductive health needs of young people. Pakistan had one of the highest maternal mortality rates in the world. Child, early and forced marriage operated as a means to control girls’ sexuality and reproductive capacity, and resulted in significant risks of unwanted and forced pregnancies. In Pakistan, where talking about sexuality and sexual health and reproductive rights was considered taboo, young people’s choices in that matter were restricted and their well-being jeopardized. Of the population of Pakistan, 55 per cent were under the age of 25 years. It was vital that Pakistan instituted awareness-raising programmes on sexual and reproductive health and rights information for young people and ensured the availability of accessible, affordable, acceptable and quality sexual and reproductive health and rights services for all persons, especially young people.

808. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues stated that Pakistan lacked the political will to address enforced disappearances, the persecution of religious minorities, the use of the death penalty and extrajudicial killings. The blanket refusal by Pakistan to commit to end the death penalty, including for juveniles and for offences that did not meet the threshold of the “most serious crimes”, was disappointing. Freedom of expression continued to be silenced through the harassment, arbitrary detention, torture and enforced disappearance of voices critical of the Government or of Islam. Pakistan had not accepted any of the recommendations calling for the repeal or amendment of blasphemy laws. Pakistan had failed to accept all of the recommendations to protect persons from violence and discrimination on the basis of their sexual orientation and gender identity. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues urged Pakistan to immediately begin implementing the recommendations that had not been accepted but were consistent with the State’s obligations under the human rights treaties to which Pakistan was a party.

809. The Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches was concerned that, since the previous universal periodic review, there had been 10 registered cases of blasphemy involving one Muslim, eight Christians and one Hindu. Cases of blasphemy against minorities highlighted shocking police brutality and a biased judicial system. Lynching by mobs raised serious concerns about the misuse of the blasphemy laws. Pakistan had received five recommendations to repeal and seven recommendations to review the blasphemy laws. The Commission called upon Pakistan to repeal all discriminatory legislation, namely blasphemy laws; establish bodies to examine the treatment by police of victims and their family members during the investigation of blasphemy cases; legislate against and punish any form of incitement to hate and violence, particularly when loudspeakers were used to mobilize violent mobs; and take measures to reform the police and judiciary to ensure the protection and promotion of religious minorities.

810. The Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development regretted that a recommendation to protect online freedom had merely been noted. The Prevention of Electronic Crimes Act empowered telecommunication regulators to arbitrarily filter or censor “objectionable content”, which had restricted online expression for religious, sexual or ethnic minorities. The law provided sweeping powers for the Pakistan Telecommunication Authority without sufficient independent judicial oversight, and the sharing of information with foreign Governments. Pakistan had accepted recommendations to investigate attacks on journalists and human rights defenders; however, it had noted recommendations to bring justice to those cases and to introduce legislation and implement concrete measures to protect them. The registration procedures of the new policy on non-governmental organizations restricted space for human rights defenders. The Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development called upon Pakistan to accept the pending recommendations to protect freedom of expression and human rights defenders and to develop a concrete and time-bound implementation plan in consultation with civil society.

811. Amnesty International stated that the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances had more than 700 pending cases from Pakistan, and the State’s Commission of Inquiry on Enforced Disappearances had received reports of hundreds more from across the country. Victims included bloggers, journalists, students, peace activists and human rights defenders. No one had ever been held accountable for an enforced disappearance. Amnesty International welcomed the acceptance by Pakistan of recommendations to make enforced disappearance a criminal offence; however, it was disappointed by the State’s failure to accept several recommendations to accede to the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. It was pleased with the acceptance of recommendations to protect journalists and the right to freedom of expression; however, it was concerned that Pakistan had not accepted recommendations to bring the perpetrators of such threats and attacks to justice. It urged Pakistan to uphold the highest human rights standards to end impunity for violations.

812. The International Commission of Jurists regretted that the blasphemy laws in Pakistan were frequently misused, discriminated against minority religions and sects, infringed upon the rights to freedom of expression and religion, and gave rise to serious fair trial concerns. In 2015, Pakistan had empowered the military courts to try people accused of terrorism-related offences. The International Commission of Jurists had documented serious fair trial

violations in the operation of the military courts. Pakistan had failed to take steps to combat impunity for serious human rights violations, including extrajudicial killings, enforced disappearances, and torture and other ill-treatment, and had not yet enacted legislation to recognize torture or enforced disappearance as a distinct autonomous offence. The International Commission of Jurists urged Pakistan to reconsider, accept and implement recommendations to ensure that military courts had no jurisdiction over civilians, including for terrorism-related offences, to repeal or amend all blasphemy laws, and to ensure all perpetrators of violations – including enforced disappearance and extrajudicial killings – were brought to justice.

813. The World Environment and Resources Council stated that Pakistan had failed to respond to or implement plans relating to previous universal periodic review recommendations. That was particularly evident with regard to enforced disappearances and the forced conversion of young Sindhi Hindu girls. Enforced disappearances had greatly increased in Sindh. The forced conversion of Sindhi Hindu girls continued to increase under the Government's patronage. That had left Hindu girls increasingly the targets of child marriage and forced conversion. The State's recent development projects either failed to consult with the local populations or ignored the will of indigenous people. The World Environment and Resources Council recommended that Pakistan ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, hold accountable all parties responsible for forced conversions, including religious institutions, and consult with all affected indigenous populations regarding development projects. It suggested that Pakistan strengthen all human rights institutions with the resources necessary to uphold the State's obligations.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

814. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 289 recommendations received, 168 had enjoyed the support of Pakistan, and 121 had been noted.

815. Concerning accession to and ratification of some international human rights instruments, the delegation of Pakistan stated that, as party to seven core international human rights instruments, Pakistan was already fulfilling its obligations in a broad area of work relating to human rights. All other international instruments were being examined on their substance, alignment with national laws and financial implications for their effective implementation.

816. Pakistan continued to regularly report to the relevant treaty bodies on the implementation of those conventions. Since May 2016, the State's periodic reports relating to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights had been reviewed by the relevant bodies.

817. In presenting its national report the previous November, the Minister for Foreign Affairs had identified a series of steps to establish and consolidate national human rights institutions and their legislative frameworks. Pakistan had accepted almost all of the 27 recommendations to further strengthen their capacity and effectiveness.

818. Many recommendations had been made to improve the socioeconomic conditions of the people of Pakistan. The State had accepted most of those recommendations, particularly those to mainstream human rights into development planning by including cross-cutting issues and promoting the right to development. It had also accepted recommendations on the Sustainable Development Goals.

819. Economic progress and anti-poverty measures, as part of the national development plan and Vision 2030, were aimed at economic growth. They were also steps towards the realization of economic, social and cultural rights. For many citizens living below the poverty line, those rights were being realized by, inter alia, expanding microcredit schemes such as the Benazir Income Support Programme, and strengthening social safety nets in areas of health and education. The specific focus of those measures was on protecting and promoting the rights of women and children. For children, they included ending child labour, providing

universal education, and improving vaccinations and primary health care for infants and neonates. Pakistan had accepted several constructive recommendations on those measures, which were complementary to the State's ongoing work in those areas.

820. The State's progress on human rights had taken place despite the challenges of terrorism and extremism. In the past 10 years, its law enforcement officials, members of the judiciary, journalists, religious minorities and civil society activists had faced threats and intimidation from terrorists. As a result of the targeted actions by security forces backed up by national consensus across the political spectrum, Pakistan had turned the tide against terrorism and eliminated all terrorist hideouts in the country. Given the enormity of the counter-terrorism challenges, that extraordinary fact needed to be recognized.

821. A result of the success in counter-terrorism was the more effective realization of the rights of minorities. There was no organized official intolerance towards religious minorities. Minorities had the constitutional right to freely profess their religion and visit their places of worship. A case in point was the flourishing Christian missionary school system, where even the most devout Muslims sent their children for education. Pakistan had accepted most of the recommendations on minority rights. The delegation also stated that, in the recent elections for the Senate, the first female Hindu senator had been elected.

822. Pakistan was formulating a policy on national interfaith harmony. Minorities had a greater voice in democracy, with 10 seats reserved in the National Assembly, 4 in the Senate and 23 in provincial assemblies. National Minorities Day was celebrated on 11 August. A 5 per cent job quota was ensured for minorities in all federal services, and interfaith harmony committees had been established by the provincial governments. Deliberations were underway on a minorities protection bill to protect the personal laws of minorities, including the marriage acts of Hindus, Sikhs, Parsis and Bahai's. The recent Hindu marriage bill of 2017 was a recognition of the community's right to regulate marriages in its own exclusive way. The Christian marriage bill was also on the anvil.

823. As administrative and legislative measures against hate speech, Pakistan had taken steps to prevent the misuse or abuse of the blasphemy law by strengthening the safeguards in place. The Penal Code provided punishment for false charges and false evidence to deter wrongful allegations. Only senior police officers were authorized to register a first information report in the case of a blasphemy issue, so that misleading or false complaints could be countered at the initial stage.

824. Pakistan had imposed a voluntary moratorium on the death penalty for many years; however, in the wake of the Peshawar school attack in December 2014, public pressure had pushed Parliament to lift that moratorium. That unanimous Parliamentary decision was the democratic voice of the people. The death penalty was imposed only for heinous crimes, in line with the Constitution and international norms.

825. Pakistan had accepted 34 out of 39 recommendations on women's rights. Some of them had been made with regard to the need for new or amended legislation. Work in that regard was being led by women parliamentarians, who accounted for nearly 25 per cent of all Members of Parliament. The Elections Act of 2017 had given the Election Commission powers to declare polls void in a constituency if female voter turnout was less than 10 per cent. The Act also provided that political parties gave at least 5 per cent of tickets to women for general seats, while the indirectly elected quota for women in the National Assembly (60 seats) and in the Senate (17 seats) would continue.

826. Pakistan had received many recommendations to eliminate violence against women, including domestic violence. In that regard, two main types of laws had been enacted: first, those prescribing penalties for anti-women practices; and second, those focusing on empowering women and vulnerable groups. Therefore, Pakistan had both types of bills: those against rape or acid crimes, and legislation providing social support, such as the Benazir Income Support Programme on protection against harassment at the workplace. Furthermore, the State's fifth periodic report to the Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women was being submitted (CEDAW/C/PAK/5).

827. Pakistan had accepted recommendations to uplift its transgender community, which had been able to secure the Government's recognition of its separate status, and as a result,

special passports and identity documents had been issued to transgender persons to enable their mainstreaming into society.

828. Concerning freedom of expression, the delegation stated that the right to information was guaranteed by the Constitution as a fundamental right.

829. Pakistan had accepted many recommendations on the protection of journalists. Any attack on a journalist or human rights defender received immediate media coverage and was taken up *suo moto* by the superior judiciary. That created deterrence for any coercive measures against journalists. High-powered commissions had been set up to investigate allegations of intimidation and harassment of journalists. A journalist welfare and protection bill being enacted by the Government would consolidate gains in that field.

Zambia

830. The review of Zambia was held on 13 November 2017 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 Zambia in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/ZMB/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/ZMB/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/ZMB/3).

831. At its 41st meeting, on 19 March 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Zambia (see sect. C below).

832. The outcome of the review of Zambia comprises of the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/37/14), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/37/14/Add.1).

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

833. The delegation, led by the Minister Counsellor Chargé d'Affaires a.i. and Deputy Permanent Representative of Zambia to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Margaret Mary Lungu Kaemba, stated that the universal periodic review mechanism provided an opportunity for all member States to provide an account of the actions they had taken to improve the human rights situation in their respective countries and to highlight the challenges that needed to be overcome in order to ensure the full enjoyment of human rights.

834. Since the review in November 2017, the Government had examined all of the recommendations that had been received and revisited some of the positions that had been taken on some of those recommendations. Consultations on the recommendations had been held with all the relevant stakeholders.

835. In relation to the two recommendations on which positions had not been taken, Zambia had supported the recommendation contained in paragraph 130.1 and noted the recommendation contained in paragraph 130.2. Furthermore, 92 recommendations, namely those contained in paragraphs 131.1–131.4, 131.11–131.53, 131.57, 131.61–131.92, 131.99–131.102, and 131.104–131.111, that had been previously noted, had since been supported. Additionally, the recommendation contained in paragraph 131.10, which had been previously noted, was now supported in part: the part of the recommendation relating to the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, as well as the three optional protocols to the Convention on the Rights of

the Child, had been supported; and the part relating to the ratification of the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty had been noted. In light of the aforementioned changes, 183 recommendations now enjoyed the support of Zambia. One recommendation had been partly supported and 19 recommendations had been noted.

836. Those recommendations that had enjoyed the support of Zambia would form the basis of the preparation of an action plan that would be used to guide the implementation process, prior to the fourth cycle review. The action plan, once completed, would complement the implementation of the Seventh National Development Plan (2017–2021) and would also contribute to the monitoring of the Sustainable Development Goals, especially Goal 16. Civil society was encouraged to complement the Government's efforts in implementing the action plan, once developed.

837. Zambia had also commenced the process of establishing a permanent mechanism to monitor the implementation of the recommendations from all human rights mechanisms.

838. The death penalty was enshrined in the Constitution and could only be abolished through a referendum. When the relevant proposed amendments, within the scope of an amended Bill of Rights, had been subjected to a referendum, the required threshold had not been met. Consequently, the proposed amendments to the Constitution could not be adopted. However, despite the retention of the death penalty in its statute books, Zambia was a de facto abolitionist State. The last executions had been carried out in 1997. Since then, successive presidents had been reluctant to authorize any executions and had been commuting the sentences to life imprisonment. Furthermore, in October 2016, the Cabinet had passed a resolution in support of General Assembly resolution 62/149 on a global moratorium on the death penalty.

839. Zambia was resolute in strengthening human rights for the well-being of all persons without distinction as to their race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

840. Zambia was determined to continue to address, through the Seventh National Development Plan, the outstanding challenges that might inhibit the fulfilment of human rights, and appealed for support in that regard. That support would ensure the promotion and protection of human rights.

841. Zambia appreciated all of the recommendations that it had received during its review and it was committed to the universal periodic review process.

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

842. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Zambia, 13 delegations made statements.

843. Algeria welcomed the efforts to promote and protect human rights, including through the integration of many international standards into the domestic legal framework. It also welcomed the measures taken to combat corruption, to develop the judicial system, to combat trafficking in persons and to protect the environment. Zambia had supported 183 recommendations, including the 2 recommendations made by Algeria.

844. Angola thanked Zambia for the supplementary information provided. Zambia had supported a substantial number of recommendations, including those made by Angola. It welcomed the State's cooperation with United Nations bodies.

845. Burundi congratulated Zambia on the acceptance of a large number of recommendations and expressed delight with the establishment of mechanisms to combat corruption. It welcomed the legislative and institutional measures adopted by Zambia to combat slavery and trafficking in persons. It noted the adoption of national policies on children and gender equality, and the different measures adopted to protect children against exploitation, including child labour. It also noted the measures implemented to protect the environment and the priority given to the management of natural resources.

846. China appreciated the constructive participation of Zambia in the universal periodic review. It thanked Zambia for having accepted the recommendations made by China and it expressed the hope that the Government would continue to promote sustainable social and economic development and raise the living standards to build a solid foundation for the fulfilment of all human rights. China encouraged Zambia to continue to develop medical and health programmes, which should include improving the treatment for HIV and AIDS.

847. The Congo noted with satisfaction the presentation by Zambia of the State's report and the supplementary information provided. It welcomed the acceptance by Zambia of the majority of the recommendations received. The implementation of those recommendations, in addition to those efforts already made, would result in a consolidation of the rule of law. The Congo welcomed the State's cooperation with the human rights mechanisms and encouraged Zambia to continue that cooperation.

