



General Assembly

Distr.: General
9 February 2021

Original: English

Human Rights Council

Forty-first session

24 June–12 July 2019

Agenda item 1

Organizational and procedural matters

Report of the Human Rights Council on its forty-first session

Vice-President and Rapporteur: Vesna Batistić **Kos** (Croatia)



Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Part one: Resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council at its forty-first session.....	4
I. Resolutions	4
II. Decisions	5
Part Two: Summary of proceedings.....	6
I. Organizational and procedural matters.....	6
A. Opening and duration of the session	6
B. Attendance	6
C. Agenda and programme of work	6
D. Organization of work	6
E. Meetings and documentation	7
F. Visits.....	7
G. Adoption of the report on the session	8
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	9
A. Update by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights	9
B. Enhanced interactive dialogue on the human rights situation in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela	10
C. Interactive dialogue on the oral update by the High Commissioner on the human rights situation of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar	11
D. Reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General.....	11
E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	12
III. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development.....	15
A. Panel discussions	15
B. Interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders	18
C. General debate on agenda item 3	29
D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	31
IV. Human rights situations that require the Council's attention	51
A. Interactive dialogue with the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic.....	51
B. Interactive dialogue with the Commission of Inquiry on Burundi.....	51
C. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders	52
D. General debate on agenda item 4	53
E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	55
V. Human rights bodies and mechanisms	57
A. Forum on Business and Human Rights.....	57
B. General debate on agenda item 5	57
C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	58

VI.	Universal periodic review	59
A.	Consideration of universal periodic review outcomes	59
B.	General debate on agenda item 6	124
C.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	125
VII.	Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories	127
	General debate on agenda item 7	127
VIII.	Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action	128
	General debate on agenda item 8	128
IX.	Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action	131
A.	Interactive dialogue with a special procedure mandate holder	131
B.	General debate on agenda item 9	131
X.	Technical assistance and capacity-building	133
A.	Annual thematic discussion on technical cooperation in the promotion and protection of human rights	133
B.	Enhanced interactive dialogue on the oral reports of the Government of the Sudan and the Office of the High Commissioner	134
C.	Enhanced interactive dialogue on the report of the team of international experts on the situation in Kasai and the oral update	134
D.	Interactive dialogue on the oral presentation by the High Commissioner on the situation of human rights in Ukraine	135
E.	Interactive dialogue with a special procedure mandate holder	136
F.	General debate on agenda item 10	136
G.	Consideration of and action on draft proposals	137
Annexes		
I.	Attendance	139
II.	Agenda	146
III.	Documents issued for the forty-first session	147

Part One

Resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council at its forty-first session

I. Resolutions

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
41/1	Situation of human rights in Eritrea	11 July 2019
41/2	Promotion and protection of human rights in the Philippines	11 July 2019
41/3	Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights	11 July 2019
41/4	Promotion of the right to peace	11 July 2019
41/5	Human rights and international solidarity	11 July 2019
41/6	Elimination of all forms of discrimination against women and girls	11 July 2019
41/7	The human rights of migrants	11 July 2019
41/8	Consequences of child, early and forced marriage	11 July 2019
41/9	The negative impact of corruption on the enjoyment of human rights	11 July 2019
41/10	Access to medicines and vaccines in the context of the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health	11 July 2019
41/11	New and emerging digital technologies and human rights	11 July 2019
41/12	The rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association	11 July 2019
41/13	Youth and human rights	11 July 2019
41/14	Equal pay	11 July 2019
41/15	Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons	11 July 2019
41/16	The right to education: follow-up to Human Rights Council resolution 8/4	11 July 2019
41/17	Accelerating efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women and girls: preventing and responding to violence against women and girls in the world of work	12 July 2019
41/18	Mandate of the Independent Expert on protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity	12 July 2019
41/19	The contribution of development to the enjoyment of all human rights	12 July 2019
41/20	Impact of arms transfers on human rights	12 July 2019
41/21	Human rights and climate change	12 July 2019
41/22	Situation of human rights in Belarus	12 July 2019
41/23	The human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic	12 July 2019

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
41/24	The Social Forum	12 July 2019
41/25	Cooperation with and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights	12 July 2019
41/26	Renewal of the mandate of the team of international experts on the situation in Kasai	12 July 2019

II. Decisions

<i>Decision</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
41/101	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Viet Nam	4 July 2019
41/102	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Afghanistan	4 July 2019
41/103	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Chile	4 July 2019
41/104	Outcome of the universal periodic review: New Zealand	4 July 2019
41/105	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Uruguay	4 July 2019
41/106	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Yemen	4 July 2019
41/107	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Vanuatu	4 July 2019
41/108	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Slovakia	4 July 2019
41/109	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Comoros	4 July 2019
41/110	Outcome of the universal periodic review: North Macedonia	4 July 2019
41/111	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Cyprus	4 July 2019
41/112	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Eritrea	5 July 2019
41/113	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Dominican Republic	5 July 2019
41/114	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Cambodia	5 July 2019

Part Two

Summary of proceedings

I. Organizational and procedural matters

A. Opening and duration of the session

1. The Human Rights Council held its forty-first session at the United Nations Office at Geneva from 24 June to 12 July 2019. The President of the Council opened the session.
2. In accordance with rule 8 (b) of the rules of procedure of the Human Rights Council, as contained in part VII of the annex to Council resolution 5/1, the organizational meeting of the forty-first session was held on 7 June 2019.
3. The forty-first session consisted of 42 meetings over 15 days (see para. 13 below).

B. Attendance

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

C. Agenda and programme of work

5. At the 1st meeting, on 24 June 2019, the Human Rights Council adopted the agenda and programme of work of the forty-first session.

D. Organization of work

6. At the 1st meeting, on 24 June 2019, the President of the Human Rights Council referred to the online system for the inscription of speakers on lists for all general debates and individual and clustered interactive dialogues to be held during the forty-first session of the Council. He also referred to the modalities and schedule of the online system, which had been launched on 19 June 2019.
7. At the same meeting, the President referred to the modalities for the tabling of draft proposals after the deadline. At the organizational meeting of the forty-first session, the Human Rights Council had agreed that an extension of the deadline for the submission of draft proposals would be granted only once, under exceptional circumstances, for a maximum period of 24 hours.
8. Also at the same meeting, the President referred to the speaking time limits for the forty-first session. The speaking time for the interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders under agenda item 3 would be two minutes for States members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.
9. At the 4th meeting, on 25 June 2019, the President outlined the speaking time limits for the general debates, which would be two and a half minutes for States members of the Human Rights Council and one and a half minutes for observer States and other observers.
10. At the 10th meeting, on 27 June 2019, the President outlined the speaking time for the panel discussions, which would be two minutes for States members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.
11. At the 18th meeting, on 2 July 2019, the President outlined the speaking time for the individual interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders on item 4, which

would be two minutes for States members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.

12. At the 24th meeting, on 4 July 2019, 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, two minutes for the national human rights institution with A status of the State concerned; up to 20 minutes for States members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and United Nations agencies to express their views on the outcome of the review, with varying speaking times according to the number of speakers in accordance with the speaking time limits set out in the appendix to the annex to Council resolution 16/21; and up to 20 minutes for other stakeholders to make general comments on the outcome of the review.

E. Meetings and documentation

13. The Human Rights Council held 42 fully serviced meetings during its forty-first session.¹

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

F. Visits

15. At the 1st meeting, on 24 June 2019, the President of Bulgaria, Rumen Radev, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

16. At the same meeting, the President of the Marshall Islands, Hilda C. Heine, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

17. Also at the same meeting, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Armenia, Zohrab Mnatsakanyan, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

18. At the same meeting, the Minister for Women and Human Rights Development of Somalia, Deqa Yasin, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

19. Also at the same meeting, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, Yoka Brandt, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

20. At the same meeting, the State Secretary for Foreign Affairs and European Integration of the Republic of Moldova, Tatiana Molcean, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

21. Also at the same meeting, the Deputy Minister for Development at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Norway, Aksel Jakobsen, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

22. At the 4th meeting, on 25 June 2019, the Vice-Chair of the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region of China, Aierken Tuniyazi, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

23. At the same meeting, the Deputy Minister for Information and Public Diplomacy at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia, Cecep Herawan, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

24. At the 12th meeting, on 27 June 2019, the Prime Minister of Iceland, Katrín Jakobsdóttir, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

25. At the 13th meeting, on 28 June 2019, the Federal Minister for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs of Austria, Alexander Schallenberg, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

¹ The proceedings of the forty-first session of the Human Rights Council can be followed through the United Nations archived webcasts of the Council sessions at <http://webtv.un.org>.

26. At the same meeting, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cameroon, Lejeune Mbella Mbella, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

27. Also at the same meeting, the Deputy Chairman of the State Committee for Affairs of Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons of Azerbaijan, Fuad Huseynov, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

28. At the 15th meeting, on 28 June 2019, the Undersecretary for Special Concerns at the Department of Social Welfare and Development of the Philippines, Camilo G. Gudmalin, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

29. At the 24th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Prime Minister of Cambodia, Samdech Akka Moha Sena Padei Techo Hun Sen, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

G. Adoption of the report on the session

30. At the 41st meeting, on 12 July 2019, the Vice-President and Rapporteur of the Human Rights Council made a statement on the draft report of the Council on its forty-first session.

31. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted *ad referendum* the draft report on the session ([A/HRC/41/2](#)) and entrusted the Rapporteur with its finalization.

32. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Greece, the Netherlands, Norway and Switzerland (also on behalf of Australia, Canada, Czechia, France, Liechtenstein, Slovakia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) made statements as observer States on the adopted resolutions.

33. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, India, Nauru, Pakistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the observer for the International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, the Association for Progressive Communications, the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, the Center for Reproductive Rights, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, the East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Franciscans International, the Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Human Rights House Foundation, the International Commission of Jurists and the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues) made statements on the session.

34. 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. Update by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

35. At the 1st meeting, on 24 June 2019, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement in which she provided an update of the activities of her Office.

36. At its 4th and 5th meetings, on 25 June 2019, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on the oral update by the High Commissioner, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Australia, Bahrain, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chile, China, China (also on behalf of Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cameroon, China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe), Croatia, Cuba, Cuba (also on behalf of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Nicaragua and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Czechia, Egypt, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Morocco² (also on behalf of Bahrain, Burkina Faso, Burundi, the Central African Republic, the Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Gabon, Guatemala, Guinea, Jordan, Kuwait, Oman, Paraguay, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal and the United Arab Emirates), Nepal, Netherlands² (also on behalf of the European Union, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, 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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay), 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, Panama and Paraguay), Philippines, Qatar, Romania² (on behalf of the European Union), Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Senegal, South Africa, South Africa (also on behalf of Algeria, Angola, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Cuba, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Timor-Leste, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zimbabwe), Spain, Thailand (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations), Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay (also on behalf of Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Paraguay and Peru), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)² (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries with the exception of Colombia, Ecuador and Peru);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Cambodia, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian

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

Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, State of Palestine;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Development Association, Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists (also on behalf of Asociación Española para el Derecho Internacional de los Derechos Humanos, the Habitat International Coalition, the International Fellowship of Reconciliation and Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples), Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amnesty International, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development (also on behalf of Franciscans International and the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues), Association burkinabé pour la survie de l'enfance, China Society for Human Rights Studies, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Conselho Indigenista Missionário, "Coup de pousse" Chaîne de l'espoir Nord-Sud, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Federation of Cuban Women, Franciscans International (also on behalf of the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development and the International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism), Human Rights Council of Australia, Human Rights Watch, Il Cenacolo, Ingénieurs du monde, Institut international pour les droits et le développement, International Committee for the Indigenous Peoples of the Americas (Switzerland), International Council of Russian Compatriots, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Human Rights Association of American Minorities, 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, Iuventum, Jeunesse étudiante tamoule, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Minority Rights Group, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Physicians for Human Rights, Sikh Human Rights Group, United Nations Watch, World Evangelical Alliance, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress, World Organization against Torture (also on behalf of Families of Victims of Involuntary Disappearance).

37. At the 6th meeting, on 25 June 2019, the representatives of Algeria, Bahrain, Benin, Brazil, Cambodia, Egypt, Gabon, Georgia, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Japan, Morocco, Pakistan, the Philippines and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

38. At the same meeting, the representatives of India and Pakistan made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

B. Enhanced interactive dialogue on the human rights situation in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela

39. At the 27th meeting, on 5 July 2019, the High Commissioner presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 39/1, a report on human rights in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela ([A/HRC/41/18](#)).

40. At the same meeting, the Director of Acción Solidaria and of Civilis Human Rights, Feliciano Reyna Ganteaume, made a statement.

41. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made a statement as the State concerned.

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, China, Croatia, Cuba, Cuba (also on behalf of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Nicaragua and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Czechia, Denmark, Iceland, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Peru (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras and Paraguay), Qatar, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Algeria, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Estonia, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Centre Europe-tiers monde, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Fundación Latinoamericana por los Derechos Humanos y el Desarrollo Social, Human Rights Watch, International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Commission of Jurists, International Service for Human Rights, World Organization against Torture.

43. At the same meeting, the High Commissioner and the Director of Acción Solidaria and of Civilis Human Rights answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

C. Interactive dialogue on the oral update by the High Commissioner on the human rights situation of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar

44. At the 35th meeting, on 10 July 2019, the High Commissioner presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution S-27/1, adopted during its twenty-seventh special session, an oral update on the human rights situation of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar.

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

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Bangladesh, China, Denmark, Egypt, Iceland, India, Japan, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: France, Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Maldives, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, Turkey, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Global Welfare Association, International Educational Development, International-Lawyers.org, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

47. Also at the same meeting, the High Commissioner answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

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

48. At the 16th meeting, on 1 July 2019, the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide and the Director of the Thematic Engagement, Special Procedures and Right to Development Division of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) presented the thematic reports prepared by OHCHR and the Secretary-General under agenda items 2, 3, 8 and 10.

49. At the 16th and 17th meetings, on 1 July 2019, and at the 18th meeting, on 2 July, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on the thematic reports under agenda items 2

and 3, presented by the Director of the Thematic Engagement, Special Procedures and Right to Development Division of OHCHR (see chap. III, sect. C).

50. At the 28th meeting, on 5 July 2019, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 6, including on thematic reports under agenda item 6, presented by the Chief of the Universal Periodic Review Branch of OHCHR (see chap. VI, sect. B).

51. At the 36th meeting, on 10 July 2019, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights presented the reports of OHCHR submitted under agenda items 2 and 10.

52. At the 36th meeting, on 10 July 2019, and at the 37th meeting, on 11 July, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 10, including on reports under agenda items 2 and 10, presented by the Deputy High Commissioner (see chap. X, sect. F).

E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Situation of human rights in Eritrea

53. At the 37th meeting, on 11 July 2019, the representative of the Netherlands (also on behalf of Australia, Austria, Belgium, France and Germany) introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.15](#), sponsored by Australia, Austria, Belgium, France, Germany and the Netherlands, and co-sponsored by Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Czechia, Denmark and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland withdrew their original co-sponsorship of the draft resolution. Subsequently, Costa Rica, Czechia, Denmark, Monaco, Portugal, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

54. At the same meeting, the representative of Eritrea made general comments on the draft resolution.

55. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Eritrea, a recorded vote was taken on retaining paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Slovakia, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Against:

Bahrain, Cameroon, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Iraq, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Somalia

Abstaining:

Angola, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Hungary, Nepal, Nigeria, Qatar, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, Tunisia

56. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council voted in favour of retaining paragraph 2 of the draft resolution by 22 votes to 13, with 12 abstentions.

57. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Eritrea, a recorded vote was taken on retaining paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Slovakia, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Against:

Bahrain, Cameroon, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Iraq, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Somalia

Abstaining:

Angola, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Hungary, Nepal, Nigeria, Qatar, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, Tunisia

58. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council voted in favour of retaining paragraph 3 of the draft resolution by 22 votes to 13, with 12 abstentions.

59. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Eritrea, a recorded vote was taken on retaining paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Slovakia, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Against:

Bahrain, Cameroon, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Iraq, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Somalia

Abstaining:

Angola, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Hungary, Nepal, Nigeria, Qatar, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, Tunisia

60. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council voted in favour of retaining paragraph 4 of the draft resolution by 22 votes to 13, with 12 abstentions.

61. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil, China, Denmark (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Egypt, Eritrea, Mexico, Somalia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

In favour:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Slovakia, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Against:

Bahrain, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, China, Cuba, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Iraq, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Somalia

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Bangladesh, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Hungary, Nepal, Nigeria, Qatar, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, Tunisia

63. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 21 votes to 13, with 13 abstentions (resolution 41/1).

64. At the same meeting, the representatives of Angola (on behalf the Group of African States) and Ethiopia made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

Promotion and protection of human rights in the Philippines

65. At the 37th meeting, on 11 July 2019, the representative of Iceland introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.20](#), sponsored by Iceland and co-sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Slovenia, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Italy, North Macedonia, Norway, Slovakia and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

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

67. 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.

68. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Bahrain, Brazil, China, Japan, Pakistan, Peru and Uruguay made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

In favour:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Iceland, Italy, Mexico, Peru, Slovakia, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Against:

Angola, Bahrain, Cameroon, China, Cuba, Egypt, Eritrea, Hungary, India, Iraq, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Japan, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, Tunisia

70. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 18 votes to 14, with 15 abstentions (resolution 41/2).

71. At the same meeting, the representative of the Philippines made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

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

A. Panel discussions

Annual full-day discussion on the human rights of women

72. An annual full-day discussion on the human rights of women was held on 27 and 28 June 2019, in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 6/30. The meeting was divided into two panel discussions.

73. At the 10th meeting, on 27 June 2019, the Human Rights Council held the first panel discussion, on the theme “Violence against women in the world of work”.

74. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Prime Minister of Iceland, Katrín Jakobsdóttir, made opening statements for the panel. The Chair of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises, Surya Deva, moderated the discussion.

75. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Coordinator of the Future of Work Initiative at the International Labour Organization, Maria-Luz Vega; Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences, Dubravka Šimonović; Regional Representative for Asia at the International Domestic Workers Federation and National President of United Domestic Workers of the Philippines, Novelita Valdez Palisoc.

76. The Human Rights Council divided the ensuing panel discussion into two speaking slots, which were held at the same meeting. During the first speaking slot, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Austria (also on behalf of Liechtenstein, Slovenia and Switzerland), Bahamas (on behalf of the Caribbean Community), China, Norway³ (also on behalf of Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania and Sweden), Philippines, Spain, Uruguay (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Panama and Peru);

(b) Representatives of observer States: France, Greece, Israel;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Catholic Child Bureau, Kayan – Feminist Organization, Plan International (also on behalf of Defence for Children International, Foundation ECPAT International and Terre des hommes fédération internationale).

77. During the second speaking slot of the first panel discussion, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Bulgaria, Denmark, Egypt, Italy, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Russian Federation, Thailand, Vanuatu;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: International Development Law Organization, International Organization of la Francophonie;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, World Jewish Congress.

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

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

79. At the 13th meeting, on 28 June 2019, the Human Rights Council held the second panel discussion, on the theme “The rights of older women and their economic empowerment”.

80. The High Commissioner made an opening statement for the panel. The Director of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) office in Geneva, Mónica Ferro, moderated the discussion.

81. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Senior Advisor to the Grandmothers to Grandmothers Campaign at the Stephen Lewis Foundation, Idah Nambeya; Professor of international law at the University of New South Wales, Andrew Byrnes; member of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, Marion Bethel.

82. The ensuing panel discussion was divided into two speaking slots, which were held at the same meeting. During the first speaking slot, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina (also on behalf of Austria, Montenegro, Portugal, Slovenia and Uruguay), Australia, Chile (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay), Czechia, Lithuania³ (also on behalf of Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Norway and Sweden), Qatar;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Greece, Israel, Russian Federation, Slovenia;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Longevity Center Global Alliance (also on behalf of AGE Platform Europe, the Association of Former International Civil Servants for Development, the International Association of Gerontology and Geriatrics, the International Federation on Ageing, the International Network for the Prevention of Elder Abuse, Make Mothers Matter, the National Alliance of Women's Organizations, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik and Widows Rights International), HelpAge International.

83. During the second speaking slot of the second panel discussion, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Bahamas, China, India, Iraq, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Ecuador, Indonesia, Lesotho, Singapore, Thailand, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women);

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme.

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

Panel discussion on women's rights and climate change

85. At the 15th meeting, on 28 June 2019, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 38/4, a panel discussion on the theme "Women's rights and climate change: climate action, best practices and lessons learned".

86. The High Commissioner for Human Rights and the President of the Marshall Islands, Hilda C. Heine (by video message), made opening statements for the panel.

87. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Adjunct Professor of climate justice at Trinity College Dublin, Chair of The Elders and former President of Ireland, Mary Robinson; Senior Specialist on Equality and Non-Discrimination at the International Labour Organization, Martin Oelz; member of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, Nahla Haidar.

88. The ensuing panel discussion was divided into two speaking slots, which were held at the same meeting. During the first speaking slot, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Canada³ (on behalf of the French-speaking States members and observers), Costa Rica³ (also on behalf of Argentina, Chile, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay), Croatia (also on behalf of Austria and Slovenia), Estonia³ (also on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway and Sweden), Fiji (also on behalf of Belgium, Chile, Costa Rica, Finland, Germany, Guatemala, Italy, Luxembourg, Maldives, the Netherlands, Peru, Slovenia, Sweden and Switzerland), Fiji (also on behalf of Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu), Marshall Islands³ (also on behalf of the Bahamas, Barbados, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Fiji, Haiti, Jamaica, Maldives, Mauritius, Palau, Singapore and Timor-Leste), Nauru³ (also on behalf of the Bahamas, the Comoros, Djibouti, Dominica, Fiji, the Gambia, Kiribati, Madagascar, Nepal, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Somalia and Vanuatu), Thailand³ (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations), Trinidad and Tobago³ (on behalf of the Caribbean Community);

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

(c) Observer for a national human rights institution: Australian Human Rights Commission;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (also on behalf of FIAN International, Franciscans International, the International Movement ATD Fourth World and International Women's Rights Action Watch Asia Pacific), Institut international de l'écologie industrielle et de l'économie verte.

89. During the second speaking slot of the panel discussion, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Bangladesh, Denmark;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Dominica, Ecuador, Ireland, Madagascar, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Conectas Direitos Humanos, Franciscans International (also on behalf of the Brahma Kumaris World Spiritual University, Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers and the Lutheran World Federation), International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations.

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

B. Interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders

Independent Expert on protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity

91. At the 1st meeting, on 24 June 2019, the Independent Expert on protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity, Victor Madrigal-Borloz, presented his reports ([A/HRC/41/45](#) and [Add.1–2](#)).

92. At the same meeting, the representatives of Georgia and Mozambique made statements as the States concerned.

93. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 1st and 2nd meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Austria (also on behalf of Greece), Chile, China, Cuba, Iceland, Mexico, Peru (also on behalf of Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica, Mexico and Uruguay), South Africa, Spain, Sweden³ (also on behalf of Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania and Norway), Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (also on behalf of Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Cabo Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Portugal, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine and Uruguay), Uruguay, Uruguay (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Mexico);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Ireland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Switzerland, Thailand, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: UN-Women (also on behalf of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF));

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

(e) Observer for a national human rights institution: Office of the Ombudsman (Samoa);

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Asociación HazteOir.org, British Humanist Association, European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Federation (also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association), Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland, Human Rights Council of Australia (also on behalf of the Human Rights Law Centre), International Planned Parenthood Federation, Swedish Federation for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights (also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association).

94. At the 2nd meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers

95. At the 1st meeting, on 24 June 2019, the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers, Diego García-Sayán, presented his report ([A/HRC/41/48](#)).

96. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 1st and 2nd meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Australia, Austria (also on behalf of Greece), China, Hungary, Iraq, Nepal, Peru, Peru (also on behalf of Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica, Mexico

and Uruguay), Sweden³ (also on behalf of Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania and Norway), Tunisia, Ukraine;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burkina Faso, Colombia, Ecuador, France, Gambia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Maldives, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Russian Federation, Thailand, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: European Union, International Development Law Organization;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Colombian Commission of Jurists (also on behalf of the World Organization against Torture), Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, Human Rights Now, International Commission of Jurists, Iraqi Development Organization, Lawyers for Lawyers, Terra de Direitos (also on behalf of Conselho Indigenista Missionário), UNESCO Centre of Catalonia.

97. At the 2nd meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

98. At the 3rd meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Brazil, China, Colombia, Spain and Turkey made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health

100. At the 3rd meeting, on 24 June 2019, the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, Dainius Pūras, presented his reports ([A/HRC/41/34](#) and [Add.1–2](#)).

101. At the same meeting, the representative of Canada made a statement as the State concerned.

102. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the national human rights institution, the Canadian Human Rights Commission, made a statement (by video message).

103. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 3rd meeting, on 24 June 2019, and at the 5th meeting, on 25 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Australia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, Cuba, Egypt, Fiji, Iceland, India, Iraq, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Portugal³ (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries), Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Switzerland³ (also on behalf of Albania, Colombia, Greece, Guatemala, Mexico, Paraguay, Portugal and Uruguay), Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Colombia, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Greece, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Malaysia, Montenegro, Morocco, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Thailand, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

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

(d) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: European Union, International Development Law Organization;

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

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

(g) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Asian-Pacific Resource and Research Centre for Women, Association of World Citizens, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, Conectas Direitos Humanos, Federation for Women and Family Planning, Health and Environment Program, Human Rights Council of Australia (also on behalf of the Australian Lesbian Medical Association and the Human Rights Law Centre), Human Rights Law Centre (also on behalf of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Corporation Family Violence Prevention and Legal Service (Victoria)), International Movement ATD Fourth World, Make Mothers Matter, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Swedish Federation for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights (also on behalf of the International Lesbian and Gay Association), Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Barua Organization.

104. At the same meetings, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the elimination of discrimination against persons affected by leprosy and their family members

105. At the 3rd meeting, on 24 June 2019, the Special Rapporteur on the elimination of discrimination against persons affected by leprosy and their family members, Alice Cruz, presented her report ([A/HRC/41/47](#)).

106. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 3rd meeting, on 24 June 2019, and at the 5th meeting, on 25 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Bangladesh, Brazil, China, Japan, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Portugal³ (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries), Senegal, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Djibouti, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Lesotho, Malaysia, Montenegro, Morocco, Portugal, Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(c) Observers for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: UNICEF, UN-Women;

(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) Observer for a non-governmental organization: China Society for Human Rights Studies.

107. At the same meetings, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants

108. At the 6th meeting, on 25 June 2019, the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants, Felipe González Morales, presented his reports ([A/HRC/41/38](#) and [Add.1](#)).

109. At the same meeting, the representative of the Niger made a statement as the State concerned.

110. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 6th meeting, on 25 June 2019, and at the 7th meeting, on 26 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Afghanistan, Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Bahamas, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, China, Cuba, Egypt, Fiji, Iceland, India, Iraq, Mexico (also on behalf of Argentina, Colombia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Thailand and Uruguay), Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Senegal, Togo, Tunisia;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lesotho, Libya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Morocco, Namibia, Paraguay, Portugal, Russian Federation, Switzerland, Thailand, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(c) Observers for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: UNICEF, UN-Women;

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

(g) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Asian-Pacific Resource and Research Centre for Women, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of the International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development, the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, Passionists International, the Teresian Association, VIVAT International and the World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations), Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (also on behalf of Amnesty International), Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Franciscans International, Friends World Committee for Consultation, Human Rights Law Centre, Ingénieurs du monde, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development (also on behalf of Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco), Terre des hommes fédération internationale, World Federation of Ukrainian Women's Organizations.

111. At the 6th meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

112. At the same meeting, the representative of Iraq made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

113. At the 9th meeting, on 26 June 2019, the representative of Iraq made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

Independent Expert on human rights and international solidarity

114. At the 6th meeting, on 25 June 2019, the Independent Expert on human rights and international solidarity, Obiora C. Okafor, presented his reports ([A/HRC/41/44](#) and [Add.1–2](#)).

115. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Netherlands and Sweden made statements as the States concerned.

116. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 6th meeting, on 25 June 2019, and at the 7th meeting, on 26 June, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Afghanistan, Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Cameroon, China, Cuba, Egypt, Nepal, Nigeria, Togo, Tunisia;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Azerbaijan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Djibouti, El Salvador, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Luxembourg, Malaysia, Morocco, Namibia, Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of the International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development, the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, Passionists International, the Teresian Association, VIVAT International and the World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations), Friends World Committee for Consultation, International Fellowship of Reconciliation.

117. At the same meetings, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

118. At the 9th meeting, on 26 June 2019, the representative of Iraq made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression

119. At the 7th meeting, on 26 June 2019, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, David Kaye, presented his reports ([A/HRC/41/35](#) and [Add.1-4](#)).

120. At the same meeting, the representative of Ecuador made a statement as the State concerned.

121. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the national human rights institution, the Office of the Ombudsman (Ecuador), made a statement (by video message).

122. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 7th and 8th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Afghanistan, Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, China, Costa Rica⁴ (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay), Cuba, Czechia, Egypt, Estonia⁴ (also on behalf of Argentina, Australia, Austria, Canada, Costa Rica, Czechia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Spain, Sweden, Tunisia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), India, Iraq, Japan, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sweden⁴ (also on behalf of Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania and Norway), Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Canada, Colombia, Cyprus, France, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Jordan, Latvia, Lithuania, Maldives, Malta, Montenegro, Myanmar, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Switzerland, Turkey, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), State of Palestine;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al Mezan Center for Human Rights, American Association of Jurists, American Civil Liberties Union, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship (also on behalf of the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development), Association for Progressive Communications, Christian Solidarity Worldwide (also on behalf of the Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights and the International Service for Human Rights), Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights

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

Now, International Center for Not-for-Profit Law (also on behalf of Article 19: International Centre against Censorship and CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation), Peace Brigades International Switzerland, Shivi Development Society.

123. At the 8th meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

124. At the 9th meeting, on 26 June 2019, the representatives of China and Iraq made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association

125. At the 7th meeting, on 26 June 2019, the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, Clément Nyaletsossi Voule, presented his reports ([A/HRC/41/41](#) and [Add.1–4](#)).

126. At the same meeting, the representatives of Armenia and Tunisia made statements as the States concerned.

127. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 7th and 8th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Afghanistan, Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chile, China, Costa Rica⁴ (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay), Czechia, Estonia⁴ (also on behalf of Argentina, Australia, Austria, Canada, Costa Rica, Czechia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Spain, Sweden, Tunisia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Iraq, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, South Africa, Sweden⁴ (also on behalf of Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania and Norway), Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Algeria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Colombia, Cyprus, Ecuador, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Montenegro, Netherlands, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Switzerland, Viet Nam, State of Palestine;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al Mezan Center for Human Rights, American Association of Jurists, American Civil Liberties Union, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Human Rights House Foundation, Shivi Development Society, World Organization against Torture.

128. At the 8th meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions

129. At the 8th meeting, on 26 June 2019, the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, Agnès Callamard, presented her reports ([A/HRC/41/36](#) and [Add.1](#)).

130. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 8th and 9th meetings, on 26 June 2019, and the 10th meeting, on 27 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cuba, Egypt, Eritrea, Italy, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway⁴ (also on behalf of Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania and Sweden), Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Canada, Colombia, France, Germany, Ireland, Jordan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Mauritania, Mauritius, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Oman, Russian Federation, Sudan, Switzerland, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, State of Palestine;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, DRCNet Foundation, Ensemble contre la peine de mort, Franciscans International (also on behalf of the Swiss Catholic Lenten Fund), International Bar Association, International Harm Reduction Association, Réseau international des droits humains.

131. At the 9th and 10th meetings, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the right to education

132. At the 8th meeting, on 26 June 2019, the Special Rapporteur on the right to education, Koumbou Boly Barry, presented her report ([A/HRC/41/37](#)).

133. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 8th and 9th meetings, on 26 June 2019, and the 10th meeting, on 27 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Afghanistan, Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, China, Cuba, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Iraq, Italy, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Slovakia, Togo, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Azerbaijan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Côte d'Ivoire, Dominica, Ecuador, Finland, France, Georgia, Greece, Indonesia, Jordan, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritania, Montenegro, Myanmar, Namibia, Portugal, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Timor-Leste, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Holy See;

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

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

(e) Observer for a national human rights institution: National Human Rights Committee (Qatar);

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amman Center for Human Rights Studies, Association apprentissage sans frontières, Edmund Rice International, Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (also on behalf of Soka Gakkai International and the Teresian Association), Rutgers.

134. At the 9th and 10th meetings, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Working Group on the issue of discrimination against women in law and in practice

135. At the 10th meeting, on 27 June 2019, the Chair of the Working Group on the issue of discrimination against women in law and in practice, Meskerem Geset Techane, presented the reports of the Working Group ([A/HRC/41/33](#) and [Add.1-2](#)).

136. At the 11th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Honduras and Poland made statements as the States concerned.

137. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 11th and 12th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Chair of the Working Group questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Afghanistan, Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina (also on behalf of Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay), Australia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Colombia⁴ (also on behalf of Argentina, Chile, Guatemala, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay), Croatia, Cuba, Eritrea, Fiji, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, South Africa, Spain, Sweden⁴ (also on behalf of Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania and Norway), Tunisia;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Armenia, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Chad, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Madagascar, Malaysia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Switzerland, Thailand, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

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

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

(e) Observer for a national human rights institution: Australian Human Rights Commission;

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development, Association for Women's Rights in Development, Christian Aid (also on behalf of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom), Conectas Direitos Humanos, Federation for Women and Family Planning, Human Rights Law Centre (also on behalf of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Corporation Family Violence Prevention and Legal Service (Victoria)), International Commission of Jurists, International Federation of ACAT, International Lesbian and Gay Association, International Service for Human Rights, Make Mothers Matter, Sikh Human Rights Group, Youth Coalition for Sexual and Reproductive Rights.

138. At the 11th and 12th meetings, the Chair of the Working Group answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises

139. At the 10th meeting, on 27 June 2019, the Chair of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises, Surya Deva, presented the reports of the Working Group ([A/HRC/41/43](#) and [Add.1–2](#)).

140. At the 11th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Kenya and Thailand made statements as the States concerned.

141. At the same meeting, the representative of the national human rights institution, the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights, made a statement.

142. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 11th and 12th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Chair of the Working Group questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina (also on behalf of Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay), Australia, Brazil, Chile, Eritrea, India, Italy, Japan, Pakistan, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Canada, Chad, Ecuador, France, Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Republic of Korea, Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Holy See;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Christian Aid (also on behalf of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom), Conectas Direitos Humanos, Conselho Indigenista Missionário (also on behalf of Conectas Direitos Humanos and Terra de Direitos), FIAN International, International Commission of Jurists, Make Mothers Matter, Sikh Human Rights Group.

143. At the 11th and 12th meetings, the Chair of the Working Group answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences

144. At the 12th meeting, on 27 June 2019, the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences, Dubravka Šimonović, presented her reports ([A/HRC/41/42](#) and [Corr.1](#) and [A/HRC/41/42/Add.1](#) and [Add.2](#)).

145. At the same meeting, the representatives of Canada and Nepal made statements as the States concerned.

146. Also at the same meeting, the national human rights institution, the Canadian Human Rights Commission, made a statement (by video message).

147. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 12th meeting, on 27 June 2019, and at the 13th and 14th meetings, on 28 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Afghanistan, Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Australia, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, China, Croatia, Egypt, Finland⁴ (also on behalf of Denmark, Estonia, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway and Sweden), India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Pakistan, Rwanda, Rwanda (also on behalf of the European Union, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Peru, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Sudan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay), Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Togo, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala and Mexico);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Algeria, Armenia, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Chad, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Ecuador, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Kiribati, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), State of Palestine;

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

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

(e) Observer for a national human rights institution: Australian Human Rights Commission;

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Corporation Family Violence Prevention and Legal Service (Victoria), Centre pour les droits civils et politiques, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, International Federation of Journalists, International Lesbian and Gay Association, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, Kayan – Feminist Organization, Liberation, Peace Brigades International Switzerland, United Nations Watch, Youth Coalition for Sexual and Reproductive Rights.

148. At the 12th meeting, on 27 June 2019, and at the 14th meeting, on 28 June, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

149. At the 15th meeting, on 28 June 2019, the representatives of Japan and the Republic of Korea made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

150. At the same meeting, the representatives of Japan and the Republic of Korea made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children

151. At the 12th meeting, on 27 June 2019, the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children, Maria Grazia Giammarinaro, presented her reports ([A/HRC/41/46](#) and [Add.1](#)).

152. At the same meeting, the representative of Nigeria made a statement as the State concerned.

153. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 12th meeting, on 27 June 2019, and at the 13th and 14th meetings, on 28 June, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Afghanistan, Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, China, Cuba, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Italy, Pakistan, Rwanda, Senegal, Togo, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Uruguay (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala and Mexico);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Algeria, Armenia, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Chad, Comoros, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Jamaica, Lesotho, Libya, Lithuania, Morocco, Netherlands, Paraguay, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Seychelles, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Holy See;

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

(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: Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, Defence for Children International, Foundation ECPAT International, VIVAT International (also on behalf of Franciscans International).

154. At the 12th and 14th meetings, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights

155. At the 14th meeting, on 28 June 2019, the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights, Philip Alston, presented his reports ([A/HRC/41/39](#) and [Corr.1](#), [A/HRC/41/39/Add.1](#) and [A/HRC/41/39/Add.2](#) and [Corr.1](#)).

156. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements as the States concerned.

157. Also at the same meeting, the national human rights institution, the Equality and Human Rights Commission (England, Scotland and Wales) (also on behalf of the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission and the Scottish Human Rights Commission) made a statement (by video message).

158. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 14th and 15th meetings, on 28 June 2019, and at the 16th meeting, on 1 July, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

- (a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Afghanistan, Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Belgium⁴ (also on behalf of Albania, Chile, France, Morocco, Peru, the Philippines, Romania and Senegal), Burkina Faso, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru (also on behalf of Chile, Ecuador, Guatemala, Paraguay and Uruguay), Philippines, Saudi Arabia;
- (b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Botswana, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Morocco, Myanmar, Norway, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;
- (c) Observers for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: FAO, UNICEF, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP);
- (d) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;
- (e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: China Society for Human Rights Studies, Edmund Rice International, Human Rights Law Centre (also on behalf of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Corporation Family Violence Prevention and Legal Service (Victoria)), Ingénieurs du monde, International Movement ATD Fourth World, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Partners for Transparency (also on behalf of the Maat Foundation for Peace, Development and Human Rights), Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, World Barua Organization.

159. At the 15th meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the rights of internally displaced persons

160. At the 14th meeting, on 28 June 2019, the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons, Cecilia Jimenez, presented her reports ([A/HRC/41/40](#) and [Add.1](#)).

161. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 14th and 15th meetings, on 28 June 2019, and at the 16th meeting, on 1 July, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

- (a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Afghanistan, Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Austria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, China, Croatia, Egypt, Iraq, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Togo, Tunisia, Ukraine, Ukraine (also on behalf of Azerbaijan, Georgia and the Republic of Moldova), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
- (b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Chad, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, Georgia, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kenya, Lesotho, Libya, Montenegro, Norway, Serbia, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Holy See;
- (c) Observers for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), UNDP;
- (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) Observer for national human rights institutions: Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions;
- (g) Observers for non-governmental organizations: European Centre for Law and Justice, Health and Environment Program, Iraqi Development Organization, Iuventum,

Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

162. At the 16th meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

163. At the 15th meeting, the representatives of Armenia and Azerbaijan made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

C. General debate on agenda item 3

164. At its 16th and 17th meetings, on 1 July 2019, and its 18th meeting, on 2 July, 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: Australia (also on behalf of the Fiji, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, New Zealand, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, the Cook Islands and Niue), Australia (also on behalf of Canada, Iceland, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Norway and Switzerland), Belgium⁵ (also on behalf of Benin, Costa Rica, France, Mexico, Mongolia, the Republic of Moldova and Switzerland), Bolivia (Plurinational State of)⁵ (also on behalf of Cuba, Nicaragua and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Brazil (also on behalf of Colombia, Mozambique, Portugal and Thailand), Cameroon, Canada⁵ (also on behalf of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Côte d'Ivoire⁵ (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cabo Verde, the Central African Republic, Chad, China, the Comoros, the Congo, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, the Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, the Sudan, Suriname, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe and the State of Palestine), Croatia (also on behalf of Costa Rica and Poland), Cuba, Ecuador⁵ (also on behalf of Peru and Thailand), Finland⁵ (on behalf of the European Union), India (also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, South Africa, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkmenistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zimbabwe), Iraq, Jordan⁵ (also on behalf of Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, the State of Palestine and the Sovereign Military Hospitaller Order of St. John of Jerusalem, of Rhodes and of Malta), Mexico (also on behalf of Argentina, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, the Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, Mongolia, Montenegro, Nepal, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand,

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

the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay), Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Portugal⁵ (also on behalf of Angola, 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), Rwanda, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)⁵ (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries with the exception of Colombia, Ecuador and Peru);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Ghana, Greece, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lesotho, Netherlands, Palau, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Singapore, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

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

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: German Institute for Human Rights;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: ABC Tamil Oli, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Corporation Family Violence Prevention and Legal Service (Victoria), Action on Smoking and Health, African Agency for Integrated Development, Alliance Defending Freedom (also on behalf of the European Centre for Law and Justice and Global Helping to Advance Women and Children), Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Asociación HazteOir.org, Association burkinabé pour la survie de l'enfance, Association des jeunes pour l'agriculture du Mali, Association Dunenyo, Association for Progressive Communications, Association for the Protection of Women and Children's Rights, Association internationale de la libre pensée, Association of World Citizens, Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique, Association Thendral, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of the American Association of Jurists, the Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Edmund Rice International, the International Confederation of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, International-Lawyers.org, the International Movement of Apostolate in the Independent Social Milieus, the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Passionists International, the Teresian Association, the World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations), Center for Africa Development and Progress, Centre for Gender Justice and Women Empowerment, China Society for Human Rights Studies, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, "Coup de pousse" Chaîne de l'espoir Nord-Sud, Edmund Rice International, European Centre for Law and Justice, Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland (also on behalf of the Swedish Federation for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights), Federation of Cuban Women, France libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Friends World Committee for Consultation, Global Institute for Water, Environment and Health, Global Welfare Association, Human Rights Council of Australia (also on behalf of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Corporation Family Violence Prevention and Legal Service (Victoria)), Il Cenacolo, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, Ingénieurs du monde, International Career Support Association, International Catholic Migration Commission (also on behalf of Defence for Children International, the International Commission of Jurists, the International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism and Terre des hommes fédération internationale), International Commission of Jurists, International Committee for the Indigenous Peoples of the Americas (Switzerland), International Educational Development, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Human Rights Association of American Minorities, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (also on behalf of Franciscans International), International Muslim Women's Union, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Iraqi Development Organization, Iuventum, Jeunesse

étudiante tamoule, Kayan – Feminist Organization, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Lawyers’ Rights Watch Canada (also on behalf of the International Bar Association and Lawyers for Lawyers), Make Mothers Matter, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Mother of Hope Cameroon Common Initiative Group, Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l’amitié entre les peuples, Muslims for Progressive Values (also on behalf of Franciscans International and Souforce), 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, Peace Brigades International Switzerland, Prahar, Presse emblème campagne, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l’homme, Right Livelihood Award Foundation, Sikh Human Rights Group, Society for Threatened Peoples, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, United Schools International, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Villages unis, VIVAT International, Widows Rights International (also on behalf of the Global Fund for Widows, the International Federation of Business and Professional Women, the International Longevity Center Global Alliance, the National Alliance of Women’s Organizations and the Tandem Project), World Barua Organization, World Evangelical Alliance.

165. At the 17th meeting, the representatives of China, Colombia, India and Pakistan made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

166. At the same meeting, the representatives of India and Pakistan made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights

167. At the 38th meeting, on 11 July 2019, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries with the exception of Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Honduras and Peru) introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.1](#), sponsored by Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries with the exception of Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Honduras and Peru) and the State of Palestine.

168. At the same meeting, the representatives of Australia and Peru made general comments on the draft resolution.

169. 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.

170. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Denmark (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and Japan made statements in explanation of vote before the vote. In his statement, the representative of Japan disassociated the respective member State from the consensus on paragraph 13 of the draft resolution.

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

In favour:

Afghanistan, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Eritrea, Fiji, India, Iraq, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Togo, Tunisia, Uruguay

Against:

Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Slovakia, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Peru

172. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 28 votes to 14, with 5 abstentions (resolution 41/3).

Promotion of the right to peace

173. At the 38th meeting, on 11 July 2019, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.2](#), sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ethiopia, Haiti, Namibia, Nicaragua, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, the Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Tunisia and Viet Nam joined the sponsors.

174. At the same meeting, the representatives of Denmark (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Iceland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

175. 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:

Afghanistan, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chile, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Eritrea, Fiji, India, Iraq, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Togo, Tunisia, Uruguay

Against:

Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Slovakia, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Argentina, Iceland

176. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 32 votes to 13, with 2 abstentions (resolution 41/4).

Human rights and international solidarity

177. At the 38th meeting, on 11 July 2019, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.3](#), sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ethiopia, Haiti, Malaysia, Namibia, Nicaragua, Senegal, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Algeria, Bahrain, Botswana, Djibouti, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malawi, Maldives, the Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sri Lanka and Viet Nam joined the sponsors.

178. At the same meeting, the representative of Denmark, 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.

179. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Denmark, 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:

Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chile, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Eritrea, Fiji, India, Iraq, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Togo, Tunisia, Uruguay

Against:

Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Slovakia, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Mexico

180. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 32 votes to 14, with 1 abstention (resolution 41/5).

Elimination of all forms of discrimination against women and girls

181. At the 28th meeting, on 11 July 2019, the representative of Mexico, also on behalf of Colombia, introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.6/Rev.1](#), sponsored by Colombia and Mexico, and co-sponsored by Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Peru, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay. Subsequently, Botswana, El Salvador, Japan, Nepal, Poland, the Republic of Korea and Serbia joined the sponsors.

182. At the same meeting, the representative of Pakistan introduced amendment [A/HRC/41/L.37](#) to the draft resolution.

183. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Egypt introduced amendment [A/HRC/41/L.41](#) to the draft resolution.

184. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced amendment [A/HRC/41/L.46](#) to the draft resolution.

185. Amendment [A/HRC/41/L.37](#) was sponsored by Pakistan. Subsequently, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Egypt, Iraq, the Russian Federation and Saudi Arabia joined the sponsors. Amendment [A/HRC/41/L.41](#) was sponsored by Egypt. Subsequently, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Iraq and Pakistan joined the sponsors. Amendment [A/HRC/41/L.46](#) was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Bahrain and Iraq. Subsequently, Bangladesh, Egypt, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia joined the sponsors.

186. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Mexico made a statement on the proposed amendments to the draft resolution.

187. At the same meeting, the representatives of Australia, Austria, Denmark (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and Peru made general comments on the draft resolution and on the proposed amendments [A/HRC/41/L.37](#), [A/HRC/41/L.41](#) and [A/HRC/41/L.46](#).

188. 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.

189. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico and Uruguay made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment [A/HRC/41/L.37](#).

190. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment [A/HRC/41/L.37](#). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Cameroon, China, Egypt, Eritrea, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia

Against:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Angola, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of the Congo, India, Nepal, Togo

191. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment [A/HRC/41/L.37](#) by 25 votes to 15, with 6 abstentions.⁶

192. At the same meeting, the representative of Mexico made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment [A/HRC/41/L.41](#).

193. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment [A/HRC/41/L.41](#). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Cameroon, China, Egypt, Eritrea, Iraq, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia

Against:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Angola, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nepal, Nigeria, Togo

194. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment [A/HRC/41/L.41](#) by 13 votes to 27, with 6 abstentions.⁶

195. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Denmark, 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/41/L.46](#).

196. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Mexico, a recorded vote was taken on amendment [A/HRC/41/L.46](#). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bahrain, Bangladesh, Cameroon, China, Egypt, Eritrea, Iraq, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia

Against:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Rwanda, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nepal, Nigeria, Philippines, Qatar, Togo

197. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment [A/HRC/41/L.46](#) by 26 votes to 11, with 9 abstentions.⁶

198. At the same meeting, the representatives of Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Cameroon, Egypt, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal and Somalia made

⁶ The delegation of Cuba did not cast a vote.

statements in explanation of vote before the vote. In their statements, the representatives of Afghanistan and Nigeria disassociated the respective member States from the consensus on paragraph 5 (e) of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Bahrain disassociated the member State from the consensus on the seventh, tenth, seventeenth and twenty-eighth preambular paragraphs and on paragraphs 5 (a), 5 (c), 5 (e), 7 and 11 of the draft resolution. In their statements, the representatives of Bangladesh, Cameroon and Saudi Arabia disassociated the respective member States from the consensus on the seventh and tenth preambular paragraphs and on paragraphs 5 (a), 5 (c), 5 (e) and 11 of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Egypt disassociated the member State from the consensus on the tenth preambular paragraph and on paragraph 5 (e) of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Iraq disassociated the member State from the consensus on the seventh and tenth preambular paragraphs and on paragraphs 5 (e) and 11 of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Pakistan disassociated the member State from the consensus on the seventh preambular paragraph and on paragraph 5 (e) of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Qatar disassociated the member State from the consensus on the tenth preambular paragraph and on paragraphs 5 (e) and 7 of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Senegal disassociated the member State from the consensus on the seventh and tenth preambular paragraphs and on paragraph 5 (e) of the draft resolution. In her statement, the representative of Somalia disassociated the member State from the consensus on the seventh preambular paragraph and on paragraphs 5 (a), 5 (c), 5 (e) and 11 of the draft resolution.

199. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 41/6).

200. At the 41st meeting, on 12 July 2019, the representative of Brazil made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

The human rights of migrants

201. At the 39th meeting, on 11 July 2019, the representative of Mexico introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.7](#), sponsored by Mexico and co-sponsored by Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Germany, Haiti, Ireland, Luxembourg, Peru, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey and Uruguay. Subsequently, Albania, Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Barbados, Canada, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Honduras, Iceland, Japan, Malta, the Marshall Islands, Nepal, the Netherlands, Paraguay, the Philippines, Spain, Sri Lanka and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

202. At the same meeting, the representatives of Denmark (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Egypt, Iceland, India, Peru and the Philippines made general comments on the draft resolution.

203. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Bulgaria, Hungary and Italy made statements in explanation of vote before the vote. In her statement, the representative of Hungary disassociated the member State from the consensus on the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. In her statement, the representative of Bulgaria disassociated the member State from the consensus on paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

204. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 41/7).

205. At the 41st meeting on 12 July 2019, the representative of Chile made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote. In her statement, the representative of Chile disassociated the member State from the consensus on the fifth preambular paragraph of the adopted resolution.

Consequences of child, early and forced marriage

206. At the 39th meeting, on 11 July 2019, the representative of the Netherlands, also on behalf of Argentina, Canada, Honduras, Italy, Montenegro, Poland, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Zambia, introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.8/Rev.1](#), sponsored by Argentina, Canada,

Honduras, Italy, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Poland, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Zambia, and co-sponsored by Albania, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Ecuador, Estonia, Fiji, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Peru, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey and Ukraine. Subsequently, Armenia, Belgium, Botswana, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, Gambia, Mozambique, Namibia, Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, Serbia and Sweden joined the sponsors.

207. At the same meeting, the representative of Egypt introduced amendments [A/HRC/41/L.39](#) and [A/HRC/41/L.42](#) to the draft resolution.

208. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Bahrain, also on behalf of Bangladesh, Egypt and Saudi Arabia, introduced amendment [A/HRC/41/L.40](#) to the draft resolution.

209. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced amendment [A/HRC/41/L.45](#) to the draft resolution.

210. Amendment [A/HRC/41/L.39](#) was sponsored by Egypt and co-sponsored by Iraq. Subsequently, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Pakistan and the Russian Federation joined the sponsors. Amendment [A/HRC/41/L.40](#) was sponsored by Bahrain and co-sponsored by Saudi Arabia. Subsequently, Bangladesh, Egypt, Pakistan, the Russian Federation and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors. Amendment [A/HRC/41/L.42](#) was sponsored by Egypt and co-sponsored by Iraq and Saudi Arabia. Subsequently, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Pakistan, the Russian Federation and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors. Amendment [A/HRC/41/L.45](#) was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Bahrain. Subsequently, Bangladesh, Egypt, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia joined the sponsors.

211. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Argentina made a statement on the proposed amendments to the draft resolution.

212. At the same meeting, the representatives of Denmark (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Fiji, Japan, Nepal and Tunisia made general comments on the draft resolution and on the proposed amendments [A/HRC/41/L.39](#), [A/HRC/41/L.40](#), [A/HRC/41/L.42](#) and [A/HRC/41/L.45](#).

213. 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.

214. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Croatia and Mexico made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment [A/HRC/41/L.39](#).

215. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Argentina, a recorded vote was taken on amendment [A/HRC/41/L.39](#). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, China, Egypt, Eritrea, Iraq, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia

Against:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Rwanda, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Angola, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nepal, Nigeria, Philippines, Togo

216. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment [A/HRC/41/L.39](#) by 26 votes to 13, with 7 abstentions.⁶

217. At the same meeting, the representatives of Czechia and Uruguay made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment [A/HRC/41/L.40](#).

218. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Argentina, a recorded vote was taken on amendment [A/HRC/41/L.40](#). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Cameroon, China, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Togo

Against:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Rwanda, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Burkina Faso, Nepal, Philippines

219. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment [A/HRC/41/L.40](#) by 23 votes to 18, with 5 abstentions.⁶

220. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Australia and Italy made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment [A/HRC/41/L.42](#).

221. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Argentina, a recorded vote was taken on amendment [A/HRC/41/L.42](#). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Cameroon, China, Egypt, Eritrea, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia

Against:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Rwanda, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Angola, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of the Congo, India, Nepal, Philippines, Togo

222. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment [A/HRC/41/L.42](#) by 25 votes to 14, with 7 abstentions.⁶

223. At the same meeting, the representatives of Austria 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/41/L.45](#).

224. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Argentina, a recorded vote was taken on amendment [A/HRC/41/L.45](#). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bahrain, Bangladesh, China, Egypt, Eritrea, Iraq, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia

Against:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Rwanda, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nepal, Nigeria, Philippines, Qatar, Togo

225. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment [A/HRC/41/L.45](#) by 26 votes to 10, with 10 abstentions.⁶

226. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Cameroon, Egypt, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal and Somalia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote. In his statement, the representative of Afghanistan disassociated the member State from the consensus on the seventeenth and twenty-second preambular paragraphs and on paragraphs 1, 2 and 9 of the draft resolution. In their statements, the representatives of Bahrain and Bangladesh disassociated the respective member States from the consensus on the sixteenth, seventeenth and twenty-first preambular paragraphs and on paragraphs 1, 2, 7, 9, 10 and 13 of the draft resolution. In her statement, the representative of Cameroon disassociated the member State from the consensus on the seventeenth and twenty-first preambular paragraphs and on paragraph 7 of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Egypt disassociated the member State from the consensus on the sixteenth preambular paragraph and on paragraphs 10 and 13 of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Iraq disassociated the member State from the consensus on the seventeenth and twenty-second preambular paragraphs and on paragraphs 1 and 9 of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Nigeria disassociated the member State from the consensus on the seventeenth and twenty-second preambular paragraphs and on paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Pakistan disassociated the member State from the consensus on the sixteenth, seventeenth and twenty-second preambular paragraphs and on paragraphs 2 and 10 of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Qatar disassociated the member State from the consensus on paragraphs 1, 9 and 10 of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Saudi Arabia disassociated the member State from the consensus on the sixteenth and seventeenth preambular paragraphs and on paragraphs 1, 2, 7, 9 and 13 of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Senegal disassociated the member State from the consensus on the sixteenth, seventeenth and twenty-second preambular paragraphs and on paragraphs 1, 2, 7 and 9 of the draft resolution. In her statement, the representative of Somalia disassociated the member State from the consensus on the sixteenth, seventeenth and twenty-second preambular paragraphs and on paragraphs 1, 2, 7, 9 and 13 of the draft resolution.

227. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 41/8).

228. At the 41st meeting on 12 July 2019, the representative of Brazil made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

The negative impact of corruption on the enjoyment of human rights

229. At the 39th meeting, on 11 July 2019, the representative of Morocco, also on behalf of Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Poland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.11](#), sponsored by Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Morocco, Poland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and co-sponsored by Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Ecuador, Eswatini, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Tunisia, Ukraine and the United Arab Emirates. Subsequently, Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Azerbaijan, the Bahamas, Bahrain, Belarus, Costa Rica, Cyprus, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Honduras, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kuwait, Lebanon, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, North Macedonia, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

230. 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.

231. At the same meeting, the representative of Japan made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

232. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 41/9).

Access to medicines and vaccines in the context of the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health

233. At the 39th meeting, on 11 July 2019, the representative of Brazil, also on behalf of China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Senegal, South Africa and Thailand, introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.13](#), sponsored by Brazil, China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Senegal, South Africa and Thailand, and co-sponsored by Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Haiti, Iraq, Kuwait, Mongolia, Peru, the Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates, Uruguay and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Bahrain, Botswana, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Fiji, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Lebanon, Libya, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mozambique, Nepal, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Sri Lanka and Viet Nam joined the sponsors.

234. At the same meeting, the representatives of Egypt, India, Peru and South Africa made general comments on the draft resolution.

235. 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.

236. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 41/10).

237. At the 41st meeting, on 12 July 2019, the representative of Japan made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote. In his statement, the representative of Japan disassociated the member State from the consensus on the twenty-fourth preambular paragraph and on paragraphs 5, 8 and 13 of the adopted resolution.

New and emerging digital technologies and human rights

238. At the 39th meeting, on 11 July 2019, the representative of the Republic of Korea, also on behalf of Austria, Brazil, Denmark, Morocco and Singapore, introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.14](#), sponsored by Austria, Brazil, Denmark, Morocco, the Republic of Korea and Singapore, and co-sponsored by Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, the Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Senegal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, the Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Botswana, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Czechia, Djibouti, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Eswatini, Haiti, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Nepal, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Slovakia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

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

240. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Bulgaria and Chile made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

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

242. At the same meeting, the representative of Pakistan made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

243. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 41/11).

The rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association

244. At the 39th meeting, on 11 July 2019, the representative of Czechia, also on behalf of Indonesia, Lithuania, Maldives and Mexico, introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.18/Rev.1](#), sponsored by Czechia, Indonesia, Lithuania, Maldives and Mexico, and co-sponsored by Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Mongolia, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine and Uruguay. Subsequently, Angola, Armenia, the Bahamas, Barbados, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Iraq, Panama, Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Togo and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

245. 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.

246. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 41/12).

Youth and human rights

247. At the 39th meeting, on 11 July 2019, the representative of El Salvador, also on behalf of Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, France, Greece, Italy, Morocco, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova and Tunisia, introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.19](#), sponsored by Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Greece, Italy, Morocco, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova and Tunisia, and co-sponsored by Albania, Algeria, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Georgia, Germany, Haiti, Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, Kuwait, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Nicaragua, North Macedonia, Peru, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Argentina, Azerbaijan, the Bahamas, Bahrain, Belarus, Botswana, Canada, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Fiji, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Lebanon, Libya, Maldives, Mali, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, Serbia, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Viet Nam joined the sponsors.

248. At the same meeting, the representatives of Egypt and Tunisia made general comments on the draft resolution.

249. 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.

250. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 41/13).

Equal pay

251. At the 39th meeting, on 11 July 2019, the representatives of South Africa and Iceland introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.21](#), sponsored by Australia, Canada, Germany, Iceland, New Zealand, Panama, South Africa and Switzerland, and co-sponsored by Albania, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Norway, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine and Uruguay. Subsequently, Barbados, Botswana, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechia, El Salvador, Fiji, the Gambia, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Rwanda, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, Thailand and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

252. At the same meeting, the representative of Denmark, 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.

253. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 41/14).

Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons

254. At the 39th meeting, on 11 July 2019, the representative of Austria, also on behalf of Honduras and Uganda, introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.23](#), sponsored by Austria, Honduras and Uganda, and co-sponsored by Albania, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Ukraine and Uruguay. Subsequently, Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Azerbaijan, the Bahamas, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechia, the Dominican Republic, Hungary, Japan, Maldives, the Marshall Islands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Panama, Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, San Marino and Serbia joined the sponsors.

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

256. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 41/15).

The right to education: follow-up to Human Rights Council resolution 8/4

257. At the 39th meeting, on 11 July 2019, the representative of Portugal introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.26](#), sponsored by Portugal and co-sponsored by Albania, Algeria, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Kuwait, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, North Macedonia, the Philippines, Poland, Qatar, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates, Uruguay and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Argentina, Azerbaijan, the Bahamas, Bahrain, Belarus, Botswana, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Côte d'Ivoire, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Georgia, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Maldives, Nepal, the Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, San Marino, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, Switzerland and Viet Nam joined the sponsors.

258. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 41/16).

259. At the 41st meeting, on 12 July 2019, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

**Accelerating efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women and girls:
preventing and responding to violence against women and girls in the world of work**

260. At the 40th meeting, on 12 July 2019, the representative of Canada introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.5/Rev.1](#), sponsored by Canada and co-sponsored by Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine and Uruguay. Subsequently, the Bahamas, Botswana, Burkina Faso, El Salvador, Ghana, the Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Serbia, South Africa, Sri Lanka and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

261. At the same meeting, the representative of Egypt introduced amendment [A/HRC/41/L.38](#) to the draft resolution.

262. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced amendments [A/HRC/41/L.43](#) and [A/HRC/41/L.44](#) to the draft resolution.

263. Amendment [A/HRC/41/L.38](#) was sponsored by Egypt and co-sponsored by Saudi Arabia. Subsequently, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Iraq, Pakistan, the Russian Federation and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors. Amendment [A/HRC/41/L.43](#) was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Bahrain. Subsequently, Bangladesh, Egypt, Iraq and Pakistan joined the sponsors. Amendment [A/HRC/41/L.44](#) was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Bahrain and Saudi Arabia. Subsequently, Bangladesh, Egypt, Iraq and Pakistan joined the sponsors.

264. At the same meeting, the representative of Iceland made a statement on the proposed amendments to the draft resolution.

265. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Argentina, Denmark, India, Japan, Somalia, South Africa and Tunisia made general comments on the draft resolution and on the proposed amendments [A/HRC/41/L.38](#), [A/HRC/41/L.43](#) and [A/HRC/41/L.44](#).

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

267. At the same meeting, the representatives of Australia and Uruguay made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment [A/HRC/41/L.38](#).

268. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Iceland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment [A/HRC/41/L.38](#). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Cameroon, China, Egypt, Eritrea, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia

Against:

Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Rwanda, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Democratic Republic of the Congo, India, Nepal, Philippines, Togo

269. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment [A/HRC/41/L.38](#) by 27 votes to 14, with 5 abstentions.⁷

270. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of 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/41/L.43](#).

271. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Iceland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment [A/HRC/41/L.43](#). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bahrain, Bangladesh, China, Egypt, Eritrea, Iraq, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia

Against:

Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Rwanda, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nepal, Nigeria, Philippines, Qatar, Togo

272. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment [A/HRC/41/L.43](#) by 28 votes to 10, with 8 abstentions.⁷

273. At the same meeting, the representatives of Czechia and Denmark made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment [A/HRC/41/L.44](#).

274. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Iceland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment [A/HRC/41/L.44](#). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Cameroon, China, Egypt, Eritrea, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia

Against:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Rwanda, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Angola, Democratic Republic of the Congo, India, Nepal, Philippines, Togo

275. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment [A/HRC/41/L.44](#) by 25 votes to 15, with 6 abstentions.⁷

276. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Cameroon, Egypt, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal and Somalia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote. In their statements, the representatives of Afghanistan, Cameroon and Iraq disassociated the respective member States from the consensus on the twenty-fourth preambular paragraph and on paragraph 10 (e) of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Bahrain disassociated the member State from the consensus on the seventeenth, twenty-fourth and twenty-eighth preambular paragraphs and on paragraphs 4, 6, 10 (b) and 10 (e) of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Bangladesh disassociated the member State from the consensus on the seventeenth, twenty-fourth and twenty-eighth preambular paragraphs and on paragraphs 4, 6, 10 (b), 10 (e) and 11 (e) of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Egypt disassociated the member State from the consensus on the seventeenth and twenty-eighth preambular paragraphs and on paragraphs 4, 6, 10 (b), 10 (e) and 11 (e) of the draft resolution. In her statement, the representative of Nigeria disassociated the member State from the

⁷ The delegation of Cuba did not cast a vote.

consensus on the twenty-fourth preambular paragraph and on paragraph 11 (e) of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Pakistan disassociated the member State from the consensus on the seventeenth and twenty-eighth preambular paragraphs and on paragraphs 6 and 10 (e) of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Qatar disassociated the member State from the consensus on paragraphs 6 and 10 (e) of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Saudi Arabia disassociated the member State from the consensus on the seventeenth, twenty-fourth and twenty-eighth preambular paragraphs and on paragraphs 4, 5 (a), 5 (c) and 11 (e) of the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of Senegal disassociated the member State from the consensus on the sixteenth and twenty-second preambular paragraphs and on paragraph 10 (e) of the draft resolution. In her statement, the representative of Somalia disassociated the member State from the consensus on the seventeenth, twenty-fourth and twenty-eighth preambular paragraphs and on paragraphs 6, 10 (b), 10 (e) and 11 (e) of the draft resolution.

277. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 41/17).

278. At the 41st meeting, on 12 July 2019, the representative of Brazil made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Mandate of the Independent Expert on protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity

279. At the 40th meeting, on 12 July 2019, the representatives of Argentina (also on behalf of Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico and Uruguay) and Uruguay introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.10/Rev.1](#), sponsored by Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico and Uruguay, and co-sponsored by Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Australia and Czechia withdrew their original co-sponsorship of the draft resolution. Subsequently, Australia, Czechia, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Panama and Serbia joined the sponsors.

280. At the same meeting, the representatives of Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation except Albania and Tunisia), Bangladesh, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Nigeria and Egypt introduced amendments [A/HRC/41/L.27](#), [A/HRC/41/L.28](#), [A/HRC/41/L.29](#), [A/HRC/41/L.30](#), [A/HRC/41/L.31](#), [A/HRC/41/L.32](#), [A/HRC/41/L.33](#), [A/HRC/41/L.34](#), [A/HRC/41/L.35](#) and [A/HRC/41/L.36](#) to the draft resolution.

281. Amendments [A/HRC/41/L.27](#), [A/HRC/41/L.28](#), [A/HRC/41/L.29](#), [A/HRC/41/L.30](#), [A/HRC/41/L.31](#), [A/HRC/41/L.32](#), [A/HRC/41/L.33](#), [A/HRC/41/L.34](#), [A/HRC/41/L.35](#) and [A/HRC/41/L.36](#) were sponsored by Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation except Albania and Tunisia. Subsequently, the Russian Federation joined the sponsors.

282. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Chile made a statement on the proposed amendments to the draft resolution.

283. At the same meeting, the representatives of Denmark (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Fiji, Iceland, Peru, South Africa and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made general comments on the draft resolution and on the proposed amendments [A/HRC/41/L.27](#), [A/HRC/41/L.28](#), [A/HRC/41/L.29](#), [A/HRC/41/L.30](#), [A/HRC/41/L.31](#), [A/HRC/41/L.32](#), [A/HRC/41/L.33](#), [A/HRC/41/L.34](#), [A/HRC/41/L.35](#) and [A/HRC/41/L.36](#).

284. 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.

285. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Austria, South Africa and Uruguay made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment [A/HRC/41/L.27](#).

286. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Chile, a recorded vote was taken on amendment [A/HRC/41/L.27](#). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Egypt, Eritrea, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Togo

Against:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Nepal, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Angola, Burkina Faso, China, Democratic Republic of the Congo, India

287. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment [A/HRC/41/L.27](#) by 26 votes to 13, with 5 abstentions.⁸

288. At the same meeting, the representatives of Austria and Uruguay made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment [A/HRC/41/L.28](#).

289. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Chile, a recorded vote was taken on amendment [A/HRC/41/L.28](#). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, China, Egypt, Eritrea, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Togo

Against:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Nepal, Peru, Rwanda, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Angola, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of the Congo, India, Philippines

290. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment [A/HRC/41/L.28](#) by 25 votes to 14, with 5 abstentions.⁸

291. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Austria and Uruguay made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment [A/HRC/41/L.29](#).

292. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Chile, a recorded vote was taken on amendment [A/HRC/41/L.29](#). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, China, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Togo, Tunisia

Against:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Angola, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nepal, Rwanda

⁸ The delegations of Cameroon, Cuba and Tunisia did not cast a vote.

293. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment [A/HRC/41/L.29](#) by 22 votes to 18, with 5 abstentions.⁹

294. At the same meeting, the representatives of Argentina 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/41/L.30](#).

295. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Chile, a recorded vote was taken on amendment [A/HRC/41/L.30](#). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, China, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Togo

Against:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Angola, Bahamas, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nepal, Rwanda

296. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment [A/HRC/41/L.30](#) by 22 votes to 16, with 6 abstentions.¹⁰

297. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Argentina 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/41/L.31](#).

298. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Chile, a recorded vote was taken on amendment [A/HRC/41/L.31](#). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, China, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia

Against:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Nepal, Peru, Rwanda, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Angola, Bahamas, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Togo

299. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment [A/HRC/41/L.31](#) by 24 votes to 15, with 5 abstentions.¹⁰

300. At the same meeting, the representatives of Australia and Mexico made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment [A/HRC/41/L.32](#).

301. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Chile, a recorded vote was taken on amendment [A/HRC/41/L.32](#). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, China, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Togo

Against:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru,

⁹ The delegations of Cameroon and Cuba did not cast a vote.

¹⁰ The delegations of Cameroon, Cuba and Tunisia did not cast a vote.

Rwanda, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Angola, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nepal, Philippines

302. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment [A/HRC/41/L.32](#) by 24 votes to 15, with 5 abstentions.¹⁰

303. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Australia and Mexico made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment [A/HRC/41/L.33](#).

304. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Chile, a recorded vote was taken on amendment [A/HRC/41/L.33](#). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, China, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Togo, Tunisia

Against:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Angola, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nepal, Philippines, Rwanda

305. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment [A/HRC/41/L.33](#) by 22 votes to 17, with 6 abstentions.¹¹

306. At the same meeting, the representatives of Australia and Mexico made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment [A/HRC/41/L.34](#).

307. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Chile, a recorded vote was taken on amendment [A/HRC/41/L.34](#). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, China, Egypt, Eritrea, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Togo

Against:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Nepal, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Angola, Bahamas, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of the Congo, India

308. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment [A/HRC/41/L.34](#) by 25 votes to 14, with 5 abstentions.¹²

309. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Chile and Fiji made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment [A/HRC/41/L.35](#).

310. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Chile, a recorded vote was taken on amendment [A/HRC/41/L.35](#). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, China, Egypt, Eritrea, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Togo, Tunisia

¹¹ The delegations of Cameroon and Cuba did not cast a vote.

¹² The delegations of Cameroon, Cuba and Tunisia did not cast a vote.

Against:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Nepal, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Angola, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of the Congo, India

311. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment [A/HRC/41/L.35](#) by 26 votes to 15, with 4 abstentions.¹³

312. At the same meeting, the representatives of Chile and Fiji made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment [A/HRC/41/L.36](#).

313. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Chile, a recorded vote was taken on amendment [A/HRC/41/L.36](#). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Afghanistan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, China, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Togo, Tunisia

Against:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Abstaining:

Angola, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nepal, Philippines, Rwanda

314. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council rejected amendment [A/HRC/41/L.36](#) by 22 votes to 17, with 6 abstentions.¹³

315. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Australia, the Bahamas, Czechia, Hungary, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation except Albania and Tunisia) and Tunisia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote. In his statement, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation except Albania and Tunisia, disassociated the respective member States from the consensus on the draft resolution.

316. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation except Albania and Tunisia, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Cuba, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Nepal, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Against:

Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, China, Egypt, Eritrea, Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia

Abstaining:

Angola, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Hungary, India, Senegal, Togo

317. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 27 votes to 12, with 7 abstentions (resolution 41/18).¹⁴

¹³ The delegations of Cameroon and Cuba did not cast a vote.

¹⁴ The delegation of Cameroon did not cast a vote.

318. At the 41st meeting, on 12 July 2019, the representative of Cuba made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

The contribution of development to the enjoyment of all human rights

319. At the 40th meeting, on 12 July 2019, the representative of China introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.17/Rev.1](#), sponsored by China and co-sponsored by Algeria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam. Subsequently, the Bahamas, Burkina Faso, the Congo, Djibouti, the Dominican Republic, Fiji, Gabon, Indonesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mali, Rwanda, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Yemen and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

320. At the same meeting, the representative of China announced that the draft resolution had been orally revised.

321. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Cuba, Egypt, India, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) and South Africa made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

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

323. At the same meeting, the representatives of Australia, Denmark (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and Japan made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

324. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Denmark, 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:

Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chile, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Eritrea, Fiji, India, Iraq, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Togo, Tunisia, Uruguay

Against:

Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Slovakia, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

325. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 33 votes to 13, with no abstentions (resolution 41/19).¹⁵

Impact of arms transfers on human rights

326. At the 41st meeting, on 12 July 2019, the representative of Ecuador, also on behalf of Peru, introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.22/Rev.1](#), sponsored by Ecuador and Peru, and co-sponsored by Iceland, Mexico, Switzerland and Uruguay. Subsequently, Albania, Angola, Austria, the Bahamas, Chile, the Congo, Cyprus, El Salvador, Greece, Honduras, Ireland, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Togo and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

327. At the same meeting, the representatives of Iceland, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay made general comments on the draft resolution.

¹⁵ The delegation of Ukraine did not cast a vote.

328. 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.

329. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Iraq made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote. In his statement, the representative of Iraq disassociated the member State from the consensus on the thirteenth and sixteenth preambular paragraphs and on paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

330. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 41/20).

331. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Australia, Egypt and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote after the vote. In his statement, the representative of Egypt disassociated the member State from the consensus on the thirteenth preambular paragraph of the adopted resolution.

Human rights and climate change

332. At the 41st meeting, on 12 July 2019, the representative of Bangladesh, also on behalf of the Philippines and Viet Nam, introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.24](#), sponsored by Bangladesh, the Philippines and Viet Nam, and co-sponsored by Armenia, Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Haiti, India, Iraq, Kuwait, Mexico, Mongolia, Peru, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Uruguay and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Afghanistan, Albania, Azerbaijan, the Bahamas, Bahrain, Botswana, Chile, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Honduras, Iceland, Lebanon, Libya, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, the Marshall Islands, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, San Marino, Sri Lanka, Switzerland and Yemen joined the sponsors.

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

334. 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.

335. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 41/21).

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

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

336. At the 19th meeting, on 2 July 2019, the Chair of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic, Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro, provided, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 40/17, an oral update.

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

338. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 19th and 20th meetings, on the same day, 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, Bahrain, Brazil, Chile, China, Croatia, Cuba, Czechia, Egypt, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden¹⁶ (also on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Norway), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Albania, Belarus, Belgium, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Estonia, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Maldives, Malta, Netherlands, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Switzerland, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Palestinian Return Centre, Physicians for Human Rights, Syrian Center for Media and Freedom of Expression, Union of Arab Jurists, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

339. At the 19th and 20th meetings, the Chair and members of the Commission of Inquiry, Karen Koning Abuzayd and Hanny Megally, answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

340. At the 20th meeting, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

341. At the 22nd meeting, on 3 July 2019, the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Turkey made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

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

B. Interactive dialogue with the Commission of Inquiry on Burundi

343. At the 20th meeting, on 2 July 2019, the Chair of the Commission of Inquiry on Burundi, Doudou Diène, provided, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 39/14, an oral briefing.

344. At the same meeting, members of the Commission of Inquiry, Françoise Hampson and Lucy Asuagbor, made statements.

¹⁶ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

345. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Burundi made a statement as the State concerned.

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Cameroon, China, Denmark, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belgium, France, Germany, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Luxembourg, Myanmar, Netherlands, Sudan, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Ingénieurs du monde, International Federation for the Protection of the Rights of Ethnic, Religious, Linguistic and Other Minorities, International Federation of ACAT (also on behalf of TRIAL International), International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Service for Human Rights, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme.

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

C. Interactive dialogue with special procedure mandate holders

Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus

348. At the 18th meeting, on 2 July 2019, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus, Anaïs Marin, presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 38/14, her report ([A/HRC/41/52](#)).

349. At the same meeting, the representative of Belarus made a statement as the State concerned.

350. 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, Czechia, Slovakia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belgium, Estonia, France, Germany, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights Watch, Ingénieurs du monde, International Fellowship of Reconciliation.

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

Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea

352. At the 18th meeting, on 2 July 2019, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea, Daniela Kravetz, presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 38/15, her report ([A/HRC/41/53](#)).

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

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Austria, Cameroon, China, Croatia, Cuba, Denmark, Iceland, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Belgium, Djibouti, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia, Sudan, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Center for Global Nonkilling, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Human Rights Watch, International Fellowship of Reconciliation, Maat Foundation for Peace, Development and Human Rights.

355. At the 19th meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar

356. At the 20th meeting, on 2 July 2019, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, Yanghee Lee, presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution S-27/1, an oral update.

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

358. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 20th meeting, on 2 July 2019, and at the 21st meeting, on 3 July, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Afghanistan, Australia, Bangladesh, China, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, India, Iraq, Japan, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Belarus, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Estonia, France, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Netherlands, Norway, Republic of Korea, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Association for Progressive Communications, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Physicians for Human Rights.

359. At the 20th and 21st meetings, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

D. General debate on agenda item 4

360. At its 21st and 22nd meetings, on 3 July 2019, 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, Austria, Cameroon, China, Cuba, Cuba (also on behalf of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Nicaragua and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Czechia, Denmark, Finland¹⁶ (on behalf of the European Union), Japan, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Peru (also on behalf of Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece,

Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Guatemala and Peru), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)¹⁶ (also on behalf of Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Nicaragua, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the Syrian Arab Republic and Zimbabwe), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)¹⁶ (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries with the exception of Colombia, Ecuador and Peru);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belarus, Belgium, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Haiti, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Netherlands, Norway, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Action of Human Movement, Africa culture internationale, African Development Association, African Regional Agricultural Credit Association, Alsalam Foundation, American Association of Jurists (also on behalf of Conselho Indigenista Missionário), Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Amman Center for Human Rights Studies, Amnesty International, Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Asian-Eurasian Human Rights Forum, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association culturelle des Tamouls en France, Association des jeunes pour l'agriculture du Mali, Association Dunenyó, Association for Progressive Communications, Association for the Protection of Women and Children's Rights, Association of World Citizens, Association pour les victimes du monde, Association Thendral, Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights (also on behalf of Al-Haq and the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies), Baha'i International Community, British Humanist Association, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Caritas Internationalis, Center for Africa Development and Progress, Centre for Gender Justice and Women Empowerment, China Society for Human Rights Studies, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Comité international pour le respect et l'application de la charte africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples, Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme, Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches (also on behalf of the World Evangelical Alliance), Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, Conectas Direitos Humanos, Conseil de jeunesse pluriculturelle, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations, Coordination des associations et des particuliers pour la liberté de conscience, "Coup de pousse" Chaîne de l'espoir Nord-Sud, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Edmund Rice International, Ensemble contre la peine de mort, European Centre for Law and Justice, Families of Victims of Involuntary Disappearance, Federation of Cuban Women, France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Franciscans International, Genève pour les droits de l'homme : formation internationale, Global Institute for Water, Environment and Health, Global Welfare Association, Godwin Osung International Foundation (The African Project), Health and Environment Program, Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, Himalayan Research and Cultural Foundation, Human Rights Watch, Il Cenacolo, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", Ingénieurs du monde, Institut international pour les droits et le développement, International Career Support Association, International Commission of Jurists, International Committee for the Indigenous Peoples of the Americas (Switzerland), International Educational Development, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (also on behalf of the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development and the International Commission of Jurists), 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 Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims, International Service for Human Rights, Iraqi Development Organization, Iuventum, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Maat Foundation for Peace, Development and Human Rights, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Minority Rights Group (also on behalf of Christian Solidarity Worldwide), Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, 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, Physicians for Human Rights, Presse emblème campagne, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Right Livelihood Award Foundation (also on behalf of Nazra for Feminist Studies), Sikh Human Rights Group, Society for Threatened Peoples, Solidarité agissante pour le développement familial, Solidarité Suisse-Guinée, United Nations Watch, United Schools International, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Victorious Youths Movement, Villages unis, World Environment and Resources Council, World Evangelical Alliance, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress, World Organization against Torture (also on behalf of Amnesty International, Franciscans International, the International Commission of Jurists and the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues).