848. Cuba commended Zambia for having reviewed all of the recommendations received. As a demonstration of the commitment of Zambia to the universal periodic review, the State had not only considered the two recommendations it had not taken a position on during the review, but had gone further and reviewed all of the recommendations noted, and had supported many of them. Cuba expressed its confidence that the implementation of the recommendations would be done with similar commitment.

849. Egypt appreciated the active efforts to enhance the promotion and protection of human rights in various areas. It noted the adoption of the amended Constitution in 2016, which provided for the strengthening of the national human rights institution and the establishment of key institutions to implement human rights obligations. Egypt also noted the laws adopted in relation to the rights of persons with disabilities, gender equality and the rights of refugees. It was pleased that Zambia had accepted the recommendations made by Egypt. It expressed the hope that the State's efforts to implement the recommendations would be successful.

850. Ethiopia commended Zambia for having identified priority areas in the promotion and protection of human rights. It thanked Zambia for having supported the recommendations to combat trafficking in persons and to increase birth registration. Ethiopia encouraged Zambia to continue its constructive engagement with the Human Rights Council.

851. Honduras commended Zambia for the transparent, cooperative and constructive spirit in which it had conducted itself during the review. It noted the commitment of Zambia to the protection of the rights of children. Honduras was pleased with the adoption of a comprehensive policy to effectively combat gender-based violence. It expressed the hope that Zambia would reconsider its position on the death penalty, consider ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, and adopt legislation prohibiting discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity.

852. Kenya thanked Zambia for its constructive engagement with the universal periodic review. It commended Zambia for having supported many recommendations, including the three recommendations made by Kenya. It called upon the international community to support Zambia in implementing the recommendations supported.

853. Lesotho commended Zambia for its positive engagement throughout the universal periodic review process and applauded Zambia for having supported most of the recommendations received. It noted the measures taken since the previous review, including the amendment of the Constitution and the enactment of a number of pieces of legislation. It called for continued support from development partners and the international community.

854. Libya thanked Zambia for its active participation in the universal periodic review process and acknowledged the State's commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights. Libya welcomed the progress made in implementing universal periodic review recommendations through efforts in the advancement of women.

855. Madagascar noted with satisfaction the number of recommendations that had been accepted by Zambia. It welcomed the efforts to guarantee the rule of law and to protect human rights, particular those relating to the rights of women. Madagascar urged Zambia to continue its efforts.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

856. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Zambia, nine other stakeholders made statements.

857. The Human Rights Commission, by video message, expressed the hope that the Government's commitment to establish a mechanism for the implementation of the universal periodic review recommendations would enhance the progressive realization of human rights. The Commission expected the Government to ratify the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty, as the Government had accepted a moratorium on the execution of death sentences. It was optimistic that the Government would continue the dialogue on the expansion of the Bill of Rights before the next general election, in 2021.

858. Save the Children International encouraged Zambia to expedite the enactment of the Children's Act, to finalize and present the Children's Code bill in Parliament, to ratify all three optional protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, to raise the minimum age of criminality, to provide adequate protection for child victims and witnesses during trial, to combat child poverty and malnutrition by strengthening child-sensitive social protection programmes, and to establish a process to empower all children to engage with the community.

859. The Swedish Association for Sexuality Education commended Zambia for having accepted 183 of the 203 recommendations. The State's acceptance of the recommendation to limit abortion provisions was in contravention of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights of Women in Africa. The Seventh National Development Plan did not comprehensively address all human rights, including in particular sexual and reproductive rights. It urged Zambia to prioritize the holding of a people-driven referendum on the Bill of Rights.

860. Action Canada for Population and Development expressed concern about the risk from the social and legal criminalization of gender and sexuality. It encouraged Zambia to comply with its regional and international obligations, to repeal laws that criminalized same-sex conduct, sex work and abortion, and to ensure access to sexual and reproductive health services.

861. Franciscans International encouraged Zambia to ensure community engagement in an adequate and accessible form, through the timely and comprehensive disclosure of project-related information. It also encouraged Zambia to adopt specific legislation on development-based displacement, resettlement and compensation for affected communities, providing clear guidelines to prevent forced evictions and to ensure sustainable and adequate reparations.

862. Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII encouraged Zambia to make further funding available, to better allocate resources for food and nutrition, education, the social and labour inclusion of persons with disabilities, to strengthen nutrition education in schools, to establish a national schools mapping mechanism, to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and to provide more education centres, services and activities for people with disabilities.

863. Amnesty International regretted that Zambia had not accepted recommendations to guarantee the rights to freedom of assembly, association and expression, and to abolish the death penalty. It was also concerned by the use of criminal libel laws to silence critics of the ruling party. It called upon Zambia to abolish the death penalty. It welcomed the State's acceptance of the recommendation to reform the Public Order Act and encouraged the Government to consult with civil society to ensure compliance with the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. It was concerned by the continued handing down of the death penalty.

864. CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation was concerned that Zambia had not implemented recommendations relating to civic space. The Government continued to use the Public Order Act to unwarrantedly limit the exercise of the right to freedom of peaceful

assembly. It called upon Zambia to take proactive measures to implement the recommendations in law and in practice.

865. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme regretted the retention of the death penalty and highlighted the fact that being a de facto abolitionist State was not enough to protect the right to life and dignity. It urged Zambia to ratify the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty. It encouraged Zambia to protect and promote human rights, especially the advancement of women, and to engage in the abolitionist efforts of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights Working Group on the Death Penalty.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

866. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 203 recommendations received, 183 had enjoyed the support of Zambia, and 19 had been noted. Additional clarification had been provided on one recommendation, indicating which part of the recommendation had been supported and which part had been noted.

867. The delegation valued the constructive comments received from the floor and took note of the thematic issues that required urgent attention, such as the rights of women and children, the death penalty, a review of the abortion laws and expanding the Bill of Rights.

868. The delegation reiterated the gratitude of Zambia to the President and the secretariat of the Human Rights Council and the troika for their support. Zambia was committed to the universal periodic review process and endeavoured to continue to intensify its efforts to implement human rights activities.

Japan

869. The review of Japan was held on 14 November 2017 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 Japan in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/JPN/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/JPN/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/JPN/3 and Corr.1).

870. At its 41st meeting, on 19 March 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Japan (see sect. C below).

871. The outcome of the review of Japan comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/37/15), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/37/15/Add.1).

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

872. The Deputy Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Mitsuko Shino, expressed her sincere appreciation for the efforts by the troika, namely Belgium, Qatar and Togo, and for the secretariat of the universal periodic review for having prepared the outcome document.

873. The delegation noted that, during the review on 14 November 2017, the delegation of Japan, consisting of relevant ministries and agencies and headed by the Government

representative, Yoshifumi Okamura, had explained in detail the State's follow-up efforts and achievements since the previous review, such as the conclusion of human rights conventions, including the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, and the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime. Such achievements included domestic and overseas initiatives, including those on the "realization of a society where all women shine".

874. The universal periodic review, which was based on dialogue and cooperation, was an important mechanism that contributed to the improvement of the human rights situation in all member States. In that regard, the delegation reiterated the State's gratitude to the member States for their constructive and valuable comments, including the advanced questions.

875. It was a milestone year, as it was the seventieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Japan had consistently placed importance on fundamental values such as democracy, freedom, human rights and the rule of law, and had continued its tireless efforts to promote and protect human rights both inside and outside Japan.

876. As a member of the Human Rights Council from the Asia-Pacific region, Japan would continue to contribute to discussions to promote human rights in the United Nations and to improve the human rights situation in other countries, as well as promote development cooperation in order to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals.

877. The delegation emphasized the process of examining the recommendations received, which had required the involvement of many ministries. All of the recommendations had been fully reviewed by the relevant ministries and carefully considered. In addition, during that review process, ministries had the opportunity to hear frank opinions from parliamentarians and civil society, including the Japan Federation of Bar Associations. Japan would continue to attach importance to having dialogues with civil society, including non-governmental organizations.

878. Out of a total of 217 recommendations, Japan had agreed to follow up on 145 recommendations, including those relating to the protection and promotion of the rights of the socially vulnerable, such as women, children and persons with disabilities. As a result of the examination by the relevant ministries, some recommendations had not been accepted by Japan.

879. The delegation stressed the fact that Japan intended to follow up on the recommendations it had supported in an appropriate manner, just as it had done during the previous review cycles. Japan had taken concrete measures on some of the recommendations, while intending to continue to follow up on those recommendations as well.

880. Since the review in November 2017, Japan had seen some progress relating to some of the recommendations that it had agreed to follow up on. For example, at the End Violence Solutions Summit on eradicating violence against children held in Sweden that year, Japan had expressed its commitment to become a pathfinding country in the Global Partnership to End Violence against Children and to contribute to the fund to end violence against children.

881. Furthermore, a week ago, Japan had held the first multi-stakeholder meeting on a baseline study on business and human rights as a process to formulate its national action plan on business and human rights. In that regard, Japan had emphasized that formulating the national action plan recommended by several countries during the universal periodic review was a step towards the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. Japan would continue to make efforts in that field in order for it to be able to report on its positive progress in the next cycle of the universal periodic review.

882. Japan was of the view that, in order to make the universal periodic review a more effective mechanism, it was critical for each country to make constant efforts to implement the recommendations through voluntary follow-up efforts. Japan had submitted a voluntary midterm report on the progress made in relation to its previous two reviews, and it intended to do the same for its fourth review.

883. Additionally, the delegation emphasized the importance of increasing public awareness about the results of the review from a human rights education perspective. In that

regard, Japan planned to upload a translated version of its review outcome report on the website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

884. While noting that the considerations of a few of the State's periodic reports to the treaty bodies were scheduled to be held by the next cycle of the universal periodic review, the delegation stated that Japan would continue to appropriately follow up on the recommendations received from those treaty bodies. It would also strengthen its cooperation with each treaty body and its commitment pertaining to the implementation of each human rights instrument. In that regard, Japan considered it important that recommendations be clear, concise and realizable, and their number should be reduced from the present level in order to avoid duplication.

885. The delegation stated that Japan would host the Tokyo Olympics and Paralympics in 2020 and it expressed the hope that the 2020 Games would be an opportunity to foster an inclusive society, based on diversity and harmony, in which all kinds of differences were recognized, including race, gender, sexual orientation and disabilities.

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

886. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Japan, 12 delegations made statements.

887. Tunisia welcomed the acceptance by Japan of the majority of the recommendations made during the review, including those made by Tunisia.

888. The Sudan welcomed the accession by Japan to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in 2014 and the adoption of the action plan to combat trafficking in persons.

889. Albania appreciated the accession by Japan to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. It welcomed the fourth action plan for gender equality and the intensive policy aimed at accelerating the empowerment of women and promoting women's participation and advancement in the workplace.

890. Egypt welcomed the acceptance by Japan of the recommendations made by Egypt to formulate a national workplan for the implementation of the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

891. Ethiopia commended Japan for having accepted its recommendations to establish a national human rights institution in compliance with the accepted international standards, and to scale up awareness-raising of human rights protection for vulnerable groups, including migrant workers.

892. Ghana welcomed the fourth action plan for gender equality and the intensive policy aimed at accelerating the empowerment of women and promoting women's participation and advancement in the workplace. It noted the efforts of Japan to enforce the law on the elimination of hate speech.

893. Haiti thanked Japan for having considered its two recommendations, namely to promulgate an anti-discrimination law and to establish a national regulatory framework to assess the environmental impact of the business activities of multinational corporations. Haiti regretted that Japan had noted its third recommendation, which was to consider improving the basic pension scheme for older persons.

894. Honduras expressed its hope that Japan would explore the possibility of ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, approve a comprehensive anti-discrimination law in line with the State's international obligations and relevant standards, and redouble its efforts to combat trafficking in persons and adopt a specific action plan for the protection and compensation of victims.

895. The Islamic Republic of Iran commended Japan for the implementation of laws and programmes aimed at fulfilling the State's obligations under the Convention on the Rights of

Persons with Disabilities and the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, and for the implementation of the action plan to combat trafficking in persons.

896. Iraq welcomed the acceptance by Japan of one recommendation out of a total of three recommendations made by Iraq during review.

897. The Lao People's Democratic Republic commended Japan for its continuing efforts to promote and protect human rights. It welcomed the State's actions to promote the rights of women by enhancing their participation in all areas, including politics, the judiciary, the executive branch and the economy.

898. Madagascar welcomed the measures taken to eliminate the sexual exploitation of children and to tackle the issues of sexual offences and trafficking in persons. It noted the enforcement of the law on the elimination of hate speech. It encouraged Japan to continue the reforms it had already begun, aimed at improving respect for human rights and the rule of law.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

899. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Japan, 10 other stakeholders made statements.

900. The International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism regretted that Japan had failed to support the recommendations relating to an anti-discrimination law, minority ethnic Koreans and the people of Ryukyu/Okinawa. It urged Japan to fully support the recommendations noted and to develop a concrete national action plan for the implementation of the universal periodic review recommendations.

901. The International Association of Democratic Lawyers expressed concern that the policies of Japan in Fukushima were inconsistent with the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement and incompatible with the State's acceptance of the universal periodic review recommendations made by Austria and Portugal. It called upon Japan to fully implement, without any delay, the review recommendations accepted.

902. Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, in a joint statement with the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development, expressed concern about the State's high-pressure education system, which sometimes led to suicides. It called upon Japan to sign and ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure, reform the education system, and implement the prohibition of corporal punishment of children in all settings.

903. The Foundation of Japanese Honorary Debts asked Japan to clear its past and deal with the victims of the Japanese Imperial Army during the Second World War. It stated that Japan remained tainted and cursed for its past military atrocities. While noting that there was no statute of limitations on war crimes and crimes against humanity, it emphasized the fact that Japanese war crimes committed during the occupation of the Dutch East Indies from 1941 to 1945 could not be absolved. It urged Japan to resolve that long-lasting issue respectfully and honourably.

904. Franciscans International urged Japan to ensure the full enjoyment of the rights of the people of Ryukyu/Okinawa based on the principle of free, prior and informed consent. It also urged Japan to adopt anti-discrimination legislation that prohibited discrimination based on ethnic identity. It further expressed concern that the construction of a new American military base was causing further severe human rights violations, without prior consultation with the people of Ryukyu/Okinawa.

905. Amnesty International was alarmed at the continued use of the death penalty in Japan. It called upon Japan to establish an official moratorium on executions as a first step towards the abolition of the death penalty. It also called upon the Government of Japan to introduce comprehensive anti-discrimination legislation at the national level to provide equal protection against discrimination for all persons and on all grounds, including sexual orientation, gender identity and sex characteristics.

906. Greenpeace International called upon the Government of Japan to immediately and fully adopt and implement the recommendations of the Human Rights Council. It called upon the Government to protect people in Fukushima and east Japan, especially vulnerable children, from further radiation exposure.

907. The Japan Federation of Bar Associations, by video message, urged Japan to implement diligently the recommendations supported, in particular those on discrimination, the adoption of the individual communication system and the establishment of a national human rights institution. It regretted that Japan had not accepted recommendations on a moratorium on the death penalty, the abolition of substitute detention or the ratification of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.

908. Human Rights Now regretted that Japan had not fully accepted the recommendations on broadcaster independence and the anti-discrimination law. It called upon Japan to implement the recommendations to establish an independent national human rights institution, to resume housing support for all evacuees and implement comprehensive health checks, and to restore the allowable dose of radiation to the 1 mSv/year limit for Fukushima.