361. At the 22nd meeting, the representatives of Afghanistan, Bahrain, Brazil, China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Japan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

362. At the same meeting, the representatives of Japan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Turkey made statements in exercise of a second right of reply.

E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Situation of human rights in Belarus

363. At the 41st meeting, on 12 July 2019, the representative of Finland, on behalf of the European Union, introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.12](#), 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, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Iceland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Norway and Switzerland. Subsequently, Iceland withdrew its original co-sponsorship of the draft resolution. Subsequently, Iceland and San Marino joined the sponsors.

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

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

366. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of China, Cuba, Iceland and Uruguay made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

367. 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:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Slovakia, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Against:

China, Cuba, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Philippines

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Iraq, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Togo, Tunisia, Uruguay

368. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 20 votes to 6, with 21 abstentions (resolution 41/22).

369. At the same meeting, the representative of Bahrain made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic

370. At the 41st meeting, on 12 July 2019, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, also on behalf of France, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, the Netherlands, Qatar and Turkey, introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.25](#), sponsored by France, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Monaco, the Netherlands, Qatar, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and co-sponsored by Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Ghana, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Morocco, North Macedonia, Norway, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and Ukraine. Subsequently, Botswana, Japan, Maldives, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Slovakia and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

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

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

373. At the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil, Chile, China, Cuba, Egypt, Iraq and Mexico (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, Panama and Peru) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

In favour:

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Spain, Togo, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Against:

China, Cuba, Egypt, Eritrea, Iraq, Philippines, Somalia

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, India, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal, South Africa, Tunisia

375. At the same meeting the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 26 votes to 7, with 14 abstentions (resolution 41/23).

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

V. Human rights bodies and mechanisms

A. Forum on Business and Human Rights

377. At the 23rd meeting, on 3 July 2019, the Chief of the Special Procedures Branch of OHCHR presented, on behalf of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises, the report on the Forum on Business and Human Rights on its seventh session, held from 26 to 28 November 2018 ([A/HRC/41/49](#)).

B. General debate on agenda item 5

378. At its 23rd meeting, on 3 July 2019, 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: Brazil, Cameroon, China, Cuba, Denmark, Finland¹⁶ (on behalf of the European Union), India, Iraq, Japan, Nepal, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Senegal, South Africa, Thailand¹⁶ (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations), Tunisia, Uruguay (also on behalf of Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Azerbaijan, Colombia, Ecuador, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Netherlands, Netherlands (also on behalf of Belgium and Luxembourg), Norway, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action of Human Movement, Africa culture internationale, African Green Foundation International, Al-Haq, 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 (also on behalf of Article 19: International Centre against Censorship, the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, Conectas Direitos Humanos, the East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, the Human Rights Law Centre, the International Commission of Jurists, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, the International Humanist and Ethical Union, the International Service for Human Rights, the Rural Women's Network Nepal and the World Organization against Torture), Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association burkinabé pour la survie de l'enfance, Association culturelle des Tamouls en France, Association des jeunes pour l'agriculture du Mali, Association for the Protection of Women and Children's Rights, Association internationale de la libre pensée, Association pour les victimes du monde, Association pour l'intégration et le développement durable au Burundi, Association Thendral, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies (also on behalf of Al-Haq and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom), Center for Africa Development and Progress, Center for Inquiry, Centre for Gender Justice and Women Empowerment, China Society for Human Rights Studies, Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de

l'homme, Global Welfare Association, Health and Environment Program, Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, International Career Support Association, International-Lawyers.org, International Muslim Women's Union, International Service for Human Rights, Iuventum, Jeunesse étudiante tamoule, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Liberation, Maat Foundation for Peace, Development and Human Rights, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Mother of Hope Cameroon Common Initiative Group, Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples (also on behalf of the American Association of Jurists, the Habitat International Coalition and the International Fellowship of Reconciliation), Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés, Prahar, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, Sikh Human Rights Group, Society for Development and Community Empowerment, Solidarité agissante pour le développement familial, Tourner la page, United Schools International, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Villages unis, World Barua Organization, World Muslim Congress.

379. At the same meeting, the representatives of China and Cuba made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

The Social Forum

380. At the 41st meeting, on 12 July 2019, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.4](#), sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Mexico, Nicaragua, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Algeria, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Botswana, Costa Rica, Djibouti, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ghana, Indonesia, Iraq, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Namibia, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, the Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka and Thailand joined the sponsors.

381. At the same meeting, the representative of Denmark, 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.

382. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution without a vote (resolution 41/24).

VI. Universal periodic review

383. 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 thirty-second session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, held from 21 January to 1 February 2019.

384. 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 that, 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 universal periodic review outcomes

385. In accordance with paragraph 14 of President's statement PRST/8/1, the following section contains a summary of the views expressed on the outcome of the review by the State under review and by member and observer States of the Human Rights Council, and general comments made by other stakeholders before the adoption of the outcome by the Council in plenary session. 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.¹⁷

Viet Nam

386. The review of Viet Nam was held on 22 January 2019 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 Viet Nam 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.6/32/VNM/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.6/32/VNM/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.6/32/VNM/3](#)).

387. At its 24th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Viet Nam (see sect. C below).

388. The outcome of the review of Viet Nam comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review ([A/HRC/41/7](#)), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also [A/HRC/41/7/Add.1](#)).

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

389. The delegation reiterated the strong commitment of Viet Nam to protect and promote human rights, the State's support for the universal periodic review mechanism, and its appreciation for the active participation of member States and their frank and constructive exchanges at the thirty-second session of the Working Group, in January 2019.

¹⁷ See <https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/41Session/Pages/default.aspx>.

390. After the session, Viet Nam had carefully examined the 291 recommendations received and had decided to accept 241 of them (83 per cent). The review of the recommendations had involved the agencies responsible for their implementation, sociopolitical organizations, professional organizations and the public. In addition, Viet Nam had taken the initial steps to develop a master plan to assign tasks to various government agencies and incorporate the implementation of universal periodic review recommendations into many key national strategies and programmes.

391. In just over six months since the session in January, the continued efforts of Viet Nam to promote human rights had been manifested in new undertakings. During its recent seventh session, the National Assembly of Viet Nam had reviewed, revised and adopted a number of important laws, including those relating to human rights in the fields of criminal justice, education, health and social security. On an important note, the National Assembly had ratified the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98), fulfilling the recommendations made by a number of countries during the interactive dialogue in January.

392. More than 50 new decrees and circulars relating to human rights had been enacted, especially those relating to improving public services, facilitating people's participation in policymaking and promoting labour rights. The issue of labour rights had also been reflected in agreements between Viet Nam and its international partners, especially the free trade agreement and the investment protection agreement signed between Viet Nam and the European Union on 30 June 2019.

393. About 75 per cent of the population of Viet Nam had access to the Internet on a daily basis. Over 64 million social media accounts were active on a single platform and millions more on other foreign and home-grown social networks. Three additional religious organizations had been granted legal status, bringing the total number of recognized organizations to 43, along with thousands of registered religious groups. In May 2019, Viet Nam had successfully hosted, for the third time, the Day of Vesak with the active participation of 20,000 international and local participants. In the first two quarters of 2019, economic growth was expected to reach 6.8 per cent. The Government had also spent more than \$200 million on social welfare and support for vulnerable groups. The poverty rate was expected to decrease by between 1 and 1.5 per cent in 2019.

394. Regarding civil and political rights, Viet Nam had accepted important recommendations to promote legal reform and the rule of law, to uphold the independence of the courts, to ensure freedom of speech and freedom of the press, including freedom of speech and of the press online, to guarantee freedom of association and assembly, labour rights and the right to access information, and to ensure the consistent implementation of the law on belief and religion.

395. Regarding economic, social and cultural rights, Viet Nam had accepted many important recommendations relating to enhancing the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals, poverty reduction and social welfare, improving people's livelihoods and access to services, protecting vulnerable groups, supporting development in remote areas, fostering new rural development, and promoting climate change and environmental protection initiatives.

396. With the aim of strengthening institutions for the protection of human rights, Viet Nam had accepted practical and effective recommendations that corresponded to its priorities and circumstances, such as those to incorporate into domestic law the provisions of the human rights treaties to which Viet Nam was a party, to study the possibility of accession to other treaties, to strengthen human rights education and to cooperate with United Nations mechanisms.

397. Among the 241 recommendations accepted were 21 that Viet Nam had accepted in part, as a number of measures suggested or implied in those recommendations were not fully in line with the circumstances in Viet Nam. Recognizing the goodwill of respective member States and being serious about the feasibility of those recommendations, Viet Nam would consider reviewing and updating policies and laws and allocating the resources necessary for their implementation when appropriate.

398. Viet Nam had not been able to accept 50 recommendations. A number of them had called for the immediate accession to several specific treaties, while such a process would require any country time and resources to undertake thorough and serious preparations. During the 10 years of participation in the universal periodic review, Viet Nam had ratified two additional core human rights treaties, along with many other international and regional agreements, especially those in the fields of migration, labour and combating trafficking in persons. Viet Nam was not yet in a position to accept a few recommendations to revise laws, including those in the fields of marriage and family, cybersecurity, and religion and belief because those laws had just been adopted. Their revision would be undertaken when appropriate, corresponding to the requirements of the circumstances and public opinion in Viet Nam.

399. Moreover, Viet Nam had not accepted recommendations containing controversial concepts or inaccurate assessments vis-à-vis the legal and historical context of Viet Nam. The State always respected and guaranteed freedom of expression, association and assembly, equality before the law and the right to benefit from digital technologies. At the same time, the provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights ruled out the abuse of freedom and democracy aimed at violating the law, infringing upon the rights and legitimate interests of organizations and individuals, or threatening national security, public safety, order and morals.

400. While recognizing their humanitarian spirit, Viet Nam had not been able to accept several recommendations relating to capital punishment. Viet Nam, like many countries, maintained capital punishment as a measure applicable to the most serious crimes, in conformity with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Nevertheless, the new Penal Code drastically reduced the number of offences to which the death penalty was applicable, while ensuring due process in legal proceedings. At the same time, Viet Nam had accepted other recommendations relating to capital punishment that were in line with the circumstances of Viet Nam.

401. The delegation highlighted the importance of implementing effectively the recommendations accepted and turning them into practical actions. It reiterated the readiness of Viet Nam for cooperation and dialogue with countries and partners throughout the process.

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

402. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Viet Nam, 13 delegations made statements.

403. China commended Viet Nam for its efforts to promote economic and social development, improve people's livelihoods and protect the rights of vulnerable groups, and for its remarkable progress in human rights. It believed that Viet Nam would continue to follow the path of human rights development in light of its own conditions, enhance people's well-being, further reduce poverty, improve social and public services, and advance the cause of human rights. It supported the Human Rights Council in endorsing the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Viet Nam.

404. Cuba highlighted the commitment of Viet Nam to human rights, and its efforts and progress made in development and poverty reduction. It noted the acceptance by Viet Nam of the recommendations made by Cuba on improving services relating to the human rights of the population and the implementation of social policies, including those on social security and health care. It supported the adoption by the Human Rights Council of the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Viet Nam.

405. Cyprus noted the continued efforts made by Viet Nam in the promotion and protection of human rights, particularly in poverty eradication, employment, economic growth and education. It welcomed the acceptance by Viet Nam of the recommendations made by Cyprus. It supported the adoption by the Human Rights Council of the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Viet Nam.

406. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea welcomed the acceptance by Viet Nam of 80 per cent of the recommendations made during the third cycle of the universal periodic

review, including its recommendations, as a full demonstration of the State's will to make further efforts in the field of human rights. It supported the adoption by the Human Rights Council of the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Viet Nam.

407. Djibouti congratulated Viet Nam for the acceptance of most of the recommendations received during the third cycle of the universal periodic review, including those made by Djibouti. It recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Viet Nam.

408. Egypt commended Viet Nam for having included human rights in the Constitution and for its economic, social and development plans and strategies. It valued the progress made to provide all citizens with social security. It encouraged Viet Nam to strengthen the protection of and respect for human rights. It recommended the adoption by the Human Rights Council of the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Viet Nam.

409. Ethiopia commended Viet Nam for having accepted many recommendations, including those made by Ethiopia to strengthen efforts on human rights education within the national education system and to step up efforts for the participation of women in political and public life. It supported the adoption by the Human Rights Council of the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Viet Nam.

410. Haiti recognized the engagement of the Government of Viet Nam with the international community and its population. It congratulated Viet Nam on its announcement of the elaboration of a national action plan for the implementation of the recommendations accepted and it hoped that the plan would be supported through the creation of a national mechanism for implementation, reporting and follow-up. It recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Viet Nam.

411. India appreciated that the recommendations accepted would be incorporated into the State's national action plan for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and that they could be integrated into numerous policies, national strategies and target programmes, including those on sustainable poverty reduction, new rural development providing care and improving public health, and gender equality. India recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Viet Nam.

412. Indonesia noted that, as a fellow State member of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, it stood ready to continue to work closely with Viet Nam to strengthen the promotion and protection of human rights in the region, including through the advancement of human rights, and the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals through bilateral and South-South cooperation. Indonesia supported the adoption by the Human Rights Council of the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Viet Nam.

413. The Islamic Republic of Iran expressed its appreciation to Viet Nam for the advancements made in promoting human rights and it acknowledged improvements in the areas of health and education. It welcomed the legislative reforms made between 2014 and 2018, including many new laws and ordinances relating to human rights. It noted the acceptance by Viet Nam of its three recommendations and it recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Viet Nam.

414. Iraq expressed its appreciation for the acceptance by Viet Nam of the two recommendations it had made on combating trafficking in persons and on fighting corruption in an efficient manner. Iraq wished that Viet Nam would consider accession to the International Convention for the Protection for All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. It recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Viet Nam.

415. Kyrgyzstan commended Viet Nam for having accepted its recommendations, namely to prioritize resources for the implementation of the national target programme for sustainable poverty reduction to 2020 and beyond, and to promote access to public services,

especially health-care services. Kyrgyzstan supported the adoption by the Human Rights Council of the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Viet Nam.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

416. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Viet Nam, 10 other stakeholders made statements.

417. The Viet Nam Peace and Development Foundation stated that Viet Nam had made progress in improving national legislation relating to human rights by having adopted laws and having ratified international conventions. It appreciated the efforts of the Government to raise awareness of human rights through education. It recommended raising awareness among all State agencies, organizations and people on the rights of vulnerable groups and creating better conditions for more genuine dialogue and the involvement of non-governmental organizations in public life.

418. The World Evangelical Alliance stated that Viet Nam pursued a policy of controlling and containing religious communities. It regretted that Viet Nam had not accepted the recommendations to revise the law on belief and religion of 2016 and appealed to the Government to review the way it treated its religious minorities. Peoples of different faiths should not be seen as a threat to national unity, but they should be welcomed into a pluralistic society where they could contribute to the development of the nation.

419. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland was disappointed with the decision of Viet Nam to note the recommendations on legalizing same-sex marriage. Viet Nam needed to uphold the principle of non-discrimination stated in the Constitution and reconsider its decision, and include same-sex marriage in the upcoming midterm review. The organization called upon the Government to set a clear deadline for legalizing same-sex marriage.

420. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues expressed concern about the number of prisoners of conscience, the repression of peaceful demonstrations, daily religious persecutions, and the harassment and arrests of and exorbitant prison sentences for human rights defenders. Through the rejection of 50 recommendations, Viet Nam had denied any revision or amendment of repressive laws, the protection of human rights defenders or a discussion of national security, which was the keystone of any repression in the country.

421. Christian Solidarity Worldwide welcomed the recommendations made to Viet Nam to revise its legislation to bring it into line with international standards, but it regretted that many of those recommendations had not been accepted. It called for the release of all those detained in connection with their religion or belief, the end of all forms of torture and ill-treatment, and thorough and impartial investigations into cases of the abuse of power by the authorities.

422. The Center for Women and Development appreciated the efforts of the Government to ensure and promote women's rights and the achievements in gender equality. Equality between men and women in all aspects had been affirmed in the Constitution. The Government had also created favourable conditions to support poor women, and women and girl victims of gender-based violence. There was still a lack of policies to support female labour in the informal sector and a significant gap in income and the retirement age between men and women.

423. Agir ensemble pour les droits de l'homme regretted that Viet Nam had noted 50 key recommendations, many of which were on freedom of expression and freedom of religion and belief. While the universal periodic review process was based on cooperation and non-confrontation, Viet Nam had accused other countries of making recommendations containing contentious terms. The voice of civil society in the country remained unheard despite recent protests against laws on freedom of religion and cybersecurity.

424. CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation welcomed the commitment of Viet Nam to extend cooperation to the Human Rights Council special procedures and urged the Government to invite the special rapporteurs on the situation of human rights defenders, on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, and on freedom of religion or belief to visit the country. It regretted that the recommendations on

the release of political prisoners had been noted, and it called upon Viet Nam to implement the recommendations to create and maintain, in law and practice, an enabling environment for civil society.

425. The Viet Nam Family Planning Association stated that Viet Nam had achieved the Millennium Development Goals on maternal mortality and child mortality ahead of plan. There were still some challenges, such as big gaps between regions, especially in disadvantaged areas, due to low incomes and unfavourable access to quality health services. It urged the Government to pay more attention to health care in disadvantaged areas and to promote reproductive and sexual health education for adolescents.

426. The World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace urged the Government to ratify the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169), and it expressed concern about the revision of the law on cybersecurity and about the monitoring of social media working on indigenous issues. It encouraged the nationwide distribution of the Sustainable Development Goals and of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

427. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 291 recommendations received, 220 had enjoyed the support of Viet Nam and 56 had been noted. Additional clarification had been provided on another 15 recommendations, indicating which part of the recommendation had been supported and which part had been noted.

428. The delegation of Viet Nam recalled that, as enshrined in article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, human rights were inalienable from the right to self-determination. They should be considered in a holistic approach and their enjoyment addressed in the context of emerging issues such as migration, environmental protection, sustainable development, poverty reduction and climate change.

429. Being well aware of the challenges ahead, Viet Nam had welcomed many positive and constructive comments while having refuted some other irresponsible and biased assessments expressed in the meeting that did not reflect the reality of the country. That approach distorted the State's policies, efforts and accomplishments, and showed ignorance of humankind's history of striving for human rights. It would not contribute to the protection and promotion of human rights in Viet Nam and in the world.

430. The delegation further provided updates on the ongoing legal reforms to better protect the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons and other endeavours to reduce social barriers that might exist. It also emphasized the flourishing religious activities in Viet Nam, where 90 per cent of the population followed a religion or upheld a belief, including 20 million Buddhists, 2 million Protestants and a large Catholic community. The delegation reaffirmed that, without the people at the heart of policies and undertakings, Viet Nam as a nation would not have overcome numerous natural and man-made challenges in history.

431. As per the continued commitment to implement the universal periodic review recommendations accepted by Viet Nam, a responsible member of the international community, the national action plan mentioned above would assign relevant agencies with specific tasks integrated into national strategy and target programmes. Viet Nam would also conduct a midterm review, after two years, on the effective implementation of the universal periodic review recommendations. Through its participation in the universal periodic review process, Viet Nam was willing to learn and share experiences and good practices with other countries and to contribute to the efforts to promote cooperation and dialogue in the field of human rights, to foster friendship among nations and to enrich the common values of mankind.

432. Lastly, the delegation expressed its gratitude to Human Rights Council members and observers for their active participation and to the troika, the secretariat and the staff and interpreters for their efforts to facilitate the prompt adoption of the report.

Afghanistan

433. The review of Afghanistan was held on 21 January 2019 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 Afghanistan 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.6/32/AFG/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.6/32/AFG/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.6/32/AFG/3](#)).

434. At its 24th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Afghanistan (see sect. C below).

435. The outcome of the review of Afghanistan comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review ([A/HRC/41/5](#)), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also [A/HRC/41/5/Add.1](#)).

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

436. The delegation was honoured to present the responses to and updates on the recommendations received as part of the third universal periodic review of Afghanistan. It appreciated the support of member States, the troika and the secretariat, and their constructive engagement and cooperation throughout the entire process. It also appreciated colleagues' comprehensive consultations to review the recommendations and prepare a positive response.

437. Afghanistan attached great importance to the universal periodic review mechanism and believed that the review provided an opportunity for constructive engagement among member States, aimed at strengthening the protection and promotion of human rights values worldwide.

438. The delegation reiterated the commitment of Afghanistan, as a member of the Human Rights Council, to the universal periodic review mechanism, as Afghanistan believed that social harmony and sustainable peace were intrinsically tied to the internalization of human rights values in its governance structure and operations. While Afghanistan and its international partners were entering into peace talks with the Taliban, protecting human rights and women's rights, more than at any other time, should be at the forefront of their collective efforts.

439. Afghanistan had received 258 recommendations in the third cycle of the universal periodic review, in January 2019. Those recommendations had been translated into the national language and examined carefully by a specially established inter-agency mechanism that comprised representatives from 26 entities from the executive, legislative and judicial authorities, the Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission and civil society organizations. Afghanistan had accepted 235 recommendations (91 per cent), while 22 recommendations had been noted and one recommendation had been partially accepted, demonstrating the solid commitment of Afghanistan to the promotion and protection of human rights and its high regard for the universal periodic review mechanism.

440. Afghanistan acknowledged the need to strengthen the institutional and legal framework for the protection of human rights and considered the advancement of human rights as a priority. Human rights were also considered a red line by the Government during any potential peace negotiations.

441. On women's rights, particularly violence against women, Afghanistan had made amendments to laws and had undertaken a variety of initiatives, which had resulted in enhancing women's rights and ensuring women's empowerment and participation in all areas of life. Afghanistan placed great importance on gender equality and women's empowerment, so it would continue to take effective measures to combat violence against women, not only by adopting measures preventing violence against them, but also by establishing institutions and special units, and training judges, prosecutors, the police and other relevant personnel in pursuit of the implementation of the Law on the Elimination of Violence against Women.

442. Afghanistan acknowledged that the implementation of laws had not been optimal, largely due to the ongoing conflict and the lack of access to legal institutions in conflict zones. However, the Government was committed to facilitating the empowerment of women and addressing the cases of violence against women, including in the areas recently cleared of insurgents.

443. On the recommendations regarding the protection of children and child marriage, Afghanistan stated that its President had issued an executive order enforcing the law on the protection of children, which defined the marriage age at 18 years, as recommended in the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The recruitment of children in the military forces and armed groups had been a challenging issue, although Afghanistan would keep working towards ensuring a safe and prosperous future for children.

444. Afghanistan had accepted the recommendations calling on it to facilitate access to education and health care. Afghanistan believed that there was always a place for improvement in those fields and it continued to invest in improving the education system, ensure access to education for all and develop programmes to facilitate access to health care. At the session of the World Health Assembly in 2019, the Minister for Health of Afghanistan, together with the World Health Organization and partner States, had agreed upon a new and improved health services package accessible to every citizen, including internally displaced persons and returnees.

445. On the 22 recommendations that had been noted, the delegation stated that, concerning accession to international human rights instruments, Afghanistan was among the leading member States in having ratified seven core international human rights conventions and three optional protocols, demonstrating its commitment to promote and protect human rights. In order to eliminate the gap between international human rights standards and their implementation at the domestic level, the Government of Afghanistan was willing to focus on its national legislation prior to considering accession to other human rights instruments. On the second category of recommendations regarding the abolition of the death penalty and the reduction of crimes carrying capital punishment, the delegation highlighted that the new Penal Code had largely decreased the application of the death penalty. In 2018, within the Office of the Attorney General, a special committee to monitor reports of the death penalty had been established. Since its establishment, the committee had reviewed 80 cases of the possible use of the death penalty, and as a result it had recommended that 78 cases be replaced with long-term imprisonment. Furthermore, the President of Afghanistan had assigned another committee under the leadership of the Deputy Attorney General to review and assess all death penalty sentences and provide specific recommendations on each case. After nearly one year of assessment, the committee had submitted its recommendations for the majority of the cases. The proposals had been accepted by the President and they were currently being implemented.

446. On the recommendation that had been partially noted, Afghanistan had accepted the call to commute "all existing death sentences for persons below 18 years of age at the time of the commission of the crime"; however, the second part of the recommendation on considering an "immediate moratorium on execution as a first step towards the abolition of the death sentence" was an undertaking that required more time and further consultations.

447. The delegation reiterated the commitment of the Government to engage fully in close cooperation with relevant treaty bodies, and to advance and review the recommendations where appropriate. Afghanistan valued the support of the international community and United Nations agencies as a significant source of building national capacity in the area of human rights.

2. General comments made by the national human rights institution of the State under review

448. The Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission (by video message) stated that it had witnessed progress in the promotion and protection of human rights, including the reform of laws, the fight against torture, and the realization of political, civil, economic and social rights. It noted that the continuation of conflict, insecurity and acts of terrorism was a major threat to that success and in fact continued to cause violations of human rights, unfortunately without accountability or justice. It reported on the increased level of attacks, including by the Taliban and other groups, on civilians, civilian places, mosques and religious minority groups. It called upon all parties to the conflict to respect international humanitarian law, protect civilians and end impunity. It was concerned about violence against women and children, poverty and the lack of job opportunities for young people. It called for a free and fair presidential election. It also called for additional technical, financial and political support to facilitate peace with justice.

3. Views expressed by member and observer States of the Human Rights Council and by United Nations entities on the outcome of the review

449. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Afghanistan, 12 delegations made statements.

450. Sri Lanka commended the continued efforts of Afghanistan to carry out the national action plan on women, peace and security, having resulted in an increase in women's representation in public institutions. It positively noted a 27 per cent rise in women's inclusion in the labour force. It welcomed the establishment of the position of Deputy Attorney General for the Elimination of Violence against Women and Children. It appreciated the efforts made to implement a policy of zero tolerance on child recruitment in its defence and security forces and its efforts to combat child labour. It encouraged all efforts by the Government to implement a robust public health policy.

451. The Sudan commended Afghanistan for its positive participation in the universal periodic review and for having taken many measures since the previous review to promote and protect human rights. It also commended Afghanistan for having accepted the majority of the recommendations and it urged the State to consider the recommendations that the Sudan had made.

452. Tunisia commended Afghanistan for its constructive and positive participation in the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, its engagement with member States and for having accepted 91 per cent of the universal periodic review recommendations, including those made by Tunisia. It emphasized the importance of strengthening and supporting the legislative and institutional framework for human rights.

453. UN-Women noted that Afghanistan had made important gains in women's human rights with the introduction of new legislation, such as the Law on the Elimination of Violence against Women, and increasing women's political participation through the revised election law. It was imperative that that positive momentum was built upon and that efforts to address ongoing challenges to women's fundamental rights were accelerated. It highlighted three areas that it believed required urgent attention, namely the elimination of violence against women, the elimination of discrimination against women and the protection of women human rights defenders.

454. The United Arab Emirates appreciated the readiness of the Government to implement the recommendations accepted during the third cycle of the universal periodic review, despite the security difficulties. It applauded Afghanistan for the spirit of responsibility expressed through political will to give new impetus to the human rights system and to promote it in accordance with national and international obligations. It highly valued the number of measures taken in the area of economic, social and cultural rights to achieve sustainable development and social justice, which would promote and preserve the dignity of individuals and consolidate the principles of the rule of law and good governance.

455. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland was encouraged by the acceptance by Afghanistan of its three recommendations. It was concerned by the violence

directed towards certain religious and ethnic minorities and it welcomed the support to establish an independent mechanism to assess how they could be better protected against violent attacks. It was encouraged by the commitment of Afghanistan to fully implement the Law on the Elimination of Violence against Women and the Penal Code of 2018. It urged Afghanistan to ensure that cases of violence against women and girls were appropriately investigated and prosecuted through the criminal justice system. It welcomed the commitment of Afghanistan to implement the national child labour strategy and action plan by investigating and prosecuting those suspected of being complicit in child exploitation. It urged Afghanistan to improve civilian casualty mitigation and the protection of journalists and to eliminate torture and ill-treatment in detention.

456. UNFPA acknowledged developments relating to the legal and institutional framework for the promotion and protection of human rights. It provided observations to support the Government in meeting the challenges in the harmonization of existing policies and the legal framework to address violence and discrimination against women and girls. It pledged its support for policies and programmes on the prevention of gender-based violence and harmful practices, advocacy work and the implementation of the national action plan to eliminate early and child marriage. UNFPA commended the improvements in addressing infant and maternal mortality and lauded Afghanistan for having launched the national coordination mechanisms and policies for internally displaced persons and returnees.

457. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela appreciated the efforts of Afghanistan, despite the internal situation, to comply with the universal periodic review recommendations accepted, the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and the submission of reports to the treaty bodies. It was pleased that the number of hospitals and treatment centres for cancer and tuberculosis had increased from 10 in 2000 to 1,937 in 2016.

458. Yemen welcomed the presentation on the achievements that Afghanistan had made in the area of human rights. It appreciated the efforts of the Government to promote and protect human rights in general and its acceptance of a large number of recommendations, up to 235, reflecting the State's desire to protect and strengthen human rights in Afghanistan.

459. Algeria welcomed the continued implementation of the national action plan on women, peace and security, despite the State's limited financial resources. It noted that Afghanistan had accepted 235 of the 258 recommendations made, including two made by Algeria concerning the implementation of measures to prevent and combat domestic violence and to provide care for abandoned children, and the adoption and implementation of effective policies to reduce poverty and unemployment, including through the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals by 2030.

460. The Plurinational State of Bolivia wished to highlight the fact that Afghanistan had accepted 235 recommendations, demonstrating the State's strong commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights, including its own recommendations to economically empower women, to strengthen the poverty reduction strategy in the national peace and development framework, and to improve food security. It stated that the challenges were manifold, but that it had no doubt that the committed efforts would lead to a positive synergy between civil and political rights, and economic, social and cultural rights.

461. China appreciated the constructive participation of Afghanistan in the universal periodic review process and commended the State for its efforts in the promotion and protection of human rights and the progress achieved. China supported Afghanistan in maintaining security, stability, unity and development. It encouraged Afghanistan in its efforts to achieve reconstruction and political reconciliation that was extensive and inclusive. China called upon the international community to provide Afghanistan with continuous and vigorous support and to fully respect its sovereignty.

4. General comments made by other stakeholders

462. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Afghanistan, nine other stakeholders made statements.

463. United Nations Watch welcomed the reforms of the Penal Code, the enactment of the anti-torture law, and the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The overall figures on the torture and ill-treatment of conflict-related detainees remained high. The organization was troubled by the high number of civilian casualties, with the Taliban and Islamic State often the primary cause of those casualties. It referred to a recent horrific attack by the Taliban, in Kabul, near a school. Fifty-one children had been wounded and 39 civilians had lost their lives, including one child. It urged the Government to reduce civilian casualties. It urged further international cooperation to improve the situation. It was concerned about the intention to expel Afghan refugees from the country and it called upon all stakeholders to work together to end that protracted war and to protect the basic human rights of the Afghan people.

464. The British Humanist Association highlighted the recommendations on the protection of the right to freedom of religion without contravening the right to freedom of expression. It welcomed the new Penal Code, which had reduced the number of capital offences; nevertheless, it noted that Afghanistan remained one of the countries where blasphemy or apostasy was punishable by death. It observed that the Constitution offered no protection or guarantee of the right to freedom of religion or belief for non-religious or minority religious groups, and it believed that that progress could not be achieved until constitutional protections were enforced. It urged Afghanistan to establish an independent mechanism to assess how religious and non-religious minorities could be protected against violent attacks and to declare a moratorium on the death penalty, including for blasphemy and apostasy, by ratifying the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

465. Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik regretted that, as in previous universal periodic review cycles, there had been no recommendation made to Afghanistan on the environment, climate change and water management, despite the fact that the country had suffered from droughts for years, as well as floods during the present year, which had caused both high numbers of casualties and financial losses. It stated that any type of disruption in the usage of the already inadequate water flow of the Helmand River would bring the life of those people in danger. It regretted to observe the negative impact on Afghan migrants and their families, especially children, in some neighbouring countries because they had not ratified the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. It welcomed the acceptance of the recommendation on ensuring the birth registration of all children born in the country, which reduced the risk of statelessness.

466. CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation regretted the lack of progress in implementing the universal periodic review recommendations relating to civic space, including those on ensuring effective investigations into and accountability for abuse against journalists and human rights defenders, which continued with impunity. It noted that Afghanistan was the deadliest country for the media, with 15 journalists and other media workers having been killed in 2018 and 5 by mid-2019. It urged Afghanistan to stand by the rights of journalists and to protect them, as parties negotiated an end to the war, following the threats by the Taliban against the media. It was concerned by the lack of transparency in the trials for the cases of two journalists killed in 2018 and the death sentences for the perpetrators. It called upon the Government to ensure that women and independent civil society organizations had a seat at the negotiation table of the peace process and meaningfully participated in decision-making, and to implement those recommendations to create and maintain, in law and in practice, an enabling environment for civil society.

467. The Association of World Citizens was deeply disappointed that Afghanistan had only noted all 20 recommendations regarding the abolition of or a moratorium on the death penalty. It welcomed the development of a national action plan to end harmful practices such as child and forced marriage and the new Penal Code to limit honour killings and other harmful practices. However, the situation of women and girls remained a great concern, including their forced marriages, violence and street harassment. The organization was disappointed that polygamy was still not outlawed. It was also worried about the health of women, as the recommendations regarding the legal and safe access of women to the

voluntary termination of pregnancy had not been accepted. It commended the acceptance of the recommendations to combat child labour.

468. Ingénieurs du monde welcomed the new Penal Code and hoped that it would remedy critical aspects of the human rights record of Afghanistan and strengthen the State's commitment to international standards. It was concerned that the situation of women remained extremely dire, especially due to the role of Taliban remnants and terrorist factions. Millions of women faced domestic abuse and harassment by law enforcement. Women faced discrimination within the justice system, and cases of violence against women were referred to traditional mediation rather than adjudicated in courts. *Baad* marriages, which was the practice of settling family disputes through forced marriage, remained widespread.

469. International-Lawyers.org stated that, despite the establishment of a legal framework to provide protection from violence against women, obstacles remained, limiting women's access to justice. While it applauded the strengthening of local laws on the elimination of violence against women, it remained concerned that they were not implemented to the same degree in all provinces and that such cases were referred to traditional mediation rather than the legal framework. Few cases of violence against women, particularly cases of rape or sexual abuse, were reported compared to the actual prevalence rates, for reasons including stigma, shame and discrimination. It recommended that Afghanistan reinforce its measures protecting women and girls from violence.

470. The International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination welcomed the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, as well as the attempt at judicial reform developed recently by Afghanistan. It supported the idea that combating impunity and ensuring justice to victims would remain the priority for the State. In the context of the armed conflict in Afghanistan, violations of human rights and humanitarian law had been committed against the civilian population by all parties to the conflict, such as child recruitment, torture, summary executions and forced disappearances. It urged Afghanistan to investigate all incidents of civilian casualties and alleged crimes that had occurred during the armed conflict, to prosecute those responsible, belonging to either armed groups or security forces, and to provide victims with reparations.

471. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme noted the efforts made by the Government to establish peace and security in Afghanistan, including the abatement of child recruitment in its defence and security forces, the limitation of the use of the death penalty, and progress in access to education and health care. It remained concerned about the recurrent violence and targeted attacks on civilians. It hoped for a successful reconciliation between various ethnic and regional Afghan groups and commanders, as well as the emergence of a balanced and broad-based Government representing diverse ethnic, regional and minority interests. It encouraged Afghanistan to intensify its efforts against impunity and corruption and to strengthen its engagement with the international community to address effectively the remaining post-conflict challenges in the country.

5. Concluding remarks of the State under review

472. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of the 258 recommendations received, Afghanistan had accepted 235 and noted 22. Additional clarification had been provided on one recommendation, indicating which part of the recommendation had been noted and which part had been accepted.

473. The delegation expressed gratitude to States for their interventions and thanked the civil society organizations for their active participation. It believed that the implementation of the recommendations accepted would strengthen the protection and promotion of human rights values in Afghanistan. The Directorate of Human Rights, within the Ministry of Justice, in collaboration with relevant stakeholders, such as governmental entities, the Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission, civil society organizations and United Nations agencies, had conducted consultations to develop an action plan with specific indicators and a follow-up mechanism to fully implement the recommendations received, taking into consideration the resources available.

474. The delegation informed the Human Rights Council that the Government was working to develop a national mechanism for reporting and follow-up. Afghanistan would also continue to analyse the recommendations noted in accordance with its national legislation, as the State was willing to focus on reviewing its national legislation.

475. The delegation concluded by thanking member and observer States, the troika and the secretariat, which had taken part constructively in the review. It thanked particularly OHCHR and other United Nations agencies for their continuous support.

Chile

476. The review of Chile was held on 22 January 2019 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 Chile 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.6/32/CHL/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.6/32/CHL/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.6/32/CHL/3](#)).

477. At its 24th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Chile (see sect. C below).

478. The outcome of the review of Chile comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review ([A/HRC/41/6](#)), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also [A/HRC/41/6/Add.1](#)).

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

479. The delegation thanked the Human Rights Council for the opportunity provided to Chile to have an open and transparent dialogue during the review process.

480. The strength of the universal periodic review was its being a space for dialogue between recommending States and the State under review, more than an examination to which States periodically submitted themselves. During its third review, Chile had received 266 recommendations from 101 States. Following a participatory process at the national level, Chile had decided to accept 211 recommendations, which constituted 79.32 per cent of the total number of recommendations received.

481. The recommendations accepted referred to a variety of topics, including the rights of children and adolescents, indigenous peoples, women and persons deprived of their liberty, and the use of force by the police. Chile shared the analysis of the human rights challenges that was the basis of those recommendations, and the Government had sought to generate national agreements and specific programmes in those areas.

482. In March 2018, the President of the Republic had called upon all political and social sectors in the country to join a working group tasked with developing a national agreement on childhood. The report of that group, presented in May of the same year, contained a number of measures aimed at ensuring the adequate protection of children and adolescents. As a result, a set of bills had been submitted to the National Congress with the objective of improving the services provided by the State for the protection of children and adolescents in vulnerable situations. Chile was also taking the measures necessary to comply with the

recommendations made in 2018 by the Committee on the Rights of the Child and had already sent the corresponding report to that Committee ([CRC/C/CHL/OIR/1](#)).

483. In 2018, the President of the Republic had also launched a gender equity agenda (the so-called “Agenda Mujer”) containing a number of legislative and administrative measures aimed at promoting the full equality of rights between men and women. In addition, the delegation highlighted the implementation, between 2014 and 2018, of the national action plan on violence against women and the discussion in the National Congress of a bill on the right of women to a life free of violence.

484. Chile had made significant efforts to improve living conditions in prisons and it recognized that that was one of the country’s great challenges. The Ministry of Justice and Human Rights was working on the social reintegration of persons deprived of their liberty and had established strategic alliances with companies and civil society organizations with the objective of training inmates to secure them access to employment at the end of their detention. The delegation also highlighted the recent enactment of a law designating the National Institute of Human Rights as the national mechanism for the prevention of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and stressed that that law guaranteed the autonomy and functional independence of the mechanism in accordance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles).

485. The delegation acknowledged the multiple and serious challenges that Chile faced regarding the protection of the rights of indigenous peoples and stressed that those challenges could be addressed only through peaceful dialogue. It also highlighted the recent approval of the law granting legal recognition to the Afrodescendent Chilean tribal people, a group that, for various reasons, had been invisible in the past.

486. Regarding the rights of migrants, the Chamber of Deputies had approved in its first reading a migration bill, which would ensure safe, orderly and regular migration while guaranteeing the rights of migrants. The bill created a council on migration policy and a national migration service and provided Chile with a modern migratory framework firmly rooted in respect for the rights of migrants and in line with international standards on migration.

487. Since 2008, Chile had been adopting policies to investigate and punish trafficking in persons and in 2011 it had approved the law that had defined that crime. However, the delegation acknowledged that more work was needed in that area and highlighted the importance of such measures as the national action plan against trafficking in persons 2015–2018, the establishment of specialized prosecutors within the Public Prosecutor’s Office, the creation of shelters for women victims of trafficking and the work of the Intersectoral Panel on Trafficking in Persons.

488. Lastly, the delegation thanked all of the States that had made recommendations. It explained that many of the noted recommendations were in the process of being implemented or were expected to be implemented in the near future, and it referred to the addendum for the position of Chile on the recommendations that had not been accepted.

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

489. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Chile, 13 delegations made statements.

490. Djibouti commended Chile for having accepted a great number of the recommendations received during the third cycle of the universal periodic review, including one made by Djibouti. It noted the explanations provided by Chile concerning the other recommendations made by Djibouti and it hoped that Chile could consider and implement them in the future.

491. Egypt applauded the efforts of Chile in the field of human rights, particularly concerning the development of a national plan on human rights and the progress achieved in the field of gender parity and women’s participation in legislative councils. It encouraged Chile to continue to make progress in the protection of human rights.

492. El Salvador acknowledged the progress made by Chile in strengthening the institutional framework for the promotion and protection of human rights and in the ratification of international human rights instruments. It encouraged Chile to continue to cooperate with international human rights mechanisms and to strengthen inclusive and comprehensive policies in favour of the most vulnerable groups of society.

493. Gabon commended Chile for its efforts to promote and protect human rights through its human rights normative and institutional framework and the implementation of the State's first national plan on human rights. It noted with satisfaction the considerable efforts made by Chile to protect and promote the rights of women and children and the rights of persons deprived of their liberty.

494. Haiti commended the commitment of Chile to promote and protect human rights and it welcomed the fact that Chile had accepted both of its recommendations, namely on the implementation of affirmative policies to integrate Chileans of African descent, in particular their inclusion the census of 2022, and on the protection of the human rights of migrants.

495. India noted that Chile had accepted 211 recommendations, including those made by India, and it appreciated the actions already taken by Chile since its review in January to implement some of the recommendations accepted. It considered the creation of the position of undersecretary for human rights and the development of the first national plan on human rights as important developments in the promotion and protection of human rights.

496. Iraq welcomed the acceptance by Chile of the three recommendations made by Iraq on reducing poverty, eliminating inequality in education and improving the living conditions of persons with disabilities.

497. Madagascar welcomed the measures taken, or that were being taken, by Chile to protect and promote of the rights of vulnerable persons, including persons with disabilities, women victims of violence and children. It encouraged Chile to continue its efforts to consolidate the rule of law and to protect human rights in the country.

498. Mexico highlighted the progress made by Chile since its previous reviews, in particular the approval of the national plan on human rights and the establishment of the Office of the Undersecretary for Human Rights. It welcomed the fact that Chile had accepted 211 recommendations, including the four recommendations made by Mexico, relating to the prevention of torture, equal access to information and communications technology, the adequate definition of femicide and the rights of migrants.

499. Morocco noted with appreciation the acceptance by Chile of its recommendation to continue efforts in the fight against poverty, and to continue efforts regarding training and education in human rights. It noted that the high number of recommendations accepted further illustrated the commitment of Chile to the promotion and protection of human rights.

500. Oman congratulated Chile on its report and on the methodology used to engage with the universal periodic review. Oman welcomed the fact that Chile had accepted the recommendations made by Oman.

501. Pakistan commended Chile for having accepted the majority of the recommendations received, including those made by Pakistan, and it appreciated the continued efforts of Chile to promote and protect the rights of women and children.

502. The Russian Federation noted that Chile had accepted the majority of its recommendations and it invited Chile to report, by the next cycle of the universal periodic review, on the creation of the national mechanism on the prevention of torture. It hoped that Chile would take measures to improve living conditions in prisons and investigate all cases of the excessive use of force by security services during protests and demonstrations, including against members of the Mapuche indigenous people.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

503. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Chile, eight other stakeholders made statements.

504. Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII commended Chile for having established the Office of the Undersecretary for Human Rights, having formulated a national plan on human rights, and having ratified the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure. It highlighted the lack of an integrated juvenile justice system and welcomed the acceptance by Chile of recommendations on persons with disabilities, including on inclusive education. It recommended that, in reforming the migration law, Chile create humanitarian visas for migrants with disabilities and multiple visas for their companions or caregivers. It also recommended that Chile create an institutional framework to enforce compliance with the principles of equality and non-discrimination, take all measures to overcome architectural barriers and adopt a national construction policy compliant with the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

505. Action Canada for Population and Development welcomed the support of Chile for all of the recommendations addressing the rights of LGBTIQ+ persons, but it noted that Law No. 21.120 on gender identity did not protect trans children against discrimination within the family. It encouraged Chile to: (a) allow children under 14 years of age to change their names and gender; (b) stop crimes against LGBTIQ+ persons through the criminalization of incitement to hatred and comprehensive sex education programmes; (c) guarantee the right to work for trans persons; (d) bring circular Nos. 34 and 21 of the Ministry of Health into line with the principle of non-pathologization of Law No. 21.120; and (e) prohibit the genital mutilation of intersex babies at birth.

506. The Association for Progressive Communications referred to the recommendations made to Chile regarding the impact of digital and surveillance technologies on human rights, in particular the rights to privacy, expression, assembly and association, as well as those on the exercise of economic, social and cultural rights. It urged Chile to adopt specific legislation to promote and protect digital rights and it hoped that Chile would implement an evaluation of surveillance and personal data collection technologies from a human rights perspective. It stressed the need to tackle violence against women in the digital environment and it encouraged Chile to review laws, policies and regulations to that end.

507. The Federation for Women and Family Planning appreciated the acceptance by Chile of various recommendations on the rights of persons with disabilities, including on the rights of institutionalized children with disabilities and on the alignment of national legislation with the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. However, it noted that, in the past, Chile had received recommendations in those areas, with no significant progress. It invited Chile to repeal the legislative provisions that allowed substituted decision-making and implement supported decision-making models. It also urged Chile to recognize and protect the sexual and reproductive rights, family rights and the right to political participation of persons with disabilities; adopt the bill on mental health; and give priority to the national plan for the inclusion of persons with disabilities presented in 2016.

508. CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation considered that Chile had failed to ensure a safe environment for human rights defenders, and particularly for indigenous peoples. It remained concerned about the lack of commitment by Chile to amend legislation regulating peaceful protests, including Supreme Decree No. 1086, and it referred to cases of the excessive use of force by the police, especially during protests by students and members of the Mapuche indigenous people. It expressed concern about the misuse of the Anti-Terrorism Law against members of the Mapuche indigenous people advocating for land and environmental rights, and it called upon the Government to create an enabling environment for civil society, including by ratifying the Regional Agreement on Access to Information, Public Participation and Justice in Environmental Matters in Latin America and the Caribbean (Escazú Agreement).

509. The International Fellowship of Reconciliation regretted that Chile had not received any recommendations about military service arrangements, which remained obligatory for all men, with no possibility to refuse. It noted that, due to the application of the principle of *voluntariedad en principio, obligatoriedad en subsidio* (voluntary in principle, compulsory if necessary), conscription needs were filled by volunteer recruits, and Chile had therefore never felt it necessary to recognize the right to conscientious objection. It hoped that, for the fourth universal periodic review cycle, Chile would revise its military service legislation by either abolishing conscription or adding conscientious objection provisions.

510. Asociación HazteOir.org referred to the right to life in the context of abortion and stated that Chile had received pressure from international and non-governmental organizations to decriminalize abortion. It stated that, before having decriminalized abortion, Chile had had the lowest maternal mortality rate in the region and one of the lowest in the world, and it asked Chile to respect and guarantee the right to life at any stage and under any circumstances, without discrimination and with a focus on the most vulnerable.

511. The Association of World Citizens regretted that Chile had not ratified the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. It believed that an increase in women's representation in the National Congress and the Senate could help to advance the ratification of the said Optional Protocol and to make safe and legal abortion available for all women. It expressed concern about the increasing number of drug users and it welcomed the fact that Chile had strengthened the treatment programme for adolescents as part of a social and health approach to combat drug use. It recommended educating schoolchildren about the harmfulness of drugs.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

512. The President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 266 recommendations received, 211 had enjoyed the support of Chile and 51 had been noted. Additional clarification had been provided on another four recommendations, indicating which part of the recommendations had been supported and which part had been noted.

513. In its concluding remarks, the delegation stressed that the promotion and protection of human rights were closely linked to the adequate functioning of the political institutions of a country, and working to strengthen democracy and the rule of law therefore resulted in the promotion and protection of human rights. For that reason, the Government was working on a new national agreement to improve the functioning of the country's institutions and political system.

514. The delegation reiterated the unrestricted commitment of Chile to the promotion and protection of human rights and to the universal human rights protection system. It welcomed the efforts of the Human Rights Council to carry out the universal periodic review, and it thanked all States and civil society organizations for their participation in the process, as well as the troika and the secretariat for their support.

New Zealand

515. The review of New Zealand was held on 21 January 2019 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 New Zealand 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.6/32/NZL/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.6/32/NZL/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.6/32/NZL/3](#)).

516. At its 25th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of New Zealand (see sect. C below).

517. The outcome of the review of New Zealand comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review ([A/HRC/41/4](#)), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the

adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also [A/HRC/41/4/Add.1](#)).

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

518. The delegation of New Zealand presented to the Human Rights Council the position of New Zealand on the recommendations received during its third universal periodic review.

519. New Zealand had made some notable progress since its universal periodic review in January 2019. Key improvements included further work in relation to child poverty, discrimination, criminal justice and family violence.

520. While considering its response to the recommendations received, New Zealand had experienced a deplorable and unprecedented act of terrorism against its Muslim community in Christchurch on 15 March 2019. New Zealand was one of the most multicultural nations in the world and it highly valued diversity. That attack had struck against its core values and reinforced its commitment to protect the human rights of all people in New Zealand.

521. The Government had received nearly 600 submissions from stakeholders and civil society on the recommendations made during the universal periodic review. The number of submissions had highlighted the keen interest of civil society in the universal periodic review process and human rights issues in New Zealand.

522. New Zealand had welcomed all of the recommendations made during the review process and had carefully considered each of them. New Zealand had accepted 160 of the 194 recommendations received.

523. A priority area was women's rights. Although New Zealand was a leader in women's rights, it accepted that inequalities still existed. Actions being taken to address gender disparities included a gender analysis tool to help the Government to consider inequities when formulating policies.

524. New Zealand had accepted all of the recommendations relating to sexual and gender-based violence. The State recognized that it had unacceptably high levels of family violence, which was one of the country's most serious social and human rights issues. A national strategy and action plan was being developed. The new Family Violence Act 2018 provided a modern framework to better prevent, identify and respond to family violence.

525. All recommendations relating to children had also been accepted. The first child and youth well-being strategy would be published in 2019 and was intended to help to protect children's rights.

526. A five-year transformation programme would build a more child-centred State care system. The Royal Commission of Inquiry into Historical Abuse in State Care and in the Care of Faith-Based Institutions was investigating the abuse of children and vulnerable adults.

527. New Zealand had accepted almost all of the recommendations relating to equality and non-discrimination. New Zealand was proud to be a multicultural society that was committed to eliminating any discriminatory practices. The terror attacks in Christchurch had further highlighted the importance of inclusion in society.

528. New Zealand had a strong legal framework to address discrimination. Discrimination was unlawful under the Human Rights Act. Avenues available for the redress of discriminatory actions included the Human Rights Commission, the Human Rights Review Tribunal and the courts.

529. The Government was currently taking measures to protect rights to equality and non-discrimination. That included reviewing existing protections against hate speech and considering amending the Human Rights Act to include gender identity as a prohibited ground of discrimination.

530. Concerning indigenous rights, the delegation recalled that, under the Treaty of Waitangi of 1840, the Government had an active duty to protect the interests of Maori in their lands and *taonga* (their treasured possessions, including language and culture).

531. New Zealand had accepted all of the recommendations relating to indigenous rights and it was continuing to focus on reducing disparities for Maori. The Government had established a new agency called the Office for Maori Crown Relations – *Te Arawhiti*. That new agency was tasked with completing historical settlements due to past Treaty breaches by the Crown and ensuring their durability.

532. New Zealand also had a dedicated Maori housing unit to improve housing opportunities. The Maori Language in Education Strategy would strengthen the protection of the Maori language.

533. New Zealand acknowledged that serious issues existed within the criminal justice system and it was committed to creating a more effective system. Most of the recommendations relating to criminal justice had been accepted. That year, the Government had launched the *Hapaitia te Oranga Tangata*: Safe and Effective Justice programme to reform the criminal justice system. The programme included improving the justice system, reassessing the balance between rehabilitation and punishment, early prevention and strong partnerships with Maori.

534. New Zealand would also consider whether the current minimum age of criminal responsibility of 10 years should be increased.

535. The Government had conducted a ministerial inquiry into mental health and addiction. The inquiry had looked at the equity of access to services and better outcomes and had also covered suicide prevention.

536. The inquiry had found inequalities within the system and mental health outcomes, especially for Maori. In response, the Government had committed to multiple actions, including the expansion of talk therapies, alcohol and other drug services, and culturally aligned therapies.

537. The delegation indicated that, while New Zealand had accepted the intent of many of the recommendations, a relatively small number (34) could not be formally accepted. Those included the recommendations concerning the themes of international instruments, abortion and amending the Human Rights Act to include gender identity. While it did not reject the intention of any recommendation, New Zealand could not accept certain recommendations because they depended on future decision-making according to the country's constitutional processes.

538. The largest number of the recommendations that had been noted suggested signing or ratifying certain international treaties and withdrawing existing reservations. New Zealand could not bypass its domestic process of considering the implications of international conventions, including by Parliament, and it was therefore unable to accept those recommendations.

539. However, New Zealand would still consider acceding to additional international treaties, including the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and the optional protocols to both the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Furthermore, New Zealand would consider removing existing reservations.

540. In addition, New Zealand would consider amending the Human Rights Act to include gender identity as a prohibited ground of discrimination. However, the recommendations relating to gender identity had been noted because a government decision had not yet been made in relation to making specific legislative changes.

541. The Government intended to introduce legislation to decriminalize abortion but could not commit to the specific models recommended. New Zealand acknowledged that protecting sexual and reproductive health and rights was a human rights priority and it was developing a multisectoral action plan on sexual and reproductive health. Lastly, the delegation addressed the State's international advocacy on human rights issues. New Zealand had recently adopted the International Human Rights Action Plan, which set refreshed priorities for the next five years. The areas in which New Zealand would show leadership included gender equality and women's empowerment, the rights of persons with disabilities, sexual

orientation and gender identity, and the abolition of the death penalty. Those priorities had been determined following an extensive consultation process.

542. New Zealand looked forward to continuing its work to improve human rights for all and welcomed the universal periodic review as a valuable part of that process.

2. General comments made by the national human rights institution of the State under review

543. The Human Rights Commission stated (by video message) that 2019 would be remembered as one of the most challenging years in recent times for human rights in Aotearoa New Zealand. It recalled that, on 15 March, 51 people, including young children, had been martyred while worshipping at two mosques in Christchurch. The Commission commended the compassionate leadership of the Prime Minister and noted the swift change to the country's gun laws. The Commission also noted the introduction of the State's first well-being budget, which focused on improving measures of well-being alongside traditional economic objectives, and it strongly urged the Government to explore how explicit human rights could help to deliver the budget and the reform agenda of the Government.

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

544. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of New Zealand, 13 delegations made statements.

545. Botswana commended New Zealand for the strides made in the protection of human rights, in particular children's rights. It noted in particular the establishment of the Ministry for Children and the enactment of the Children's Act to ensure a child-centred approach in the country's policies. It was pleased to note that two recommendations from Botswana were among those that had enjoyed the support of New Zealand.

546. Burkina Faso hailed the efforts by New Zealand to effectively implement human rights for its citizens and all persons who lived in its territory. It welcomed the acceptance by New Zealand of recommendations received, including those relating to strengthening the protection of the rights of women and children. It called upon the Human Rights Council to adopt the report on New Zealand.

547. The Comoros encouraged New Zealand to make further efforts to strengthen the rights of indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities. It urged New Zealand to continue to focus on reducing inequalities and disparities between Maori and other ethnic groups. It expressed the view that the recommendations accepted by New Zealand, in particular those relating to indigenous and minority rights, would be of great value in combating those inequalities.

548. Egypt thanked New Zealand for its responses to the recommendations received and welcomed the acceptance of numerous recommendations. It noted the measures taken to protect human rights, in particular the adoption of a national action plan to follow up on the universal periodic review recommendations. It urged New Zealand to continue to further promote and protect human rights.

549. Fiji commended New Zealand for the acceptance of more than two thirds of the recommendations received, including the one made by Fiji to adopt the zero carbon bill and an environmental health action plan. It appreciated the intention of New Zealand to complete its first national climate change risk assessment in 2020. Fiji welcomed the commitment of New Zealand to submit a midterm report in 2021, and it recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the universal periodic review report on New Zealand.

550. The Islamic Republic of Iran welcomed the commitment of New Zealand to the universal periodic review process and it noted the acceptance of two of the four recommendations it had made. While expressing sympathy for the families of the victims of the Christchurch massacre and the Muslim community, it remained concerned about Islamophobia and it urged New Zealand to take all the measures necessary to confront that phenomenon, which was rooted in xenophobia and racism. It expressed the belief that national anti-discrimination legislation should ensure the protection of ethnic minorities, including the Maori and Pasifika communities.

551. Iraq was grateful to New Zealand for having accepted two of its recommendations on combating domestic violence and improving the conditions of migrant workers and asylum seekers. Iraq hoped that New Zealand would in the future consider accepting its third recommendation to accelerate the process of acceding to the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

552. Lesotho noted the steps taken by New Zealand relating to the representation of women in decision-making positions and to promote gender equality. It noted the persistence of challenges, in particular those relating to the increase in the prison population. It also noted the national action plan for the protection and promotion of human rights, which monitored the implementation of human rights recommendations. It encouraged New Zealand to consider ratifying the human rights treaties to which it was not yet a party.

553. Madagascar welcomed the progress made by New Zealand since its previous review in the protection and promotion of human rights, in particular the implementation of measures to respect cultural diversity and establish social justice. It commended the commitment of New Zealand to submit a midterm report in 2021 and the decision of the Government to review its internal processes to implement international human rights standards. Madagascar urged New Zealand to pursue the reforms it had embarked upon to give greater effect to respect for human rights.

554. Pakistan commended New Zealand for having accepted the majority of the recommendations received, including the ones it had made. It appreciated the undertaking of the Government to review the current protections against hate speech and to develop a national strategy to address racial discrimination and racism.

555. The Russian Federation noted that New Zealand had accepted one of its three recommendations, relating to providing Maori and Pasifika with adequate access to education and the labour market. It regretted that New Zealand had not accepted the recommendations on the ratification of a wide range of international human rights instruments, and on the need to develop and adopt a written constitution and to ensure the proper constitutional or legislative recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi. It expressed the belief that their implementation would significantly enhance the ability to protect the human rights of Maori and other representatives of the indigenous peoples of small island States in the South Pacific.

556. Sri Lanka noted that New Zealand had accepted 160 out of the 194 recommendations received, including those it had made. Noting that both countries had experienced brutal acts of terrorism, it stressed the importance of combating terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, while safeguarding human rights, the rule of law and ensuring the well-being of all communities. It noted the continued efforts of New Zealand to combat all forms of racism and discrimination and that a new race relations commissioner would be appointed, along with the development of a national strategy to address racial discrimination.

557. Tunisia welcomed the acceptance by New Zealand of a great number of recommendations, including those it had made relating to continuing efforts to ensure the prevention of violence against women and domestic violence through the strengthening of women's programmes and national plans, and to efforts to combat racial discrimination and hate speech and promote diversity and tolerance.

4. General comments made by other stakeholders

558. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of New Zealand, six other stakeholders made statements.

559. Villages unis welcomed the positive steps taken by New Zealand, including the ratification of core human rights instruments. It noted the ratification in 2016 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The action by the Prime Minister after the killings of Muslims by a terrorist had set an example for the international community.

560. Action Canada for Population and Development noted that the Government had stated that protecting sexual and reproductive health and rights was a priority. However, it indicated that there was no evidence that such rights were a priority, given the existence of significant inequities and the lack of policy, funding and services dedicated to addressing those. Efforts

to develop a national action plan on sexual and reproductive health and rights had not progressed and had faced challenges, including insufficient and inconsistent consultation with the sector. The draft plan's proposed measures were flawed, and there was no mechanism to ensure accountability.

561. International-Lawyers.org welcomed the acceptance by New Zealand of 160 recommendations out of the 194 recommendations received. It encouraged New Zealand to continue its efforts regarding the rights of minorities, including by ensuring that hate speech and hate crimes were duly investigated. It commended the Prime Minister's action after the attacks on the two mosques at Christchurch, in particular by bringing communities together, and it called upon all States to follow that positive example. It commended the ratification of core human rights conventions and called for the ratification of additional instruments as recommended during the universal periodic review.

562. The International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination welcomed the action taken to ensure gender equality and to increase the participation of women in leadership positions, and the improvement of the socioeconomic situation of indigenous peoples. However, despite efforts to implement recommendations received during the previous cycle, the high incarceration rate and the overrepresentation of Maori at every stage of the criminal justice system still needed to be addressed. In addition, New Zealand should take concrete steps to address sexual and domestic violence. The organization strongly recommended that the country eradicate discrimination against Maori by tackling the social inequalities they experienced.

563. The International Humanist and Ethical Union was pleased that the abortion law was under review and that New Zealand had accepted the recommendation to remove abortion from the Crimes Act 1961 and to review the Contraception, Sterilisation and Abortion Act 1977. However, like Canada, Iceland and Uruguay, it urged the Government to adopt recommendation Model A from the Law Commission's report on "alternative approaches to abortion law". It congratulated New Zealand for having repealed its blasphemy law since the previous review. It was disappointed that the Statement on Religious Diversity had excluded persons of various ethical beliefs and noted that there were persecuted atheists who had sought refuge in New Zealand.

564. The Association of World Citizens welcomed the acceptance by New Zealand of the recommendation to consider acceding to additional international human rights instruments. It expressed the hope that the midterm report would also address the implementation of the recommendations that had not been accepted because of their form rather than their content. It looked forward to a review of the age of criminal responsibility, indicating that it was unacceptable that persons could be prosecuted from ages 10 and 12 years and tried as an adult at 17 years of age. Though appreciating the increase in the refugee quota, the Association of World Citizens did not accept that, in any case, a person who qualified as a refugee under the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees would not be granted asylum.

5. Concluding remarks of the State under review

565. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 194 recommendations received, 160 had enjoyed the support of New Zealand and 34 had been noted.

566. The delegation thanked the member States, the Human Rights Commission and the members of civil society who had been present. As a part of its commitment to ongoing action, New Zealand intended to publish a midterm report on the universal periodic review in 2021. The delegation emphasized the continuing commitment of the Government to human rights and to active participation in international human rights processes.

Uruguay

567. The review of Uruguay was held on 23 January 2019 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 Uruguay 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.6/32/URY/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.6/32/URY/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.6/32/URY/3](#)).

568. At its 25th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Uruguay (see sect. C below).

569. The outcome of the review of Uruguay comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review ([A/HRC/41/8](#)), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also [A/HRC/41/8/Add.1](#)).

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

570. The delegation noted that the universal periodic review of Uruguay had allowed the country to assess its progress in legal, institutional and public policy frameworks linked to the recommendations received and accepted during its review in 2014, and to respond to the advanced questions submitted by some of the delegations.

571. The national report of the country and further updates had been prepared with the full commitment and responsibility of the national mechanism for reporting and follow-up on recommendations. For that purpose, consultations with civil society had been conducted through the mechanism, with the drafting process explained and contributions requested. Further meetings had also been organized to solicit comments on the national report.

572. Uruguay had also provided clarifications with regard to some of the specific recommendations, both orally and in writing as an addendum to the report of the Working Group. Those explanations referred to the recommendations concerning: the conditions of the applicability of the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169), while considering the reality of Uruguay; the adoption and implementation of national human rights legislation; the accreditation of the National Human Rights Institution and Office of the Ombudsman with A status, in accordance with the Paris Principles; the follow-up to the human rights recommendations through the national mechanism for reporting and follow-up on recommendations; progress in legal, institutional and public policy measures against discrimination, in particular racial discrimination, with particular emphasis on the adoption of the plan for and establishment of a national council for racial equity; the implementation of equality and non-discrimination measures, with particular emphasis on groups in vulnerable situations; the reform of the penitentiary system, and commitment to consolidate the national mechanism for the prevention of torture and the institutional strengthening of the Office of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Prison System, an independent body responsible for monitoring the prison system; the conditions of detention of adolescents in conflict with the law, highlighting that, since 2016, there had been no overcrowding in the juvenile detention system; the criminalization of the crime of torture; efforts to implement a policy on truth, justice, reparations and guarantees of non-recurrence; the fight against trafficking in persons, highlighting in particular the enactment of a comprehensive law and the establishment of a national council to prevent and combat trafficking in and the exploitation of persons, as the governing and coordination body of public policies on trafficking in persons; the consideration of the family in its various forms; the progress made in the areas of economic, social and cultural rights; the protection of the rights of children in accordance with the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the concluding observations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child, while considering them as right holders and not

mere objects of protection; progress in the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, highlighting in particular the provisions of article 12 of the Convention on the recognition of legal capacity; the absolute prohibition of the recruitment of children under 18 years of age by the Uruguayan armed forces, in accordance with the Childhood and Adolescence Code, which had established that children and adolescents could not participate in armed conflicts or receive training for that purpose.

573. The delegation stressed that, as in previous universal periodic review cycles and in line with the commitment of Uruguay to human rights, the country had accepted all of the recommendations it had received. In doing so, Uruguay had made a commitment to redouble its efforts with a view to continuing the progress achieved and improving the legal and institutional framework, as well as the plans and programmes developed to promote and protect human rights.

574. The delegation emphasized that Uruguay was renewing its commitment and claiming again that the way in which the society handled diversity, complexity and social conflicts, as well as the attention it gave to the most vulnerable and unprotected people and groups, was the best indicator of the quality of development and prosperity of the society. It also stressed that there were no rights without corresponding obligations, and there were no obligations other than those corresponding to rights, and the starting and ending point of the legal system was always human rights.

575. The delegation emphasized the integrality and universality of all rights, as well as the rights of future generations, and flagged that the costs of realizing our rights could not affect those of future generations.

576. The delegation reiterated the gratitude of Uruguay to all the delegations that had participated so constructively in the universal periodic review, and to the National Human Rights Institution and Office of the Ombudsman and representatives of civil society. It acknowledged the role of civil society as fundamental in defending the achievements made to protect rights.

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

577. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Uruguay, 13 delegations made statements.

578. Madagascar congratulated Uruguay for having accepted a considerable number of recommendations made during the thirty-second session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, in January 2019, and it encouraged Uruguay to continue its efforts in the promotion and protection of human rights. It noted with satisfaction the actions taken by Uruguay and it urged the Government to strengthen measures to combat discrimination based on race and sexual identity and to apply strictly the law on preventing and combating trafficking in persons.

579. Mexico recognized the progress made by Uruguay, in particular the creation of the national council to prevent and combat trafficking in and the exploitation of persons and the adoption of a relevant national action plan. It welcomed the fact that Uruguay had accepted all 226 recommendations, including those made by Mexico on sexual and reproductive health, education and indigenous peoples, some of which were in the process of implementation. Mexico encouraged Uruguay to continue to implement all of the recommendations.

580. Oman commended Uruguay for the cooperative approach it had taken towards the universal periodic review and for having accepted the recommendations made by Oman. It wished Uruguay more progress and prosperity.

581. Pakistan commended Uruguay for having accepted all of the recommendations made during the session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review in January 2019. It appreciated the commitment of Uruguay to gender equality and it noted in particular the efforts of the national council on gender.

582. The Russian Federation noted positively that Uruguay had accepted all of its recommendations concerning the need to improve the penitentiary system, to bring the State's legislation into compliance with the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and to adopt a comprehensive law introducing criminal liability for all acts of violence against women. Nevertheless, it remained concerned about the continuous increase in the number of persons in detention and cases of violence in detention centres.

583. Tunisia appreciated the approach taken by Uruguay to involve civil society in all matters concerning human rights. It also welcomed the adoption of legislation to consolidate the legislative and constitutional framework on human rights. It commended Uruguay for having accepted all of the recommendations during the universal periodic review, demonstrating its firm commitment to human rights.

584. UN-Women welcomed the efforts of Uruguay to advance women's rights, including through important normative and public policy milestones. It expressed its willingness to offer support in areas such as: eradicating femicide and providing resources for the implementation of legislation on gender-based violence; tackling trafficking in and the exploitation of persons; increasing the representation of women in political and public life and addressing unequal working conditions; eliminating discrimination and stereotypes against women, particularly women of African descent; and improving detention conditions for women and children.

585. UNICEF noted the significant progress in reducing poverty in the country, in particular the reduction of child poverty. It congratulated Uruguay on the positive trend in tackling child mortality, on reunifying children living in residential care with their families and communities, and on the decrease in adolescent pregnancy. It remained concerned about the high rates of violence against children and encouraged the authorities to continue multisectoral efforts to prevent violence against children.

586. UNFPA welcomed the outcome report of the third cycle of the universal periodic review, which demonstrated the commitment of Uruguay to the promotion and protection of human rights in the areas of gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls, sexual and reproductive health and rights, and the specific rights of persons with disabilities, older persons, Afrodescendants and other groups of persons in situations of vulnerability and disadvantage.

587. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela congratulated Uruguay on its efforts to implement the recommendations accepted. It recognized the efforts made to increase the rates of enrolment and permanence in the educational system, including those of the most vulnerable sectors of the population. It appreciated the decrease in poverty, extreme poverty and inequality rates, which it noted as excellent.

588. Algeria congratulated Uruguay on the progress made to combat poverty and inequalities and on the measures taken in favour of persons with disabilities, in particular the protocol aimed at their integration in educational institutions. It noted that Uruguay had accepted the recommendations made by Algeria to ensure the accessibility of basic health services for persons with disabilities and to reduce school dropout rates among girls, a recommendation that was being implemented.

589. Barbados commended Uruguay for its efforts to promote and protect human rights across the country. The Government's human rights agenda sought to permeate all its national policies and was made effective in collaboration with civil society. Barbados congratulated Uruguay on the recommendations accepted, including those made by Barbados, which demonstrated the willingness of Uruguay to continue to strengthen its national systems for equality and non-discrimination for the benefit of the Afrodescendent populations, indigenous persons, and women and children, among others.

590. The Plurinational State of Bolivia appreciated that Uruguay was a party to new fundamental instruments on human rights and their respective protocols, as well as all subregional and regional instruments on human rights. It commended the acceptance by Uruguay of all of the recommendations received and it thanked the State for the clarifications

provided with regard to seven recommendations concerning the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169).

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

591. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Uruguay, seven other stakeholders made statements.

592. The International Planned Parenthood Federation welcomed the progress made by Uruguay in recent years in having adopted laws and public policies to uphold sexual and reproductive rights. The new regulations, however, were not sufficient to reduce inequalities. Therefore, it was necessary to provide enhanced training in the health and education sectors on key areas of sexual and reproductive health. The organization recognized the importance of the legalization of abortion in 2012, and noted the persistent barriers relating to the conscientious objection of gynaecologists in some parts of the country, resulting in grave violations of women's rights. For that reason, it appreciated the acceptance of the recommendations to take measures and to be stricter in the regulation of conscientious objection in order to prevent its abuse and to ensure access to services. It hoped that the commitment to sexual and reproductive rights assumed by Uruguay would materialize in the necessary actions and resources and that women, girls and adolescents would be able to access sexual and reproductive health services in a safe, timely, free and quality manner.

593. Edmund Rice International noted that, although school attendance had been mandatory from the age of 4 years since 2008 and that enrolment levels were increasing, including for the most vulnerable groups, the rate of graduation for 18- to 20-year-olds remained low, with only a 0.9 per cent increase since the previous universal periodic review, in 2014. That indicated that young people did not complete their secondary education. The rate was even lower among the most vulnerable groups. Although Uruguay had accepted the recommendations on education during the previous review, no substantive changes had been made in the education system. The organization called upon Uruguay to implement specific public policies in order to ensure that children completed the education cycle and to prevent early school dropout. It further recommended that Uruguay increase the education budget to ensure the participation of low-income children and adolescents in education and to resume all programmes aimed at guaranteeing educational continuity for children and adolescents.

594. The International Catholic Child Bureau congratulated Uruguay on its acceptance of all of the recommendations, including those concerning violence against children and adolescents. Nevertheless, it mentioned that, despite Law No. 18214 on the personal integrity of children and adolescents having been included in the Childhood and Adolescence Code, in practice, those responsible for the care, treatment, education or supervision of minors, including family members, did not sufficiently benefit from the awareness-raising programmes provided for by the law. Despite positive developments within the framework of the national plan on early childhood, infancy and adolescence 2016–2020, the number of cases of violence against children and adolescents, including sexual violence and sexual exploitation in tourism, was on the rise. The organization called upon Uruguay to increase the resources allocated to fight violence against children and to implement concrete and specific measures aimed at eliminating violence against children and adolescents, including corporal punishment.

595. Action Canada for Population and Development appreciated the commitment of Uruguay to human rights, which was demonstrated by its acceptance of all of the recommendations received, including those concerning sexuality and gender. It suggested concrete actions for the implementation of the recommendations relating to violence and discrimination against LGBTI+ persons, such as investigating the assassination of trans women according to due process, guaranteeing the conviction of perpetrators, and guaranteeing the health and physical integrity of LGBTI* persons, in particular trans women. The organization also drew attention to the absence of recommendations for Uruguay to take measures to eliminate practices contrary to international human rights standards, as unnecessary and premature interventions continued to be made on intersex persons at birth, despite what was stated in the law against gender-based violence against women. Furthermore, it noted that the so-called “conversion therapies” discriminated against LGBT

persons, despite the fact that Uruguay had declared a fight against discrimination and other practices undermining sexual and reproductive rights, particularly those of LGBTI persons.

596. Amnesty International welcomed the interpretation by Uruguay of the recommendation on the protection of the family in line with human rights standards, including families formed by same-sex couples, and the recommendation on parents' rights implying the subordination of those to children's rights and well-being. It also welcomed the acceptance by Uruguay of the recommendations to ensure that crimes against humanity and human rights violations committed between 1973 and 1985 were not subject to a statute of limitations, and to bring to justice those responsible for those crimes, as well as those responsible for more recent threats to judicial officials and human rights defenders. It encouraged Uruguay to urgently implement the recommendations to improve the living conditions of prison inmates and opportunities for their rehabilitation and integration, and to implement the law against gender-based violence against women. It also encouraged Uruguay to improve the protection of the rights of migrants. Lastly, it encouraged Uruguay to promote the meaningful involvement of civil society in the follow-up to the recommendations.

597. The Association of World Citizens remained concerned about child marriage and girl brides in Uruguay. The fact that 25 per cent of girls married before the age of 18 years should be regarded seriously, and a national plan of action was needed, especially for rural, poor and illiterate families. Mandatory primary and secondary education and the inclusion of migrants in society could help to reduce child marriage significantly. In addition, combating violence and discrimination against women still needed more attention and a budget to reach Sustainable Development Goal 5. Systematic human rights education for police forces, the judiciary and heads of prisons could preserve the human rights of prison inmates and those arrested.

598. Madre stated that, in paragraph 8 of the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Uruguay, it was stated that "Uruguay had continued to examine the conditions of applicability of the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169) of the International Labour Organization. It was unclear how the definition of indigenous peoples contained in article 1 of that Convention could be applied in the context of Uruguay", which demonstrated ambiguity. It also noted the reference of Uruguay to Charrua language programmes and asked for more details about the programme, including the number of persons who had benefited from it.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

599. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 226 recommendations received, all 226 recommendations had enjoyed the support of Uruguay.

600. In conclusion, the delegation of Uruguay thanked the States, its National Human Rights Institution and Office of the Ombudsman and the representatives of civil society for their participation, and it reiterated its gratitude to the delegation of Mexico, the country that had acted as the rapporteur of the troika during the review. It took due note of the valuable comments received and stated that they would be submitted to the members of the national mechanism for reporting and follow-up on recommendations and would be considered during the follow-up process on the recommendations. The delegation stressed that, for many of the recommendations, there were already updated information and statistics, as most of them were already being implemented. Uruguay was committed to presenting a midterm report, as it had done in previous cycles, with information about the implementation of and follow-up on the recommendations.

Yemen

601. The review of Yemen was held on 23 January 2019 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 Yemen 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.6/32/YEM/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.6/32/YEM/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.6/32/YEM/3](#) and [Corr.1](#)).

602. At its 25th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Yemen (see sect. C below).

603. The outcome of the review of Yemen comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review ([A/HRC/41/9](#)), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also [A/HRC/41/9/Add.1](#)).

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

604. The delegation of Yemen expressed appreciation to all of the delegations that had made valuable recommendations and had participated in the third cycle review of Yemen. The delegation looked forward to strengthening its cooperation with the Human Rights Council.

605. The Government of Yemen had been working towards implementing its human rights recommendations, in conjunction with civil society organizations and the support of the international community, despite the many challenges it faced as a result of the coup by the Houthi militias.

606. The Government had been urging the House of Representatives to discuss and approve bills relating to human rights, including one on the minimum age for marriage, the draft law against enforced disappearance, and other bills on the accession of Yemen to the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.

607. The delegation reiterated that the National Dialogue Conference still represented an important and necessary road map for the future of Yemen. Despite the challenges, the Conference had helped the Government to make measured progress in human rights. A new draft constitution that was aimed at establishing a system of good governance and at promoting the rule of law, democracy and respect for human rights was in the process of being drafted and would provide a basis for a new federal Government that guaranteed a new political and social contract based on the principle of partnership and equality.

608. The delegation found it regrettable that the Houthi militias hindered the process of political transition and pushed the country into a situation of disaster, one from which the Yemeni people were still suffering. The Government, in cooperation with civil society, had developed strategies that promoted core human rights principles, including the national human rights strategy and the strategy to combat trafficking in persons, and had established the national observatory to monitor violations of children's rights.

609. Among the cardinal objectives of those initiatives were those to provide staff working in the field of human rights with capacity-building and vocational training, and to develop coordination mechanisms with civil society organizations, the international community and the private sector. The President of the Republic had established a national independent commission of inquiry to investigate all allegations of violations of human rights and

international humanitarian law. The committee had been carrying out its work with great professionalism and dedication and had published numerous reports since its establishment.