909. Advocates for Human Rights called upon Japan to undertake a comprehensive public education campaign, in collaboration with civil society organizations such as the Center for Prisoners' Rights, in order to educate the public about human rights and alternatives to the death penalty.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

910. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 217 recommendations received, 145 had enjoyed the support of Japan and 72 had been noted.

911. The delegation expressed its sincere appreciation to all stakeholders who had actively and constructively been engaged in the universal periodic review of Japan. Japan would continue its efforts to promote and protect human rights inside and outside the country and to ensure that the State's views and efforts were well understood by the international community on an objective and factual basis.

912. Regarding the State's recognition of history, the delegation stated that Japan was squarely facing up to history, which had been made clear by the statement by Prime Minister Shinzo Abe on 14 August 2015, in which he expressed the deep remorse of Japan for the past war. The delegation also emphasized that such positions articulated by previous Cabinets would remain unshakable into the future. With deep remorse for the past and repentance for the war, Japan had been consistently promoting freedom, democracy and the rule of law as a contributor to peace and prosperity in Asia and the world.

913. Regarding the people in Okinawa, Japan noted that it was largely understood that the people in Okinawa had inherited a unique culture and tradition over their long history. However, the Government of Japan recognized only the Ainu people as indigenous people in Japan. The people of Okinawa were equally Japanese nationals. Therefore, they enjoyed the rights of Japanese nationals.

914. Regarding the recommendations relating to the death penalty, Japan believed that the death penalty issue should be decided independently by each country in accordance with the law. The delegation stressed the fact that domestic public opinion, the existence of extremely vicious crime cases and other factors made it inappropriate to abolish the death penalty.

915. Regarding the recommendations relating to freedom of expression, the delegation stated that freedom of expression, including that of the press, was one of the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Japanese Constitution. Japan had given every respect to that right by applying the law on broadcasting.

916. Regarding the recommendations relating to the nuclear accident in Fukushima, Japan would do its utmost to accelerate reconstruction, bearing in mind that many people, including nuclear accident victims, were living with great inconvenience as evacuees, even now. Japan would continue to implement measures, including those to ensure the provision of medical and long-term nursing care systems, and to develop the educational environment for children.

917. In conclusion, the delegation reiterated the continued commitment of Japan to cooperate constructively with the universal periodic review.

Ukraine

918. The review of Ukraine was held on 15 November 2017 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 Ukraine in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/UKR/1 and Corr.1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/UKR/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/UKR/3).

919. At its 42nd meeting, on 19 March 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Ukraine (see sect. C below).

920. The outcome of the review of Ukraine comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/37/16), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/37/16/Add.1).

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

921. The delegation of Ukraine, led by the Permanent Representative of Ukraine to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Yurii Klymenko, expressed appreciation to all of the delegations for their recommendations made in November 2017, and to the troika members – Georgia, Netherlands and Rwanda – for having facilitated the review process.

922. The universal periodic review provided an important channel to elaborate on national achievements and challenges in the field of human rights in a constructive and equal manner. Ukraine was committed to securing a successful future for the universal periodic review mechanism as a whole, and its position on the recommendations received had taken into account proposals of civil society through wide consultations with all the relevant State bodies.

923. Bearing in mind that the goal of the universal periodic review was not mere acceptance but rather the relevant implementation of the recommendations, the Government of Ukraine had examined the 190 recommendations made during the review, and had methodically considered all of them through intergovernmental cooperation and consultations with civil society representatives. It had accepted 163 recommendations and noted 27 recommendations.

924. The Government had provided its written comments in the addendum to the report of the Working Group, having noted that a number of the recommendations accepted were already in the process of being implemented.

925. Regarding the recommendations noted, the delegation stated that in Ukraine the universal periodic review process was largely based on consultations with, and the active role of, different governmental bodies and non-governmental organizations. The dialogue with civil society had been a great opportunity to assess the human rights situation in a self-critical manner; it had been a good experience that was worth continuing.

926. In order to establish an effective follow-up procedure under the aegis of the Ministry of Justice, a working group would be created to elaborate the mechanism and an action plan

for the implementation of the universal periodic review recommendations. The working group would include not only representatives of the relevant State institutions, but also representatives of non-governmental organizations. The Government welcomed civil society's participation in and contribution to the implementation process. Only by working together could positive changes for everyone be achieved.

927. Ukraine was aware of the human rights challenges, but it had persevered diligently to address them. The main challenge for Ukraine at present, with the greatest impact on the human rights situation and on all spheres of the lives of Ukrainians, was the aggression of the Russian Federation, which had highlighted new problems relating to the protection of human rights in the areas of occupation. Kremlin-backed militants and Russian regular servicemen were using force and ideologically motivated violence, which resulted in the killing and torture of prisoners, hostage-taking and disappearances.

928. Ukraine had faced a humanitarian crisis, which had resulted in about 1.5 million Ukrainians having had to leave their homes and become internally displaced persons. In 2014, Ukraine had lacked experience, means and a legislative framework to deal with the mass influx of people from Donbass and the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, Ukraine, temporarily occupied by the Russian Federation. Short-term housing and emergency help had been provided to people fleeing persecution and war. Ukraine appreciated the international support and experience in finding solutions to those extraordinary challenges.

929. There was a clear understanding that Russian aggression should not hinder or prevent Ukraine from implementing its international human rights obligations and commitments, respecting human rights and strengthening the democratic functioning of the country's institutions in line with the international standards and values. The work of Ukraine on human rights was based on the universality and indivisibility of human rights, the principle of non-discrimination and equal opportunities, and transparency.

930. Lastly, the delegation stated that the dialogue with all States Members of the United Nations in the universal periodic review global forum kept States focused and self-critical and forced them to keep looking into possible improvements. The universal periodic review mechanism created an environment for the genuine contribution to the strengthening of national human rights worldwide.

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

931. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Ukraine, 13 delegations made statements.

932. Georgia, as a member of the troika, commended the delegation of Ukraine for its exemplary engagement during the session. It noted with appreciation the acceptance of most of the recommendations, including those made by Georgia relating to the intensification of cooperation with the international community.

933. Honduras congratulated Ukraine on its constructive spirit and expressed the hope that Ukraine would consider the possibility of ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, and that it would consider assigning the financial, technical and human resources necessary to strengthen the Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights, and to adopt specific policies to prevent and combat, inter alia, the increase in hate speech and crimes based on racial prejudice, summary executions and sexual violence.

934. Lithuania noted positively the acceptance by Ukraine of the majority of the recommendations and it particularly welcomed the State's support for all of the recommendations made by Lithuania. It appreciated the constitutional amendments to allow for the ratification of the Rome Statute and the steps taken with a view to ratifying the Istanbul Convention. Lithuania supported the efforts by Ukraine to hold accountable those responsible for violations of human rights and international humanitarian law in the occupied territories.

935. The Republic of Moldova commended Ukraine for its engagement with the universal periodic review and other international human rights mechanisms, and it welcomed the

State's acceptance of the majority of the recommendations received during the review, including those made by the Republic of Moldova to prevent torture and to combat sexual violence. The Republic of Moldova expressed concern over the human rights violations in the conflict-affected areas, while welcoming measures taken by the Government to protect the rights of those affected by conflict. It took the present opportunity to reiterate its support for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine.

936. Romania commended Ukraine for its acceptance of all of the recommendations made by Romania, and it wished Ukraine success in the implementation of the recommendations and the fruitful participation in the Human Rights Council.

937. The Russian Federation noted with concern that the majority of its recommendations had not been accepted by Ukraine, and there was no corresponding explanation. The position adopted by the Government of Ukraine demonstrated that it was unwilling and unable to stop the violations of human rights in the country. The Russian Federation found it unacceptable that a member of the Human Rights Council conducted military actions against its own people, usurped authority and power by limiting the activities of opposition parties, violated freedom of expression and the right to education for linguistic minorities, and promoted hatred and racism as State policies. The blockade of voting stations for the presidential elections in the Russian Federation was a clear demonstration of that attitude.

938. Sierra Leone noted the national action plan on the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the establishment of strategies to provide more comprehensive social protection to internally displaced persons in the long term. Sierra Leone was pleased to note that two out of the three recommendations it had made to Ukraine had enjoyed the State's support. Sierra Leone encouraged Ukraine to consider ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families soon.

939. UNFPA commended Ukraine for its universal periodic review report and expressed its willingness to support Ukraine in implementing the recommendations received in partnership with public entities, the Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights and other national stakeholders, including from civil society and academia. In the framework of the country cooperation programme, UNFPA would provide technical assistance and other forms of support with a focus on specific recommendations.

940. UNICEF welcomed the recent progress towards the realization of child rights in Ukraine, including the establishment of an inter-agency coordination council on justice for children and the current process of drafting a law on juvenile justice in line with international standards. It was concerned about the high numbers of children living in residential care, the lack of safeguards to limit placement and the insufficient quality services available to vulnerable families. It also expressed concern about the increasing proportion of children with disabilities in institutions.

941. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland welcomed the engagement of Ukraine in the universal periodic review process, while it was concerned about the human rights situation in the east and the illegally annexed Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, Ukraine, temporarily occupied by the Russian Federation, with particular concern for Crimean Tatars, who faced regular harassment, enforced disappearances, arbitrary detention and enforced psychiatric detainment. Human rights violations and abuses, including extrajudicial killings, illegal detentions, torture and gender-based violence, had been committed by all sides in the conflict in eastern Ukraine. The United Kingdom hoped that Ukraine would accept its recommendation to record and investigate those violations and abuses and bring the perpetrators to justice.

942. Afghanistan firmly believed that tolerance should be promoted in every society in order to protect all human rights and it therefore appreciated the support of Ukraine for its recommendation to ensure the promotion and protection of cultural diversity and tolerance within society through effective measures, including public campaigns. Afghanistan regretted that Ukraine had not accepted its recommendation to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

943. Albania appreciated the work of Ukraine to modify the Constitution and bolster the independence of judicial authorities, in particular through the elimination of political influence. Albania encouraged Ukraine to continue efforts to establish an independent court and it recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the outcome of the universal periodic review of Ukraine.

944. Egypt congratulated Ukraine on positive developments, especially the amendments to the Constitution introduced in 2016 to launch comprehensive judicial reform, as well as the creation of a national mechanism for the prevention of torture and mistreatment, and the establishment of a commissioner for gender equality. Egypt recommended that Ukraine pursue efforts to combat trafficking in persons and ensure assistance to victims, and it hoped that that recommendation would be responded to positively.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

945. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Ukraine, eight other stakeholders made statements.

946. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom highlighted the effects of the austerity measures on the human rights situation in Ukraine and stressed that, as a result, women's social and economic rights were in jeopardy. Such policies increased the feminization of poverty and hindered the implementation of the women, peace and security agenda, and initiatives to combat gender-based violence. It emphasized the importance of broadening the economic agenda beyond fiscal consolidation and the inclusion of all regions of Ukraine in policy considerations. It also emphasized the interrelation between violence against women, gender inequality, conflict and austerity.

947. The Human Rights House Foundation stressed the fact that the responsibility for the dire human rights situation in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, Ukraine, temporarily occupied by the Russian Federation, lay with local de facto authorities and the authorities of the Russian Federation. Residents of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea were also subject to discriminatory policies of the Government of Ukraine. It recommended that Ukraine simplify access to public services for residents of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea with regard to the registration of births, deaths and marriages; guarantee the right to vote in local elections by internally displaced persons from the Autonomous Republic of Crimea; simplify access to the Autonomous Republic of Crimea for foreign journalists, lawyers and human rights defenders; and refrain from taking measures aimed at further isolating the Crimean population from its legitimate Government of Ukraine.

948. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland, in a joint statement with the International Lesbian and Gay Association, commended Ukraine for having accepted 10 recommendations on implementing effective measures to combat hate crimes and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. It suggested that, to ensure the protection of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons, the Government should implement all policy actions prescribed in the action plan on the implementation of the national human rights strategy, noting that most actions had not been followed up on due to a lack of prioritization and the unavailability of a budget. It called upon the Government to scale up efforts to implement all of the recommendations concerning sexual orientation and gender identity.

949. Article 19: International Centre against Censorship expressed its concern about the failure of the authorities to respect the right to freedom of expression, particularly in relation to journalists, minority groups and those speaking out against corruption. Impunity remained a problem and law enforcement agencies failed to adequately address attacks on the representatives of the media. The authorities must dedicate the resources necessary for investigatory and prosecutorial procedures. Article 19 was concerned about the harassment of civil society organizations involved in exposing corruption schemes and against representatives of marginalized groups and persons protesting right wing nationalism. It urged the Government to protect freedom of expression both in law and in practice.

950. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues welcomed the acceptance by Ukraine of the recommendations to ratify the Istanbul Convention, and it noted that ratification had been put on the parliamentary agenda. Despite the list of professional bans

for women having been abolished, the Labour Code still contained discriminatory provisions, restricting women's access to certain professions. All legislation should clearly include the prohibition of discrimination against women.

951. Advocates for Human Rights urged the Government to ratify the Istanbul Convention, especially considering the fact that domestic violence was widespread. Despite having accepted recommendations to criminalize domestic violence, Ukraine had only noted recommendations to ensure the prosecution and adequate punishment of perpetrators of violence. In 2017, Ukraine had amended the Criminal Code to make domestic violence a crime. However, the adoption of such legislation should not be a substitute for the ratification of the Istanbul Convention. It encouraged the Government to fully support and fund the provision of shelter and support services for victims of domestic violence in coordination with the relevant non-governmental organizations.

952. Amnesty International stated that there were few effective ways for victims of gender-based and domestic violence to protect themselves and seek justice. It welcomed the Government's acceptance of recommendations to facilitate the ratification and implementation of the Istanbul Convention. It highlighted human rights violations occurring in eastern Ukraine and, in that regard, welcomed the State's commitment to cooperate with the International Criminal Court and its acceptance of recommendations to ensure the ratification of the Rome Statute. Welcoming the establishment of the State Bureau of Investigations, it called upon the Government to ensure the resources necessary for the investigation of crimes committed by law enforcement agencies and public officials. It also expressed concern about the increase in physical violence against independent journalists and civil society organizations since 2016.

953. The International Fellowship of Reconciliation drew attention to the case of Ukrainian journalist and human rights activist Ruslan Kotsaba, which raised concerns regarding freedom of expression, freedom of conscience and the independence of the members of the judiciary. It provided details of the criminal case that had been brought against him.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

954. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 190 recommendations received, 163 had enjoyed the support of Ukraine, and 27 had been noted.

955. The delegation reiterated that the recommendations accepted by Ukraine would be included in the national action plan on the implementation of the human rights national strategy. Regarding the recommendations made by the Russian Federation, the position of Ukraine was unambiguous. The delegation strongly condemned the decision by the Russian Federation to hold elections on 18 March 2018 in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, Ukraine, temporarily occupied by the Russian Federation, in order to legitimize the consequences of its aggression against Ukraine, thus violating international laws and agreements, including General Assembly resolutions. As a result, the elections would not have legal consequences; they would be considered null and void and not be recognized by the international community.

Sri Lanka

956. The review of Sri Lanka was held on 15 November 2017 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 Sri Lanka in accordance with paragraph 15 (a) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/LKA/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/LKA/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21 (A/HRC/WG.6/28/LKA/3).

957. At its 42nd meeting, on 19 March 2018, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Sri Lanka (see sect. C below).

958. The outcome of the review of Sri Lanka comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/37/17), 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 Human Rights Council in plenary session 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

959. The delegation of Sri Lanka, led by the Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka to the United Nations at Geneva, Ravinatha Aryasinha, thanked OHCHR, the secretariat of the universal periodic review and the troika for their contributions and invaluable cooperation. He expressed appreciation to all of the delegations for their active participation in the review of Sri Lanka and their valuable recommendations.

960. Sri Lanka was committed to constructive engagement with the United Nations system and procedures, and with individual Member States in promoting human rights locally and internationally.

961. Sri Lanka had participated in its third review, in November 2017, with the backdrop of a renewed and transformed local setting following presidential and parliamentary elections in 2015, and with a renewed focus on strengthening, promoting, protecting and upholding human rights; strengthening democracy, good governance and the rule of law; reconciliation and sustainable peace; equality and dignity for all; upholding the pluralistic nature of society; and creating inclusive and equitable growth and development in the country.

962. Since the review in November 2017, Sri Lanka had already made progress in implementing some of the recommendations.

963. On 5 December 2017, Sri Lanka had acceded to the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and had designated the Human Rights Commission of Sri Lanka as the national preventive mechanism. On 7 March 2018, the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance bill was passed by Parliament, criminalizing enforced disappearance.

964. On 28 February 2018, the President of Sri Lanka had appointed the chair and commissioners for the Office on Missing Persons, making the Office fully operational. Sri Lanka had allocated 1.4 billion Sri Lankan rupees for the Office on Missing Persons in the national budget for 2018. The Constitutional Council, in its selection process, had ensured that the chair and commissioners represented a cross section of society.

965. A counter-terrorism act that would conform to human rights safeguards and other international standards was envisaged. The draft legislation was expected to be gazetted for tabling in Parliament for consideration once the established procedures, including translation into local languages, were completed shortly. On 6 March 2018, the Cabinet of Ministers had approved the formulation of legislation to establish an office for reparations.

966. On 13 December 2017, Sri Lanka had acceded to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, and on 1 March 2018 it had acceded to the Convention on Cluster Munitions.

967. From 4 to 7 March 2018, Sri Lanka had received the Special Envoy on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction. From 4 to 15 December 2017, it had received the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention for an official visit, and in January 2018 it had participated in the review on the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

968. Amendments had been made to the Local Authorities Elections Act and the Provincial Councils Elections Act, having ensured a quota for female representatives to be elected to local governments and provincial councils.

969. For the effective implementation of the National Human Rights Action Plan 2017–2021, a three-tier mechanism had been established to regularly monitor the progress being made by all the relevant line ministries and agencies (an interministerial committee, an officials committee and 10 ministerial sectoral committees) and to give guidance and direction. All action points specified in the plan were being incorporated into the action plans of the relevant ministries and agencies. The Human Rights Commission of Sri Lanka was represented in the officials committee, and civil society representatives nominated by the Human Rights Commission were represented in all sectoral committees.

970. In response to recent incidents targeting members of the Muslim community, Sri Lanka was determined to take action against all perpetrators of the incidents in accordance with the due process of the law. Victim compensation processes had already commenced and arrests had been made. Temporary restrictions on the use of social media had been lifted. Sri Lanka had entered into an active engagement with social media operators, particularly Facebook, to work on the prevention of hate speech. The emergency regulations imposed on 6 March 2018 had been rescinded on 17 March 2018.

971. Sri Lanka, with technical assistance from OHCHR, was exploring the best possible mechanism to put in place locally for regular reporting and follow-up on the recommendations from the universal periodic review process and the treaty bodies. The delegation expressed appreciation for the assistance that OHCHR had offered in that regard.

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

972. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Sri Lanka, 13 delegations made statements.

973. The Russian Federation stated that it supported the efforts of the Government of Sri Lanka to provide reconciliation and protection for the victims of crimes, and to guarantee freedom of expression. It trusted that Sri Lanka would continue to implement a policy aimed at bringing its legislation into line with its international human rights commitments.

974. Sierra Leone noted the Government's commitment to cooperate with the United Nations human rights mechanisms, the extension of a standing invitation to all thematic special procedures, and the accession to the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. It was pleased to note that most of its recommendations made to Sri Lanka had been supported and it applauded any future legislative measure to effectively combat hate speech and incitement to hatred.

975. The Sudan noted with satisfaction the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the establishment of the Ministry of National Integration and Reconciliation and the adoption of the National Human Rights Action Plan 2017–2021. It commended Sri Lanka for the standing invitation to the special procedures and noted with satisfaction that Sri Lanka had supported the two recommendations made by the Sudan.

976. UNFPA mentioned that, in the context of universal health coverage, there was a need to ensure equal access to sexual and reproductive health services without discrimination, including for persons with disabilities, older persons and other disadvantaged populations. Further measures were needed to provide young people and adolescents, including those who fell outside of formal education settings, with access to quality comprehensive sexuality education and reproductive health education. UNFPA would continue to support the Ministry of Education and associated institutions to develop a national comprehensive sexuality education teacher training guide, as well as the Ministry of Skills Development and Vocational Training to reach out to out-of-school young people. The implementation of the national action plan to address sexual and gender-based violence and the women-headed household action plan needed to be expedited with adequate budgetary allocations and the enforcement of laws for the timely prosecution of rape and sexual violence and compensation for victims.

977. The United Arab Emirates appreciated the positive steps taken in various human rights spheres in line with national needs and priorities. It highly appreciated the commitment to

the implementation of measures to bolster sustainable development and social justice, while ensuring the exercise of economic, social and cultural rights. It also appreciated the constructive and responsible approach that marked the efforts of Sri Lanka to strengthen the rule of law and good governance.

978. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland welcomed the acceptance by Sri Lanka of a number of its recommendations, including to accede to the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. It welcomed the commitment of Sri Lanka to design and implement strategies to tackle sexual and gender-based violence, including by addressing related stigma towards victims and survivors. It called upon Sri Lanka to introduce legislation requiring businesses to report publicly on efforts to ensure transparency in supply chains. It urged Sri Lanka to fully implement the commitments made in Human Rights Council resolutions 30/1 and 34/1.

979. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the development of the National Human Rights Action Plan 2017–2021 and free education from primary to university levels.

980. Afghanistan appreciated the acceptance by Sri Lanka of its recommendations to consider ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and to ensure the full alignment of the Human Rights Commission of Sri Lanka with the Paris Principles.

981. China appreciated the formulation of the National Human Rights Action Plan 2017–2021 and the commitment of Sri Lanka to eliminate poverty, develop the economy and raise people's living standards. It appreciated the State's acceptance of recommendations made by China and hoped that Sri Lanka would continue to promote sustainable economic and social development and poverty alleviation, and to better protect people's rights to education, health, work and food, as well as other rights.

982. Belarus welcomed the active interaction of Sri Lanka with the treaty bodies and special procedures, as well as the adoption of the National Human Rights Action Plan 2017–2021.

983. Burundi welcomed the reforms made in the judicial sector to improve the administration of justice, in particular to remedy the delays in that area. It welcomed the adoption of the Law on Assistance to and Protection of Victims of Crime and Witnesses and commended the State for its efforts to reduce poverty. It also commended Sri Lanka for the establishment of the Ministry of National Coexistence, Dialogue and Official Languages and the Secretariat for Coordinating Reconciliation Mechanisms. It encouraged Sri Lanka to continue its efforts to improve the rights of women and children.

984. Algeria welcomed the progress made by Sri Lanka in human rights since the transition in 2015, and the Government's commitment to find political solutions to the problems of armed conflict, within the framework of national reconciliation. It welcomed the adoption of the National Human Rights Action Plan 2017–2021, the ratification of a number of international human rights instruments and the adoption of measures to combat torture. It noted that Sri Lanka had accepted the recommendations made by Algeria regarding national reconciliation and the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals.

985. Cuba stated that the information provided by Sri Lanka showed that there was a commitment to advance in the promotion and protection of human rights in the country, despite the important challenges Sri Lanka faced. The implementation of the recommendations accepted and the promises and voluntary commitments made by the country would help it to overcome those challenges.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

986. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Sri Lanka, 10 other stakeholders made statements.

987. The International Buddhist Relief Organization stated that, out of 230 recommendations for the universal periodic review of Sri Lanka, the Government had rejected none. It stated that the Secretary-General of the United Nations had violated the

Charter of the United Nations and appointed a panel of experts for an investigation on Sri Lanka, whose report had been challenged even by the Security Council. Pakistan had stated that that was an intrusion into the sovereignty of Sri Lanka. A total of 24 members of the Human Rights Council had not supported the investigation on Sri Lanka. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America had not been obliged to sign the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance while leading wars against terrorism, but the Human Rights Council had obliged Sri Lanka to do so, which was a violation of its impartiality.

988. Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers, in a joint statement with Franciscans International, stated that serious concerns remained regarding Colombo International Financial City, in particular the loss of the livelihoods of fishing communities. It flagged the fact that sand mining and dumping activities were destroying the coral reefs. A looming hazard was the emission of toxic particles from the construction of high-rise buildings over 15 to 20 years, which had not been sufficiently mentioned in environmental impact assessment reports. It asked States to urge Sri Lanka to ensure that comprehensive environmental and human rights impact assessments were carried out, to conduct a participatory and effective consultation with all stakeholders, and to ensure that no health hazards resulted from the construction of the project.

989. The International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism welcomed the appointment of the commissioners for the Office of Missing Persons and called upon Sri Lanka to take the measures necessary to ensure that the Office could operate independently and effectively. It expressed grave concern about the series of violent attacks against the Muslim community and it urged Sri Lanka to provide adequate protection for the community concerned, conduct thorough investigations and bring every perpetrator to justice, and take decisive measures against any group or individual who incited hatred, violence or racial discrimination, in line with article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. It also emphasized the need to uphold a victim-centred approach and an inclusive policy when developing strategies for the follow-up to the universal periodic review.

990. The Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development noted that Sri Lanka had not accepted recommendations to repeal or review the Prevention of Terrorism Act and it expressed regret that the Government had rejected recommendations to develop a clear timeline and benchmarks to accelerate the implementation of the State's commitments under Human Rights Council resolution 30/1. It called upon the Government to develop a concrete and time-bound implementation plan in consultation with national human rights institutions and civil society organizations.

991. The World Evangelical Alliance, in a joint statement with Christian Solidarity Worldwide, highlighted its concerns regarding freedom of religion or belief in Sri Lanka. It had documented over 20 incidents of threats to Christians since 15 November 2017, including attacks on places of worship and inter-community incidents. It stated that Muslim minorities were also being attacked and it condemned the communal tensions in Digana, a village near Kandy. It commended the actions of local-level government officials and law enforcement officials who had intervened on behalf of Christians in Batticaloa District. It renewed the call for the formal recognition of evangelical Christian communities in Sri Lanka, and it reiterated the call for the Ministry of Buddhasasana and Religious Affairs to withdraw the circular issued in September 2008 pertaining to the construction of places of worship.

992. The International Commission of Jurists urged the Government to demonstrate through action its willingness to bring to account those who had incited communal violence, in line with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights Act. It noted the limited progress made on implementing Human Rights Council resolution 30/1. There was little transparency with regard to the other mechanisms, in particular the mechanism on accountability, as well as efforts to repeal and replace the Prevention of Terrorism Act. Any new counter-terrorism law must comply with international human rights standards.

993. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland commended Sri Lanka for its commitment in the National Human Rights Action Plan 2017–2021 to protect those discriminated against because of their gender identity. It

was unfortunate that protection based on sexual orientation had been omitted other than specifically in the health-care sector. It urged Sri Lanka to expand the fundamental rights chapter of the Constitution of Sri Lanka to include protection against discrimination based on sexual orientation explicitly, and to further amend the National Human Rights Action Plan to include protection against discrimination based on sexual orientation. Sri Lanka should set up mechanisms to address and break down the stigma around the LGBTIQ community by initiating public awareness efforts to educate law enforcement, teachers, health-care workers, public employees and the general public, and call for an end to attacks, abuse and discrimination based on sexual orientation, gender identity and expression, and sex characteristics.

994. Amnesty International noted that Sri Lanka had taken some important steps towards delivering on the commitments in Human Rights Council resolution 30/1, but it expressed disappointment about the lack of further progress, in particular with regard to addressing enforced disappearances, ensuring the protection of religious and ethnic minorities and human rights defenders, and repealing the Prevention of Terrorism Act. It expressed deep concern that Sri Lanka had failed to publish a timeline for the full implementation of resolution 30/1 and that the State had rejected six universal periodic review recommendations to do so. It called upon Sri Lanka to urgently provide the Council with a time-bound schedule for the implementation of commitments under Council resolution 30/1, to take immediate steps to guarantee accountability and reparations, to publish a complete list of detainees and those who had surrendered, and to repeal the Prevention of Terrorism Act.

995. Franciscans International, in a joint statement with Dominicans for Justice and Peace, expressed concern that Sri Lanka had not accepted many recommendations on taking the steps necessary to implement an effective transitional justice process. Of particular concern were the shrinking space of civil society and reprisals against human rights defenders and journalists.

996. Advocates for Human Rights welcomed the acknowledgement by Sri Lanka during the interactive dialogue that it was abolitionist in practice and it saluted the State's commitment to consider ratifying the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and to consider abolishing the death penalty. It urged Sri Lanka to ensure that its consideration of abolition over the next four years was genuine, thoughtful and constructive, and included concrete measures, such as parliamentary debates, transparent and thorough responses to the Human Rights Commission's formal review of the death penalty, consultations with civil society organizations, and a public education campaign about human rights, including alternatives to the death penalty.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

997. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 230 recommendations received, 177 had enjoyed the support of Sri Lanka and 53 had been noted.

998. The delegation thanked the secretariat of OHCHR, the troika, and all of the States and other stakeholders for their contributions to the universal periodic review of Sri Lanka. Sri Lanka was looking forward to continuing to implement the recommendations, which would be done in consultation and in cooperation with all stakeholders on the ground, as well as systems and procedures of the United Nations and those international partners that assisted Sri Lanka in reaching its human rights and development goals.

B. General debate on agenda item 6

999. At its 42nd and 43rd meetings, on 19 March 2018, 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: Bulgaria¹⁵ (on behalf of the European Union), China, Cuba, Georgia, Iraq, Jordan¹⁵ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Kenya, Russian Federation¹⁵ (also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh,

¹⁵ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Malaysia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam), South Sudan¹⁵ (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Haiti, Mozambique, Nepal, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Yemen), Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam¹⁵ (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Botswana, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Morocco, Republic of Moldova, Sierra Leone;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: ABC Tamil Oli, Action of Human Movement, Advocates for Human Rights, African Regional Agricultural Credit Association, Alliance Creative Community Project, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association culturelle des Tamouls en France, Association d'entraide médicale Guinée, Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association of World Citizens, Association pour les victimes du monde, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Association Thendral, Canners International Permanent Committee, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, Center for Organisation Research and Education, Colombian Commission of Jurists, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, European Union of Public Relations, Indian Council of South America, Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Educational Development, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Human Rights Association of American Minorities, International-Lawyers.Org, International Lesbian and Gay Association (also on behalf of Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland and the International Service for Human Rights), International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Iraqi Development Organization, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Pan African Union for Science and Technology, Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Solidarité Suisse-Guinée, Swiss Catholic Lenten Fund (also on behalf of the Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries and Réseau international des droits humains), Tamil Uzhagam, Tourner la page, United Nations Watch, United Schools International, UPR Info, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Villages Unis, World Environment and Resources Council, World Muslim Congress.