610. During the review process, Yemen had received 252 recommendations, of which the Government had accepted 182 and deferred 70 for further examination. Of those 70, the Government had then chosen to accept another 19 recommendations. In total, the Government had accepted 201 out of 252 recommendations, which was a high percentage of acceptance. It was in the interest of the Government of Yemen to deal positively with the universal periodic review mechanism and to take serious measures to maintain and protect human rights.

611. The Government was focusing its attention on the following challenges: end the coup d'état and achieve peace and stability throughout the country; bring back constitutional legitimacy and re-establish State institutions; implement the outcomes of the comprehensive National Dialogue Conference that established a new federal State with a new constitution and electoral laws, and the holding of local government elections; maintain security in the country and end the terrorism and vandalism that threatened the security of the country and citizens; provide for essential needs, including fuel, electricity, basic materials, education, health and social services; address the problem of social disintegration and promote national unity following the coup d'état; provide the support necessary for internally displaced persons and refugees, as well as illegal immigrants; and urgently restore humanitarian aid.

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

612. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Yemen, 13 delegations made statements.

613. UNFPA acknowledged the efforts of the Government to address gender-based violence, including the development of standard operating procedures. It remained concerned about the possible rise in early and child marriage as a coping mechanism resulting from the pressures of the conflict, and that nearly half of health facilities were non-functioning or partially functioning.

614. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela stated that the international community must cooperate with Yemen to alleviate the humanitarian situation, particularly regarding food shortages and health and social services. It reiterated its support for efforts made towards a just and lasting peace in the country and it recommended strengthening social programmes, especially for the most vulnerable sectors.

615. Viet Nam commended the progress achieved to develop a legal framework for the protection and promotion of human rights and the efforts made to rebuild educational infrastructure through the establishment of programmes for children with special needs and a committee to support the most vulnerable groups.

616. Algeria noted that Yemen had accepted two recommendations from Algeria, namely one on increasing efforts to prevent the exploitation and trafficking of children, and the second on the development of legislation relating to children. It wished Yemen every success in its effort to give effect to the various recommendations.

617. Bahrain highly appreciated the significant efforts made by Yemen, in spite of the difficult situation and the huge and complicated challenges, including such reforms as the establishment of the national independent commission of inquiry to examine allegations of violations of human rights, and a strategy to combat the recruitment of child soldiers.

618. The Plurinational State of Bolivia welcomed the information on the measures taken to establish a committee to implement the recommendations in the context of the comprehensive National Dialogue Conference, which had included stakeholders from civil society and which had paved the way for a new constitution and was seen as a road map to address political, economic, social and cultural issues.

619. Botswana noted with appreciation that Yemen had accepted 200 recommendations, including one of its own. While Yemen had not accepted its recommendation to ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, Botswana was encouraged by the State's

acceptance of many human rights treaties. It supported the adoption of the universal periodic review outcome and wished Yemen success.

620. China noted that the Government had resumed the implementation of the national human rights strategy and social protection strategy and had taken measures to guarantee the rights of minority and vulnerable groups. China hoped that the Government would continue to promote poverty reduction, improve people's lives, and realize stability and development.

621. The Comoros commended Yemen for its commitment to promote and protect women's rights, encouraging the emergence of women's leadership. It hoped that Yemen would implement the recommendations accepted, including those on the promotion of the national human rights institution to A status in conformity with the Paris Principles.

622. Cuba welcomed the acceptance of a large number of recommendations, particularly those made by Cuba, including those regarding the protection of children in emergency situations and the improvement of the quality and scope of systems for health care, education and support to people with disabilities. Cuba supported the adoption of the universal periodic review outcome report on Yemen.

623. Djibouti congratulated Yemen on having accepted a large number of recommendations received as part of the third universal periodic review cycle and it was delighted in particular to see that the two recommendations from Djibouti had been accepted. Djibouti wished Yemen every success in implementing the recommendations accepted.

624. Egypt appreciated the fact that the Government of Yemen had accepted a large number of recommendations, including those recommendations from Egypt on promoting the independence of justice and combating trafficking in persons. Egypt wished Yemen every success in the implementation of the recommendations accepted and it recommended the adoption of the report on Yemen.

625. India highlighted the importance of human rights for peace, stability and liberty and noted the challenges that Yemen had been facing in bringing about peace and development. India appreciated the socioeconomic development measures taken by Yemen towards poverty alleviation, the improvement of basic education and access to health care.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

626. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Yemen, 10 other stakeholders made statements.

627. Villages unis commended the efforts of Yemen with regard to violence against women and children and the ratification of the main international conventions, especially the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. It recommended that Yemen put pressure on all parties in order to immediately end the war and request the Houthis to reveal the minefield maps and to cooperate with international organizations in order to demine those minefields. It also called upon Yemen to put an end to abductions and enforced disappearances, to make public information relating to the situation of detainees and to inform their family members. It also recommended that Yemen accede to the Rome Statute.

628. United Nations Watch stated that the human rights record of Yemen had received the worst possible rating and that in Yemen women were the subject of gross and systematic discrimination. Rape victims had to provide male witnesses and the Penal Code granted leniency to men who committed so-called "honour" killings of women for perceived immodest or defiant behaviour. It claimed that gender-based violence and other serious violations were not considered crimes. In the gender inequality index, Yemen ranked 149 out of 149. It contested the choice of the United Nations to elect a representative from Yemen to hold the position of vice-president on the Executive Board of UN-Women.

629. The Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture stated that the number of civilian victims amounted to 39,000, among them 15,000 children, as a result of air strikes by the coalition. It remained deeply concerned about the protection of children in Yemen. It observed that 41 hospitals had been destroyed. Without the reopening of the airport of Yemen

to humanitarian relief, all of the human rights mechanisms remained helpless. It called upon the Human Rights Council to condemn the human rights violations against the civilian population and it claimed that the Saudi-led coalition shouldered much of the responsibility for the violations.

630. The Amman Center for Human Rights Studies shed light on the arms trade relating to the conflict in Yemen, which prevented any possibility to improve human rights in the country. It urged exporting States to prohibit the sale of arms that could lead to possible violations. According to the report of the Group of Eminent International and Regional Experts on Yemen ([A/HRC/39/43](#)), serious human rights violations in Yemen had allegedly been committed by all parties to the conflict, including reported attacks against civilians, enforced disappearances, torture, violations of freedom of expression, sexual violence and the recruitment of children in armed forces. The organization urged the Human Rights Council to adopt initiatives preventing the further sale of weapons to countries involved in the war in Yemen. It demanded that the Arms Trade Treaty be respected by all countries and it called for the creation of an international commission responsible for investigating crimes caused by the war and the aggression in Yemen. Lastly, it called upon the Human Rights Council to foster dialogue in Yemen.

631. Ingénieurs du monde remained deeply concerned about the situation of women in Yemen, stating that women were subject to discrimination by law and custom, and the escalation of the conflict and the humanitarian fallout had deeply weakened the situation of women and girls in society. In 2018, it had been estimated that 3 million women and girls had been exposed to different forms of violence. Among pregnant women, 1.1 million were victims of malnutrition and illness according to UNICEF. It observed that forced marriage and child marriage were constantly increasing in the country; the rights of women in terms of succession, divorce and the custody of children were lower than the rights of men. The testimony of a woman before a court was equivalent to only half of that of a man. Judicial remedy was almost non-existent for women. Given those facts, the organization found it ironic that the United Nations had decided in 2019 that a representative from Yemen would hold the position of vice-president of the Executive Board of UN-Women.

632. Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain expressed its deep concern about the casualties being caused by aerial campaigns. The Government had failed to respond when the coalition had imposed a blockade that had smothered civilians, caused a famine that had killed more than 200 children and continued to affect millions of civilians. The Government was using famine and poverty as a weapon of war. Actions that could qualify as war crimes and crimes against humanity were being taken. Only a comprehensive political solution could produce peace for the Yemeni people.

633. The Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies stated that, since the previous universal periodic review of Yemen, gross human rights violations by all parties to the conflict were still ongoing. It remained deeply concerned about the indiscriminate killings of civilians. On 28 June, the coalition led by Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, with the participation of Yemeni forces, had carried out an air strike on a civilian home, having resulted in the killing of six civilians, including children and women. The coalition continued to impose restrictions that affected the daily lives of millions of civilians. It urged the Government to immediately open all border crossing points, seaports and airports for humanitarian and commercial flights. It also urged the Government to comply with the recommendations it had accepted to ease the suffering of detainees and their families and to halt the practice of arbitrary arrest and torture.

634. CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation noted with concern that, as the war intensified in Yemen, human right defenders and journalists continued to face grave risks for undertaking their essential work. It remained concerned that the law of 1990 on the press and publications continued to criminalize those exercising free speech in Yemen. It called upon the Government of Yemen to take proactive measures to address those concerns and to implement the recommendations to create and maintain, in law and in practice, an enabling environment for civil society.

635. The Iraqi Development Organization expressed concern that the Government of Yemen had not implemented human rights recommendations and that the Government had

not become a State party to the Rome Statute during the period before the war. Instead, the Government had set up a national commission to investigate human rights violations in Yemen, but so far it had not done so impartially. The organization denounced, among others, the lack of implementation by the Government of the universal periodic review recommendations on the right to health and to education and the rights of the child.

636. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme strongly denounced the silent geopolitical war that continued to ravage Yemen and to decimate the civilian population, the majority of whom were children. The Saudi-led coalition had carried out hundreds of disproportionately indiscriminate and unjustified air strikes, having killed thousands of civilians and having struck civilian targets in violation of the rules of international humanitarian law, and Houthi forces used mines that were prohibited, in addition to recruiting children. Both sides had harassed journalists and human rights defenders. In view of the humanitarian disaster, the organization called upon the international community to support Yemen in the fulfilment of the Stockholm Agreement and to respect the ceasefire.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

637. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 252 recommendations received, 201 had enjoyed the support of Yemen and 51 had been noted.

638. The delegation reiterated that, despite all of the challenges, the Government of Yemen would continue to solicit the support of all of the brotherly and friendly countries, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, and relief agencies.

639. The delegation stated that the Government of Yemen supported the efforts of the United Nations and its partners in order to reach a peaceful solution, and in that sense, it called upon all States to support the efforts of the Government for peace and it expressed appreciation for and commitment to the mediation efforts made by Sweden.

Vanuatu

640. The review of Vanuatu was held on 24 January 2019 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 Vanuatu 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.6/32/VUT/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.6/32/VUT/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.6/32/VUT/3](#)).

641. At its 25th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Vanuatu (see sect. C below).

642. The outcome of the review of Vanuatu comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review ([A/HRC/41/10](#)), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session.

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

643. The delegation of Vanuatu stated that Vanuatu had considered and taken positions on all of the recommendations made during the review in January 2019. Out of a total of 135

recommendations, Vanuatu had supported 96 recommendations and noted 39 recommendations.

644. The delegation highlighted that, for the recommendations supported, the Government had taken the appropriate actions to begin the process of ensuring that they were implemented. The Ministry of Justice and Community Services and the National Human Rights Committee were working on an implementation plan for the recommendations that had been supported during the third cycle of the universal periodic review. The plan would guide the Government in ensuring that the recommendations were implemented. In that regard, the Government had been in discussions with OHCHR on technical cooperation to implement the recommendations. Furthermore, the Government would continue to seek assistance from its bilateral and multilateral partners in terms of capacity and infrastructure to ensure the implementation of those recommendations.

645. Regarding the recommendations that had been noted, the delegation explained that the Government had noted them because they were matters that would require further consideration by the Government. For example, with regard to the recommendations to ratify international human rights instruments, Vanuatu would need to consider its capacity in terms of implementing the instruments before it could ratify them. With regard to those recommendations to raise the minimum age for marriage in compliance with international human rights standards, to eliminate child and forced marriage, and to amend the Constitution and other relevant legislation to incorporate fully the principle of equality between women and men, the Government would consider them when implementing the recommendations it had supported relating to women and children.

646. The delegation stated that Vanuatu wished to acknowledge the technical assistance to support the State in the universal periodic review process provided by the Pacific Island Forum Secretariat, the Pacific Community, the Regional Rights Resource Team in partnership with the Commonwealth, the Melanesian Spearhead Group and OHCHR. It also acknowledged the invaluable contributions of civil society to the human rights issues of Vanuatu.

647. Vanuatu acknowledged the efforts and work done by the troika, namely Angola, Croatia and Iraq, for the third cycle of the universal periodic review. It also extended its sincere appreciation for the invaluable contributions of States by having made recommendations to Vanuatu, which were aimed at ensuring that Vanuatu complied with its international human rights obligations.

648. Moreover, Vanuatu wished to express its deepest appreciation to its bilateral and multilateral partners for their continued assistance in matters relating to the implementation of those recommendations.

649. The delegation stated that Vanuatu emphasized the significance of the universal periodic review process in ensuring the promotion and protection of human rights in all States. It reaffirmed the State's commitment to the universal periodic review process and the implementation of the recommendations supported. Vanuatu would also consider the recommendations it had noted in the third cycle of the universal periodic review for future reference.

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

650. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Vanuatu, 12 delegations made statements.

651. China commended Vanuatu for having acceded to the core international human rights treaties, including the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, for having made efforts to respond to the effects of climate change, and for having protected the rights of vulnerable groups, including women, children, older persons and persons with disabilities. It appreciated the acceptance by Vanuatu of the recommendations made by China and expressed the hope that Vanuatu would continue to implement the National Sustainable Development Plan, to reduce poverty, to improve living conditions, to

promote gender equality and to guarantee the rights of vulnerable people, including women, children and persons with disabilities.

652. Cuba recognized the acceptance of a large number of recommendations, in particular those made by Cuba, regarding the realization of the rights to health and education, and the expansion of access to rural populations. It urged Vanuatu to continue to confront the great challenges it faced as a small island developing State, particularly in relation to climate change and disaster risk reduction.

653. Fiji recognized the positive steps taken by Vanuatu to implement and strengthen its policies on climate change and disaster risk reduction, in particular the establishment of the National Advisory Board on Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction, with committees in all of the provinces, to assist communities the most affected by disasters. It welcomed the acceptance by Vanuatu of the recommendations made by Fiji, particularly those on implementing climate change and gender policies and setting out strategies to ensure that women were part of decision-making on national climate action policies. Fiji stood ready to continue to work closely with Vanuatu to further promote and protect the human rights of its citizens.

654. Iraq appreciated the acceptance by Vanuatu of its recommendations relating to accession to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and to improving the educational system in order to ensure the provision of equal opportunities for all.

655. New Zealand welcomed the ongoing commitment to advance the human rights of all in Vanuatu. It commended Vanuatu for its work to develop key policies and frameworks to support the human rights agenda, including the National Sustainable Development Plan 2016–2030, which was a pathway to ensuring that the rights of the people of Vanuatu were protected and promoted. It also recognized the serious challenge that climate change would pose to Vanuatu, and it commended the State for its proactive response. It noted the acceptance of the three recommendations it had made to Vanuatu in relation to domestic violence, prison conditions and women's political participation. It looked forward to ongoing engagement with Vanuatu on those important issues, including working with the Department of Women's Affairs to reduce violence against women and girls and to improve coordination across the sector. It committed itself to working with Vanuatu Correctional Services to improve the management of correctional facilities and to provide safe custodial services. Furthermore, it welcomed the Government's recognition of the valuable role that civil society played in the universal periodic review process, encouraging the Government to continue its engagement with civil society during the implementation phase.

656. Sri Lanka noted the commitment of Vanuatu to fully implement universal access to education. In that regard, it appreciated the measures taken to allocate school grants, while encouraging the Government to expand them to all grades. It also welcomed the fact that Vanuatu had joined the Pacific Partnership to End Violence against Women and Girls, encouraging its successful implementation. It acknowledged the need for assistance and support for capacity-building initiatives in Vanuatu aimed at building resilience, and the implementation of the national policy on climate change and disaster-induced displacement of 2018.

657. Tunisia appreciated the acceptance by Vanuatu of its recommendations, which would strengthen the institutional human rights framework of Vanuatu.

658. UN-Women welcomed the adoption of the Municipalities (Amendment) Act No. 5 of 2015, which had established a quota system for women contesting for seats in local government elections, thus strengthening women's participation in politics. It also welcomed the Government's increased support to resourcing the Department of Women's Affairs. It reiterated its commitment to support the Government in ensuring equal opportunities for women and girls and it looked forward to continuing to work through the Markets for Change project in promoting women's economic empowerment. It would also continue to provide the Vanuatu Gender and Protection Cluster with technical support to promote the inclusion of gender and protection in humanitarian preparedness and response. In that regard, it recommended that the Government strengthen the Cluster by allocating more resources and

ensuring that gender and protection were mainstreamed throughout national preparedness and response mechanisms. Furthermore, it noted the continued underrepresentation of women in national politics, urging the Government to introduce temporary special measures to increase women's representation in the national Government.

659. UNFPA noted that Vanuatu continued to face unprecedented and unique vulnerabilities, including volcanic activity, rising sea levels and cyclones, due to the effects of climate change. It emphasized the need to consider the promotion and protection of human rights within the context of the pervasive impact of climate change. It welcomed the Government's commitment to include gender and disability as grounds for discrimination, and to improve the health and status of women, young people and persons with disabilities, while noting that, during periods of natural disaster and emergencies, women, including girls, adolescents, young women and older women, were particularly vulnerable to violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect. It commended the Government for the establishment of the Reproductive, Maternal, Newborn, Child and Adolescent Health Policy and Implementation Strategy 2017–2020. It expressed its commitment to provide Vanuatu with support in implementing several recommendations relating to the prevention and elimination of violence against women and girls, the implementation of the Family Protection Act to ensure all cases of gender-based violence were duly investigated and prosecuted, the reduction of maternal mortality, and the implementation of effective measures to continue to expand access to health-care services among rural populations.

660. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela appreciated that, despite the challenges of geographic dispersion and climate change, Vanuatu had made efforts to implement the universal periodic review recommendations the State had accepted. It praised Vanuatu for the establishment of free primary education and it welcomed the Education Act that set the age of compulsory schooling between 4 and 18 years. It also encouraged Vanuatu to continue to consolidate its successful social policies in favour of the most vulnerable sectors of the population. It urged the international community to provide the cooperation and assistance that Vanuatu required in order to fulfil its human rights obligations.

661. Viet Nam commended Vanuatu for having accepted a large number of recommendations, including the two recommendations made by Viet Nam on promoting and protecting the rights of vulnerable groups in the context of climate change, and on promoting access to basic health services.

662. Algeria welcomed the efforts made by Vanuatu to implement the recommendations of the second cycle of the universal periodic review, in particular those relating to reducing social inequalities, protecting the rights of the child and providing persons with disabilities with support, in particular through the adoption of a national policy on disability inclusion. It noted the acceptance by Vanuatu of its own recommendations to raise adult literacy rates, to prohibit the corporal punishment of children in all settings and to protect the rights of persons with disabilities.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

663. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Vanuatu, three other stakeholders made statements.

664. Franciscans International commended Vanuatu for having supported the recommendations relating to the commitment to review existing policies and programmes on climate change adaptation and mitigation using a human rights-based approach. It also commended Vanuatu for having established a progressive policy through the establishment of the Ministry of Climate Change Adaptation, Meteorology, Geo-Hazards, Energy, Environment and Disaster Management, which was responsible for the implementation of the current national policy on climate change and disaster risks reduction. In 2018, the report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change referred to the widespread harm and human rights impacts of global warming.¹⁸ The organization called upon the Human Rights Council to conduct a study to evaluate whether the universal periodic review

¹⁸ See www.ipcc.ch/sr15/.

recommendations on climate change had brought coherence and a positive impact on the climate policy in action at the national level.

665. The Center for Global Nonkilling commended Vanuatu for its low death rate, as compared to that of other States. It expressed surprise and regret, however, that Vanuatu had refused the recommendation to ratify the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. It called upon Vanuatu to review its decision and to ratify the Convention as soon as possible.

666. The Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative commended the Government of Vanuatu for having accepted 96 recommendations, including those relating to a national plan for the implementation of the universal periodic review recommendations, the setting up of a national human rights institution, climate change, the elimination of discrimination, violence and abuse against women and children, the prevention of police brutality, and ensuring access to health care and education. It expressed regret, however, that Vanuatu had only noted 39 recommendations relating to the ratification of core international human rights instruments, the elimination of gender discrimination and stereotypes, the protection of the rights and social inclusion of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual and intersex persons. It praised Vanuatu for having taken commendable steps to eliminate corruption. It also noted that the law on access to information needed broad dissemination. It highlighted that, despite the fact that Vanuatu had supported the recommendation regarding civic education and raising awareness about previous cycle universal periodic review recommendations, the Government had not taken any effective action, especially in rural areas. It recommended that Vanuatu implement the universal periodic review recommendations in cooperation with civil society.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

667. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 135 recommendations received, 96 had enjoyed the support of Vanuatu and 35 had been noted.

668. The delegation reiterated its thanks for the invaluable contributions made by States, non-governmental organizations and other stakeholders during the third cycle of the universal periodic review of Vanuatu. It concluded by reaffirming the commitment of Vanuatu to the universal periodic review and to the implementation of the recommendations supported.

Slovakia

669. The review of Slovakia was held on 28 January 2019 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 Slovakia 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.6/32/SVK/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.6/32/SVK/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.6/32/SVK/3](#)).

670. At its 26th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Slovakia (see sect. C below).

671. The outcome of the review of Slovakia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review ([A/HRC/41/13](#)), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the

adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also [A/HRC/41/13/Add.1](#)).

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

672. The delegation of Slovakia stated that the universal periodic review process had been of great importance for Slovakia and that the authorities were doing their utmost to implement as many recommendations as possible in order to improve human rights standards in the country. The delegation extended the gratitude of the Government to States Members of the United Nations for their participation in the third review of Slovakia, which had been held in January 2019, and for their questions, comments and recommendations made during the interactive dialogue.

673. Slovakia appreciated the prevailing spirit of openness and constructiveness during the interactive dialogue. The delegation expressed appreciation for the contributions of non-governmental organizations during the review process. The universal periodic review process and the States under review, including Slovakia, had benefited greatly from first-hand information on the human rights situation on the ground provided by those organizations and from their valuable expertise.

674. The delegation reiterated the firm commitment of Slovakia to the universal periodic review, which had played a unique role in the United Nations human rights architecture. It had proven to be an effective tool for the promotion and protection of human rights. One of the main achievements of the review process had been the increased attention of Governments and non-governmental actors paid to human rights and fundamental freedoms. The potential of that mechanism should be further developed while maintaining focus on its main elements, particularly its universality and dialogue-based approach.

675. Slovakia had received 195 recommendations during the interactive dialogue in January 2019. The relevant ministries and other State institutions had thoroughly examined, scrutinized and analysed all of the recommendations. As a result, Slovakia had supported 176 recommendations. Some of them were already in the process of implementation, or Slovakia intended to address them through existing or future strategies and programmes. The State had also decided to partially support 9 recommendations and to note only the 10 remaining recommendations for further consideration.

676. With regard to the recommendations that had been partially supported, the delegation underlined that Slovakia had supported them in principle, which meant that the Government supported the idea and reasoning behind the recommendations. However, the Government was not in a position to accept them fully.

677. The delegation provided further clarifications on several recommendations. Slovakia had noted the recommendations concerning the ratification of the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention). In its resolution 1697 of 29 March 2019, the National Council (Parliament) had called upon the Government to refrain from moving towards the ratification of the Convention and it had notified the Council of Europe that Slovakia did not intend to become a party to the Convention.

678. The Constitution and its article 41 recognized marriage between a man and a woman. Therefore, Slovakia had noted the recommendations calling for the legal recognition of the marriage of same-sex couples and the extension of full marriage rights to such couples. Marriage, parenthood and family enjoyed protection under domestic legislation.

679. Slovakia had noted the recommendation to establish an independent and impartial oversight authority over the police in order to investigate alleged cases of ill-treatment and to bring those responsible to justice. The authorities had already taken several effective legal steps regarding an independent and impartial oversight authority over the police force. The Bureau of the Inspection Service had been established on 1 February 2019.

680. A few recommendations had covered sexual and reproductive health. Slovakia had noted two of them because a strategy for specialized paediatrics and gynaecology and

obstetrics, as well as existing legislation, had covered the provision of sexual and reproductive health services.

681. A significant number of recommendations had called for improvements in the situation of Roma in education, employment, housing and health care. The improvement in the situation of the Roma community had been a long-term priority for the Government. Slovakia had recognized the need to apply a comprehensive approach to Roma integration. The authorities would continue to implement the existing programmes and strategies with a view to achieving tangible progress in that field. The implementation of the strategy for the integration of Roma up to 2020 as the main reference document for national policies would remain the primary objective. Slovakia had therefore accepted all of the recommendations relating to the Roma community.

682. The delegation reiterated the firm commitment of the Government to fight against racism, extremism and other forms of intolerance. Slovakia had noted the recommendation to prohibit by law and prevent the activities of extremist organizations. The Government had supported the recommendation in principle.

683. Slovakia believed that the recommendations made during the third review of Slovakia would allow the country to further improve the protection and promotion of human rights in all areas of life.

684. The delegation reiterated the continued commitment of Slovakia to cooperate constructively with the mechanism and to make further efforts in the protection and promotion of human rights in Slovakia, as well as at the international level.

685. The delegation extended its gratitude to the troika, namely Afghanistan, Cameroon and Chile, for having facilitated the review process, and to the secretariat for its work, valuable support and assistance during the whole process.

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

686. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Slovakia, 13 delegations made statements.

687. Egypt noted with appreciation the efforts of Slovakia to protect the rights of children and to prevent and eliminate violence against women, including through the adoption of a national strategy on gender equality. It hoped that Slovakia would support the three recommendations made by Egypt, namely those calling for the prevention of intolerance and violence, the protection of families as a foundational unit of society and the promotion of gender equality.

688. India noted the adoption in 2015 of a national strategy for the protection and promotion of human rights through a participatory and inclusive process with the help of the council for human rights, national minorities and gender equality. It also noted the steps taken by Slovakia to promote gender equality, to protect the rights of women and children, and to implement a strategy on the integration of the Roma community.

689. The Islamic Republic of Iran noted that Slovakia had not supported the two recommendations it had made. It remained concerned about the situation of human rights in Slovakia and emphasized the need for improvements concerning, among others, the degrading and ill-treatment of persons with disabilities, particularly persons with psychological disabilities, and the discrimination against and intimidation of persons belonging to minorities, including Roma, Muslims and persons of African descent.

690. Iraq welcomed the acceptance by Slovakia of the three recommendations made by Iraq on combating racial discrimination and eliminating obstacles to victims' access to justice, on continuing efforts to prevent the exploitation and trafficking of migrants, and on strengthening gender equality and the participation of women in the labour market.

691. Pakistan commended Slovakia for having accepted the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Pakistan. It expressed its appreciation for the efforts of Slovakia to protect children from violence.

692. The Russian Federation noted that Slovakia had supported the majority of the recommendations made during the review. It hoped that Slovakia would take effective measures to eliminate structural discrimination against Roma and all obstacles to the enjoyment of their economic, social and cultural rights.

693. Serbia noted with appreciation that Slovakia had supported the majority of the recommendations. It welcomed the collaboration of the Government with civil society, national human rights institutions and other partners with the aim of advancing the protection of human rights and implementing the recommendations from the universal periodic review. Serbia called upon Slovakia to harmonize the implementation of those recommendations with the measures taken to realize the Sustainable Development Goals.

694. Tunisia noted with appreciation the adoption of national strategies and laws to protect children from violence, and to combat violence against women, extremism and racial discrimination. It welcomed the acceptance by Slovakia of the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Tunisia.

695. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela noted with appreciation the efforts of Slovakia to modernize legislation to effectively combat racism and racial discrimination. It noted a rural development programme for 2014–2020 that included measures to increase the accessibility of water in villages.

696. Afghanistan noted with appreciation that Slovakia had supported the majority of the recommendations, including the two recommendations made by Afghanistan to prevent all forms of discrimination and intolerance and to ensure quality and inclusive education. Afghanistan commended Slovakia for its efforts to promote and protect human rights.

697. Algeria noted that Slovakia had supported the two recommendations made by Algeria to adopt preventive measures in order to combat increasing intolerance and radicalization and to adopt a human rights-based approach to disability.

698. Belgium noted with appreciation the acceptance by Slovakia of the recommendation made by Belgium to combat hate speech. It regretted, however, that Slovakia had not supported its recommendations to ratify the Istanbul Convention and to adopt a comprehensive programme for reproductive health and rights. Belgium considered those two recommendations important and it therefore called upon Slovakia to reconsider its position on those recommendations.

699. Cyprus noted with appreciation the efforts of Slovakia to promote gender equality. It commended Slovakia for having supported the recommendation made by Cyprus to develop an anti-discrimination strategy for schools.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

700. No other stakeholders made a statement.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

701. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 195 recommendations received, 176 had enjoyed the support of Slovakia and 17 had been noted. Additional clarification had been provided on another two recommendations, indicating which part of the recommendation had been supported and which part had been noted.

702. In conclusion, the delegation stated that Slovakia recognized the importance of human rights in the lives of people living in Slovakia and in the development of society in general. Slovakia remained committed to the protection and promotion of human rights at the national and international levels, and to the universal period review mechanism, which provided the Government with a great opportunity to share with other member States achievements and challenges in promoting and protecting human rights in Slovakia. The Government had taken seriously all of the concerns raised during the interactive dialogue and was committed to addressing those issues.

703. The delegation reiterated that, out of 195 recommendations, Slovakia had supported 176 recommendations, partially supported 9 recommendations and noted only 10

recommendations for further consideration. Slovakia would continue its full cooperation with other stakeholders, including civil society, towards the effective implementation of those recommendations. An inclusive approach to the promotion and protection of human rights would bring desirable results. Those partners had played an indispensable role in the efforts of Slovakia to elevate the human rights of people in the country.

Comoros

704. The review of the Comoros was held on 25 January 2019 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 Comoros 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.6/32/COM/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.6/32/COM/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.6/32/COM/3](#)).

705. At its 26th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the Comoros (see sect. C below).

706. The outcome of the review of the Comoros comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review ([A/HRC/41/12](#)), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also [A/HRC/41/12/Add.1](#)).

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

707. The delegation stated that, during the third cycle of the universal periodic review, the Comoros had received 177 recommendations. It had accepted 163 and its position regarding 14 recommendations had been postponed. After having extensively examined the pending 14 recommendations, the Comoros wished to share its position.

708. Concerning the recommendation contained in paragraph 119.1, on the abolition of the death penalty and the ratification of the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Government was against the death penalty. It had initiated the process for its abolition by having introduced into the new draft Penal Code provisions to that effect. However, because of the hostility of the majority of parliamentarians and the population as a whole, that recommendation had been noted. The Comoros added that, from the time independence had been gained, in 1975, until 2009, the death penalty had been applied only three times. In addition, since 2009, that sentence had not been applied at all.

709. Regarding the recommendations contained in paragraphs 119.2–119.6, the Comoros continued to consider sexual orientation as an area of privacy. Moreover, the delegation noted that there had been no reports of violence or discrimination against people on the basis of their sexual orientation or gender identity. Those recommendations had therefore been noted.

710. With regard to the recommendations contained in paragraphs 119.7 and 119.8, on freedom of religion, pursuant the Constitution, the membership and the attachment of the Comorian population to Islam constituted the basis of the construction of identity and social cohesion. However, insidious proselytism had threatened the fragile structure of the Comoros and risked endangering social and religious peace. Bearing in mind its duty to preserve the

Islamic religion practiced in the country, the Comoros had decided to take note of those recommendations.

711. With regard to the recommendations contained in paragraphs 119.9–119.11 and 119.13, on the elimination of the corporal punishment of children, it was a fact that families, and especially Koranic teachers, considered corporal punishment as indispensable and beneficial to the education of children. In the past, those punishments might have taken violent and traumatic forms. However, families no longer tolerated those excesses from which they themselves had suffered in their childhood. The authorities were also largely convinced of the harmful effects of such practices on the psychosocial development of children. However, before legislating on that issue, the Comoros would launch a widespread awareness-raising campaign, leading society to understand the need to ban corporal punishment. Pending the results of those awareness-raising actions, the Government had decided to take note of the related recommendations.

712. In relation to the recommendation contained in paragraph 119.12, concerning trafficking in persons and forced child labour, the delegation referred to the situation of domestic employees, stating that the Government condemned such practices, even if sometimes those placements allowed children of modest origins to continue their studies, which they would never have been able to do if they had remained with their families. Children selling peanuts and candies in the street worked for their parents and thus contributed to lightening the load on their families who were in a precarious situation. In rural areas, children participated in farm work for the same reasons, and the Government was not aware of children engaged in remunerated work outside the family. Nevertheless, the Comoros remained vigilant and intended to ban forced labour in all its forms. However, the Government considered that the manner to end those practices was through combating extreme poverty.

713. In 2015, the Government had enacted a law against trafficking in persons. The new Penal Code was awaiting its promulgation. Its Chapter XVI was devoted to transnational organized crime offences, including trafficking in persons. Moreover, Parliament had passed a law authorizing the President of the Comoros to ratify the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime. Thus, the Comoros had accepted the recommendation contained in paragraph 119.12.

714. With respect to the recommendation contained in paragraph 119.14, on child marriage and genital mutilation, the Family Code, which expressly banned child marriage, had been adopted. While it established the possibility of betrothal before the age of 18 years, article 14 provided that men and women younger than 18 years of age could not enter into marriage. Nevertheless, according to article 15, a competent judge could grant age exemptions for serious and legitimate reasons when there was the mutual consent of the future spouses. As a result, the Comoros had accepted the recommendation contained in paragraph 119.14. In addition, female genital mutilation was not practiced in the Comoros.

715. In conclusion, the delegation stated that all of the recommendations received had thus been studied with great attention by the authorities. The exercise had allowed the Comoros to reconsider its positions with respect to certain human rights and to accept some of the other recommendations received. The Comoros was willing to continue the dialogue.

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

716. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Comoros, 12 delegations made statements.

717. Djibouti congratulated the Comoros on the acceptance of almost all of the recommendations received during the State's third universal periodic review and it welcomed the acceptance by the Comoros of the two recommendations it had made. It wished the Comoros every success in implementing the recommendations accepted, and it recommended the adoption of the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on the Comoros.

718. Egypt commended the Comoros for the recommendations accepted, including those from Egypt on women's rights and the right to work. It appreciated the efforts made by the State to improve the human rights situation at all levels. It wished the Comoros every success in implementing the recommendations accepted and it recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on the Comoros.

719. Ethiopia thanked the Comoros for having accepted several recommendations, including its own concerning women's participation in political and public life and their representation in decision-making bodies, and the mobilization of resources for the improvement of the prison system in general and prison conditions in particular. It encouraged the Comoros to take all the measures necessary to implement the recommendations accepted. It recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on the Comoros.

720. India noted that the Comoros had accepted 163 of the 177 recommendations received. It appreciated that the Comoros had accepted its recommendations. It also noted the efforts made by the Comoros to consolidate its social policy in favour of children, women and persons with disabilities. India understood that the Comoros had focused on the recommendations that would require education and awareness, considering the priorities of its people. India recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on the Comoros and it wished the State every success in implementing the recommendations accepted.

721. Iraq welcomed the acceptance by the Comoros of the recommendations, including those relating to the strengthening of the judicial system and efforts to ensure compliance with the State's obligations under international human rights instruments. Iraq recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on the Comoros. It also recommended that the Comoros implement the recommendations accepted in accordance with the State's international obligations.

722. Libya thanked the Comoros for its active participation in the universal periodic review process and its commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights. It commended the progress made by the Comoros through the ratification of the main human rights instruments, such as the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. It recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on the Comoros.

723. Madagascar congratulated the Comoros on the recommendations accepted and wished the State every success in their implementation. It welcomed the achievements of the Comoros in the areas of health and education, the empowerment of women and young people, and the protection of children. It commended the Comoros for its acceptance of the recommendation to receive special procedure mandate holders and it encouraged the Government to continue its cooperation. It invited the Human Rights Council to adopt the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on the Comoros.

724. Mali noted the acceptance by the Comoros of most of the recommendations, including its own to bring detention centres into compliance with international standards. Nevertheless, Mali had noted that, despite the willingness and efforts of the Comorian authorities, detention conditions remained challenging due to a lack of adequate resources. Mali called upon partners to support the efforts of the Comoros to improve prison conditions and it wished the Comoros every success in the implementation of the recommendations accepted.

725. Mauritania welcomes the acceptance by the Comoros of the majority of the recommendations made. It welcomed the State's commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights, as well as the various measures taken to develop the education, health and environment sectors. It also welcomed the ratification by the Comoros of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. It wished the Comoros every success in implementing the recommendations accepted and recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on the Comoros.

726. Morocco welcomed the ratification by the Comoros of international human rights instruments, the measures taken to eliminate violence and discrimination against women and the awareness-raising campaigns to promote women's participation in decision-making positions. Morocco wished the Comoros success in the implementation of the recommendations supported during the State's third review.

727. Senegal welcomed the ratification by the Comoros of some human rights instruments, including the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and its Optional Protocol and the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. Senegal appreciated the progress made by the Comoros to promote economic and social development, to reduce poverty, and to adopt a national health policy and measures to strengthen educational infrastructures. Senegal encouraged the Comoros to accelerate the nomination of members of the National Commission for Human Rights and Freedoms in conformity with the Paris Principles.

728. Serbia commended the steps taken by the Comoros to provide universal access to education and health care, and the adoption of a national youth policy. It welcomed the revision of the Constitution, which represented an important step forward in promoting, protecting and respecting human rights. Serbia valued the role played and the activities conducted by the National Commission for Human Rights and Freedoms, and it supported the continuation of the work of the Commission.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

729. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Comoros, one other stakeholder made a statement.

730. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme welcomed the adoption of the law on gender parity and the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. However, it remained concerned about the restrictions imposed on the media and on freedom of religion, prison overcrowding, the trafficking of migrants, the exploitation of children and the high number of child marriages. It recommended that the Comoros immediately release all political prisoners. It also called upon the international community to support the Comoros in its efforts to eliminate poverty and to protect human rights.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

731. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 177 recommendations received, 165 had enjoyed the support of the Comoros and 12 had been noted.

732. The delegation thanked the members of the Human Rights Council and the organizations that had taken the floor for their support. The delegation highlighted the fact that, for the first time in the history of the Comoros, a woman had been elected Governor of the most important island of the Comoros, and in addition a woman was the President of the National Commission for Human Rights and Freedoms. The National Assembly had approved the ratification of the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, as a response to the recommendations received during the third universal periodic review. The Comoros was committed to continuing its progress in the implementation of the recommendations with the support of the international community.

North Macedonia

733. The review of North Macedonia was held on 24 January 2019 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 North Macedonia 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.6/32/MKD/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.6/32/MKD/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.6/32/MKD/3](#)).

734. At its 26th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of North Macedonia (see sect. C below).

735. The outcome of the review of North Macedonia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review ([A/HRC/41/11](#)), the views of the State under Review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also [A/HRC/41/11/Add.1](#)).

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

736. The delegation of North Macedonia stated that, during the past few months, there had been a number of consultations with government institutions on all of the 169 recommendations received during the third cycle of the universal periodic review. The universal periodic review outcome had also been discussed at the meeting of the intersectoral body for human rights held on 2 May 2019, chaired by the Minister for Foreign Affairs. The outcome of that process had shown that the vast majority of the recommendations had enjoyed the full support of the Government and just two had not enjoyed its support. As a result, most of the recommendations accepted were being implemented, some had already been implemented and a few were yet to start to be implemented.

737. A number of recommendations were related to the Ombudsman Institution, the focus being its accreditation with A status in line with the Paris Principles. In 2016, amendments to the law on the Ombudsman had been adopted to fulfil the criteria for A status. The law had been harmonized with the Paris Principles through the introduction of a pluralistic approach in the appointment of managerial positions in the institution and the financial independence of the Ombudsman Institution.