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Czechia

1000. At its 37th meeting, on 15 March 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 37/101 without a vote.

Argentina

1001. At its 37th meeting, on 15 March 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 37/102 without a vote.

Gabon

1002. At its 37th meeting, on 15 March 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 37/103 without a vote.

Ghana

1003. At its 38th meeting, on 15 March 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 37/104 without a vote.

Peru

1004. At its 38th meeting, on 15 March 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 37/105 without a vote.

Guatemala

1005. At its 38th meeting, on 15 March 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 37/106 without a vote.

Switzerland

1006. At its 39th meeting, on 15 March 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 37/107 without a vote.

Republic of Korea

1007. At its 39th meeting, on 15 March 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 37/108 without a vote.

Benin

1008. At its 40th meeting, on 19 March 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 37/109 without a vote.

Pakistan

1009. At its 41st meeting, on 19 March 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 37/110 without a vote.

Zambia

1010. At its 41st meeting, on 19 March 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 37/111 without a vote.

Japan

1011. At its 41st meeting, on 19 March 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 37/112 without a vote.

Ukraine

1012. At its 41st meeting, on 19 March 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 37/113 without a vote.

Sri Lanka

1013. At its 42nd meeting, on 19 March 2018, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 37/114 without a vote.

VII. Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories

A. Interactive dialogue with the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967

1014. At the 43rd meeting, on 19 March 2018, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967, Michael Lynk, presented his report (A/HRC/37/75).

1015. At the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made a statement as the State concerned.

1016. Also at the same meeting, the national human rights institution, the Independent Commission for Human Rights in Palestine, made a statement (by video message).

1017. 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: Brazil, Cuba, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan¹⁵ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Tunisia (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Djibouti, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Maldives, Morocco, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Haq (also on behalf of the Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights), Al Mezan Center for Human Rights, Amuta for NGO Responsibility, Institute on Human Rights and the Holocaust, Medical Aid for Palestinians, Palestinian Return Centre, Women's Centre for Legal Aid and Counselling, World Jewish Congress.

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

1018. At the 44th meeting, on 20 March 2018, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights introduced, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions S-9/1 and S-12/1, the tenth periodic report of the High Commissioner on the human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, in particular on the excessive use of force, arbitrary detention, torture and ill-treatment, restrictions on freedoms of movement, expression, peaceful assembly and association, and the pervasive lack of accountability for violations of international human rights law and international humanitarian law (A/HRC/37/38).

1019. At the same meeting, the Deputy High Commissioner also presented: pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 31/36, the report of the High Commissioner on the database of all business enterprises involved in the activities detailed in paragraph 96 of the report of the independent international fact-finding mission to investigate 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/37/39); pursuant to Council resolution 34/28, the report of the High Commissioner on ensuring accountability and justice for all violations of international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem (A/HRC/37/41); pursuant to Council resolution 34/30, the report of the High Commissioner on the human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem (A/HRC/37/42); and pursuant to Council resolution 34/31, the report of the High Commissioner on Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the occupied Syrian Golan (A/HRC/37/43).

1020. Also at the same meeting, the Deputy High Commissioner presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 34/27, the report of the Secretary-General on the situation of human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan (A/HRC/37/40).

1021. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and the State of Palestine made statements as the States concerned.

C. General debate on agenda item 7

1022. At its 44th meeting, on 20 March 2018, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 7, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola, Bolivia (Plurinational State of)¹⁵ (also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Malaysia, Nicaragua, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the United Arab Emirates and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Chile, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Japan, Jordan¹⁵ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Kuwait¹⁵ (on behalf of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf), Nigeria, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovenia, South Africa, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Morocco, Namibia, Oman, Russian Federation, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Turkey, Uruguay, Yemen;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa culture internationale, Al-Haq, Al Mezan Center for Human Rights (also on behalf of the World Organization against Torture), Amuta for NGO Responsibility, Asian-Eurasian Human Rights Forum, Association of World Citizens, Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, B'nai B'rith, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches, Conseil de jeunesse pluriculturelle, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, European Union of Jewish Students, Human Rights Watch, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", Institute on Human Rights and the Holocaust, International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, International Commission of Jurists, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Federation of Journalists, International Human Rights Association of American Minorities, International-Lawyers.Org, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Meezaan Center for Human Rights, Norwegian Refugee Council, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Palestinian Center for Development and Media Freedoms "MADA", Palestinian Return Centre, United Nations Watch, Women's Centre for Legal Aid and Counselling, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress.

D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan

1023. At the 56th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.18, sponsored by Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation. Subsequently, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

1024. At the same meeting, the representatives of Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic made statements as the States concerned.

1025. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Australia, Brazil, Ecuador, Slovakia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), South Africa, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

1026. 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:

Afghanistan, Angola, Brazil, Burundi, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Australia, Belgium, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Panama, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Togo, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Democratic Republic of the Congo, Japan, Mexico, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Switzerland

1027. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 25 votes to 14, with 7 abstentions (resolution 37/33).¹⁶

Right of the Palestinian people to self-determination

1028. At the 56th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.46, sponsored by Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, Cuba, Ecuador and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Belarus, Botswana, Costa Rica, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, Portugal, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

1029. At the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made a statement as the State concerned.

1030. 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:

Afghanistan, Angola, Belgium, Brazil, Burundi, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iraq, Japan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Australia, United States of America

Abstaining:

Democratic Republic of the Congo

1031. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 43 votes to 2, with 1 abstention (resolution 37/34).¹⁶

¹⁶ The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.

Human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem

1032. At the 56th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.47, sponsored by Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, Cuba, Ecuador and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Botswana, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, Portugal, Slovenia, South Africa and Sweden joined the sponsors.

1033. At the same meeting, the representative of Slovakia, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, made a general comment on the draft resolution.

1034. 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:

Afghanistan, Angola, Belgium, Brazil, Burundi, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iraq, Japan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Australia, Togo, United States of America

Abstaining:

Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda

1035. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 41 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions (resolution 37/35).¹⁶

Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan

1036. At the 56th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.48, sponsored by Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, Cuba, Ecuador and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Botswana, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, Portugal, Slovenia, South Africa, Sweden and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

1037. At the same meeting, the President of the Human Rights Council announced that draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.48 had been orally revised.

1038. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

1039. At the same meeting, the representative of Hungary made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

1040. 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:

Afghanistan, Angola, Belgium, Brazil, Burundi, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Germany, Iraq, Japan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Australia, Hungary, Togo, United States of America

Abstaining:

Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Georgia, Panama, Rwanda, Slovakia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

1041. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised by 34 votes to 4, with 8 abstentions (resolution 37/36).¹⁶

Ensuring accountability and justice for all violations of international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem

1042. At the 56th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.49, sponsored by Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, Cuba, Ecuador and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

1043. At the same meeting, the President of the Human Rights Council announced that draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.49 had been orally revised.

1044. 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:

Afghanistan, Angola, Belgium, Brazil, Burundi, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Iraq, Kyrgyzstan, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovenia, South Africa, Switzerland, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Australia, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Panama, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Slovakia, Spain, Ukraine

1045. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised by 27 votes to 4, with 15 abstentions (resolution 37/37).¹⁶

VIII. Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

General debate on agenda item 8

1046. At its 45th and 46th meetings, on 20 March 2018, 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: Bulgaria¹⁷ (on behalf of the European Union), China, Iraq, Jordan¹⁷ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Kenya, Nepal, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Estonia, Greece, India, Israel, Jordan, Libya, Mozambique, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: ABC Tamil Oli, Action of Human Movement, Advocates for Human Rights, African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, African Regional Agricultural Credit Association, Agence internationale pour le développement, Alliance Creative Community Project, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amuta for NGO Responsibility, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association d'entraide médicale Guinée, Association for the Protection of Women and Children's Rights, Association of World Citizens, Association pour les victimes du monde, Association pour l'intégration et le développement durable au Burundi, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Association Thendral, Canners International Permanent Committee, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Center for Organisation Research and Education, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Conectas Direitos Humanos (also on behalf of Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales and the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues), Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, European Union of Public Relations, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International-Lawyers.Org, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Service for Human Rights, Iraqi Development Organization, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Le pont, Liberation, Ma'arij Foundation for Peace and Development, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Meezaan Center for Human Rights, Nouveaux droits de l'homme, Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Pan African Union for Science and Technology, Prahar, Presse emblème campagne, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Réseau international des droits humains (also on behalf of the Center for Reproductive Rights, Conectas Direitos Humanos, Conselho Indigenista Missionário, the East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Franciscans International, Friends of the Earth International, Front Line: International Foundation for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders, the International Commission of Jurists, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, the International Lesbian and Gay Association, the International Service for Human Rights and the World Organization against Torture), Solidarité Suisse-Guinée, Stichting International Center for Ethnobotanical Education, Research and Service, Tamil Uzhagam, Tourner la page, United Nations Watch, United Schools International,

¹⁷ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

VAAGDHARA, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization, World Environment and Resources Council, World Muslim Congress.

1047. At the 46th meeting, on 20 March 2018, the representatives of Brazil, China, Cuba, India, Pakistan and Spain made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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 promoting tolerance, inclusion, unity and respect for diversity in the context of combating racial discrimination

1048. At the 40th meeting, on 19 March 2018, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 72/157, an annual commemorative meeting at the occasion of the commemoration of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination with a focus on promoting tolerance, inclusion, unity and respect for diversity in the context of combating racial discrimination.

1049. At the same meeting, the Director of the Human Rights Council and Treaty Mechanisms Division of OHCHR made an opening statement for the debate.

1050. Also at the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Chief Executive at the Nelson Mandela Foundation, Sello Hatang; Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Singapore to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Foo Kok Jwee; writer, Fatou Diome; member of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, Nicolás Marugán. The Human Rights Council divided the debate into two slots.

1051. During the ensuing discussion for the first speaking slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries), Brazil, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Morocco¹⁷ (on behalf of States members and observers of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, France, India, Sierra Leone;

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

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Australian Human Rights Commission (by video message);

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism.

1052. During the discussion for the second speaking slot, also at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Iraq, Mexico, Senegal, South Africa, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Argentina, Bahrain, Haiti, Iran (Islamic Republic of);

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

1053. At the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

B. General debate on agenda item 9

1054. At the 46th meeting, on 20 March 2018, the Director of the Human Rights Council and Treaty Mechanisms Division of OHCHR presented the report of the High Commissioner on combating intolerance, negative stereotyping and stigmatization of, and discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against, persons based on religion or belief (A/HRC/37/44).

1055. At the same meeting, the Permanent Representative of Zimbabwe to the United Nations Office at Geneva and Chair-Rapporteur of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Human Rights Council on the Elaboration of Complementary Standards to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Taonga Mushayavanhu, presented the report of the Committee on its ninth session, held from 24 April to 5 May 2017 (A/HRC/37/76).

1056. Also at the same meeting, the Permanent Representative of Sierra Leone to the United Nations Office at Geneva and Chair-Rapporteur of the Intergovernmental Working Group on the Effective Implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, Yvette Stevens, presented the report of the Working Group on its fifteenth session, held from 9 to 20 October 2017 (A/HRC/37/77).

1057. At the 46th and 47th meetings, on 20 March 2018, 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: Bahamas¹⁷ (also on behalf of Antigua and Barbuda), Brazil, Brazil (also on behalf of Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay), Bulgaria¹⁷ (on behalf of the European Union), China, Cuba, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan¹⁷ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Mexico, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), South Africa, Togo (on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (also on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Botswana, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Libya, Malaysia, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Turkey;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: ABC Tamil Oli, Action of Human Movement, African Regional Agricultural Credit Association, Alliance Creative Community Project, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amuta for NGO Responsibility, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association d'entraide médicale Guinée, Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association for the Protection of Women and Children's Rights, Association of World Citizens, Association pour les victimes du monde, Association pour l'intégration et le développement durable au Burundi, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Association Thendral, Auspice Stella, Canners International Permanent Committee, Center for Environmental and Management Studies, Center for Organisation Research and Education, Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Conseil de jeunesse pluriculturelle, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, European Union of Jewish Students, European Union of Public Relations, Human Security Initiative Organization, Indian Council of South America, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, International Association for Democracy in Africa, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Educational Development, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Human Rights Association of American Minorities, International-Lawyers.Org, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations (also on behalf of the African Commission of Health and Human Rights Promoters, the African Development Association, Association Dunenyu, the Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, Comité international pour le respect et l'application de la charte africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples, Global Action on Aging, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", the International Association against Torture, the

International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Educational Development, the International Federation for the Protection of the Rights of Ethnic, Religious, Linguistic and Other Minorities, the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the Victorious Youths Movement), Iraqi Development Organization, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Le pont, Liberation, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Meezaan Center for Human Rights, Nouveaux droits de l'homme, Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Pan African Union for Science and Technology, Prahar, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Sikh Human Rights Group, Society for Development and Community Empowerment, Solidarité Suisse-Guinée, Tamil Uzhagam, Tourner la page, United Nations Watch, United Schools International, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization, World Environment and Resources Council, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress.

1058. At the 47th meeting, the representative of Latvia 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

1059. At the 56th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.17, sponsored by Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation. Subsequently, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Canada, the Dominican Republic, the Philippines, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

1060. At the same meeting, the representative of Slovakia, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, made a general comment on the draft resolution.

1061. 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.

1062. At the 56th meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 37/38).

X. Technical assistance and capacity-building

A. High-level interactive dialogue on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic

1063. At the 49th meeting, on 21 March 2018, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 36/25, a high-level interactive dialogue on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic.

1064. At the same meeting, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights and Head of OHCHR in New York made an opening statement for the interactive dialogue, on behalf of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.

1065. Also at the same meeting, the following made statements: Deputy Special Representative and Deputy Head of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic; Special Representative of the African Union to the Central African Republic, Bédializoun Moussa Nébié; Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic, Marie-Thérèse Keïta Bocoum; Minister for Justice of the Central African Republic, Flavien Mbata; representative of the Leadership de la Femme en Centrafrique, Lina Ekomo.

1066. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, and at the 50th meeting, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the presenters questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Belgium, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Congo, Czechia, France, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Russian Federation, Sudan;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, World Evangelical Alliance (also on behalf of Caritas Internationalis).

1067. At the 50th meeting, the presenters answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

B. Enhanced interactive dialogue on the situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

1068. At the 47th meeting, on 20 March 2018, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights and Head of OHCHR in New York provided, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 35/33, an oral update on the situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

1069. At the same meeting, the following made statements: Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Head of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; leader of the international team of experts on the situation in the Kasai region, Bacre Waly Ndiaye; Minister for Human Rights of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Marie-Ange Mushobekwa.

1070. During the ensuing discussion, also at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the presenters questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola, Australia, Belgium, China, Germany, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Botswana, Congo, France, Ireland, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Sudan;

(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: Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, African Development Association, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Federation of ACAT, International Service for Human Rights, World Evangelical Alliance.

1071. At the same meeting, the presenters answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

C. Interactive dialogue on the situation of human rights in Libya

1072. At the 48th meeting, on 21 March 2018, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights and Head of OHCHR in New York presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 34/38, the report of the High Commissioner on the situation of human rights in Libya, and the effectiveness of technical assistance and capacity-building measures received by the Government of Libya (A/HRC/37/46).

1073. At the same meeting, the representative of Libya made a statement as the State concerned.

1074. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, also at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: China, Egypt, Germany, Jordan¹⁷ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Nigeria, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Bahrain, Burkina Faso, Czechia, Estonia, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Malta, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Russian Federation, Sudan, Yemen;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Human Rights Watch, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (also on behalf of International-Lawyers.Org), Ma'arij Foundation for Peace and Development, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, United Nations Watch, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

1075. At the same meeting, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

D. Interactive dialogue on cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights

1076. At the 49th meeting, on 21 March 2018, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights provided, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 35/31, an oral update on the situation of human rights in Ukraine.

1077. At the same meeting, the representative of Ukraine made a statement as the State concerned.

1078. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, also 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: Australia, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Bulgaria, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Sweden;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Advocates for Human Rights, Amnesty International, Human Rights House Foundation, Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”, World Federation of Ukrainian Women’s Organizations.

1079. At the same meeting, the Deputy High Commissioner answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

E. Interactive dialogue with a special procedure mandate holder

Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Mali

1080. At the 48th meeting, on 21 March 2018, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Mali, Suliman Baldo, presented his report (A/HRC/37/78).

1081. At the same meeting, the representative of Mali made a statement as the State concerned.

1082. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, also at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: China, Côte d’Ivoire, Germany, Senegal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Canada, Denmark, Estonia, France, Luxembourg, Norway, Sudan;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Catholic Child Bureau (also on behalf of the International Movement of Apostolate in the Independent Social Milieus), International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Service for Human Rights, United Nations Watch.

1083. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

F. General debate on agenda item 10

1084. At the 51st meeting, on 22 March 2018, the Deputy High Commissioner introduced country-specific reports and oral updates of the High Commissioner submitted under agenda item 10 (A/HRC/37/45 and A/HRC/37/64).

1085. At the same meeting, the Director of the Field Operations and Technical Cooperation Division of OHCHR made a statement.

1086. Also at the same meeting, member of the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Technical Cooperation in the Field of Human Rights, Morten Kjaerum, presented the report of the Board of Trustees (A/HRC/37/79).

1087. At the same meeting, the representatives of Afghanistan, Cambodia, Haiti and Yemen made statements as the States concerned.

1088. During the ensuing general debate, at the 51st and 52nd meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Deputy High Commissioner questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Antigua and Barbuda¹⁷ (also on behalf of Afghanistan, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Haiti, Mozambique, Nepal, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, South Sudan and Yemen), Australia, Brazil (also on behalf of Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Peru and Uruguay), Bulgaria¹⁷ (on behalf of the European Union), China, Egypt, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iraq, Japan, Jordan¹⁷ (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Mexico, Netherlands¹⁷ (also on behalf of Belgium, Canada, Egypt, Ireland, Luxembourg, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen), Pakistan, Peru, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone¹⁷ (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Colombia, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Mozambique, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, Zambia and the State of Palestine), Spain, Switzerland, Togo (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Canada, Costa Rica, Estonia, Finland, France, India, Ireland, Jordan, Latvia, Libya, Lithuania, Malaysia, Maldives, Myanmar, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand;

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

(d) Observers for national human rights institutions: Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission (by video message), Office for the Protection of Citizens (Haiti);

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: ABC Tamil Oli, Action of Human Movement, Advocates for Human Rights, Alliance Creative Community Project, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development (also on behalf of CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Freedom House and Front Line: International Foundation for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders), Association AMOR, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association culturelle des tamouls en France, Association d'entraide médicale Guinée, Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association of World Citizens, Association pour les victimes du monde, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Association Thendral, Baha'i International Community, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Center for Organisation Research and Education, Conseil de jeunesse pluriculturelle, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Human Rights Now, Human Rights Watch, Indian Council of South America, Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, International Buddhist Relief Organisation, International Commission of Jurists, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Human Rights Association of American Minorities, International Lesbian and Gay Association, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International-Lawyers.Org, Iraqi Development Organization, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, Kham Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Le pont, Liberation, Lumos Foundation, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational and Transparty, Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Prahar, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Save the Children International, Society for Development and Community Empowerment, Tamil Uzhagam, Tourner la page, United Nations Watch, VAAGDHARA,

Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, World Barua Organization.

1089. At the 52nd meeting, on 22 March 2018, the representatives of Cambodia and the Russian Federation made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

G. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Technical assistance and capacity-building for Mali in the field of human rights

1090. At the 56th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representative of Togo, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.14, sponsored by Togo, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, France, Georgia, Germany, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Croatia, Czechia, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Lithuania, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Thailand, Turkey and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

1091. At the same meeting, the representatives of Belgium and Slovakia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made general comments on the draft resolution.

1092. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Mali made a statement as the State concerned.

1093. 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.

1094. At the 56th meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 37/39).

Cooperation with Georgia

1095. At the 56th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representative of Georgia introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.43, sponsored by Georgia and co-sponsored by Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine and the United States of America. Subsequently, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

1096. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a general comment on the draft resolution.

1097. 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.

1098. At the 56th meeting, the representatives of Australia, Brazil, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

1099. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Australia, Belgium, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Togo, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Philippines, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Switzerland, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates

1100. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 19 votes to 5, with 23 abstentions (resolution 37/40).

Technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in Libya

1101. At the 56th meeting, on 23 March 2018, the representative of Togo, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/37/L.45, sponsored by Togo, on behalf of the Group of African States, and co-sponsored by Italy. Subsequently, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

1102. At the same meeting, the representative of Slovakia, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, made a general comment on the draft resolution.

1103. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Libya made a statement as the State concerned.

1104. 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.

1105. At the 56th meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 37/41).

1106. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote and general comments on all of the draft proposals adopted under agenda item 10.

Annex I

Attendance

Members

Afghanistan	Georgia	Rwanda
Angola	Germany	Saudi Arabia
Australia	Hungary	Senegal
Belgium	Iraq	Slovakia
Brazil	Japan	Slovenia
Burundi	Kenya	South Africa
Chile	Kyrgyzstan	Spain
China	Mexico	Switzerland
Côte d'Ivoire	Mongolia	Togo
Croatia	Nepal	Tunisia
Cuba	Nigeria	Ukraine
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Pakistan	United Arab Emirates
Ecuador	Panama	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Egypt	Peru	United States of America
Ethiopia	Philippines	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
	Qatar	
	Republic of Korea	

States Members of the United Nations represented by observers

Albania	El Salvador	Madagascar
Algeria	Equatorial Guinea	Malawi
Andorra	Eritrea	Malaysia
Antigua and Barbuda	Estonia	Maldives
Argentina	Fiji	Mali
Armenia	Finland	Malta
Austria	France	Mauritania
Azerbaijan	Gabon	Monaco
Bahamas	Ghana	Montenegro
Bahrain	Greece	Morocco
Bangladesh	Guatemala	Mozambique
Belarus	Guyana	Myanmar
Benin	Haiti	Namibia
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Honduras	Netherlands
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Iceland	New Zealand
Botswana	India	Niger
Bulgaria	Indonesia	Norway
Burkina Faso	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Oman
Cambodia	Ireland	Paraguay
Cameroon	Israel	Poland
Canada	Italy	Portugal
Central African Republic	Jordan	Republic of Moldova
Chad	Kazakhstan	Romania
Colombia	Kuwait	Russian Federation
Congo	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Costa Rica	Latvia	Serbia
Cyprus	Lebanon	Sierra Leone
Czechia	Lesotho	Singapore
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	Libya	Somalia
Denmark	Liechtenstein	South Sudan
Djibouti	Lithuania	Sri Lanka
	Luxembourg	

Sudan	Timor-Leste	Yemen
Swaziland	Turkey	Zambia
Sweden	Turkmenistan	Zimbabwe
Syrian Arab Republic	Uganda	
Thailand	United Republic of Tanzania	
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Uzbekistan	
	Viet Nam	

Non-Member States represented by observers

Holy See
State of Palestine

United Nations

Department of Peacekeeping Operations	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
Economic Commission for Europe	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS	United Nations Environment Programme
United Nations Children's Fund	United Nations Population Fund
United Nations Development Programme	

Specialized agencies and related organizations

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	International Telecommunication Union
International Organization for Migration	World Health Organization

Intergovernmental organizations

African Union	Council of Europe
Commonwealth	European Union
Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf	International Development Law Organization
	Organization of Islamic Cooperation

Other entities

International Committee of the Red Cross
International Olympic Committee
Sovereign Military Hospitaller Order of St. John of Jerusalem, of Rhodes and of Malta

National human rights institutions, international coordinating committees and regional groups of national institutions

Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission	Equality and Human Rights Commission (Great Britain)
Australian Human Rights Commission	Finnish Human Rights Centre and the Parliamentary Ombudsman
Instituto Nacional de Derechos Humanos (Chile)	Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions
Commission nationale des droits de l'homme (Mauritania)	Human Rights Commission of Zambia
Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice (Ghana)	Independent Commission for Human Rights of the State of Palestine
Conseil national des droits de l'homme (Morocco)	Office of the People's Advocate (Albania)
	National Committee for Human Rights of Qatar
	National Council for Human Rights of Egypt
	National Human Rights Commission of Mexico

National Human Rights Commission of
Nigeria
National Human Rights Commission of
the Republic of Korea

Office for the Protection of Citizens (Haiti)
Procuraduría de los Derechos Humanos (Guatemala)
South African Human Rights Commission

Non-governmental organizations

ABC Tamil Oli
Action Canada for Population and
Development
Action contre la faim
Action internationale pour la paix et le
développement dans la région des
Grands Lacs
Action of Human Movement
Action pour la protection des droits de
l'homme en Mauritanie
Advocates for Human Rights
Africa culture internationale
African-American Society for
Humanitarian Aid and Development
African Commission of Health and
Human Rights Promoters
African Development Association
African Regional Agricultural Credit
Association
Agence internationale pour le
développement
Agir ensemble pour les droits de l'homme
Al Baraem Association for Charitable
Work
Al-Hakim Foundation
Al-Haq
Aliran Kesedaran Negara National
Consciousness Movement
Al-Khoei Foundation
Alliance Creative Community Project
Alliance Defending Freedom
Alliance globale contre les mutilations
génitales féminines
Alliance pour la solidarité et le partage en
Afrique – Jeunesse pour intégration
culturelle et sociale
Al Mezan Center for Human Rights
Alsalam Foundation
American Association of Jurists
American Bar Association
Americans for Democracy and Human
Rights in Bahrain
Amnesty International
Amuta for NGO Responsibility
Anglican Consultative Council
Arab Organization for Human Rights
Article 19: International Centre against
Censorship
Asian-Eurasian Human Rights Forum
Asian Forum for Human Rights and
Development
Asian Legal Resource Centre

Asian-Pacific Resource and Research Centre
for Women
Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas
Association AMOR
Association Bharathi centre culturel
franco-tamoul
Association culturelle des Tamouls en France
Association d'entraide médicale Guinée
Association des étudiants tamouls de France
Association Dunenyo
Association for Defending Victims of
Terrorism
Association for Progressive Communications
Association for the Prevention of Torture
Association for the Protection of Women and
Children's Rights
Association internationale pour l'égalité des
femmes
Association mauritanienne pour la promotion
des droits de l'homme
Association mauritanienne pour la promotion
du droit
Association Miraisme International
Association of World Citizens
Association "Paix" pour la lutte contre la
contrainte et l'injustice
Association pour les victimes du monde
Association pour l'intégration et le
développement durable au Burundi
Association solidarité internationale pour
l'Afrique
Association Thendral
Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII
Auspice Stella
Badil Resource Center for Palestinian
Residency and Refugee Rights
Baha'i International Community
B'nai B'rith
British Humanist Association
Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies
Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for
Peace
Canners International Permanent Committee
Caritas Internationalis
Center for Economic and Social Rights
Center for Environmental and Management
Studies
Center for Global Nonkilling
Center for Inquiry
Center for International Environmental Law
Center for International Human Rights

Center for Organisation Research and Education
Center for Reproductive Rights
Centre Europe-tiers monde
Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy
Centre indépendant de recherches et d'initiatives pour le dialogue
Centre pour les droits civils et politiques
Centro des Promoción y Defensa de los Derechos Sexuales y Reproductivos
Chant du guépard dans le désert
Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims
Child Development Foundation
Child Foundation
China Society for Human Rights Studies
Chinese Association for International Understanding
Christian Solidarity Worldwide
CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation
Colombian Commission of Jurists
Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos
Comisión Unidos vs Trata
Comité international pour le respect et l'application de la charte africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples
Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches
Commission to Study the Organization of Peace
Conectas Direitos Humanos
Conseil de jeunesse pluriculturelle
Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme
Conselho Indigenista Missionário
Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations
Coordination des associations et des particuliers pour la liberté de conscience
Corporación para la Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos – Reiniciar
Corporate Accountability International
“Coup de pouce” Chaîne de l'espoir Nord-Sud
Defence for Children International
Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers
DRCNet Foundation
Drepavie
Earthjustice
East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project
Ecumenical Alliance for Human Rights and Development
Ecumenical Federation of Constantinopolitans
Edmund Rice International
Egyptian Organization for Human Rights
Ensemble contre la peine de mort
Equal Rights Trust
Espace Afrique International
European Centre for Law and Justice
European Union of Jewish Students
European Union of Public Relations
Family Health Association of Iran
Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland
FIAN International
Fondation d'Auteuil
Fondation pour l'étude des relations internationales et du développement
Forum Azzahrae pour la femme marocaine
Foundation ECPAT International
Foundation for GAIA
Foundation of Japanese Honorary Debts
France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand
Franciscans International
Friedrich Ebert Foundation
Friends of the Earth International
Friends World Committee for Consultation
Fundación Latinoamericana por los Derechos Humanos y el Desarrollo Social
Fundación Vida – Grupo Ecológico Verde
Fundalatin
Geneva Centre for Human Rights Advancement and Global Dialogue
Geneva Institute for Human Rights
Genève pour les droits de l'homme: formation internationale
Geo Expertise Association
Global Action on Aging
Global Hope Network International
Global Institute for Water, Environment and Health
Global Policy Forum
Graduate Women International
Greenpeace International
Habitat International Coalition
HelpAge International
Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights
Heritage Foundation
Himalayan Research and Cultural Foundation
Human Rights Advocates
Human Rights Association for Community Development in Assiut
Human Rights Council of Australia
Human Rights House Foundation
Human Rights Law Centre
Human Rights League of the Horn of Africa
Human Rights Now

Human Rights Watch
 Human Security Initiative Organization
 Il Cenacolo
 Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society
 Indian Council of Education
 Indian Council of South America
 Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru"
 Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee
 Initiative d'opposition contre les discours extrémistes
 Initiatives of Change International
 Institut de Drets Humans de Catalunya
 Institute for Planetary Synthesis
 Institute for Policy Studies
 Institute on Human Rights and the Holocaust
 International Association for Democracy in Africa
 International Association of Democratic Lawyers
 International Bar Association
 International Bridges to Justice
 International Buddhist Relief Organisation
 International Career Support Association
 International Catholic Child Bureau
 International Center for Not-for-Profit Law
 International Commission of Jurists
 International Council of Russian Compatriots
 International Doctors for Healthier Drug Policies, CIC
 International Educational Development
 International Federation for Human Rights Leagues
 International Federation for the Protection of the Rights of Ethnic, Religious, Linguistic and Other Minorities
 International Federation of ACAT
 International Federation of Journalists
 International Fellowship of Reconciliation
 International Humanist and Ethical Union
 International Human Rights Association of American Minorities
 International Institute for Non-Aligned Studies
 International-Lawyers.Org
 International Lesbian and Gay Association
 International Longevity Center Global Alliance
 International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism
 International Movement ATD Fourth World
 International Movement for Fraternal Union among Races and Peoples
 International 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
 International Organization of Employers
 International PEN
 International Planned Parenthood Federation
 International Service for Human Rights
 International Trade Union Confederation
 International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development
 International Women Bond
 International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations
 Iranian Elite Research Center
 Iraqi Development Organization
 Islamic Women's Institute of Iran
 Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco
 IT for Change
 IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association
 Iuventum
 Japan Federation of Bar Associations
 Japanese Workers Committee for Human Rights
 Jossour forum des femmes marocaines
 Jssor Youth Organization
 Jubilee Campaign
 Kejibaus Youth Development Initiative
 Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture
 Kirkon Ulkomaanavun Säätiö
 Labour, Health and Human Rights Development Centre
 La manif pour tous
 Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada
 Le pont
 Liberation
 Lumos Foundation
 Lutheran World Federation
 Ma'arij Foundation for Peace and Development
 Maat Foundation for Peace, Development and Human Rights
 Maher
 Make Mothers Matter
 Mary Robinson Foundation
 Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association
 Medical Aid for Palestinians
 Meezaan Center for Human Rights
 Minnesota Citizens Concerned for Life Education Fund
 Minority Rights Group
 Nagorik Uddyog
 National Coordinator for Human Rights
 Next Century Foundation
 NGO Coordination post Beijing Switzerland