738. The judicial sector reform strategy for 2017–2022 continued to be implemented and the Government had adopted the first annual report on its implementation in March 2019. Amendments to the Law on Courts and the new Law on the Judicial Council had been adopted in full compliance with the recommendations of the European Commission for Democracy through Law.

739. The new Law on Prevention of and Protection against Discrimination had been published in the Official Gazette of the Republic of North Macedonia on 22 May 2019. As a result, Parliament had published and opened a public competition for the election of new members of the commission for the prevention of and protection against discrimination. The procedure under the public competition was still underway. It is expected that the new commission would start working in September 2019. Appropriate premises had been provided for the new commission, and the budget of the commission had been tripled for 2019. The Ministry of Labour and Social Policy was preparing an analysis of the degree of alignment of national legislation with the new Law on Prevention of and Protection against Discrimination. The Ministry of Labour and Social Policy had concluded a memorandum of cooperation with civil society organizations, covering a period until 2021 and focused on delivering training for the public sector on non-discrimination and on fighting hate speech. Training was already underway.

740. The Government of North Macedonia repeatedly condemned all forms of hate speech regardless of the individuals who had expressed it or of the targeted individuals and groups.

741. The new Law on Prevention of and Protection against Discrimination introduced sexual orientation and gender identity as grounds of discrimination. Furthermore, a number of laws, which were part of the new social reform, included sexual orientation and gender identity and provided mechanisms for protection against discrimination on those grounds. On 29 June, the first Skopje pride had been held and it had been attended by a number of public officials, including Members of Parliament and ministers. North Macedonia was planning to develop a national action plan on the advancement of the rights of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex community and to coordinate the signing of a regional declaration on the advancement of the rights of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex community.

742. There were activities underway for the implementation of the national action plan on the implementation of the Istanbul Convention. Under the national action plan, 5 new shelter centres would be opened for victims of gender-based violence, and 25 centres (shelters, counselling offices and crisis centres) would be established by 2023. In addition, efforts were underway for the implementation of gender-responsive budgeting, as well as training on strategic planning, and there were procedures underway for the establishment of a training centre for gender-responsive budgeting. A workshop was also planned for the fall of 2019, based on the recommendations from the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women and the universal periodic review recommendations on gender equality and non-discrimination. The workshop was expected to result in an action plan for the implementation of the recommendations.

743. The implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement remained the priority for the Government. The Agreement was referred to in the amendment to the preamble of the Constitution adopted on 11 January 2019. The adoption of the amendments to the law on government and the law on the organization of State institutions had been passed on 27 March. It provided the basis for the establishment of the new Ministry of the Political System and Intercommunity Relations.

744. In May 2019, the Government of North Macedonia had adopted the draft general strategy on the concept of “one society and interculturalism”. The main goal of the concept was to build a society based on equality and non-discrimination. The strategic areas of action were the legal framework, education, culture, youth, the media and social cohesion.

745. The national strategy for Roma 2014–2020 and action plans on education, housing, employment and health were being implemented. In order to solve the problem of persons not registered in the birth register, a draft law on persons without regulated civil status had been prepared.

746. A new law on the termination of pregnancy had been adopted in 2019. The new law ensured respect for the dignity of pregnant women, the rights to privacy, to information and to the confidentiality of personal and medical data.

747. In a consultative process involving all the relevant stakeholders, including civil society organizations and professional associations, a strategy had been drafted for the advancement of primary health care, accompanied by an action plan covering the period 2019–2023.

748. Comprehensive reforms had also been made in the area of social and child protection to fight against poverty, especially child poverty, through the adoption of amendments to the law on the protection of children and the law on the social security of older persons.

749. On persons with disabilities, in September 2018, the Government had adopted the *Timjanik* national strategy for deinstitutionalization 2018–2027. Its implementation envisaged measures and activities for the transformation of residential institutions and for moving beneficiaries into the community. A total number of 150 persons with disabilities would benefit from the service. During the school year for 2018/19, 300 teaching assistants had started providing children with disabilities with assistance in 34 municipalities.

750. Overcrowding in prisons was being resolved through the construction of new, and the expansion of existing, accommodation facilities for convicted and detained persons. Regarding the issue of corruption and ill-treatment in prisons, within the framework of the national strategy for the development of the penitentiary system 2015–2019, a special strategic goal was foreseen, establishing more effective mechanisms to deal with cases of the inadequate treatment of persons deprived of liberty and cases of corruption by employees of the penitentiary system.

751. The Directorate for the Execution of Sanctions would also begin preparing a new national strategy for the penitentiary system for the period 2020–2025. A strategy for the development of the probation service for 2015–2020 would also be developed. Regarding health care in prisons, the procedure for the inclusion of all health-care workers from all penitentiary institutions in the public primary health-care system had been completed.

752. The new Law on Prevention of Corruption and Conflicts of Interest had been adopted. In line with the new law, the new State Commission for the Prevention of Corruption had been established. Since its formation in February 2019, the Commission, on its own initiative or on the basis of applications received, had initiated a total of 308 cases aimed at the prevention of corruption, and decisions had been made for 44 cases.

753. The new Law on Free Access to Public Information had been adopted. It facilitated the exercise of the right of natural and legal persons to access public information. The new law also introduced the right to seek information about the incomes and expenditures of political parties.

754. The delegation of North Macedonia stressed that freedom of the media and freedom of expression remained of the utmost importance for the Government of North Macedonia. The main goal of the reforms in that area was to facilitate conditions for self-regulation, and to ensure media pluralism and non-interference in the independence of the media. Any reforms in that area had been and would be implemented in full cooperation with the representatives of media organizations and the media itself. The main activity in that field was the preparation of amendments to the Law on Audio and Audiovisual Media Services, mostly in the context of strengthening the independence, professionalization and financing of the public broadcaster (National Radio Television) and the Agency for Audio and Audiovisual Media Services.

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

755. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of North Macedonia, nine delegations made statements.

756. Oman congratulated the country on its national report and on having developed a particular method of cooperation with the universal periodic review. It noted that that universal periodic review had been held as part of a dialogue and it thanked North Macedonia for having accepted the recommendations of Oman.

757. The Russian Federation noted that North Macedonia had accepted the recommendations made, two of which had been from the Russian Federation. It noted progress in the area of human rights in accordance with United Nations mechanisms, but it expressed concern about the current deficiencies in the justice system of North Macedonia, which in its view was experiencing serious interference from abroad. It hoped that the recommendations accepted by North Macedonia during the universal periodic review would be duly implemented, which would allow the State to overcome other existing shortcomings in the area of human rights in the country.

758. Tunisia welcomed the recent developments since the beginning of the universal periodic review. It welcomed the new legislation to reinforce the legislative and institutional frameworks on human rights in line with the State's international obligations.

759. UN-Women encouraged North Macedonia to advance the comprehensive protection of the rights of women survivors of violence and to ensure quality support services. It noted with appreciation the efforts of the Government to seize new opportunities to promote and accelerate transformative change for gender equality and the improvement of the lives of

women and girls with a special accent on vulnerable categories. It reaffirmed its readiness to assist the Government in adopting and implementing a comprehensive strategy to eliminate discriminatory gender stereotypes that led to prejudices, and to tackle harmful practices against women and girls by engaging men and boys and promoting non-violent masculinity.

760. UNFPA complimented North Macedonia on the recognition of sexual and reproductive health rights and on having advanced their fulfilment through various achievements. As part of its country programme for 2016–2020, UNFPA had agreed to provide technical and other forms of support, contributing to the recommendations contained in paragraphs 104.69, 104.119, 104.122–104.124, 104.137 and 104.164, on health care for persons with disabilities, sexual and reproductive rights, mother and child protection programmes and the implementation of the Istanbul Convention.

761. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela highlighted the efforts made in relation to the new legal framework to combat discrimination, starting with the discussion on the draft law on that issue. It praised the measures adopted to protect victims of domestic violence, for example, the adoption of the first law on the prevention of and protection against domestic violence. It wished the Government every success in the implementation of the universal periodic review recommendations accepted.

762. Algeria commended the efforts made by North Macedonia to implement a number of initiatives, including the national strategy on equality and non-discrimination and the national action plan for the implementation of the Law on Prevention of and Protection against Discrimination. North Macedonia had accepted a large number of recommendations, two of which had been made by Algeria on the implementation of measures to ensure that the most vulnerable and marginalized groups were fully protected by the social security system, and on the adoption of measures to ensure that persons with disabilities had access to mobility aids and functional devices.

763. The Islamic Republic of Iran expressed concern about the continued practice of xenophobia, racial and religious discrimination against the country's minorities, including Muslims and Roma. It urged the Government to modify its policy of the forced deportation of migrants and refugees.

764. Iraq appreciated the acceptance by North Macedonia of its recommendations on the law on gender equality, on ensuring the rights of immigrants, on combating trafficking, and on promoting women's participation in political life and decision-making.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

765. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of North Macedonia, two other stakeholders made statements.

766. Action Canada for Population and Development welcomed the acceptance of the recommendations to address the promotion and protection of sexual reproductive health and rights, especially those relating to the availability and accessibility of medical abortion throughout the country, in line with the safe abortion guidelines of the World Health Organization, and to ensure the universal coverage of all costs relating to sexual reproductive health and rights and modern contraceptive methods. However, the drugs required for medical abortion were still not registered and not available on the market. The organization called upon the Government to make modern contraception accessible to all women in the country and to put it under the coverage of the national health insurance fund.

767. CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation welcomed the improvements in legislation and practice to promote civic space. North Macedonia had revised the legal framework to safeguard freedom of expression and opinion and to improve the general climate, particularly for independent journalists, broadcasting and the regulatory body. However, threats against independent journalists continued to be frequent. Since its previous universal periodic review, the Government had only partially implemented the eight recommendations relating to freedom of expression and opinion. The organization encouraged the Government to amend the existing legislation that undermined freedom of association, such as the Penal Code and the recently proposed law on lobbying. While the law on police had been improved, the law on public assembly still needed improvements.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

768. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 169 recommendations received, 167 had enjoyed the support of North Macedonia and 2 had been noted.

769. The delegation of North Macedonia thanked all of the intervening States, participating stakeholders, including civil society and other international organizations, and the troika. It reiterated the importance of media and judicial reforms for the Government of North Macedonia and its strong commitment to respect the recommendations received during the universal periodic review.

Cyprus

770. The review of Cyprus was held on 29 January 2019 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 Cyprus 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.6/32/CYP/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.6/32/CYP/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.6/32/CYP/3](#)).

771. At its 26th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Cyprus (see sect. C below).

772. The outcome of the review of Cyprus comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review ([A/HRC/41/15](#)), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also [A/HRC/41/15/Add.1](#)).

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

773. The delegation relayed the appreciation of the Government for the constructive engagement of other member States during the review. Cyprus was pleased to have received positive comments on the progress made to combat trafficking in persons, safeguarding the rights of migrants, promoting gender equality in all spheres of public and political life, and improving conditions in prisons. It also appreciated the constructive criticism.

774. Cyprus had carefully considered the recommendations it had received in consultation with the competent authorities and national independent monitoring mechanisms, including the Commissioner for the Protection of Children's Rights, the Commissioner for Administration and the Protection of Human Rights (Ombudsman), the Commissioner for Gender Equality and the Law Commissioner.

775. Out of the 188 recommendations received, Cyprus had supported 163, representing almost 87 per cent of the total received. It had partially accepted six recommendations, as it did not agree with part of the recommendations due to legal or constitutional obstacles. Cyprus had taken note of 19 recommendations that it was not in a position to implement on legal, constitutional or other grounds.

776. With regard to the recommendations that touched upon the consequences of the continued occupation and forced division of a part of Cyprus, the Government was committed to implementing citizenship legislation in an efficient, non-discriminatory and transparent

manner. However, there was no automaticity on that issue, irrespective of the nationality of the applicant. Concerning the standardization of geographical names, national legislation was aimed at discouraging and halting any arbitrary attempts to further change and destroy the historic, cultural and demographic character in the occupied areas of Cyprus.

777. Cyprus had continued to demonstrate serious and sustained efforts to combat trafficking in persons and had strengthened child protection measures. The Government had a comprehensive policy on gender equality, and in its commitment to implementing Sustainable Development Goal 5, it was focusing primarily on protecting and empowering vulnerable groups of women.

778. Cyprus was taking and supporting initiatives to increase women's participation in leadership and decision-making positions in public and political life, both in elected and non-elected bodies. Women had also been appointed to numerous high-ranking positions, including the Accountant General and the Law Commissioner. Furthermore, the position of women in the labour market had been advanced and the gender pay gap had been further reduced. At the heart of the efforts by Cyprus were also the implementation of Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) and the adoption of a national action plan on women, peace and security, which was in the final stage of preparation.

779. During the previous 18 months, Cyprus had recorded a 70 per cent increase in arrivals of irregular migrants and asylum seekers. Some asylum seekers entered Cyprus from the areas under the effective control of the Government, but mostly, and increasingly, from the occupied areas. Cyprus provided asylum seekers with assistance, expanded their employment options, and ensured free access to health services and education. Cyprus was working towards the implementation of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration and the global compact on refugees. It facilitated the integration of migrants into society by providing access to public education, free language courses and vocational training. The detention of migrants was a measure of last resort. Detention for longer periods occurred only when serious matters of public order and security were involved, and those detentions were reviewed on a monthly basis.

780. With regard to overcrowding in prisons, the Government had enacted legislation increasing the possibilities for conditional release, as well as electronic monitoring. It had also undertaken extensive prison reforms aimed at the rehabilitation and reintegration of inmates.

781. In implementing the strategic action plan for gender equality in education 2018–2020 and a national strategy and an action plan on combating the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children and child pornography, Cyprus attached particular importance to the rights of children with disabilities.

782. Cyprus was also unwaveringly committed to advancing the rights of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex community and had therefore accepted all the relevant recommendations. The process of establishing a national mechanism to promote multiculturalism, acceptance and respect for diversity, with the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons as an important component, was underway. As a new member of the Equal Rights Coalition and the European Governmental LGBTI Focal Points Network, Cyprus would benefit from the best practices of other participating States in order to safeguard the full equality of its citizens regardless of their sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression or sex characteristics.

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

783. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Cyprus, 13 delegations made statements.

784. Tunisia valued the developments achieved by Cyprus in the area of human rights and the efforts made to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It welcomed the national strategies and legislation on gender equality, the empowerment of vulnerable groups of women and combating trafficking in persons.

785. The United Arab Emirates valued the achievements in human rights at the national level and the range of measures taken, in particular on economic rights. They reflected the devoted will and tireless efforts of Cyprus that had started decades ago to promote and protect human rights, including institutional and legislative reforms and the implementation of its international obligations. That was bound to realize equality, social justice and equal opportunities.

786. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela commended the measures adopted by Cyprus to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals, as one of the first States to conduct a national review on the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It commended Cyprus for offering free education without discrimination, guaranteeing equal access for all children and promoting tolerance in its educational policy.

787. Viet Nam commended the achievements of Cyprus in promoting gender quality and the rights of vulnerable groups, and the decision to assume a leading role in the region to address the impact of climate change. Viet Nam hoped that Cyprus would take further actions to combat trafficking in persons and to improve the working conditions of migrant workers.

788. Afghanistan welcomed the fact that Cyprus had accepted the recommendations on the protection of victims of trafficking, asylum seekers and migrants, migrant workers and children, including the three recommendations made by Afghanistan on ensuring the continuous implementation of the national framework on combating trafficking in persons and advancing the protection of asylum seekers, refugees and migrant workers.

789. Algeria took note of the steps taken by Cyprus to ratify the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness and the approval of the Charter on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action. It noted that Cyprus had accepted the two recommendations made by Algeria to implement measures to facilitate access to health services by persons with disabilities and to improve the procedures for judging and detaining minors.

790. Bahrain appreciated the efforts made to promote and protect human rights, in particular on gender equality. It commended the fact that many policies and strategies on human rights had been adopted in line with international and regional standards, including the first national strategy on persons with disabilities and the second national action plan on persons with disabilities. Bahrain hoped that Cyprus would continue its efforts to combat trafficking in persons.

791. China thanked Cyprus for having accepted the recommendations made by China. It hoped that Cyprus would continue to promote economic development and improve the standard of living of its people in order to build a solid foundation for the enjoyment of human rights of its people, and implement policy measures to safeguard the rights of women, children, persons with disabilities and migrants.

792. Cuba recognized the wide acceptance by Cyprus of the recommendations received, including those made by Cuba regarding gender equality and the elimination of gender inequality. It urged Cyprus to continue efforts in the reduction of poverty and social exclusion and the negative effects of the financial crisis in different spheres of human rights in the country.

793. Egypt welcomed the promotion and protection of the rights of women and the efforts to ensure gender equality. It commended the acceptance by the Government of the two recommendations made by Egypt, on the implementation of a national action plan to combat trafficking in persons, and on maintaining efforts to ensure the empowerment of women and gender equality in all areas.

794. India noted that Cyprus had accepted the two recommendations made by India and it appreciated that Cyprus intended to act in accordance with the recommendations or that actions were already underway on the recommendations accepted and were currently being implemented. It also noted that Cyprus had partially accepted six of the recommendations on the ratification of or accession to a number of treaties.

795. The Islamic Republic of Iran noted that Cyprus had accepted the two recommendations it had made. It also noted that Cyprus had actively participated in the

universal periodic review process, which demonstrated the State's commitment to protect and promote human rights.

796. Iraq commended the acceptance by Cyprus of the two recommendations made by Iraq, on taking the necessary measures to promote the role of the national women's rights mechanism and on efforts to combat poverty. Iraq commended the acceptance by Cyprus of the majority of the recommendations received and it expressed the hope that those would be implemented in line with the State's international obligations.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

797. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Cyprus, three other stakeholders made statements.

798. United Nations Watch welcomed the progress made by Cyprus towards gender equality. It urged Cyprus to adopt the recommendations on the protection of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons from incitement to violence and to take further measures to prevent the exploitation of domestic workers. It recalled that the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights had expressed its deep concern regarding the massive destruction of cultural heritage sites in the northern part of Cyprus. It regretted that, due to the persistent division of Cyprus, the monitoring of and reporting on the human rights situation in the northern part of the island remained limited. It noted that the Government was unable to ensure the application of international human rights instruments in areas not under its effective control, which meant that the Government was unable to remedy the violations of freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and freedom of the press that were taking place in the northern part of the island. It urged continued dialogue between all parties with the aim of a peaceful settlement that would ensure full respect for human rights for all.

799. The International Fellowship of Reconciliation drew the attention of the Human Rights Council to the militarization of the island and stated that some 18,000 Cypriots were on active military service. The total number of troops on the island, including those from other nations, amounted to 56,000. Conscientious objection provisions in Cyprus were far from perfect. The organization drew the attention of the Council to paragraph 20 of the report of OHCHR ([A/HRC/41/23](#)), noting that it referred to poor information and difficulties of application deadlines. It also noted the punitive length of the service. It encouraged the Government and the de facto authorities in the northern part of the island to avail themselves of the report for the purpose of legislative review.

800. The International Humanist and Ethical Union welcomed the enactment of a law on civil partnerships for same-sex couples and the amendment to the Criminal Code to tackle hate speech based on gender and sexual orientation. It was pleased that Cyprus had accepted all of the universal periodic review recommendations on the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons and of women. However, it drew the attention of the Human Rights Council to the criminalization of religious insult and it recommended that Cyprus amend the Criminal Code to bring it into line with international and European human rights laws. It also noted that an official school textbook included a derogatory mischaracterization of atheist people and it asked the Government to provide information on the measures taken on that issue.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

801. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 188 recommendations received, 163 had enjoyed the support of Cyprus and 19 had been noted. Additional clarification had been provided on another six recommendations, indicating which part of the recommendation had been supported and which part had been noted.

802. The delegation underlined that Cyprus was committed to further improving its human rights record in all aspects and that respect for human rights was and would remain the top priority for the Government. The universal periodic review process and the recommendations received provided Cyprus with an excellent opportunity to reflect on what had been achieved and to set new goals for accomplishing more in the protection and promotion of human rights.

Continuous and renewed efforts were required to meet the constantly arising new challenges, as reflected in the great number of recommendations that Cyprus had accepted.

Eritrea

803. The review of Eritrea was held on 28 January 2019 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 Eritrea 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.6/32/ERI/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.6/32/ERI/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.6/32/ERI/3](#)).

804. At its 28th meeting, on 5 July 2019, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Eritrea (see sect. C below).

805. The outcome of the review of Eritrea comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review ([A/HRC/41/14](#)), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also [A/HRC/41/14/Add.1](#)).

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

806. The delegation of Eritrea stated that Eritrea supported the universal periodic review mechanism and considered it to be the most effective tool in promoting human rights globally. Eritrea welcomed the open, frank and constructive participation of many States and other stakeholders during its review.

807. The delegation thanked the member States for having recognized the efforts made by Eritrea in the implementation of the recommendations from the previous review and for their thoughtful, constructive and action-oriented recommendations. All of the recommendations had been considered on their merit, based on objectivity, constructiveness, relevance to the country's context, the needs and ideals of humanity, clarity and priority.

808. Eritrea had supported 131 recommendations and noted the remaining recommendations. The scope and content of the recommendations supported had covered the full range of the rights enshrined in the two most important international human rights conventions, namely the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Recommendations had been noted because they were framed in a prescriptive and presumptuous manner, failed to recognize and acknowledge the reality on the ground and the challenges faced by Eritrea, were presented in unqualified terms, or targeted important and highly valued programmes, including the national service. The association of the national service with forced labour was unwarranted and unacceptable, and it was an attempt at negating its critical role in national development and the survival of the country. In addition, there was a prevailing tendency to use the international human rights architecture for other objectives that underpinned some of the recommendations. There was also the tendency to focus on political and civil rights at the expense of economic, social and cultural rights. In addition, existing commitments to regional and international instruments and the State's legal, institutional and organizational capacity had also been taken into account. Nevertheless, the Government remained open to implementing any of the recommendations noted that, in its view, would advance the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

809. The implementation of the recommendations would be undertaken solely on the basis of national ownership. The strategy for the implementation of the recommendations would envisage consolidating ongoing efforts to create a solid architecture for the coordination and follow-up to the recommendations from the universal periodic review and from treaty bodies, and aligning those recommendations with the national goals in the framework of the action plan 2019–2023. It would also envisage focusing on innovative approaches and best practices and ensuring the availability of the resources necessary for the implementation of the recommendations. All of the relevant stakeholders would be involved in the formulation of the action plan.

810. The work of the universal periodic review coordinating body would be supported by concrete planning, continuous assessment, and formative and summative evaluations done in a systemic manner, maximizing the implementation of the recommendations from the review.

811. Since the review, the Government had initiated a new development road map. In addition, Eritrea had ratified the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182) on 7 June and engaged with the Human Rights Committee on the implementation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

812. The Horn of Africa was going through rapid changes with profound implications for the future of the region and the continent. The attainment of peace was the fruit of the resilience and sacrifices of the Eritrean people. At the regional level, Eritrea was working with other countries to build trust and move forward in consolidating peace and promoting mutually beneficial cooperation and partnership. That engagement was also extended to countries and organizations beyond its immediate borders.

813. The delegation emphasized that it was critically important to have objective and realistic expectations of Eritrea. In that vein, the context, needs and ideals of human betterment, as well as the progress made by Eritrea in the difficult 20 years, ought to be recognized. The use of the recent attainment of peace in the region by some member States to exert pressure on Eritrea while ignoring the objective reality in the country was unconstructive and unhelpful.

814. It was time for the Human Rights Council to gain a better understanding of the reality on the ground in Eritrea and to be mindful of the positive trajectory the country had embarked on, which should not be taken for granted. Eritrea needed the support and cooperation of the Council, founded on fair and just treatment.

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

815. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Eritrea, 12 delegations made statements.

816. Oman noted that the addendum submitted by Eritrea and thanked the delegation for the additional information provided in its statement. It also thanked Eritrea for having supported the recommendations made by Oman during the review.

817. Pakistan commended the Government of Eritrea for having supported the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Pakistan. It appreciated the efforts in the areas of education, health, political participation, the justice system and food security.

818. The Russian Federation noted that Eritrea had supported about half of the recommendations received. Despite the difficult situation in the country, Eritrea had taken measures to promote and protect human rights, which indicated its readiness to cooperate with international monitoring mechanisms. The Russian Federation encouraged Eritrea to continue to work to improve the penitentiary system and to reform legislation on the right to freedom of conscience and religion.

819. Senegal noted with satisfaction the willingness of the Eritrean authorities to strengthen positive actions for the promotion, protection and full enjoyment of human rights. The human rights efforts of the Government were visible in several areas, as illustrated by the positive actions and initiatives that had been taken to ensure food security and health measures,

poverty eradication, access to education and housing, and the empowerment of women and girls, among others.

820. The Sudan thanked Eritrea for the detailed presentation. It commended Eritrea for its commitment to the principles of human rights and for its participation in the review. It also commended Eritrea for having supported the recommendations made by the Sudan and for having committed to re-examine the recommendations that had been noted.

821. The Syrian Arab Republic welcomed the efforts made by Eritrea to strengthen the protection of human rights. It was grateful to Eritrea for having supported the recommendations that it had made. It commended Eritrea for the spirit of cooperation and positive dialogue during the review.

822. Tunisia welcomed the efforts made by Eritrea to promote the rights of women and children. It expressed the hope that the universal periodic review would open the door to the greater promotion and protection of human rights. Tunisia welcomed the fact that Eritrea had supported a large number of recommendations.

823. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland expressed disappointment that none of the recommendations it had made had been supported by Eritrea. It urged Eritrea to address the issues relating to the national service and to open its places of detention to organizations with expertise. It was encouraged by the State's support for the recommendations from other States concerning the rights to liberty and security of person, the right to a fair trial, efforts to improve the penitentiary system and the protection of detainee rights. It was further encouraged by the support for the recommendations on promoting freedom of religion or belief and the rights to freedom of expression and peaceful assembly. It noted that Eritrea had made limited progress in the implementation of the recommendations from the previous review. It recognized areas of progress, but it urged Eritrea to address its human rights situation.

824. The United Republic of Tanzania commended Eritrea for its continued commitment to the implementation of the recommendations supported. Eritrea should enhance food security by expanding irrigation systems across the country in order to further increase household and national food security. The State should also continue to invest in, and improve access to, good quality education across the board.

825. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela applauded the initiatives to improve the standard of living of the population in the areas of housing, education, health and public services. It valued the expansion of access to free health services in rural areas. It commended the progress made in ensuring access to safe drinking water, with 85 per cent coverage in rural areas and 92 per cent in urban areas.

826. Yemen welcomed the delegation of Eritrea and expressed appreciation for the national report, which provided an overview of the successes in the field of human rights. It appreciated the efforts made by Eritrea to promote and protect human rights in the country.

827. Afghanistan thanked the delegation of Eritrea for having conveyed its position on the recommendations from the review. It welcomed the decision by Eritrea to support the recommendations made by Afghanistan relating to reforming the national legal framework and strengthening access to education.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

828. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Eritrea, six other stakeholders made statements.

829. The East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project welcomed the support of the Government of Eritrea for the recommendations on ratifying human rights instruments, cooperating with OHCHR and guaranteeing women's rights, but it expressed disappointment at the refusal by Eritrea to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, to criminalize marital rape, and to accept requests for visits by special procedure mandate holders.

830. The Center for Global Nonkilling, in a joint statement with Conscience and Peace Tax International, congratulated Eritrea on having supported all of the recommendations on

freedom of religion. There was a lot of work to be done, people and religious leaders to be freed, and health-care centres to be reopened. It encouraged Eritrea to swiftly review its position regarding national and military services, to make sure that it was voluntary and of limited duration.

831. Human Rights Watch remained concerned about the fact that Eritrea continued to subject its population to widespread forced labour and imposed restrictions on freedoms of expression, opinion and faith. It expressed regret that Eritrea had not supported any of the recommendations calling for a reform of the country's indefinite national service and an end to forced conscription. It asked whether Eritrea would comply with international human rights law and the State's obligations arising from its membership on the Human Rights Council by unconditionally releasing all persons arbitrarily detained, ending the forced conscription of children, reforming the national service system and fully cooperating with the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea.

832. CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation welcomed the Joint Declaration of Peace and Friendship between Eritrea and Ethiopia, signed in July 2018. However, it remained concerned about the fact that the human rights situation in the country continued to worsen, that civic space continued to be severely suppressed, and that there were serious restrictions to freedom of peaceful assembly, expression and association. It noted with concern the closure of 20 health centres administered by Catholic churches and the arbitrary arrest of four Christian bishops.

833. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme commended Eritrea for the efforts made in the field of health education, the fight against child marriage and the fight against female genital mutilation. However, it deplored the restrictions imposed on the freedoms of expression and religion, the lack of independence of the judiciary, arbitrary detentions, prison overcrowding and the lack of cooperation with special procedure mandate holders. It urged Eritrea to immediately and unconditionally release all political prisoners and to grant special procedure mandate holders full and unhindered access to Eritrea.

834. The Maat Foundation for Peace, Development and Human Rights stated that Eritrea prevented national non-governmental organizations from participating in the universal periodic review process. Civil and political rights did not enjoy sufficient protection because of the lack of established institutions. It was difficult to access custodial services. The enforcement of economic and social rights had suffered a setback because of the economy of the country. Climate change triggered food insecurity. Children under the age of 18 years had been forced to undertake certain national service activities during their holidays, which Eritrea called social services.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

835. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 261 recommendations received, 131 had enjoyed the support of Eritrea and 130 had been noted.

836. In response to the comments, the delegation reiterated that the recommendations supported were broad in scope and content and covered the full range of rights, prescribed in the two most important conventions. In addition, a number of the recommendations noted could have been supported had they been framed in a constructive manner.

837. The decision by Eritrea to serve as a member of the Human Rights Council was motivated by the determination to do its part in advancing human rights through equal, shared and collective responsibility. Eritrea also aimed to ensure a balanced approach to all human rights issues and to advocate for full adherence to the key principles of non-selectivity, objectivity and non-politicization of human rights, and to eliminate double standards. The blanket argument that, as a member of the Council, Eritrea was expected to fulfil a particular set of standards was inaccurate.

838. There should be an objective assessment of the situation in Eritrea and the progress made by Eritrea, given its reality. There should also be a better understanding of the country's challenges and opportunities to promote progressive transformation, leading to the advancement of human rights.

839. The attainment of the full enjoyment of human rights was an ambition that continued to develop further as Eritrea achieved the most basic aspirations. For decades, the country's efforts had focused on establishing a society proud of its history, with its citizens progressively enjoying a better life and a promising future. That objective remained the main challenge, coupled with the commitment to fulfil the enjoyment of all human rights.

840. Eritrea was pursuing a human rights-centred development path that was critical for nation-building efforts. Like any other State, Eritrea faced challenges in all sectors, including in the human rights sector, which the Government was committed to addressing. Eritrea would work to ensure that the universal periodic review mechanism became an effective tool in strengthening the coordination of its national institutions, and it would implement the recommendations supported.

Dominican Republic

841. The review of the Dominican Republic was held on 30 January 2019 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 Dominican Republic 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.6/32/DOM/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.6/32/DOM/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.6/32/DOM/3](#)).

842. At its 28th meeting, on 5 July 2019, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the Dominican Republic (see sect. C below).

843. The outcome of the review of the Dominican Republic comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review ([A/HRC/41/16](#)), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also [A/HRC/41/16/Add.1](#)).

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

844. The delegation expressed its thanks to the delegations that had participated in the universal periodic review of the Dominican Republic, for all of the recommendations made and for having recognized the advances and achievements in human rights experienced by the country in recent years.

845. Of the 191 recommendations received by the Dominican Republic, 127 had been accepted, representing almost 70 per cent of those made to the country. The recommendations accepted by the Dominican Republic covered a wide range of themes, many already linked to the national agenda and others in the phase of implementation.

846. The commitment of the Dominican Republic to human rights was unconditional. At just four and a half months from the meeting of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, some of the recommendations accepted had been translated into initiatives and concrete actions, such as the implementation of the national human rights plan and the launch of the gender parity initiative, which promoted equality of work, business and leadership opportunities between men and women. Through that initiative, measures had been put in place to increase women's presence in the workplace, to identify and reduce gender wage gaps and to increase women's presence in positions of responsibility, in both the public and private sectors. Likewise, the Senate had approved the bill that had created the

comprehensive support system for the prevention, punishment and eradication of violence against women. The Directorate of Human Rights at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had presented the first semester report on the implementation of the national human rights plan, highlighting the following:

(a) The legislative branch was presented with a draft law on positive parenting for the promotion of the good treatment and prohibition of violent discipline of children and adolescents;

(b) A national campaign had been initiated to promote positive parenting, as a response to violence experienced by children and adolescents in the home;

(c) The Central Electoral Board had authorized people with physical disabilities unable to access polling stations to exercise their right to vote from their homes;

(d) On 7 July 2017, the Attorney General had remitted its considerations on the draft amendment of the Civil Code, in its articles 144 et seq., on child marriage, recommending the elimination of exceptions for contracting marriage before 18 years of age. Consequently, the Attorney General had maintained its position. It was noted that the aforementioned legislative amendment was currently under consideration in the National Congress;

(e) The Ministry of Labour had created a commission to unify criteria relating to domestic work in the country. The commission had arrived at the conclusion that, in the country, such work was regulated by the following norms: the Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189); the Labour Code of the Dominican Republic; and resolution 52-2004.

847. In terms of the recommendations relating to the excessive use of force, extrajudicial executions, violations on the part of security forces and arbitrary detentions, the delegation reiterated the commitment of the Dominican Republic to investigate those complaints.

848. Regarding the situation generated by judgment TC/0168/13 of the Constitutional Court, a special regime had been established through Act No. 169/14 for persons born in the Dominican Republic but not properly registered in the Dominican civil registry. The Dominican Republic had expressed, during all human rights reviews, that there was no statelessness in the country and that any case that might arise would be submitted and answered individually.

849. In terms of issues relating to migration, the delegation reiterated that the Government did not carry out arbitrary expulsions of migrants, but rather adhered to applicable international and national provisions.

850. It was in the interest of the Government of the Dominican Republic to provide, in the shortest time possible, the relevant instruments corresponding to the beneficiaries of Act No. 169/14. Through the national plan for the regularization of foreign nationals and the special naturalization of migrants, established through Decree No. 327/13, actions had been carried out free of charge by the Ministry of Interior and Police to regularize 260,241 people of 116 nationalities, of which 97.8 per cent had been of Haitian nationality. The Dominican Republic guaranteed fair access to the naturalization process to all those who met the legal requirements. For the beneficiaries of Group B of Act No. 169/14, the process was minimal, simple and quick and, at present, the country was working on all of the requests received. The process for receiving requests for naturalization established in Act No. 169/14 was now finished.

851. In the Dominican Republic, all foreigners had their basic rights guaranteed; foreigners authorized to reside legally in the country, whatever their migratory status, were guaranteed all their rights in accordance with current legislation without the need for additional guarantees.

852. As a sample of the ongoing efforts of the Government of the Dominican Republic to provide migrants with documentation, the General Directorate of Migration had created a protocol to guarantee the effective renewal of previously acquired documents through the national plan for the regularization of foreign nationals and the special naturalization of migrants, in accordance with resolution 01/17 of the National Migration Council. That

protocol had been executed in four phases over one year, with advertising being one of the phases. For the optimum development of the process and to create better awareness for the beneficiary population, civil society and international organizations had participated in supporting the dissemination of the advertising campaign and supporting the beneficiaries through the process. That had made it possible to reach, through multiple channels, migrants favoured by migratory regularization, and gave everyone the opportunity to preserve their migratory status through the renewal or change of category of the acquired migratory status. All of that demonstrated concrete actions on the part of the Dominican Republic to preserve the human rights of migrants, showing that, after the renewal phase had been completed, there were more than 209,000 foreigners with legal migratory status in the Dominican Republic. In each case the human rights of the migrants were respected.

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

853. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Dominican Republic, 12 delegations made statements.

854. Brazil recognized the efforts made by the Dominican Republic through the adoption of legislative and public policy measures in order to ensure the human rights consecrated in the Constitution of 2010. Brazil commended the Dominican Republic for having launched the national human rights plan and for the number of universal periodic review recommendations accepted by the country. Brazil reiterated its concerns about cases of statelessness and about the necessity to adopt additional measures to prevent HIV/AIDS in the country.

855. Chile noted that it had praised the Dominican Republic during the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review for its first national human rights plan, for having created a monitoring system for the implementation of the recommendations, and for having ratified the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty. Chile stressed the commitment of the Dominican Republic to strengthen the national human rights institution according to the Paris Principles.

856. China commended the Dominican Republic for its active participation during its third universal periodic review. It welcomed the State's achievements in promoting and protecting human rights. It thanked the Dominican Republic for having accepted the recommendations from China. It hoped that the Dominican Republic would continue to execute the Progressing with Solidarity programme aimed at combating poverty, achieving sustainable development, protecting the rights of women and children, and advancing in education.

857. Cuba was pleased with the ample number of recommendations accepted by the Dominican Republic during its third universal period review. It exhorted the Dominican Republic to continue to develop its positive public policies to promote women's rights and combat gender violence, and to pursue the implementation of social programmes aimed at eradicating poverty and broadening access to health and education services.

858. Cyprus thanked the Dominican Republic for having readily accepted the majority of the recommendations received during the State's third universal period review, and for the meaningful engagement of the Dominican Republic with the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review. It also commended the State's decision to accept the recommendations made by Cyprus regarding quality education and the promotion of the social inclusion of girls.

859. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea took note of the report of the Working Group and the additional information provided by the delegation of the Dominican Republic. It welcomed the acceptance by the Dominican Republic of many of the universal periodic review recommendations and the State's commitment to make further efforts in the field of human rights.

860. El Salvador noted positively the political will of the Dominican Republic to accept 127 recommendations during its third universal period review and to face some challenges connected with their implementation. It encouraged the Dominican Republic to continue to

cooperate with the universal human rights system and to strengthen inclusive public policies aimed at protecting the most vulnerable groups.

861. Haiti regretted that the Dominican Republic had noted the recommendations regarding migrants, statelessness and arbitrary expulsions. It noted with concern the position of the Dominican Republic against signing the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration. It reiterated its commitment to engage in cooperation with the Dominican Republic in order to find solutions regarding the questions of migrants and other fields.

862. India noted that the Dominican Republic had accepted as many as 127 recommendations of those received during the State's third universal period review, including the two recommendations made by India. It appreciated the efforts made by the Dominican Republic to guarantee the enjoyment of human rights for its citizens, and the State's commitment to continue to cooperate with universal human rights mechanisms.

863. Iraq thanked the active and constructive participation of the Dominican Republic during the third universal periodic review. It appreciated that the State had supported two recommendations made by Iraq regarding combating smuggling and trafficking in migrants. It noted with appreciation the efforts made by the Dominican Republic regarding access to justice for women through the adoption of legislative measures.

864. Mexico recognized the advances made by the Dominican Republic aimed at elaborating draft legislation on non-discrimination, which would include discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. It noted with satisfaction that the Dominican Republic had accepted the recommendation made by Mexico regarding the legal and safe termination of pregnancy.

865. Morocco thanked the Dominican Republic for its acceptance of the recommendations made by Morocco with regard to pursuing efforts to improve access to adequate housing, and in schooling and school infrastructure development. It congratulated the Dominican Republic on having launched the national human rights plan 2018–2022 and on the State's first evaluation report, presented in June 2019 by the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

866. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Dominican Republic, eight other stakeholders made statements.

867. Plan International commended the commitment made by the Dominican Republic to implement the recommendations regarding combating violence against women and children. It welcomed the commitment of the Ministry of Education to adopt public policies for gender equality in the educational system. It congratulated the Dominican Republic on having launched the national plan for the reduction of adolescent pregnancy 2019–2023. It welcomed the acceptance by the Dominican Republic of the recommendations on combating trafficking in children, raising the minimum age of marriage to 18 years and providing the National Council for Children and Adolescents with adequate resources.