Noble Institution for Environmental Peace
 Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational
 and Transparty
 Norwegian Refugee Council
 Nouveaux droits de l'homme
 Observatoire mauritanien des droits de
 l'homme et de la démocratie
 Oidhaco, Bureau international des droits
 humains – action Colombie
 Organisation internationale pour les pays
 les moins avancés
 Organisation marocaine des droits
 humains
 Organisation pour la communication en
 Afrique et de promotion de la
 coopération économique internationale
 Organization for Defending Victims of
 Violence
 Oxfam Great Britain
 Palestinian Center for Development and
 Media Freedoms “MADA”
 Palestinian Return Centre
 Pan African Union for Science and
 Technology
 Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation
 Pax Christi International
 Peace Brigades International Switzerland
 People for Successful Corean
 Reunification
 Plan International
 Prahar
 Prajachaitanya Yuvajana Sangam
 Presse emblème campagne
 Prevention Association of Social Harms
 Privacy International
 Public Organization “Public Advocacy”
 Rencontre africaine pour la défense des
 droits de l'homme
 Réseau international des droits humains
 Réseau unité pour le développement de
 Mauritanie
 Roads of Success
 Russian Peace Foundation
 Save a Child's Heart in Memory of Dr.
 Ami Cohen
 Save the Children International
 Servas International
 Sexual Rights Initiative
 Sikh Human Rights Group
 Social Service Agency of the Protestant
 Church in Germany
 Society for Development and Community
 Empowerment
 Society for Recovery Support
 Society for the Psychological Study of
 Social Issues
 Society for Threatened Peoples
 Society of Iranian Women Advocating
 Sustainable Development of the Environment
 Soka Gakkai International
 Solidarité Suisse-Guinée
 Soroptimist International
 Stichting International Center for Ethnobotanical
 Education, Research and Service
 Stichting War Child
 Sudanese Women Parliamentarians Caucus
 Swedish Association for Sexuality Education
 Swiss Catholic Lenten Fund
 Syrian Center for Media and Freedom of
 Expression
 Tamil Uzhagam
 Tchad agir pour l'environnement
 Terre des hommes fédération internationale
 Tides Center
 Tourner la page
 UNESCO Centre Basque Country
 UNESCO Centre of Catalonia
 Union of Arab Jurists
 United Nations Watch
 United Schools International
 United Towns Agency for North-South
 Cooperation
 UPR Info
 VAAGDHARA
 Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik
 Villages Unis
 VIVAT International
 Women's Centre for Legal Aid and
 Counselling
 Women's Federation for World Peace International
 Women's Human Rights International Association
 Women's International League for Peace
 and Freedom
 World Barua Organization
 World Council of Arameans (Syriacs)
 World Environment and Resources Council
 World Evangelical Alliance
 World Federation of Ukrainian
 Women's Organizations
 World Jewish Congress
 World Medical Association
 World Muslim Congress
 World Organization against Torture
 Young Heart Foundation
 Zonta International

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

Documents issued for the thirty-seventh session

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/37/1	1 Agenda and annotations
A/HRC/37/2	1 Report of the Human Rights Council on its thirty- seventh session
A/HRC/37/3	2 Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/3/Add.1	2 Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the activities of the Office of the High Commissioner in Guatemala
A/HRC/37/3/Add.2	2 Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the situation of human rights in Honduras
A/HRC/37/3/Add.3	2 Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the situation of human rights in Colombia
A/HRC/37/4	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Czechia
A/HRC/37/4/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/37/5	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Argentina
A/HRC/37/5/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/37/6	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Gabon
A/HRC/37/6/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/37/7	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Ghana
A/HRC/37/7/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/37/8	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Peru
A/HRC/37/8/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/37/9	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Guatemala
A/HRC/37/9/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/37/10	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Benin

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/37/11	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Republic of Korea
A/HRC/37/11/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/37/12	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Switzerland
A/HRC/37/12/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/37/13	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Pakistan
A/HRC/37/13/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/37/14	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Zambia
A/HRC/37/14/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State
A/HRC/37/15	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Japan
A/HRC/37/15/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/37/16	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Ukraine
A/HRC/37/16/Add.1	6 Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/37/17	6 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: Sri Lanka
A/HRC/37/18	2, 3 Report of the Secretary-General on the safety of journalists and the issue of impunity: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/37/19	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/37/20	2 United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/37/21	2 Measures taken to implement Human Rights Council resolution 9/8 and obstacles to its implementation, including recommendations for further improving the effectiveness of, harmonizing and reforming the treaty body system: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/37/22	2 Question of human rights in Cyprus: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the question of human rights in Cyprus
A/HRC/37/23	2 Promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on Sri Lanka
A/HRC/37/24	2 Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran: report of the Secretary-General

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/37/25	2, 3	Right to access to justice under article 13 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/26	2, 3	Rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities: annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/27	2, 3	Summary of the discussions held during the seminar entitled “Exchanging national experiences and practices on the implementation of effective safeguards to prevent torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment during police custody and pretrial detention”: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/28	2, 3	Summary report on the panel discussion of the impact of multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination and violence in the context of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance on the full enjoyment of all human rights by women and girls: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/29	2, 3	Intersessional seminar on cultural rights and the protection of cultural heritage: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/30	2, 3	Question of the realization in all countries of economic, social and cultural rights: report of the Secretary-General on the role of economic, social and cultural rights in building sustainable and resilient societies for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
A/HRC/37/31	2, 3	Summary of the biennial Human Rights Council panel discussion on unilateral coercive measures and human rights: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/32	2, 3	Realization of the right to work: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/33	2, 3	Protecting the rights of the child in humanitarian situations: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/34	2, 3	Principles and practical guidance on the protection of the human rights of migrants in vulnerable situations: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/34/Add.1	2, 3	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/35	2, 3	Summary of the panel discussion on human rights, climate change, migrants and persons displaced across international borders: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/36	2, 3	Summary report of the annual full-day of discussion on women’s human rights: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/37	2, 5	Report on the twenty-fourth annual meeting of special rapporteurs/representatives, independent experts and chairs of working groups of the special procedures of the Human Rights

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
	Council (Geneva, 27-30 June 2017), including updated information on special procedures
A/HRC/37/37/Add.1	2, 5 Facts and figures with regard to the special procedures in 2017
A/HRC/37/38	7 Implementation of Human Rights Council resolutions S-9/1 and S-12/1: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/39	2, 7 Database of all business enterprises involved in the activities detailed in paragraph 96 of the report of the independent international fact-finding mission to investigate 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: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/40	2, 7 Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/37/41	2, 7 Ensuring accountability and justice for all violations of international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/42	2, 7 Human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem: report of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/43	7 Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the occupied Syrian Golan: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/44	2, 9 Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping, stigmatization, 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/37/45	2, 10 Situation of human rights in Afghanistan and technical assistance achievements in the field of human rights: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/46	2, 10 Situation of human rights in Libya, and the effectiveness of technical assistance and capacity-building measures received by the Government of Libya: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/47	3 Annual report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict
A/HRC/37/48	3 Annual report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children
A/HRC/37/49	3 Report of the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief
A/HRC/37/49/Add.1	3 Mission to Albania
A/HRC/37/49/Add.2	3 Mission to Uzbekistan
A/HRC/37/49/Add.3	3 Mission to Albania: comments by State
A/HRC/37/49/Add.4	3 Mission to Uzbekistan: comments by State

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/37/50	3 Report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment
A/HRC/37/50/Add.1	3 Mission to Turkey
A/HRC/37/50/Add.2	3 Mission to Turkey: comments by the State
A/HRC/37/51	3 Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders
A/HRC/37/51/Add.1	3 Observations on communications transmitted to Governments and replies received
A/HRC/37/51/Add.2	3 Mission to Mexico
A/HRC/37/51/Add.3	3 Mission to Australia
A/HRC/37/51/Add.4	3 Mission to Mexico: comments by the State
A/HRC/37/52	3 Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism on the human rights challenge of states of emergency in the context of countering terrorism
A/HRC/37/53	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
A/HRC/37/53/Add.1	3 Mission to Chile
A/HRC/37/54	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 human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights: development of guiding principles for assessing the human rights impact of economic reform policies
A/HRC/37/54/Add.1	3 Mission to Tunisia
A/HRC/37/54/Add.2	3 Mission to Panama
A/HRC/37/54/Add.3	3 Visit to Switzerland
A/HRC/37/54/Add.4	3 Mission to Tunisia: comments by the State
A/HRC/37/55	2, 3 Report of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights
A/HRC/37/55/Add.1	3 Mission to Serbia and Kosovo
A/HRC/37/55/Add.2	3 Mission to Serbia and Kosovo: comments by the State
A/HRC/37/56	3 Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities
A/HRC/37/56/Add.1	3 Visit to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea
A/HRC/37/56/Add.2	3 Mission to Kazakhstan
A/HRC/37/56/Add.3	3 Visit to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea: comments by State
A/HRC/37/56/Add.4	3 Mission to Kazakhstan: comments by the State
A/HRC/37/57	3 Report of the Independent Expert on the enjoyment of human rights by persons with albinism
A/HRC/37/57/Add.1	3 Mission to the United Republic of Tanzania

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/37/57/Add.2	3	Report of the Independent Expert on the enjoyment of human rights by persons with albinism on the expert workshop on witchcraft and human rights
A/HRC/37/57/Add.3	3	Report of the Independent Expert on the enjoyment of human rights by persons with albinism on the Regional Action Plan on Albinism in Africa (2017–2021)
A/HRC/37/58	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment
A/HRC/37/58/Add.1	3	Mission to Uruguay
A/HRC/37/58/Add.2	3	Mission to Mongolia
A/HRC/37/59	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment
A/HRC/37/60	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the sale and sexual exploitation of children, including child prostitution, child pornography and other child sexual abuse material
A/HRC/37/60/Add.1	3	Mission to the Dominican Republic
A/HRC/37/61	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to food
A/HRC/37/61/Add.1	3	Mission to Zambia
A/HRC/37/62	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to privacy
A/HRC/37/63	3	Report of the Independent Expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order
A/HRC/37/64	2, 10	Role and achievements of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights in assisting the Government and people of Cambodia in the promotion and protection of human rights: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/37/65	3	Joint study on the contribution of transitional justice to the prevention of gross violations and abuses of human rights and serious violations of international humanitarian law, including genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, and their recurrence: report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence and the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide
A/HRC/37/66	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on minority issues
A/HRC/37/67	3	Report on the third session of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on transnational corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights
A/HRC/37/68	4	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran
A/HRC/37/68/Add.1	4	Reply to the report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran to be presented at the thirty-seventh Human Rights Council (March 2018)
A/HRC/37/69	4	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/37/70	4	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar
A/HRC/37/71	4	Report of the Commission on Human Rights in South Sudan
A/HRC/37/72	4	Report of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/37/73	5	Report of the Special Rapporteur on minority issues on recommendations made by the Forum on Minority Issues at its tenth session on the theme “Minority youth: towards inclusive and diverse societies”
A/HRC/37/74	5	2017 Social Forum: report of the Co-Chair-Rapporteurs
A/HRC/37/75	7	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967
A/HRC/37/76	9	Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Elaboration of Complementary Standards on its ninth session
A/HRC/37/77	9	Report of the Intergovernmental Working Group on the Effective Implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action on its fifteenth session
A/HRC/37/78	10	Report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Mali
A/HRC/37/79	10	Report of the Chair of the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Technical Cooperation in the Field of Human Rights
A/HRC/37/80	3, 4, 7, 9, 10	Communications report of Special Procedures: communications sent, 1 June to 30 November 2017; Replies received, 1 August 2017 to 31 January 2018
A/HRC/37/80/Corr.1	3, 4, 7, 9, 10	Corrigendum
A/HRC/37/81	2	Conclusions and recommendations of special procedures: report of the Secretary-General

Documents issued in the conference room papers series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/37/CRP.1	10	Report on the human rights situation in Ukraine
A/HRC/37/CRP.2	4	Report of the Commission on Human Rights in South Sudan
A/HRC/37/CRP.3	4	“I lost my dignity”: sexual and gender-based violence in the Syrian Arab Republic: conference room paper of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/37/CRP.4	2, 3	The slow onset effects of climate change and human rights protection for cross-border migrants

Documents issued in the limited series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/37/L.1	1 The deteriorating situation of human rights in Eastern Ghouta, in the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/37/L.2	1 Amendment to draft resolution L.1
A/HRC/37/L.3	1 Amendment to draft resolution L.1
A/HRC/37/L.4	1 Amendment to draft resolution L.1
A/HRC/37/L.5	1 Amendment to draft resolution L.1
A/HRC/37/L.6	1 Amendment to draft resolution L.1
A/HRC/37/L.7	1 Amendment to draft resolution L.1
A/HRC/37/L.8	1 Amendment to draft resolution L.1
A/HRC/37/L.9	1 Amendment to draft resolution L.1
A/HRC/37/L.10	3 The right to privacy in the digital age
A/HRC/37/L.11/Rev.1	3 Integrity of the judicial system
A/HRC/37/L.12	3 Adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and the right to non-discrimination in this context
A/HRC/37/L.13	3 Mandate of the Independent Expert on the enjoyment of human rights by persons with albinism
A/HRC/37/L.14	10 Technical assistance and capacity-building for Mali in the field of human rights
A/HRC/37/L.15	3 The role of good governance in the promotion and protection of human rights
A/HRC/37/L.16	3 Promoting human rights and the Sustainable Development Goals through transparent, accountable and efficient public services delivery
A/HRC/37/L.17	9 Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping and stigmatization of, and discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against, persons based on religion or belief
A/HRC/37/L.18	7 Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan
A/HRC/37/L.19	3 Human rights and the environment
A/HRC/37/L.20	3 Freedom of religion or belief
A/HRC/37/L.21	3 The right to food
A/HRC/37/L.22	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/37/L.23	3 Mandate of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights
A/HRC/37/L.24	3 Question of the realization in all countries of economic, social and cultural rights
A/HRC/37/L.25	3 Rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities

Documents issued in the limited series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/37/L.26	3 High-level intersessional discussion celebrating the centenary of Nelson Mandela
A/HRC/37/L.27	10 Cooperation with Georgia
A/HRC/37/L.28	3 Right to work
A/HRC/37/L.29	4 Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea
A/HRC/37/L.30	3 Cultural rights and the protection of cultural heritage
A/HRC/37/L.31	3 Promoting human rights through sport and the Olympic ideal
A/HRC/37/L.32	3 The negative impact of corruption on the right to be free from torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment
A/HRC/37/L.33	3 Rights of the child: protection of the rights of the child in humanitarian situations
A/HRC/37/L.34	3 Human rights and unilateral coercive measures
A/HRC/37/L.35	3 Equality and non-discrimination of persons with disabilities and the right of persons with disabilities to access to justice
A/HRC/37/L.36	3 Promoting mutually beneficial cooperation in the field of human rights
A/HRC/37/L.37	3 Promotion and protection of human rights and the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
A/HRC/37/L.38	4 The human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/37/L.39	4 Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran
A/HRC/37/L.40	4 Situation of human rights in South Sudan
A/HRC/37/L.41	3 Contribution to the implementation of the joint commitment to effectively addressing and countering the world drug problem with regard to human rights
A/HRC/37/L.42	3 The need for an integrated approach to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development for the full realization of human rights, focusing on all the means of implementation
A/HRC/37/L.43	4 Situation of human rights in Myanmar
A/HRC/37/L.44	3 Prevention of genocide
A/HRC/37/L.45	10 Technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in Libya
A/HRC/37/L.46	7 Right of the Palestinian people to self-determination
A/HRC/37/L.47	7 Human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem
A/HRC/37/L.48	7 Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan

Documents issued in the limited series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/37/L.49	7 Ensuring accountability and justice for all violations of international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem
A/HRC/37/L.50/Rev.1	3 Terrorism and human rights
A/HRC/37/L.51	3 Amendment to the draft resolution L.44
A/HRC/37/L.52	3 Amendment to the draft resolution L.44
A/HRC/37/L.53	3 Amendment to the draft resolution L.44
A/HRC/37/L.54	3 Amendment to the draft resolution L.44
A/HRC/37/L.55	3 Amendment to the draft resolution L.44
A/HRC/37/L.56	3 Amendment to the draft resolution L.44
A/HRC/37/L.57	3 Amendment to the draft resolution L.44
A/HRC/37/L.58	3 Amendment to the draft resolution L.41
A/HRC/37/L.59	3 Amendment to the draft resolution L.41
A/HRC/37/L.60	4 Amendment to the draft resolution L.38
A/HRC/37/L.61	3 Amendment to the draft resolution L.41
A/HRC/37/L.62	3 Amendment to the draft resolution L.41
A/HRC/37/L.63	3 Amendment to the draft resolution L.50/Rev.1

Documents issued in the Government series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/37/G/1	2 Letter dated 30 January 2018 from the Permanent Representative of Guatemala to the United Nations Office and other International Organizations in Geneva addressed to the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/G/2	4 Note verbale dated 19 February 2018 from the Permanent Mission of Armenia to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/G/3	4 Letter dated 26 February 2018 from the Permanent Representative of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/37/G/4	4 Letter dated 9 March 2018 from the Chargé d'affaires, a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Eritrea to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/37/G/5	3 Letter dated 19 March 2018 from the Permanent Representative of Singapore to the United Nations

Documents issued in the Government series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
	Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/37/G/6	3 Note verbale dated 29 March 2018 from the Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/G/7	1 Note verbale dated 27 March 2018 from the Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations Office and other International Organizations at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/37/G/8	2 Note verbale dated 26 April 2018 from the Permanent Mission of Turkey to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

Documents issued in the national institutions series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/37/NI/1	6 Written submission by the Commission on Human Rights of the Philippines
A/HRC/37/NI/2	3 Written submission by the National Human Rights Council of Morocco
A/HRC/37/NI/3	3 Written submission by the National Human Rights Institution and Office of the Ombudsperson of Uruguay
A/HRC/37/NI/4	3 Written submission by the Commission for Human Rights and Good Governance of Tanzania
A/HRC/37/NI/5	2 Written submission by the Commission on Human Rights of the Philippines
A/HRC/37/NI/6	6 Written submission by the National Human Rights Commission of Korea
A/HRC/37/NI/7	6 Written submission by the Human Rights Commission of Zambia
A/HRC/37/NI/8	9 Joint written submission by the Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain, the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission and the Scottish Human Rights Commission

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/37/NGO/1	4 Written statement submitted by Terre Des Hommes Federation Internationale, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/2	3 Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/3	10 Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/4	3 Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/5	2 Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/6	7 Written statement submitted by Palestinian Return Centre, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/7	4 Written statement submitted by Palestinian Return Centre, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/8	4 Written statement submitted by Palestinian Return Centre, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/9	3 Written statement submitted by the World Muslim Congress, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/10	4 Exposé écrit présenté par l'Agence pour les droits de l'homme, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/37/NGO/11	10 Written statement submitted by Agence pour les droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/12	4 Written statement submitted by Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/13	4 Written statement submitted by Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, 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/37/NGO/14	4 Written statement submitted by Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/15	4 Written statement submitted by Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/16	4 Written statement submitted by Coordination des associations et des particuliers pour la liberté de conscience, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/17	3 Written statement submitted by Cercle de recherche sur les droits et les devoirs de la personne humaine, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/18	3 Written statement submitted by the World Muslim Congress, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/19	4 Written statement submitted by the World Muslim Congress, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/20	4 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/21	3 Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/22	4 Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/23	6 Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/24	7 Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/25	9 Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, 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/37/NGO/26	8 Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/27	3 Written statement submitted by the Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/28	4 Written statement submitted by the Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/29	3 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/30	3 Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/31	3 Written statement submitted by the Association of Citizens Civil Rights Protection “Manshour-e Parseh”, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/32	3 Joint written statement submitted by Make Mothers Matter – MMM, New Humanity, and ONG Hope International, non-governmental organizations in general consultative status; the International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (OIDEF), Association Points-Coeur, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, the Catholic International Education Office, the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, the Foundation for GAIA, the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, the Lazarus Union, the Planetary Association for Clean Energy and the Teresian Association, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status; and Soka Gakkai International, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/37/NGO/33	6 Written statement submitted by the public organization “Public Advocacy”, 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/37/NGO/34	3 Written statement submitted by the Islamic Women's Institute of Iran, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/35	3 Written statement submitted by Chant du guépard dans le désert, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/36	4 Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/37	6 Exposé écrit présenté conjointement par Franciscans International, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif général; et International Catholic Child Bureau, Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco et Mouvement international d'apostolat des milieux sociaux indépendants, organisations non gouvernementales dotées du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/37/NGO/38	3 Written statement submitted by Asociación Española para el Derecho Internacional de los Derechos Humanos (AEDIDH), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/39	7 Written statement submitted by the public organization "Public Advocacy", a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/40	6 Written statement submitted by the public organization "Public Advocacy", a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/41	3 Written statement submitted by the Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/42	4 Written statement submitted by the Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/43	3 Written statement submitted by the Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims, a non-

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
	governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/44	3 Written statement submitted by the Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/45	3 Written statement submitted by the Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/46	4 Written statement submitted by the Family Health Association of Iran, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/47	3 Written statement submitted by the Family Health Association of Iran, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/48	3 Written statement submitted by the Family Health Association of Iran, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/49	3 Written statement submitted by the International Commission of Jurists, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/50	3 Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/51	3 Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/52	3 Written statement submitted by the Modern Advocacy, Humanitarian, Social and Rehabilitation Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/53	4 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/54	3 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/55	3 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
	non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/56	3 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/57	3 Written statement submitted by Association Miraisme International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/58	3 Written statement submitted by the European Centre for Law and Justice / Centre Européen pour la justice et les droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/59	4 Written statement submitted by the European Centre for Law and Justice, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/60	6 Written statement submitted by the European Centre for Law and Justice, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/61	6 Written statement submitted by the public organization "Public Advocacy", a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/62	4 Written statement submitted by Christian Solidarity Worldwide, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/63	3 Written statement submitted by Christian Solidarity Worldwide, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/64	3 Written statement submitted by Child Rights Connect, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/65	3 Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/66	6 Written statement submitted by the Japanese Association for the Right to Freedom of Speech, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/67	4 Written statement submitted by International Educational Development, non-governmental organizations on the roster

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/37/NGO/68	4 Written statement submitted by the Child Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/69	3 Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/70	3 Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/71	3 Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/72	3 Written statement submitted by Graduate Women International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/73	3 Written statement submitted by the European Centre for Law and Justice, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/74	3 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/75	3 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/76	3 Written statement submitted by Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/77	3 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/78	6 Written statement submitted by Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/79	4 Written statement submitted by the International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/80	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/37/NGO/81	3 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/82	4 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, and ODHIKAR – Coalition for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/83	3 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/84	3 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/85	7 Written statement submitted by the Association for Progressive Communications, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/86	3 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/87	3 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/88	4 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/89	3 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/90	2 Written statement submitted by the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/91	3 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/92	3 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/93	3 Written statement submitted by the International Bar Association, 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/37/NGO/94	1 Written statement submitted by the International Bar Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/95	4 Written statement submitted by Coordination des associations et des particuliers pour la liberté de conscience, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/96	3 Exposé écrit présenté par le Centre européen pour la justice et les droits de l'homme, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif special
A/HRC/37/NGO/97	2 Written statement submitted by the Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/98	7 Joint written statement submitted by Al Mezan Centre for Human Rights and the World Organisation against Torture, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/99	7 Joint written statement submitted by Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man and the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/100	2 Written statement submitted by Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/101	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/37/NGO/102	3 Written statement submitted by Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/103	3 Written statement submitted by Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/104	3 Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/105	7 Written statement submitted by United Nations Watch, 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/37/NGO/106	7 Written statement submitted by United Nations Watch, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/107	3 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/108	4 Written statement submitted by Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/109	10 Exposé écrit présenté conjointement par International Catholic Child Bureau, Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, and le Mouvement International d'Apostolate des Milieux Sociaux Independants, organisations non gouvernementales dotées du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/37/NGO/110	3 Written statement submitted by Rencontre Africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/111	7 Written statement submitted by United Nations Watch, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/112	3 Written statement submitted by Rencontre Africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/113	3 Written statement submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/114	4 Written statement submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/115	7 Joint written statement submitted by Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man, the BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights and the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/116	7 Written statement submitted by Medical Aid for Palestinians (MAP), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/117	3 Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association nationale de promotion et de protection des droits de

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
	l'homme, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/37/NGO/118	3 Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/119	4 Written statement submitted by Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/120	4 Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/121	4 Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/122	4 Written statement submitted by Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/123	10 Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status, International Educational Development, and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/37/NGO/124	3 Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/125	4 Joint written statement submitted by the Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational and Transparty, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status; the Women's Human Rights International Association and France Libertés: fondation Danielle Mitterrand, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status; International Educational Development, and Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/37/NGO/126	10 Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), non-governmental organization in special consultative status; International Educational Development and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/37/NGO/127	4 Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD),

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
	non-governmental organization in special consultative status; International Educational Development and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/37/NGO/128	3 Joint written statement submitted by Greenpeace International, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status and the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/129	3 Exposé écrit présenté par Drepavie, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/37/NGO/130	4 Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status, International Educational Development and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/37/NGO/131	4 Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/132	4 Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/133	4 Written statement submitted by the Iraqi Development Organization, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/134	3 Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Arab Organization for Human Rights and IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development and World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/37/NGO/135	4 Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/136	4 Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/137	4 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/37/NGO/138	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/37/NGO/139	4 Written statement submitted by the Women's Human Rights International Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/140	7 Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Arab Lawyers Union, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, International-Lawyers.org, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association and the Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/37/NGO/141	7 Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Arab Lawyers Union, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, International-Lawyers.Org, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association and the Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/37/NGO/142	7 Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Arab Lawyers Union, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, International-Lawyers.Org, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association and the Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/37/NGO/143	7 Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Arab Lawyers Union, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, International-Lawyers.Org, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association and the Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
	Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/37/NGO/144	4 Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Arab Lawyers Union, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, International-Lawyers.Org, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association and the Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/37/NGO/145	4 Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status, International Educational Development and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/37/NGO/146	4 Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status, International Educational Development and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/37/NGO/147	3 Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status, International Educational Development and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/37/NGO/148	4 Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status, International Educational Development and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/37/NGO/149	5 Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Arab Organization for Human Rights and the Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/37/NGO/150	2 Written statement submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/151	2 Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/152	4 Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/153	3 Written statement submitted by Prahar, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/154	4 Written statement submitted by ODHIKAR – Coalition for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/155	4 Written statement submitted by ODHIKAR – Coalition for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/156	4 Written statement submitted by ODHIKAR – Coalition for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/157	3 Written statement submitted by the Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europe, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/158	3 Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/159	4 Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/160	3 Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/161	2 Joint written statement submitted by the American Association of Jurists, Asociación Española para el Derecho Internacional de los Derechos Humanos, France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, and Paz y Cooperación, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, and Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, a non-governmental organization on the roster

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/37/NGO/162	3 Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/163	3 Written statement submitted by Liberal International (World Liberal Union), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/164	3 Joint written statement submitted by International-Lawyers.Org, the Arab Organization for Human Rights and the Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/37/NGO/165	4 Joint written statement submitted by International-Lawyers.Org, the Arab Organization for Human Rights and the Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development and the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/37/NGO/166	5 Written statement submitted by the Islamic Women's Institute of Iran, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/167	4 Written statement submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/168	4 Written statement submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/169	9 Written statement submitted by Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/170	2 Written statement submitted by Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/171	3 Written statement submitted by Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/172	8 Written statement submitted by Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/173	4 Written statement submitted by Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, a non-

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
	governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/174	3 Written statement submitted by Make Mothers Matter, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/175	10 Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/176	4 Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/177	4 Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/178	4 Written statement submitted by Nazra for Feminist Studies, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/179	10 Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/180	4 Joint written statement submitted by Association bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, ABC Tamil Oli, Alliance Creative Community Project, Association burkinabé pour la survie de l'enfance, Association culturelle des tamouls en France, Association des étudiants tamouls de France, Association Mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit, Association pour les victimes du monde, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Association Thendral, Le Pont, Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, the Society for Development and Community Empowerment, Tamil Uzhagam and Tourner la page, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/181	4 Written statement submitted by People for Successful Corean Reunification, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/182	6 Written statement submitted by the Japan Federation of Bar Associations, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/183	3 Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, 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/37/NGO/184	4 Written statement submitted by the Child Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/185	10 Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/186	3 Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/187	4 Written statement submitted by the Human Rights League of the Horn of Africa, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/188	3 Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/189	2 Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/190	3 Written statement submitted by Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/191	3 Written statement submitted by Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/192	7 Written statement submitted by Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/193	7 Written statement submitted by Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/194	3 Written statement submitted by Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/196	3 Written statement submitted by Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/197	3 Written statement submitted by IT for Change, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/198	3 Written statement submitted by the Next Century Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>
A/HRC/37/NGO/199	3 Written statement submitted by the Next Century Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/200	2 Written statement submitted by Action contre la faim, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/37/NGO/201	10 Exposé écrit présenté par United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif special

Annex IV

Special procedure mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-seventh session

Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (member from African States)

Albert Kwokwo Barume (Democratic Republic of the Congo)

Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (member from North America)

Kristen Carpenter (United States of America)

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

Livingstone Sewanyana (Uganda)

Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Mali

Alioune Tine (Senegal)

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

Fabián Salvioli (Argentina)

Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association

Nyaletsossi Clément Voule (Togo)

Working Group on the use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination (member from African States)

Chris Kwaja (Nigeria)

Working Group on the use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination (member from Eastern European States)

Jelena Aparac (Croatia)

Working Group on the use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination (member from Latin American and Caribbean States)

Lilian Bobea (Dominican Republic)