868. The International Planned Parenthood Federation welcomed the fact that the Dominican Republic had supported the recommendations received on providing resources for the implementation of a strategic plan on reducing adolescent pregnancies, on legislation on violence against women, and on decriminalizing abortion in certain situations. It also welcomed the fact that the Dominican Republic had taken measures to implement certain recommendations, such as the departmental order by the Ministry of Education on incorporating a gender perspective into national education.

869. The Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches expressed concern about statelessness in the Dominican Republic. It noted that, in 2014, several recommendations to address that issue had been made and regrettably, once again, the Dominican Republic had noted them during the third cycle. It welcomed the acceptance of the recommendations contained in paragraphs 94.160 and 94.162, but it was concerned about persons born before 2010 who had been left in "legal limbo" regarding their right to nationality. It argued that those persons risked being denied access to registration for basic services and being deported to other countries that they did not know or with which

they had no link. It urged the authorities to respect the right to a nationality of those at risk of becoming stateless and to implement all of the recommendations that would ensure that.

870. The Center for Global Nonkilling congratulated the Dominican Republic on its effort to address the birth registration issue. It noted with some regret that, although the Dominican Republic had committed itself to ratify the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, no recommendation to that end had been made to the State. The Dominican Republic had declined the ratification of other human rights treaties, which included the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, stating that it was preparing the means needed to implement those recommendations. It wished to see those ratifications occur before the next passage of the Dominican Republic in the universal periodic review process.

871. Amnesty International welcomed the acceptance by the Dominican Republic of the recommendations to fight all forms of discrimination, including the approval of a comprehensive anti-discrimination bill. It called upon the authorities to ensure that civil society would be consulted widely regarding such a law. It welcomed the acceptance by the Dominican Republic of those recommendations aimed at enhancing the protection of sexual and reproductive rights. It noted that, although the Government had committed to investigating human rights violations carried out by law enforcement officers, it was regrettable that the State had rejected specific recommendations to guarantee access to justice for victims and to end impunity. It urged the Dominican Republic to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

872. Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers noted its disappointment with the response of the Dominican Republic to the recommendation from Chile on the promotion of a national action plan on business and human rights. The national human rights plan could not replace the development of a policy strategy to protect people against human rights abuses by businesses, as observed in the eastern region. The Dominican Republic had to take concrete action in order to combat impunity, including by ensuring that the victims had access to justice. It regretted the State's response to the recommendation on statelessness and the right to nationality of children and adolescents. It urged the authorities to recognize the important role of civil society in monitoring respect for human rights.

873. Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, in a joint statement with the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development, stated that it appreciated the acceptance of several recommendations by the Dominican Republic relating to the rights of children, women and migrants, especially those of Haitian origin. The organization remained concerned regarding the quality of education, the rights of women and adolescent pregnancies. It made recommendations in the areas of inclusive and quality education for all children, the protection of victims of racial or ethnic discrimination, the reduction of adolescent pregnancies, and the elimination of femicides and other forms of violence against women.

874. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme noted the efforts made by the Dominican Republic to tackle violence against women, eradicate child labour and regularize the status of people who could be stateless. It congratulated the Dominican Republic on having ratified the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty and the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict. It commended the adoption of the first national human rights plan and the creation of a national system for monitoring human rights recommendations. It remained concerned about the racial discrimination and precarious situations faced by some migrants, refugees and asylum seekers. It encouraged the Dominican Republic to consider ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, the Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons and the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

875. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 191 recommendations received, 127 had enjoyed the support of the Dominican Republic and 64 had been noted.

876. Lastly, the delegation reiterated its recognition of and gratitude for the work of the troika, made up of Peru, Qatar and Togo, and the secretariat of the universal periodic review for its support and professionalism. In addition, the delegation extended its gratitude for the work of the interpretation staff, without whose support it would not have been possible to present the report.

Cambodia

877. The review of Cambodia was held on 30 January 2019 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 Cambodia 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.6/32/KHM/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.6/32/KHM/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.6/32/KHM/3](#) and [Corr.1](#)).

878. At its 28th meeting, on 5 July 2019, the Human Rights Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Cambodia (see sect. C below).

879. The outcome of the review of Cambodia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review ([A/HRC/41/17](#)), the views of the State under review concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions contained therein and the State's voluntary commitments and replies to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group and that were presented before the adoption of the outcome by the Human Rights Council in plenary session (see also [A/HRC/41/17/Add.1](#)).

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

880. The delegation of Cambodia reaffirmed its Government's support for the universal periodic review mechanism. It greatly appreciated the constructive engagement and diverse cross-regional participation in its review. It also appreciated the broad spectrum of topics raised during the review, ranging from economic, social and cultural rights, to civil and political rights.

881. The delegation stressed that, during the interactive dialogue, 73 delegations had made 198 recommendations to Cambodia. After an in-depth discussion and consultation with all the relevant line ministries, institutions and other stakeholders, Cambodia had decided to accept 173 recommendations, tantamount to nearly 88 per cent, and to take note of 25 recommendations.

882. Cambodia had actually wished to accept all the recommendations made by all friendly countries, but some recommendations had been noted because of their wording and nature, which did not reflect the real situation in Cambodia and the efforts of the Government. In addition, some other recommendations could not be implemented, as they were against the Constitution and national legislation of Cambodia and had been made for political reasons and a political agenda.

883. As for the 173 recommendations accepted, Cambodia would take all the appropriate measures based on its ways, means and resources available to implement them in order to

better promote, protect and respect the rights of Cambodian citizens, which had been improved tremendously during recent years. That high number of recommendations accepted also further reflected the strong commitment that the Government had made and continued to make, as well as its seriousness, towards the promotion and protection of human rights.

884. However, while the country had shown clear commitment to implement and create awareness of human rights, Cambodia regretted to hear the numerous issues raised that did not truly represent the situation on the ground, especially in the areas of civil and political rights. It expressed disappointment to have seen the recent news release, delivered on 19 June 2019 by OHCHR in Geneva, in which the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Cambodia, Rhona Smith, and the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, David Kaye, had fallaciously alleged that the application of law and order by law enforcement officers was aimed at silencing political opponents and restricting the right to freedom of expression online and offline.

885. Actually, the recent legal action against members of the former opposition party by local and court authorities was an attempt to enforce the rule of law against the violators, who tried to exempt themselves from law and justice on the ground that they were simply promoting different voices in different ways with malicious intention. The political rhetoric full of incitement, hatred, discrimination, violence, harassment, abuses, social riot appeal, calls for support of illegal movement, organization and rebellion against a legitimately elected Government made by those members of the former opposition party so far was not the right to freedom of expression and opinion. It was an illegal act and must face criminal liability in accordance with the criminal law of Cambodia. If that trend were left unchecked, it would end up in the way that freedom of expression and opinion was distorted and twisted to undermine the rule of law, human rights and democracy once and for all.

886. In a democratic country upholding human rights and adhering to the rule of law, all Cambodian citizens were treated equally before the law regardless of their political affiliation, profession, social status or past. Each and every person was legally accountable not because of who they were but because of what offences they had committed.

887. In that regard, Cambodia would continue to work closely with the relevant stakeholders in a collaborative manner in accordance with the established law, in order to safeguard the interests of both the majority of its citizens and also those from minority and marginal groups. Cambodia took note of all the statements and the concerns expressed and it hoped that they would abide by principles and stop politicizing issues of concern. The country would not accept those politically driven recommendations and statements that were based on biases with complete disregard for facts and the State's national conditions.

888. The delegation reaffirmed that its Government attached great importance to the universal periodic review and it would continue to uphold its principles with its non-confrontational, non-politicized and non-selective approach. Cambodia encouraged members of the Human Rights Council to view the State's significant progress in an objective manner while adhering to constructive dialogue and cooperation. In particular, Cambodia resolutely opposed the practice of using human rights as a pretext to interfere in the internal affairs of others and to undermine their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

889. As a follow-up to the adoption of the report, the Cambodian Human Rights Committee and OHCHR in Cambodia would work together to organize workshops and other programme activities to disseminate all of the recommendations accepted to all the relevant line ministries and institutions for implementation. The Cambodian Human Rights Committee would also monitor the implementation of those recommendations and report back to the Human Rights Council either in the midterm review if possible or in the next cycle of the review.

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

890. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Cambodia, 13 delegations made statements.

891. The Russian Federation noted with satisfaction that Cambodia had accepted the majority of the recommendations, including the two from the Russian Federation. It noted the efforts made by the Government focusing on combating extreme poverty, ensuring sustainable development, and improving access to health care and education.

892. Senegal welcomed the efforts of the Government to promote and protect human rights, especially through the establishment of national mechanisms to combat torture and other forms of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, the launching of a campaign against child labour and a national action plan to 2025 to eliminate the worst forms of child labour.

893. Singapore commended Cambodia for its constructive participation in the universal periodic review process and for having accepted approximately 85 per cent of the 198 recommendations received during its third review, including the two recommendations from Singapore. That was a notable increase from the proportion of recommendations accepted during its second review, and it demonstrated the political commitment of Cambodia to continue to improve the well-being and aspirations of its people.

894. Thailand welcomed the commitment made by the Prime Minister of Cambodia, in his address to the Human Rights Council, to uphold human rights, democracy and the rule of law. It encouraged Cambodia to consider a voluntary midterm report as a means to enhance dialogue with the relevant national stakeholders and sustain the momentum for the implementation of the recommendations.

895. Tunisia commended the steps taken to strengthen the legislative and institutional framework for human rights in the country. In particular, it applauded the establishment of a national mechanism to combat torture and the adoption of strategies for children in street situations, persons with disabilities and homeless children.

896. UN-Women commended the commitment of the Government to promote gender equality. It reiterated its support for national efforts to enhance access to justice by implementing approaches that limited the use of mediation and provided legal aid as part of a package of essential services for women and girls who experienced violence. It reaffirmed its readiness to support and assist Cambodia in the State's efforts to accelerate gender equality and implement the related universal periodic review recommendations.

897. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland recognized that some positive steps had been taken by Cambodia, including the renewal of the memorandum of understanding with OHCHR, the removal of the requirement for non-governmental organizations to give the local authority three days' notification of activity, and the commitment to end trafficking in persons and forced labour. However, it remained gravely concerned by restrictions placed on freedoms of expression, association and peaceful assembly. It urged Cambodia to release Kem Sokha and to ensure that he, and the remaining 108 banned former Cambodia National Rescue Party politicians, could freely engage in political activity.

898. UNFPA commended the Government for having integrated comprehensive sexuality education as part of the education curriculum reform, and it advocated for increased investments in education and services, particularly in comprehensive sexuality education to help to empower women and youth to make informed reproductive health choices and trigger long-term behavioural changes towards sexuality and gender relations. It expressed its readiness to support the Government to develop its first national gender policy and its five-year gender strategy 2019–2023, with a focus on preventing and addressing all forms of violence against women and enhancing women's access to the minimum standards of health-care and other services, such as multisectoral coordination mechanisms to respond to the needs of gender-based violence survivors.

899. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela valued the country's economic growth of 7 per cent per annum over the past few decades and it was pleased that the poverty rate had declined from 53.2 per cent in 2004 to 13.5 per cent in 2015 through the significant increase in the minimum wage for workers and the strengthening of the social security system in favour of vulnerable groups. It recommended the adoption of the report on Cambodia.

900. Viet Nam noted that the high ratio and large spectrum of the recommendations accepted illustrated the strong commitment of the Government of Cambodia to the promotion and protection of human rights at present and in the future. It expressed its readiness to further cooperation with Cambodia, not only in exchanging national experiences on the protection and promotion of human rights but also in collaborating on joint efforts relating to United Nations human rights mechanisms and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations.

901. Algeria noted with satisfaction the establishment of a national mechanism for the prevention of torture and the adoption of laws to protect the rights of persons with disabilities and children against degrading treatment, forced labour and sexual abuse.

902. Belgium welcomed the fact that Cambodia had committed to ratifying the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty, in line with the provisions of its Constitution, which prohibited the application of the death penalty. It stressed that that important commitment strengthened the global movement towards the universal abolition of the death penalty.

903. The Plurinational State of Bolivia recognized that Cambodia was now an exporting country and one of the fastest expanding economies, with a remarkable track record in poverty reduction and improving social indicators. It expressed its gratitude to Cambodia for having taken into account its recommendations to give continuity to initiatives that facilitated the supply of clean water, and to strengthen land policies to ensure gender equality and equity. It recommended that the Human Rights Council adopt the report on Cambodia.

3. General comments made by other stakeholders

904. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Cambodia, eight other stakeholders made statements.

905. The International Lesbian and Gay Association called upon Cambodia to work with the relevant stakeholders to fully implement the recommendations specifically relating to sexual orientation, gender identity and expression and sex characteristics rights, and sexual and reproductive health and rights, with a view to enabling marriage equality for same-sex couples, enacting laws and policies protecting lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer persons from discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity and expression and sex characteristics, and introducing legislation allowing legal gender recognition for transgender persons. It encouraged Cambodia to continue to strengthen its ongoing efforts towards the effective implementation of a new comprehensive sexuality education curriculum in schools.

906. The International Federation for Human Rights Leagues stated that, despite having accepted 87 per cent of the recommendations, Cambodia was effectively a one-party State where the ruling party controlled the legislative and executive branches and consistently exerted undue influence on the judiciary. In addition, it expressed its concern about the refusal of Cambodia to commit to the release of those who had been arbitrarily detained on politically motivated charges. It highlighted that the failure to accept the recommendations calling upon the Government to issue a standing invitation to all United Nations special procedures for country visits illustrated the selective engagement of the Government with the United Nations system.

907. The International Catholic Child Bureau noted that the school system in Cambodia lacked the resources to carry out its assignments. It hoped that the newly adopted strategic plan on education would build a strong leadership and momentum for an in-depth reform of the education sector. It called upon Cambodia to significantly increase the budget allocated to education; to develop ways and means to stop the high drop-out rate and ultimately provide those children with alternative solutions, such as vocational training; to train enough qualified teachers and strengthen the capacities of current teachers to improve the quality of education; to fight against violence in schools, including corporal punishment; and to guarantee effective access to education for children in remote and rural areas, including by building schools in those areas.

908. The Asian-Pacific Resource and Research Centre for Women highlighted that adolescent pregnancy remained a key issue in Cambodia. In addition, there was limited data

concerning abortion, which further complicated the issue. It urged Cambodia to ensure the implementation of the law on abortion; to address barriers that prevented adequate implementation, including stigma, negative beliefs and sociocultural taboos through increased awareness campaigns about and service provision of safe abortions, particularly among the marginalized; and to invest in evidence generation on abortion issues to better inform policies and programmes.

909. Human Rights Watch noted that the Cambodian population had been deprived of free and fair national elections in 2018, as Cambodia had turned into a one-party State. Furthermore, since its previous review, Cambodia had adopted new repressive legislation and amended other laws to further restrict freedom of expression and association. It remained concerned about the “fake news” and cybersecurity bills, which could mean the end of online freedom in the country, and about the Government’s claim that there were no political prisoners in Cambodia. It called upon the Government to reverse course and accept all of the universal periodic review recommendations relating to civil and political rights, including dropping all politically motivated charges, releasing political prisoners and amending or repealing repressive laws that restricted basic rights.

910. The Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development regretted that Cambodia had not accepted the recommendations to review the law on associations and non-governmental organizations in line with international standards. It remained concerned by the recent statements by the Government on the need for an anti-fake news law and an anti-cybercrime law, which would further limit the spaces available for dissent. It called upon Cambodia to accept the recommendations to reform those pieces of legislation to adhere to its international obligations as a first step towards the restoration of democracy and civic space.

911. CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation called upon Cambodia to take concrete steps to restore civic space, which had been drastically undermined in recent years. It expressed its disappointment that the Government had not accepted certain recommendations to amend or repeal repressive laws, including the law on political parties, the law on associations and non-governmental organizations, and the law on trade unions, as human rights defenders, activists and journalists were routinely subject to judicial harassment and legal action. It urged Cambodia to recreate an enabling environment for free and pluralistic media, including by ceasing the judicial harassment of journalists and the abuse of tax regulations to harass media outlets and associations.

912. The Association of World Citizens noted that firm measures of the international community were essential to persuade the Government of Cambodia to resume the path of democracy after the voluntary derailment during the election periods of 2013–2018. Such measures included heavy European sanctions on Cambodia. In addition, in order for the Government to gain the support and trust of the Khmer people and of the international community, it must take steps to end all of the illegal and unequal agreements signed with Viet Nam in 1979 and onwards and to implement the recommendations made by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Cambodia in 2012 concerning the reform of the electoral and judicial systems in light of free and democratic elections.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

913. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council stated that, based on the information provided, out of 198 recommendations received, 173 had enjoyed the support of Cambodia and 25 had been noted.

914. In its concluding remarks, the delegation highlighted that a number of issues raised had already been addressed and clearly elaborated in the State’s national report. It stressed that statements or recommendations that weaponized human rights as a tool to interfere in Cambodian internal affairs were neither accepted nor welcomed. In addition, the statements made by some stakeholders bearing a humiliating character should not have room in the Human Rights Council.

915. It reassured some delegations who might feel that their comments or concerns had not been fully addressed that their views would be conveyed to the relevant authority for consideration or action accordingly.

916. While appreciating the satisfactory achievements that Cambodia had made towards the development of human rights, democracy and the rule of law, the Government acknowledged that some issues remained to be addressed and some shortcomings needed to be improved. The Government remained committed to undertaking appropriate and realistic measures to ensure the full enjoyment of human rights in Cambodia.

917. The delegation acknowledged that the entire universal periodic review process had been beneficial to Cambodia, as it had provided an opportunity to evaluate the progress, achievement and shortcomings in the promotion and protection of human rights in the country. It also enabled the Government to continue to undertake the measures and concrete policies necessary to further improve its existing human rights framework.

918. The delegation reiterated the message of the Prime Minister during his statement to the Human Rights Council on 4 July 2019 that the Government was committed to adhering to human rights, democracy and the rule of law in accordance with the provisions of the international human rights instruments to which Cambodia was a party. However, Cambodia denied all acts of using human rights as a tool to interfere in the domestic jurisdiction of a sovereign State, which contradicted international norms, rules and standards.

B. General debate on agenda item 6

919. At its 28th meeting, on 5 July 2019, and its 29th meeting, on 8 July, 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: Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina, Bahrain, China (also on behalf of Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cameroon, China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe), Cuba, Denmark, Dominica¹⁹ (also on behalf of the Bahamas, the Comoros, Djibouti, Fiji, the Gambia, Kiribati, Madagascar, Nauru, Nepal, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Somalia and Vanuatu), Finland¹⁹ (on behalf of the European Union), India, Iraq, Nicaragua¹⁹ (also on behalf of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Rwanda, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Tunisia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)¹⁹ (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries with the exception of Colombia, Ecuador and Peru);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Georgia, Greece, Kenya, Libya, Montenegro, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: ABC Tamil Oli, Africa culture internationale, Alliance Creative Community Project, Alsalam Foundation, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, Association pour les victimes du monde, Center for Africa Development and Progress, 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, Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers, Edmund Rice International, Fondazione Marista per la Solidarietà Internazionale, the International Federation of ACAT, the International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development, the 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), Jeunesse étudiante tamoule, Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie, Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins

¹⁹ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of member and observer States.

avancés, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Solidarité agissante pour le développement familial, Tamil Uzhagam, Tourner la page, UPR Info, Villages unis, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, World Muslim Congress.

920. At the 28th meeting, the representative of Spain made a statement in exercise of the right of reply.

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Viet Nam

921. At its 24th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 41/101 on the outcome of the review of Viet Nam.

Afghanistan

922. At its 24th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 41/102 on the outcome of the review of Afghanistan.

Chile

923. At its 24th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 41/103 on the outcome of the review of Chile.

New Zealand

924. At its 25th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 41/104 on the outcome of the review of New Zealand.

Uruguay

925. At its 25th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 41/105 on the outcome of the review of Uruguay.

Yemen

926. At its 25th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 41/106 on the outcome of the review of Yemen.

Vanuatu

927. At its 25th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 41/107 on the outcome of the review of Vanuatu.

Slovakia

928. At its 26th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 41/108 on the outcome of the review of Slovakia.

Comoros

929. At its 26th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 41/109 on the outcome of the review of the Comoros.

North Macedonia

930. At its 26th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 41/110 on the outcome of the review of North Macedonia.

Cyprus

931. At its 26th meeting, on 4 July 2019, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 41/111 on the outcome of the review of Cyprus.

Eritrea

932. At its 28th meeting, on 5 July 2019, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 41/112 on the outcome of the review of Eritrea.

Dominican Republic

933. At its 28th meeting, on 5 July 2019, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 41/113 on the outcome of the review of the Dominican Republic.

Cambodia

934. At its 28th meeting, on 5 July 2019, the Human Rights Council adopted, without a vote, decision 41/114 on the outcome of the review of Cambodia.

VII. Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories

General debate on agenda item 7

935. At the 29th meeting, on 8 July 2019, the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and the State of Palestine made statements as the States concerned.

936. At the same meeting, 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: Afghanistan, Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Bahrain, Bangladesh, Chile, Cuba, Egypt, Iraq, Nigeria, Oman¹⁹ (on behalf of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf), Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Senegal, South Africa, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)¹⁹ (also on behalf of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba and Nicaragua), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)¹⁹ (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries with the exception of Colombia, Ecuador and Peru);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Namibia, Nicaragua, Oman, Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen;

(c) Observer for a national human rights institution: Independent Commission for Human Rights (State of Palestine);

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-Haq, Al Mezan Center for Human Rights, American Association of Jurists, Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies (also on behalf of Al-Haq, the Al Mezan Center for Human Rights, Conectas Direitos Humanos and Human Rights Watch), Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations, Defence for Children International, European Union of Jewish Students, Global Institute for Water, Environment and Health, Health and Environment Program, Human Rights Watch, Ingénieurs du monde, Institute for NGO Research, International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, International-Lawyers.org, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Kayan – Feminist Organization, Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture, Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, Palestinian Return Centre, Union of Arab Jurists, United Nations Watch, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, World Jewish Congress.

VIII. Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

General debate on agenda item 8

937. At its 29th and 30th meetings, on 8 July 2019, 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: Australia, Bahrain, Belgium¹⁹ (also on behalf of Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine and Uruguay), Belgium¹⁹ (also on behalf of Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, the Bahamas, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, the Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, the Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zimbabwe and the State of Palestine), Bolivia (Plurinational State of)¹⁹ (also on behalf of Cuba, Nicaragua and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Burkina Faso (on behalf of the French-speaking States members and observers), Cameroon, China, Cuba, Estonia¹⁹ (also on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway and Sweden), Finland¹⁹ (on behalf of the European Union), Georgia¹⁹ (also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and the State of Palestine), India, Iraq, Nepal, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Philippines, Tunisia;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Greece, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Libya, Netherlands, Russian Federation, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: ABC Tamil Oli, Action Canada for Population and Development, Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs, Action of Human Movement, African Agency for Integrated Development, African Green Foundation International, Allied Rainbow Communities International, American Association of Jurists, Asian-Eurasian Human Rights Forum, Asian-Pacific Resource and Research Centre for Women (also on behalf of the Afri-health Optonet Association, the Association for Women's Rights in Development, the Buddhist Tzu Chi Foundation, the Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network, the Center for Reproductive Rights, Centro de Promoción y Defensa de los Derechos

Sexuales y Reproductivos, Ecoforum of Non-Governmental Organizations of Uzbekistan, EMPOWER, EngenderHealth, FIAN International, Franciscans International, the Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries, the International Alliance of Women, the International Planned Parenthood Federation, the International Planned Parenthood Federation (Africa region), Make Mothers Matter, Movimiento Manuela Ramos, Plan International, the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Rutgers, the Society for International Development, the Swedish Association for Sexuality Education, the Swedish Federation for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights and Vaagdhara), Asociación HazteOír.org, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association culturelle des Tamouls en France, Association des jeunes pour l'agriculture du Mali, Association Dunenyo, Association for the Protection of Women and Children's Rights, Association pour les victimes du monde, Association pour l'intégration et le développement durable au Burundi, Association Thendral, Centre d'action pour le développement rural, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (also on behalf of Conectas Direitos Humanos), Ecumenical Alliance for Human Rights and Development, Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland, France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, Giving Life Nature Volunteer, Human Rights Council of Australia (also on behalf of the Human Rights Law Centre), Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, Ingénieurs du monde, Institute for NGO Research, International Human Rights Association of American Minorities, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Lesbian and Gay Association (also on behalf of the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, the Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development, Asistencia Legal por los Derechos Humanos, Association for Progressive Communications, Balance Promoción para el Desarrollo y Juventud, the Center for Reproductive Rights, Centre pour les droits civils et politiques, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales, Centro de Promoción y Defensa de los Derechos Sexuales y Reproductivos, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Conectas Direitos Humanos, the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, the East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, EMPOWER, Equitas International Centre for Human Rights Education/Equitas centre international d'éducation aux droits humains, Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland, Franciscans International, Front Line: International Foundation for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders, Fundación para Estudio e Investigación de la Mujer, the Global Network of Sex Work Projects, HelpAge International, the Human Rights Law Centre, the Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries, the International Bar Association, the International Commission of Jurists, the International Federation on Ageing, the International Humanist and Ethical Union, the International Human Rights Internship Program, the International Longevity Center Global Alliance, the International Service for Human Rights, Korea Women's Associations United, the Lesbian and Gay Federation in Germany, LGBT Denmark: National Organization for Gay Men, Lesbians, Bisexuals and Transgendered People, the Minority Rights Group, Muslims for Progressive Values, the National Association of Community Legal Centres, NGO Coordination post Beijing Switzerland, OutRight Action International, Pacific Women's Watch (New Zealand), Peace Brigades International Switzerland, People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy, the Regional Centre for International Development Cooperation Limited (By Guarantee), Rutgers, the Society of Catholic Medical Missionaries, the Swedish Association for Sexuality Education, the Syrian Center for Media and Freedom of Expression, the United Nations Association of the United States of America, the Universal Rights Group, Vaestoliitto – Family Federation of Finland, the Women and Media Collective and Women for Women's Human Rights: New Ways), International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of Allied Rainbow Communities International, Amnesty International, the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, the Center for Reproductive Rights, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, the European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Federation, Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland, the Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries, the Human Rights Council of Australia, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, the International Lesbian and Gay Association, the International Planned Parenthood Federation, the International Service for Human Rights, the Lesbian and Gay Federation in Germany, Nazra for Feminist Studies, OutRight Action International and the Swedish Federation for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights), Iraqi Development

Organization, Make Mothers Matter, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Mother of Hope Cameroon Common Initiative Group, Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés, Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale, Tamil Uzhagam, Tourner la page, United Nations Watch, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, Victorious Youths Movement, Villages unis, World Barua Organization, World Jewish Congress, World Muslim Congress, World Organization against Torture (also on behalf of the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, the International Lesbian and Gay Association, the International Service for Human Rights and Nazra for Feminist Studies).

938. At the 30th meeting, on 8 July 2019, the representatives of China, India and Pakistan made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

939. At the same meeting, the representatives of India and Pakistan made statements in exercise of a second 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. Interactive dialogue with a special procedure mandate holder

Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

940. At the 30th meeting, on 8 July 2019, the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, E. Tendayi Achiume, presented her reports ([A/HRC/41/54](#) and [Add.1–2](#) and [A/HRC/41/55](#)).

941. At the same meeting, the representatives of Morocco and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements as the States concerned.

942. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of the following national human rights institutions made statements: Equality and Human Rights Commission (England, Scotland and Wales) (also on behalf of the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission and the Scottish Human Rights Commission) (by video message), National Human Rights Council (Morocco).

943. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 30th and 31st meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Brazil, Cuba, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Tunisia, Uruguay;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Ecuador, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Malta, Myanmar, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Conectas Direitos Humanos, European Union of Jewish Students, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, Minority Rights Group, Sikh Human Rights Group, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Jewish Congress.

944. At the 31st meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

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

B. General debate on agenda item 9

946. At its 31st meeting, on 8 July 2019, and at its 32nd meeting, on 9 July, 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: Afghanistan, Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil (also on behalf of Chile, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Peru and Uruguay), Cameroon, China, Cuba, Egypt, Finland¹⁹ (on behalf of the European Union), India, Iraq, Nicaragua¹⁹ (also on behalf of Cuba, Bolivia (Plurinational State of) and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Nigeria, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), South Africa, Togo, Tunisia, Ukraine,

Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)¹⁹ (on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries with the exception of Colombia, Ecuador and Peru);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Armenia, Belarus, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Libya, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: ABC Tamil Oli, Action of Human Movement, Africa culture internationale, African Agency for Integrated Development, African Green Foundation International, Alliance Creative Community Project, Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association burkinabé pour la survie de l'enfance, Association des jeunes pour l'agriculture du Mali, Association for the Protection of Women and Children's Rights, Association pour les victimes du monde, Association pour l'intégration et le développement durable au Burundi, Centre for Gender Justice and Women Empowerment, China Association for Preservation and Development of Tibetan Culture, Conseil de jeunesse pluriculturelle, Ecumenical Alliance for Human Rights and Development, European Centre for Law and Justice, European Union of Jewish Students, Genève pour les droits de l'homme : formation internationale, Giving Life Nature Volunteer, Global Institute for Water, Environment and Health, Global Welfare Association, Godwin Osung International Foundation (The African Project), Health and Environment Program, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, Institute for NGO Research, Institut international pour les droits et le développement, International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, International Council of Russian Compatriots, International Educational Development, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International Human Rights Association of American Minorities, International-Lawyers.org, International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Iraqi Development Organization, Jeunesse étudiante tamoule, Kayan – Feminist Organization, Le pont, Liberation, Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association, Mother of Hope Cameroon Common Initiative Group, Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, Palestinian Return Centre, Prahar, Sikh Human Rights Group, Tamil Uzhagam, Tourner la page, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik, World Jewish Congress.

947. At the 31st meeting, the representatives of Bangladesh and Myanmar made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

948. At the 32nd meeting, the representatives of China and the Lao People's Democratic Republic made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

X. Technical assistance and capacity-building

A. Annual thematic discussion on technical cooperation in the promotion and protection of human rights

949. At its 34th meeting, on 10 July 2019, the Human Rights Council held, pursuant to Council resolution 39/18, an annual thematic panel discussion on technical cooperation in the promotion and protection of human rights. The meeting focused on the theme “Technical cooperation and capacity-building in the field of the human rights of older persons”. The report on the activities of OHCHR, the United Nations system and regional organizations to support States’ efforts to promote and protect the human rights of older persons (A/HRC/41/32), mandated by the same resolution, served as a basis for the panel discussion.

950. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel discussion. The Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Thailand to the United Nations Office at Geneva, Sek Wannamethee, moderated the discussion.

951. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: National Secretary for the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Older Persons, Ministry of Women, Family and Human Rights of Brazil, Antônio Fernandes Toninho Costa; Director of the Department of Health Promotion at the World Health Organization, Ruediger Krech; Head of the Implementation and Follow-Up Section, Department of Social Awareness and Communication at the Centre for Elderly Empowerment and Care of Qatar, Shaikha Ahmed al-Horeb.

952. The ensuing panel discussion was divided into two speaking slots, which were held at the same meeting. During the first speaking slot, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Australia, Brazil, China, Maldives¹⁹ (also of behalf of the Bahamas, Barbados, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Fiji, Haiti, the Marshall Islands, Singapore and Vanuatu), Singapore¹⁹ (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations), Slovenia¹⁹ (also on behalf of Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Montenegro, Namibia, Portugal, Singapore, Tunisia and Uruguay);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Indonesia, Nauru, Singapore, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: HelpAge International (also on behalf of the Association of Former International Civil Servants for Development, the International Association of Gerontology and Geriatrics and the International Network for the Prevention of Elder Abuse), International Lesbian and Gay Association (also on behalf of Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland), International Longevity Center Global Alliance (also on behalf of HelpAge International, the International Federation on Ageing and the International Network for the Prevention of Elder Abuse).

953. During the second speaking slot, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Bahamas, Chile, Egypt, India, Qatar, Senegal;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Albania, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Greece, Russian Federation;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l’homme, Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik.

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

B. Enhanced interactive dialogue on the oral reports of the Government of the Sudan and the Office of the High Commissioner

955. At the 32nd meeting, on 9 July 2019, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights and the Rapporteur of the Advisory Council for Human Rights at the Ministry of Justice of the Sudan, Osama Humeida, presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 39/22, their oral reports on progress towards the opening of a country office in the Sudan.

956. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 32nd and 33rd meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the participants of the enhanced interactive dialogue questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Cameroon, China, Denmark, Egypt, Eritrea, Iceland, Japan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Senegal, Somalia, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belgium, Botswana, Burundi, Canada, Djibouti, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ireland, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Luxembourg, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, South Sudan, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, Yemen;

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

(d) Observers for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: UNICEF, UN-Women;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (also on behalf of Physicians for Human Rights), Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, World Organization against Torture.

957. At the 33rd meeting, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights, the Rapporteur of the Advisory Council for Human Rights at the Ministry of Justice of the Sudan, the Director of Human Rights, Women and Children at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Sudan, Rahma Salih Elobied, and the Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative of the Sudan to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, Osman Abufatima Adam Mohammed, answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

C. Enhanced interactive dialogue on the report of the team of international experts on the situation in Kasai and the oral update

958. At the 33rd meeting, on 9 July 2019, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 38/20, the report of the team of international experts on the situation in Kasai ([A/HRC/41/31](#)). He provided, pursuant to Council resolution 39/20, an oral update on the situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

959. At the same meeting, the following made statements: Director of the United Nations Joint Human Rights Office in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Abdoul Aziz Thioye, on behalf of the 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, Leila Zerrougui; members of the team of international

experts on the situation in Kasai, Bacre Waly Ndiaye and Sheila B. Keetharuth; Minister for Human Rights of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Marie-Ange Mushobekwa Likulia.

960. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the participants of the enhanced interactive dialogue questions:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Australia, Cameroon, China, Czechia, Egypt, Eritrea, Senegal, Spain, Sweden¹⁹ (also on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Norway), Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belgium, Botswana, Congo, Estonia, France, Germany, Liechtenstein, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Switzerland;

(c) Observers for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: UNICEF, UN-Women;

(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, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Defence for Children International, Franciscans International (also on behalf of Caritas Internationalis, Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers and the Swiss Catholic Lenten Fund), International Federation for the Protection of the Rights of Ethnic, Religious, Linguistic and Other Minorities, International Federation of ACAT, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme, World Organization against Torture.

961. At the same meeting, the participants of the enhanced interactive dialogue answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

D. Interactive dialogue on the oral presentation by the High Commissioner on the situation of human rights in Ukraine

962. At the 34th meeting, on 10 July 2019, the Deputy High Commissioner presented, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 35/31, an oral update on the situation of human rights in Ukraine.

963. At the same meeting, the representative of Ukraine made a statement as the State concerned.

964. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 34th and 35th 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: Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Hungary, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belgium, Canada, Estonia, France, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovenia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International, Human Rights House Foundation, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", Institute for NGO Research, International Catholic Child Bureau, International Council of Russian Compatriots, World Federation of Ukrainian Women's Organizations.

965. At the 35th 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 the Central African Republic

966. At the 35th meeting, on 10 July 2019, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic, Marie-Therese Keita Bocoum, provided, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 39/19, an oral update on her report on technical assistance and capacity-building in the field of human rights in the Central African Republic.

967. At the same meeting, the representative of the Central African Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

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

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Australia, Cameroon, China, Egypt, Eritrea, Senegal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Gabon, Morocco, Portugal, Russian Federation;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Caritas Internationalis (also on behalf of the World Evangelical Alliance), Catholic International Education Office, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, Defence for Children International, International Federation for the Protection of the Rights of Ethnic, Religious, Linguistic and Other Minorities, International Federation of ACAT, International-Lawyers.org, Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme.

969. Also at the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

F. General debate on agenda item 10

970. At the 36th meeting, on 10 July 2019, the Deputy High Commissioner provided an oral update on the promotion and protection of human rights in Nicaragua, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 40/2, and an oral update on cooperation with Georgia, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 40/28.

971. At the same meeting, the representatives of Georgia and Nicaragua made statements as the States concerned.

972. At its 36th meeting, on 10 July 2019, and at its 37th meeting, on 11 July, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 10, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States members of the Human Rights Council: Afghanistan, Angola (on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina (also on behalf of Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay and Peru), Australia, Bahamas (also on behalf of Dominica), Bolivia (Plurinational State of)¹⁹ (also on behalf of Cuba, Nicaragua and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Brazil (also on behalf of Honduras, Indonesia, Morocco, Norway, Qatar, Singapore, Thailand and Turkey), Brazil (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries), Bulgaria, Cameroon, China, Croatia, Cuba, Egypt, Fiji (also on behalf of Barbados, Ethiopia, Lesotho, Mauritania and Seychelles), Finland¹⁹ (on behalf of the European Union), Gambia¹⁹ (also on behalf of the Bahamas, the Comoros, Djibouti, Dominica, Fiji, Kiribati, Madagascar, Nauru, Nepal, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Somalia and Vanuatu), Hungary, India, Iraq, Italy, Mexico, Pakistan (also on behalf of Algeria, China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic

Republic of), Myanmar, Nigeria, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zimbabwe), Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Spain, Thailand¹⁹ (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations), Tunisia, Tunisia (also on behalf of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, El Salvador, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation except Albania, Cameroon and Togo), the Philippines, the Syrian Arab Republic, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zimbabwe), Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)¹⁹ (also on behalf of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba and Nicaragua);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Algeria, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kenya, Latvia, Libya, Lithuania, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: ABC Tamil Oli, African Agency for Integrated Development, African Green Foundation International, Amnesty International, Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas, Asociación HazteOir.org, Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul, Association culturelle des Tamouls en France, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme, East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project, Ecumenical Alliance for Human Rights and Development, Giving Life Nature Volunteer, Global Welfare Association, Health and Environment Program, Human Rights House Foundation, Human Rights Watch, International Commission of Jurists, International Council of Russian Compatriots, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Iraqi Development Organization, Prahar, Réseau international des droits humains, Tourner la page.

973. At the 36th meeting, the representatives of Georgia and Israel made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

974. At the 37th meeting, the representatives of China, Costa Rica, Georgia and the Republic of Moldova made statements in exercise of the right of reply.

G. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Cooperation with and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights

975. At the 41st meeting, on 12 July 2019, the representative of Ukraine introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.9](#), sponsored by Ukraine and co-sponsored by Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Israel, Mexico, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Spain and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

976. At the same meeting, the representatives of Australia, Czechia, Denmark (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Iceland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made general comments on the draft resolution.

977. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil and Cameroon made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

In favour:

Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Rwanda, Slovakia, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Against:

Cameroon, China, Cuba, Eritrea, Philippines

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, India, Iraq, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Togo, Tunisia, Uruguay

979. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution by 20 votes to 5, with 22 abstentions (resolution 41/25).

980. At the same meeting, the representative of Ukraine made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Renewal of the mandate of the team of international experts on the situation in Kasai

981. At the 41st meeting, on 12 July 2019, the representative of Angola, on behalf of the Group of African States, introduced draft resolution [A/HRC/41/L.16/Rev.1](#), sponsored by Angola, on behalf of the Group of African States. Subsequently, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

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

983. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Denmark, on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council, made general comments on the draft resolution as orally revised.

984. At the same meeting, the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo made a statement as the State concerned.

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

986. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft resolution as orally revised without a vote (resolution 41/26).

987. At the same meeting, the representatives of Peru (also on behalf of Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Luxemburg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Uruguay) and Ukraine made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

Annex I

Attendance

Member

Afghanistan	Democratic Republic of	Philippines
Angola	the Congo	Qatar
Argentina	Denmark	Rwanda
Australia	Egypt	Saudi Arabia
Austria	Eritrea	Senegal
Bahamas	Fiji	Slovakia
Bahrain	Hungary	Somalia
Bangladesh	Iceland	South Africa
Brazil	India	Spain
Bulgaria	Iraq	Togo
Burkina Faso	Italy	Tunisia
Cameroon	Japan	Ukraine
Croatia	Mexico	United Kingdom of
Cuba	Nepal	Great Britain and
Czechia	Nigeria	Northern Ireland
Chile	Pakistan	Uruguay
China	Peru	

States Members of the United Nations represented by observersAlbania

Algeria	Dominican Republic	Libya
Andorra	Ecuador	Liechtenstein
Armenia	El Salvador	Lithuania
Azerbaijan	Estonia	Luxembourg
Barbados	Finland	Madagascar
Belarus	France	Malawi
Belgium	Gabon	Malaysia
Bhutan	Gambia	Maldives
Bolivia	Georgia	Mali
(Plurinational	Germany	Malta
State of)	Ghana	Marshall Islands
Bosnia and	Greece	Mauritania
Herzegovina	Haiti	Mauritius
Botswana	Honduras	Monaco
Brunei Darussalam	Indonesia	Montenegro
Burundi	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Morocco
Cambodia	Ireland	Mozambique
Canada	Israel	Myanmar
Chad	Jamaica	Namibia
Colombia	Jordan	Nauru
Comoros	Kazakhstan	Netherlands
Costa Rica	Kenya	New Zealand
Côte d'Ivoire	Kiribati	Nicaragua
Cyprus	Kuwait	North Macedonia
Democratic	Kyrgyzstan	Norway
People's	Lao People's Democratic	Oman
Republic of	Republic	Palau
Korea	Latvia	Papua New Guinea
Djibouti	Lebanon	Paraguay
Dominica	Lesotho	Poland
	Liberia	Portugal

Republic of Korea	Sri Lanka	United Arab Emirates
Republic of Moldova	Sudan	United Republic of Tanzania
Romania	Sweden	Uzbekistan
Russian Federation	Switzerland	Vanuatu
Serbia	Syrian Arab Republic	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
Seychelles	Thailand	Viet Nam
Singapore	Timor-Leste	Yemen
Slovenia	Trinidad and Tobago	Zambia
South Sudan	Turkey	
	Turkmenistan	

Non-Member States represented by observers

Holy See
State of Palestine

United Nations

Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
United Nations Children's Fund	United Nations Population Fund
United Nations Development Programme	United Nations Research Institute for Social Development
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	

Specialized agencies and related organizations

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	International Telecommunication Union
International Organization for Migration	World Health Organization
	World Meteorological Organization

Intergovernmental organizations

Commonwealth	Inter-Parliamentary Union
Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf	Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
European Union	Organization of Islamic Cooperation
International Development Law Organization	Parliamentary Assembly of the Mediterranean
International Organization of la Francophonie	

Other entities

International Committee of the Red Cross
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	Independent Commission for Human Rights (State of Palestine)
Australian Human Rights Commission	Kenya National Commission on Human Rights
Canadian Human Rights Commission	National Commission on Human Rights and Freedoms (Cameroon)
Commissioner for Human Rights (Poland)	National Human Rights Committee (Qatar)
Commission on Human Rights (Philippines)	National Human Rights Council (Morocco)
Danish Institute for Human Rights	National Institute of Human Rights (Chile)
Equality and Human Rights Commission (England, Scotland and Wales)	Office of the Ombudsman (Ecuador)
German Institute for Human Rights	Office of the Ombudsman for Human Rights and Justice (Timor-Leste)
Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions	Office of the Ombudsman (Samoa)
Human Rights Commission (New Zealand)	Scottish Human Rights Commission
	Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights

Non-governmental organizations

ABC Tamil Oli	Alliance Creative Community Project
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Corporation Family Violence Prevention and Legal Service (Victoria)	Alliance Defending Freedom
Access Now	Alliance globale contre les mutilations génitales féminines
ACT Alliance – Action by Churches Together	Alliance internationale pour la défense des droits et des libertés
Action aides aux familles démunies	Allied Rainbow Communities International
Action Canada for Population and Development	Al Mezan Center for Human Rights
Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs	Alsalam Foundation
Action of Human Movement	Alulbayt Foundation
Action on Smoking and Health	Al Zubair Charitable Foundation
Action pour la protection des droits de l'homme en Mauritanie	American Association of Jurists
Africa culture internationale	American Civil Liberties Union
African Agency for Integrated Development	Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain
African-American Society for Humanitarian Aid and Development	Amman Center for Human Rights Studies
African Development Association	Amnesty International
African Green Foundation International	Arab Organization for Human Rights
African Regional Agricultural Credit Association	Arab Penal Reform Organization
Agir ensemble pour les droits de l'homme	Archbishop E Kataliko Actions for Africa “KAF”
Aid Organization	Ariel Foundation International
Al-Ayn Social Care Foundation	Article 19: International Centre against Censorship
Al Baraem Association for Charitable Work	Asian-Eurasian Human Rights Forum
Al-Haq	Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development
Al-Khoei Foundation	Asian-Pacific Resource and Research Centre for Women
	Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development
	Asistencia Legal por los Derechos Humanos

Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas	Center for Women and Development
Asociación Española para el Derecho Internacional de los Derechos Humanos	Centre catholique international de Genève
Asociación HazteOír.org	Centre d'action pour le développement rural
Association Adala-Justice	Centre de documentation, de recherche et d'information des peuples autochtones
Association aide aux femmes et enfants	Centre Europe-tiers monde
Association apprentissage sans frontières	Centre for Gender Justice and Women Empowerment
Association Bharathi centre culturel franco-tamoul	Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy
Association burkinabé pour la survie de l'enfance	Centre indépendant de recherches et d'initiatives pour le dialogue
Association congolaise pour le développement agricole	Centre intercommunautaire congolais pour les personnes avec handicap
Association culturelle des Tamouls en France	Centre pour les droits civils et politiques
Association des jeunes pour l'agriculture du Mali	Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales
Association Dunenyo	Child Development Foundation
Association for Progressive Communications	Child Rights Connect
Association for the Prevention of Torture	China Association for Preservation and Development of Tibetan Culture
Association for the Protection of Women and Children's Rights	China Society for Human Rights Studies
Association for Women's Rights in Development	Christian Aid
Association internationale de la libre pensée	Christian Solidarity Worldwide
Association internationale des médecins pour la promotion de l'éducation et de la santé en Afrique	CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation
Association of World Citizens	Colombian Commission of Jurists
Association pour les victimes du monde	Comisión Jurídica para el Autodesarrollo de los Pueblos Originarios Andinos "Capaj"
Association pour l'intégration et le développement durable au Burundi	Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos
Association solidarité internationale pour l'Afrique	Comité des observateurs des droits de l'homme
Association Thendral	Comité international pour le respect et l'application de la charte africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples
Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII	Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme
Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Resource Rights	Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches
Baha'i International Community	Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative
Bahjat Al-Baqir Charity Foundation	Conectas Direitos Humanos
Beijing Zhicheng Migrant Workers' Legal Aid and Research Center	Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd
British Humanist Association	Conseil de jeunesse pluriculturelle
Buddies Association of Volunteers for Orphans, Disabled and Abandoned Children	Conseil international pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux droits de l'homme
Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies	Conselho Indigenista Missionário
Caritas Internationalis	Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations
Catholic International Education Office	Coordination des associations et des particuliers pour la liberté de conscience
Center for Africa Development and Progress	"Coup de pousse" Chaîne de l'espoir Nord-Sud
Center for Global Nonkilling	Defence for Children International
Center for Inquiry	Dianova International
Center for Justice and International Law	

Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers	Genève pour les droits de l'homme : formation internationale
DRCNet Foundation	Giving Life Nature Volunteer
Earthjustice	Global Action on Aging
East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project	Global Helping to Advance Women and Children
Eastern Sudan Women Development Organization	Global Hope Network International
Ecumenical Alliance for Human Rights and Development	Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
Edmund Rice International	Global Institute for Water, Environment and Health
Egyptian Organization for Human Rights	Global Policy Forum
Elizka Relief Foundation	Global Welfare Association
Ensemble contre la peine de mort	Godwin Osung International Foundation (The African Project)
Espace Afrique international	Good Neighbors International
European Centre for Law and Justice	Graduate Women International
European Humanist Federation	Health and Environment Program
European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Association	HelpAge International
European Union of Jewish Students	Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights
Families of Victims of Involuntary Disappearance	Himalayan Research and Cultural Foundation
Family Health Association of Iran	Humanist Institute for Cooperation with Developing Countries
Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland	Human Rights Council of Australia
Federation for Women and Family Planning	Human Rights House Foundation
Federation of Cuban Women	Human Rights Law Centre
FIAN International	Human Rights Now
First Modern Agro. Tools – Common Initiative Group	Human Rights Watch
Fondation Afrique développement international	Il Cenacolo
Fondation CIOMAL de l'Ordre de Malte (Campagne internationale de l'Ordre de Malte contre la lèpre)	Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”
Fondation Cordoue de Genève	Indigenous People of Africa Coordinating Committee
Fondation des œuvres pour la solidarité et le bien-être social	Ingénieurs du monde
Fondation pour l'étude des relations internationales et du développement	Initiative féministe européenne
Fondazione Marista per la Solidarietà Internazionale	Insamlingsstiftelsen Kvinna till Kvinna
Forum Azzahrae pour la femme marocaine	Institute for NGO Research
Foundation ECPAT International	Institute for Planetary Synthesis
France libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand	Institut international de l'écologie industrielle et de l'économie verte
Franciscans International	Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'homme
Freedom House	Institut international pour les droits et le développement
Friends World Committee for Consultation	Inter-African Committee on Traditional Practices Affecting the Health of Women and Children
Fundación Latinoamericana para los Derechos Humanos y el Desarrollo Social	International Association for Religious Freedom
Fundación Vida – Grupo Ecológico Verde	International Association of Democratic Lawyers
Geneva Institute for Human Rights	International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists
	International Bar Association
	International Bridges to Justice
	International Buddhist Relief Organisation
	International Career Support Association
	International Catholic Child Bureau

International Catholic Migration Commission	International Planned Parenthood Federation
International Center for Not-for-Profit Law	International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims
International Commission of Jurists	International Relief Services
International Committee for the Indigenous Peoples of the Americas (Switzerland)	International Service for Human Rights
International Council of AIDS Service Organizations	International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development
International Council of Russian Compatriots	International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations
International Council of Women	Iraqi Development Organization
International Educational Development	Islamic Human Rights Commission
International Federation for Human Rights Leagues	Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco
International Federation for the Protection of the Rights of Ethnic, Religious, Linguistic and Other Minorities	Jeunesse étudiante tamoule
International Federation of ACAT	Kayan – Feminist Organization
International Federation of Anti-Leprosy Associations	Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture
International Federation of Journalists	Latter-Day Saint Charities
International Federation of Medical Students' Associations	Lawyers for Lawyers
International Fellowship of Reconciliation	Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada
International Harm Reduction Association	Le pont
International Humanist and Ethical Union	Liberation
International Human Rights Association of American Minorities	Ligue marocaine de la citoyenneté et des droits de l'homme
International Institute for Human Rights, Environment and Development	Lutheran World Federation
International-Lawyers.org	Ma'arij Foundation for Peace and Development
International Lesbian and Gay Association	Maat Foundation for Peace, Development and Human Rights
International Longevity Center Global Alliance	Madre
International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism	Maharat Foundation
International Movement ATD Fourth World	Make Mothers Matter
International Movement of Apostolate in the Independent Social Milieus	Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association
International Muslim Women's Union	Migrant Forum in Asia
International Network for the Prevention of Elder Abuse	Minority Rights Group
International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination	Mother of Hope Cameroon Common Initiative Group
International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education	Mothers Legacy Project
International Peacebuilding Alliance	Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples
	Muslims for Progressive Values
	National Alliance of Women's Organizations
	New Future Foundation
	Norwegian Refugee Council
	Observatoire mauritanien des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie
	Open Society Institute
	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
	OutRight Action International

Palestinian Center for Development and Media Freedoms “MADA”	Tandem Project
Palestinian Return Centre	Tchad Agir pour l’environnement
Pan African Union for Science and Technology	Teresian Association
Partners for Transparency	Terra de Direitos
Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation	Terre des hommes fédération internationale
Pax Romana	Tourner la page
Peace Brigades International Switzerland	TRIAL International
Physicians for Human Rights	UNESCO Centre of Catalonia
Plan International	Union for International Cancer Control
Prahar	Union of Arab Jurists
Prajachaitanya Yuvajana Sangam	United Methodist Church General Board of Church and Society
Presse emblème campagne	United Nations Watch
Promotion du développement économique et social	United Schools International
Public International Law and Policy Group	United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation
Redress Trust	Universal Peace Federation
Refugee Council of Australia	Universal Rights Group
Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l’homme	Vaagdhara
Reporters sans frontières international	Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik
Réseau européen pour l’égalité des langues	Victorious Youths Movement
Réseau international des droits humains	Viet Nam Family Planning Association
Right Livelihood Award Foundation	Viet Nam Peace and Development Foundation
Rutgers	Village Suisse ONG
Save the Children International	Villages unis
Servas International	VIVAT International
Shivi Development Society	Widows for Peace through Democracy
Sikh Human Rights Group	Widows Rights International
Sociedade Maranhense de Direitos Humanos	Women and Media Collective
Society for Development and Community Empowerment	Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom
Society for Threatened Peoples	World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace
Soka Gakkai International	World Barua Organization
Solidarité agissante pour le développement familial	World Environment and Resources Council
Solidarité Suisse-Guinée	World Evangelical Alliance
Swedish Association for Sexuality Education	World Federation of Ukrainian Women’s Organizations
Swedish Federation for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights	World Jewish Congress
Swiss Catholic Lenten Fund	World Medical Association
Syrian Center for Media and Freedom of Expression	World Muslim Congress
Tamil Uzhagam	World Organization against Torture
	World Vision International
	World Young Women’s Christian Association
	Youth Coalition for Sexual and Reproductive Rights

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 forty-first session

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/41/1	1	Agenda and annotations
A/HRC/41/2	1	Report of the Human Rights Council on its forty-first session
A/HRC/41/3– E/CN.6/2019/7	2	Report of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women on the activities of the United Nations trust fund in support of actions to eliminate violence against women: note by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/41/4	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on New Zealand
A/HRC/41/4/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/41/5	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Afghanistan
A/HRC/41/5/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/41/6	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Chile
A/HRC/41/6/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/41/7	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Viet Nam
A/HRC/41/7/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/41/8	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Uruguay
A/HRC/41/8/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/41/9	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Yemen
A/HRC/41/9/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/41/10	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Vanuatu
A/HRC/41/11	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on North Macedonia

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/41/11/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/41/12	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on the Comoros
A/HRC/41/12/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/41/13	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Slovakia
A/HRC/41/13/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/41/14	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Eritrea
A/HRC/41/14/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/41/15	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Cyprus
A/HRC/41/15/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/41/16	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on the Dominican Republic
A/HRC/41/16/Add. 1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/41/17	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Cambodia
A/HRC/41/17/Add.1	6	Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments and replies presented by the State under review
A/HRC/41/18	2	Human rights in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/18/Add.1	2	Report on the situation of Human Rights in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela: comments by the State
A/HRC/41/19	2	Child, early and forced marriage in humanitarian settings: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/20	2, 3	Summary of the expert workshop on good practices of United Nations-system support to States in preventing and fighting against corruption, with a focus on human rights: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/41/21	10	National policies and human rights: a compilation of good practices, challenges, lessons learned and recommendations in mainstreaming human rights: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/22	2, 3	Summary report on the annual half-day panel discussion on the rights of indigenous peoples: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/23	2, 3	Approaches and challenges with regard to application procedures for obtaining the status of conscientious objector to military service in accordance with human rights standards: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/24	2, 3	Prevention of genocide: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/41/25	2, 3	Implementation and enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/26	2, 3	Analytical study on gender-responsive climate action for the full and effective enjoyment of the rights of women: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/27	2, 3	Human rights in the response to HIV: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/28	2, 6	Operations of the Voluntary Fund for participation in the universal periodic review: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/29	2, 6	Operations of the Voluntary Fund for Financial and Technical Assistance in the implementation of the universal periodic review: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/30	2, 8	Consultation on the experiences and practices of national human rights institutions in working to support the establishment and maintenance of inclusive societies and the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/31	2, 10	Report of the team of international experts on the situation in Kasai
A/HRC/41/32	2, 10	Activities of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the United Nations system and regional organizations' efforts to support States' efforts to promote and protect the human rights of older

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		persons: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/33	3	Women deprived of liberty: report of the Working Group on the issue of discrimination against women in law and in practice
A/HRC/41/33/Add.1	3	Visit to Honduras
A/HRC/41/33/Add.2	3	Visit to Poland
A/HRC/41/33/Add.3	3	Visit to Honduras: comments by the State
A/HRC/41/33/Add.4	3	Visit to Poland: comments by the State
A/HRC/41/34	3	Right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health: report of the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health
A/HRC/41/34/Add.1	3	Visit to Kyrgyzstan
A/HRC/41/34/Add.2	3	Visit to Canada
A/HRC/41/34/Add.3	3	Visit to Kyrgyzstan: comments by the State
A/HRC/41/35	3	Surveillance and human rights: report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression
A/HRC/41/35/Add.1	3	Visit to Ecuador
A/HRC/41/35/Add.2	3	Follow-up on country visits
A/HRC/41/35/Add.3	3	Overview of submissions received in preparation of A/HRC/41/35
A/HRC/41/35/Add.4	3	Summary of an experts consultation on A/HRC/41/35
A/HRC/41/36	3	Extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions: report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions
A/HRC/41/36/Add.1	3	Overview of activities undertaken by the mandate since 1 March 2018, including observations on communications transmitted between 1 March 2018 and 28 February 2019 and replies received between 1 May 2018 and 30 April 2019
A/HRC/41/37	3	Right to education: the implementation of the right to education and Sustainable Development Goal 4 in the context of the growth of private actors in education: report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to education

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/41/38	3	The impact of migration on migrant women and girls: a gender perspective: report of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants
A/HRC/41/38/Add.1	3	Visit to the Niger
A/HRC/41/39	3	Climate change and poverty: report of the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights
A/HRC/41/39/Add.1	3	Visit to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
A/HRC/41/39/Add.2	3	Visit to the Lao People's Democratic Republic
A/HRC/41/39/Add.3	3	Visit to United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: comments by the State
A/HRC/41/39/Add.4	3	Visit to Lao People's Democratic Republic: comments by the State
A/HRC/41/40	3	Internal displacement and the role of national human rights institutions: report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of internally displaced persons
A/HRC/41/40/Add.1	3	Global and national activities under the twentieth anniversary of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement
A/HRC/41/41	3	Rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association: report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association
A/HRC/41/41/Add.1	3	Observations on communications transmitted to Governments and replies received
A/HRC/41/41/Add.2	3	Civil society participation in the implementation of Agenda 2030 on Sustainable Development
A/HRC/41/41/Add.3	3	Visit to Tunisia
A/HRC/41/41/Add.4	3	Visit to Armenia
A/HRC/41/42	3	Violence against women, its causes and consequences: report of the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences
A/HRC/41/42/Add.1	3	Visit to Canada
A/HRC/41/42/Add.2	3	Visit to Nepal
A/HRC/41/42/Add.3	3	Visit to Canada: comments by the State
A/HRC/41/43	3	Gender dimensions of the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: report of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises
A/HRC/41/43/Add.1	3	Visit to Thailand

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/41/43/Add.2	3	Visit to Kenya
A/HRC/41/43/Add.3	3	Visit to Thailand: comments by the State
A/HRC/41/44	3	Human rights and international solidarity: report of the Independent Expert on human rights and international solidarity
A/HRC/41/44/Add.1	3	Visit to Sweden
A/HRC/41/44/Add.2	3	Visit to the Netherlands
A/HRC/41/45	3	Data collection and management as a means to create heightened awareness of violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity: report of the Independent Expert on protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity
A/HRC/41/45/Add.1	3	Visit to Georgia
A/HRC/41/45/Add.2	3	Visit to Mozambique
A/HRC/41/46	3	Trafficking in persons, especially women and children: report of the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children
A/HRC/41/46/Add.1	3	Visit to Nigeria
A/HRC/41/47	3	Stigmatization as dehumanization: wrongful stereotyping and structural violence against women and children affected by leprosy: report of the Special Rapporteur on the elimination of discrimination against persons affected by leprosy and their family members
A/HRC/41/48	3	Independence of judges and lawyers: report of the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers
A/HRC/41/49	5	Report of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises on the seventh Forum on Business and Human Rights
A/HRC/41/50	5	Contribution of development to the enjoyment of human rights: study of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee
A/HRC/41/51	5	Activities of vulture funds and their impact on human rights: final report of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee
A/HRC/41/52	4	Situation of human rights in Belarus: report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus
A/HRC/41/53	4	Situation of human rights in Eritrea: report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/41/54	9	Global extractivism and racial equality: report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance
A/HRC/41/54/Add.1	9	Visit to Morocco
A/HRC/41/54/Add.2	9	Visit to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
A/HRC/41/54/Add.3		Mission to Morocco: comments by the State
A/HRC/41/54/Add.4	9	Visit to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: comments by the State
A/HRC/41/55	9	Combating glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and other practices that contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance: report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance
A/HRC/41/56	3, 4, 7, 9, 10	Communications report of special procedures

Documents issued in the conference room papers series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/41/CRP.1	3	Annex to the report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions: investigation into the unlawful death of Mr. Jamal Khashoggi
A/HRC/41/CRP.2	10	Report on the human rights situation in Ukraine 16 February to 15 May 2019

Documents issued in the limited series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/41/L.1	3	Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights
A/HRC/41/L.2	3	Promotion of the right to peace
A/HRC/41/L.3	3	Human rights and international solidarity
A/HRC/41/L.4	5	The Social Forum
A/HRC/41/L.5 and Rev.1	3	Accelerating efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women and girls: preventing and responding to violence against women and girls in the world of work
A/HRC/41/L.6 and Rev.1	3	Elimination of all forms of discrimination against women and girls
A/HRC/41/L.7	3	The human rights of migrants
A/HRC/41/L.8 and Rev.1	3	Consequences of child, early and forced marriage

Documents issued in the limited series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/41/L.9	10	Cooperation with and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights
A/HRC/41/L.10 and Rev.1	3	Mandate of the Independent Expert on protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity
A/HRC/41/L.11	3	The negative impact of corruption on the enjoyment of human rights
A/HRC/41/L.12	4	Situation of human rights in Belarus
A/HRC/41/L.13	3	Access to medicines and vaccines in the context of the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health
A/HRC/41/L.14	3	New and emerging digital technologies and human rights
A/HRC/41/L.15	2	Situation of human rights in Eritrea
A/HRC/41/L.16 and Rev.1	10	Renewal of the mandate of the team of international experts on the situation in Kasai
A/HRC/41/L.17 and Rev.1	3	The contribution of development to the enjoyment of all human rights
A/HRC/41/L.18 and Rev.1	3	The rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association
A/HRC/41/L.19	3	Youth and human rights
A/HRC/41/L.20	2	Promotion and protection of human rights in the Philippines
A/HRC/41/L.21	3	Equal pay
A/HRC/41/L.22 and Rev.1	3	Impact of arms transfers on human rights
A/HRC/41/L.23	3	Mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons
A/HRC/41/L.24	3	Human rights and climate change
A/HRC/41/L.25	4	The human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/41/L.26	3	The right to education: follow-up to Human Rights Council resolution 8/4
A/HRC/41/L.27	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/41/L.10/Rev.1
A/HRC/41/L.28	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/41/L.10/Rev.1
A/HRC/41/L.29	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/41/L.10/Rev.1
A/HRC/41/L.30	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/41/L.10/Rev.1
A/HRC/41/L.31	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/41/L.10/Rev.1

Documents issued in the limited series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/41/L.32	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/41/L.10/Rev.1
A/HRC/41/L.33	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/41/L.10/Rev.1
A/HRC/41/L.34	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/41/L.10/Rev.1
A/HRC/41/L.35	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/41/L.10/Rev.1
A/HRC/41/L.36	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/41/L.10/Rev.1
A/HRC/41/L.37	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/41/L.6/Rev.1
A/HRC/41/L.38	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/41/L.5/Rev.1
A/HRC/41/L.39	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/41/L.8/Rev.1
A/HRC/41/L.40	3	Idem
A/HRC/41/L.41	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/41/L.6/Rev.1
A/HRC/41/L.42	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/41/L.8/Rev.1
A/HRC/41/L.43	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/41/L.5/Rev.1
A/HRC/41/L.44	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/41/L.5/Rev.1
A/HRC/41/L.45	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/41/L.8/Rev.1
A/HRC/41/L.46	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/41/L.6/Rev.1

Documents issued in the Government series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/41/G/1	2, 3, 5, 8	Note verbale dated 23 April 2019 from the Permanent Mission of Cuba to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/41/G/2	3	Letter dated 29 April 2019 from the Permanent Representative of Liechtenstein to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council

Documents issued in the Government series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/41/G/3	3	Note verbale dated 6 June 2019 from the Permanent Mission of Japan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/G/4	3	Note verbale dated 6 June 2019 from the Permanent Mission of Honduras to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/G/5	3	Note verbale dated 6 June 2019 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
A/HRC/41/G/6	4	Letter dated 14 June 2019 from the Permanent Representative of Georgia to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/41/G/7	4	Note verbale dated 2 July 2019 from the Permanent Mission of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/G/8	2	Note verbale dated 13 June 2019 from the Permanent Mission of South Africa to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/G/9	4	Note verbale dated 2 July 2019 from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/G/10	3	Note verbale dated 5 July 2019 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/41/G/11	2	Letter dated 8 July 2019 from the Permanent Representatives of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council

Documents issued in the Government series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/41/G/12	9	Note verbale dated 9 July 2019 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/41/G/13	4	Note verbale dated 9 July 2019 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/41/G/14	4	Note verbale dated 12 July 2019 from the Permanent Mission of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/G/15	4	Note verbale dated 12 July 2019 from the Permanent Mission of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/G/16	2	Note verbale dated 12 July 2019 from the Permanent Mission of Italy to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/G/17	3	Letter dated 12 July 2019 from the representatives of Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Comoros, the Congo, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Gabon, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Togo, Turkmenistan, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe and the State of Palestine to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/41/G/18	9	Note verbale dated 15 July 2019 from the Permanent Mission of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

Documents issued in the Government series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/41/G/19	4	Note verbale dated 19 July 2019 from the Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/41/G/20	2	Note verbale dated 22 July 2019 from the Permanent Mission of Portugal to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/G/21	2	Note verbale dated 26 July 2019 from the Permanent Mission of Slovenia to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/G/22	3	Letter dated 26 July 2019 from the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations Office at Geneva and addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/41/G/23	4	Note verbale dated 6 June 2019 from the Permanent Mission of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/G/24	4	Note verbale dated 6 June 2019 from the Permanent Mission of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/G/25	3	Note verbale dated 19 June 2019 from the Permanent Mission of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/G/26	4	Note verbale dated 13 June 2019 from the Permanent Mission of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/41/G/27	4	Note verbale dated 19 June 2019 from the Permanent Mission of Azerbaijan 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/41/NI/1	3	Written submission by the Samoa's Office of the Ombudsman, the Australian Human Rights Commission, the National Human Rights Commission of India, the Human Rights Commission of Malaysia, the National Human

Documents issued in the national institutions series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		Rights Commission of Mongolia, the National Human Rights Commission of Nepal, the New Zealand Human Rights Commission, the Commission on Human Rights of the Philippines and the Provedoria for Human Rights and Justice of Timor-Leste
A/HRC/41/NI/2	3	Written submission by the Samoa's Office of the Ombudsman

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/41/NGO/1	4	Written statement submitted by Himalayan Research and Cultural Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/2	3	Written statement submitted by Iranian Elite Research Center, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/3	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/41/NGO/4	3	Written statement submitted by Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/5	3	Written statement submitted by Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/6	3	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/41/NGO/7	4	Written statement submitted by Amman Center for Human Rights Studies, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/8	3	Written statement submitted by Conseil International pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux Droits de l'Homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/10	3	Written statement submitted by Conseil International pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux Droits de l'Homme, 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/41/NGO/11	3	Written statement submitted by Conseil International pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux Droits de l'Homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/12	3	Written statement submitted by Conseil International pour le soutien à des procès équitables et aux Droits de l'Homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/13	4	Exposé écrit présenté par Association nationale de promotion et de protection des droits de l'homme, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/41/NGO/14	3	Written statement submitted by Réseau Européen pour l'Égalité des Langues, non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/15	4	Written statement submitted by International Campaign to Ban Landmines, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/16	3	Written statement submitted by All China Women's Federation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/17	3	Written statement submitted by Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europe, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/18	3	Written statement submitted by World Muslim Congress, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/19	4	Written statement submitted by Public Organization "Public Advocacy", a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/20	4	Written statement submitted by Public Organization "Public Advocacy", a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/21	4	Written statement submitted by Public Organization "Public Advocacy", a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/22	4	Written statement submitted by 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/41/NGO/23	4	Written statement submitted by Public Organization “Public Advocacy”, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/24	4	Written statement submitted by Public Organization “Public Advocacy”, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/25	4	Written statement submitted by Public Organization “Public Advocacy”, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/26	4	Written statement submitted by Public Organization “Public Advocacy”, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/27	4	Written statement submitted by Public Organization “Public Advocacy”, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/28	7	Written statement submitted by BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/29	7	Written statement submitted by BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/30	2	Joint written statement submitted by American Association of Jurists, Asociacion Cubana de las Naciones Unidas (Cuban United Nations Association), Asociación Española para el Derecho Internacional de los Derechos Humanos AEDIDH, Association Mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit, Association mauritanienne pour la transparence et le développement, Association Nationale des Echanges Entre Jeunes, Centro de Estudios Sobre la Juventud, Fundación Latinoamericana por los Derechos Humanos y el Desarrollo Social, International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL), International Fellowship of Reconciliation, Paz y Cooperación, World Barua Organization (WBO), non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Indian Council of South America (CISA), International Educational Development, Liberation, Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l’amitié entre les peuples, 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/41/NGO/31	7	Written statement submitted by Al Mezan Centre for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/32	3	Exposé écrit présenté par Association “Paix” pour la lutte contre la Contrainte et l’injustice, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/41/NGO/33	4	Written statement submitted by Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/34	4	Written statement submitted by Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/35	4	Written statement submitted by Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/36	4	Written statement submitted by Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/37	4	Written statement submitted by Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/38	4	Written statement submitted by Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/39	4	Written statement submitted by Iraqi Development Organization, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/40	2	Written statement submitted by Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/41	7	Written statement submitted by Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/42	3	Written statement submitted by Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/43	3	Exposición escrita presentada por la Centro UNESCO De Donostia-San Sebastián, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/41/NGO/44	3	Written statement submitted by France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/45	4	Joint written statement submitted by World Evangelical Alliance, Baptist World Alliance, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/46	4	Written statement submitted by Physicians for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/47	4	Written statement submitted by Physicians for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/48	4	Written statement submitted by Physicians for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/49	4	Written statement submitted by Physicians for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/50	3	Written statement submitted by World Muslim Congress, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/51	3	Written statement submitted by World Muslim Congress, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/52	3	Joint written statement submitted by Réseau Européen pour l'Égalité des Langues, UNESCO Centre of Catalonia, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/53	4	Joint written statement submitted by International Educational Development, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/41/NGO/54	2	Written statement submitted by African Green Foundation International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/55	6	Written statement submitted by Institut International pour les Droits et le Développement, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/56	3	Exposé écrit présenté par Il Cenacolo, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/41/NGO/57	4	Exposé écrit présenté par Il Cenacolo, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/41/NGO/58	3	Written statement submitted by Graduate Women International (GWI), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/59	4	Written statement submitted by Family Health Association of Iran, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/60	4	Written statement submitted by Iranian Elite Research Center, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/61	10	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/62	3	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/63	3	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/64	3	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/65	8	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/66	3	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/67	3	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/68	3	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/69	6	Written statement submitted by Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés (OIPMA), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/70	4	Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), International-Lawyers.Org, Union of Arab Jurists, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, non-governmental

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/41/NGO/71	4	Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”, International-Lawyers.Org, Union of Arab Jurists, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/41/NGO/74	4	Written statement submitted by African Green Foundation International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/75	2	Written statement submitted by African Green Foundation International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/76	3	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/77	3	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/78	3	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/79	3	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/80	9	Written statement submitted by African Green Foundation International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/81	3	Written statement submitted by China Association for Preservation and Development of Tibetan Culture (CAPDTC), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/82	4	Written statement submitted by World Muslim Congress, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/83	4	Written statement submitted by 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/41/NGO/84	9	Written statement submitted by Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/85	6	Written statement submitted by Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/86	3	Written statement submitted by Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/87	3	Written statement submitted by Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/88	3	Written statement submitted by Al-Ayn Social Care Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/89	4	Written statement submitted by The Palestinian Return Centre, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/90	4	Written statement submitted by Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/91	4	Written statement submitted by Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/92	4	Written statement submitted by The Palestinian Return Centre, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/93	4	Written statement submitted by Amman Center for Human Rights Studies, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/94	4	Written statement submitted by Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/95	4	Written statement submitted by European Centre for Law and Justice, The / Centre Européen pour le droit, les Justice et les droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/96	4	Written statement submitted by European Centre for Law and Justice, The / Centre Européen pour le droit, les Justice et les droits de l'homme, 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/41/NGO/97	3	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/98	3	Written statement submitted by International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (OIDEF), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/99	3	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/100	4	Joint written statement submitted by World Evangelical Alliance, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/101	3	Written statement submitted by International-Lawyers.Org, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/102	3	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/103	4	Written statement submitted by International-Lawyers.Org, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/104	3	Written statement submitted by Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/105	3	Joint written statement submitted by Global Fund for Widows, Guild of Service, Widows' Rights International and National Alliance of Women's Organizations, a non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/106	3	Written statement submitted by Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/107	3	Written statement submitted by Christian Solidarity Worldwide, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/108	3	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/109	4	Written statement submitted by Christian Solidarity Worldwide, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/110	4	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights 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/41/NGO/111	3	Written statement submitted by Pax Romana (International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs and International Movement of Catholic Students), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/112	3	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/113	3	Written statement submitted by Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights (JKCHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/114	10	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/115	4	Written statement submitted by Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights (JKCHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/116	3	Written statement submitted by Ecumenical Federation of Constantinopolitans, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/117	3	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/118	9	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/119	9	Written statement submitted by Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights (JKCHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/120	3	Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/121	3	Written statement submitted by Prahar, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/122	8	Written statement submitted by Partners For Transparency, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/123	4	Written statement submitted by Nazra for Feminist Studies, 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/41/NGO/124	4	Written statement submitted by Liberation, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/41/NGO/125	3	Joint written statement submitted by Widows Rights International, Global Fund for Widows, Guild of Service, National Alliance of Women's Organizations, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Widows for Peace through Democracy, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/41/NGO/126	4	Written statement submitted by Global Welfare Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/127	3	Joint written statement submitted by International Harm Reduction Association (IHRA), Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network, DRCNet Foundation, IDPC Consortium, World Hepatitis Alliance, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/128	3	Written statement submitted by European Centre for Law and Justice, The / Centre Européen pour le droit, les Justice et les droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/129	8	Written statement submitted by Liberation, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/41/NGO/130	3	Joint written statement submitted by International Harm Reduction Association (IHRA), Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network, DRCNet Foundation, IDPC Consortium, Rede Brasileira de Redução de Danos e Direitos Humanos - REDUC, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/131	3	Joint written statement submitted by International Harm Reduction Association (IHRA), Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network, DRCNet Foundation, IDPC Consortium, Release Legal Emergency and Drugs Service, Washington Office on Latin America, World Hepatitis Alliance, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/132	3	Joint written statement submitted by International Harm Reduction Association (IHRA), Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network, DRCNet Foundation, IDPC Consortium, World Hepatitis Alliance, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/133	10	Written statement submitted by African Green Foundation International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/134	4	Written statement submitted by Coordination des Associations et des Particuliers pour la Liberté de Conscience, 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/41/NGO/136	4	Written statement submitted by African Green Foundation International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/137	2	Joint written statement submitted by IDPC Consortium, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociación Civil, International Harm Reduction Association (IHRA), México Unido contra la Delincuencia, A.C., non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/138	3	Written statement submitted by European Centre for Law and Justice, The / Centre Européen pour le droit, les Justice et les droits de l'homme, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/139	9	Written statement submitted by Liberation, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/41/NGO/140	3	Written statement submitted by ODHIKAR - Coalition for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/141	10	Joint written statement submitted by International Catholic Child Bureau, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/142	3	Joint written statement submitted by New Humanity, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, American Association of Jurists, Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, International Confederation of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development - VIDES, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, Teresian Association, nongovernmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/143	3	Joint written statement submitted by New Humanity, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, American Association of Jurists, Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, International Confederation of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development - VIDES, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, Teresian Association, World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/41/NGO/144	3	Written statement submitted by Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/145	3	Written statement submitted by Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/146	7	Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”, International-Lawyers.Org, Kayan - Feminist Organization, Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/41/NGO/147	4	Joint written statement submitted by Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/148	3	Joint written statement submitted by American Civil Liberties Union, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociación Civil, Legal Resources Centre, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/149	3	Written statement submitted by Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/150	9	Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”, International-Lawyers.Org, Kayan - Feminist Organization, Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/41/NGO/151	7	Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”, International-Lawyers.Org, Kayan - Feminist Organization, Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/41/NGO/152	3	Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”, International-Lawyers.Org, Kayan - Feminist

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		Organization, Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/41/NGO/153	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/41/NGO/154	3	Exposé écrit présenté par Association Internationale pour l'égalité des femmes, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/41/NGO/155	4	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/156	4	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/158	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/159	3	Written statement submitted by Habitat International Coalition, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/160	4	Written statement submitted by Stichting Global Human Rights Defence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/161	3	Written statement submitted by Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/41/NGO/162	7	Written statement submitted by Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/163	9	Written statement submitted by Sikh Human Rights Group, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/164	3	Written statement submitted by Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/165	3	Written statement submitted by Aid Organization, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/166	9	Written statement submitted by International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, 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/41/NGO/167	4	Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), International-Lawyers.Org, Union of Arab Jurists, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/41/NGO/169	5	Written statement submitted by Sikh Human Rights Group, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/170	4	Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), International-Lawyers.Org, Union of Arab Jurists, United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/41/NGO/171	7	Joint written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), Indian Movement “Tupaj Amaru”, International-Lawyers.Org, Kayan - Feminist Organization, Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/41/NGO/172	3	Written statement submitted by Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/177	6	Written statement submitted by United Nations Watch, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/178	3	Written statement submitted by Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/179	3	Written statement submitted by International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/180	4	Written statement submitted by Sign of Hope e.V.-Hoffnungszeichen, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/181	4	Written statement submitted by International Council of Russian Compatriots (ICRC), 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/41/NGO/182	3	Exposición escrita presentada por la Auspice Stella, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/41/NGO/183	5	Written statement submitted by International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/184	3	Joint written statement submitted by Action on Smoking and Health, Cancer Aid Society, Corporate Accountability International, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Union against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/41/NGO/185	3	Exposé écrit présenté par Association Adala-Justice, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/41/NGO/186	3	Exposé écrit présenté par Association Adala-Justice, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/41/NGO/187	3	Written statement submitted by Institut International pour les Droits et le Développement, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/188	4	Joint written statement submitted by International Educational Development, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/41/NGO/189	3	Written statement submitted by Beijing Children's Legal Aid and Research Center, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/190	9	Written statement submitted by China Society for Human Rights Studies (CSHRS), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/191	4	Written statement submitted by Institut International pour les Droits et le Développement, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/192	7	Written statement submitted by The Palestinian Return Centre, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/193	4	Written statement submitted by Public Organization "Public Advocacy", a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/41/NGO/194	4	Exposé écrit présenté par Il Cenacolo, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/41/NGO/195	3	Joint written statement submitted by Global Fund for Widows, Guild of Service, Widows' Rights International and National Alliance of Women's Organizations, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
