Advance unedited version

Distr.: General
22 July 2016

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Thirty-first session
Agenda item 1
Organizational and procedural matters

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

Vice-President and Rapporteur: H.E. Mr. Bertrand **de Crombrugghe** (Belgium)

Contents

Part One

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

I. Resolutions

Resolution	*Title*	*Date of adoption*
31/1	Composition of staff of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights	23 March 2016
31/2	Integrity of the judicial system	23 March 2016
31/3	Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism: mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism	23 March 2016
31/4	Commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Right to Development	23 March 2016
31/5	Question of the realization in all countries of economic, social and cultural rights	23 March 2016
31/6	The rights of persons with disabilities in situations of risk and humanitarian emergencies	23 March 2016
31/7	Rights of the child: information and communications technologies and child sexual exploitation	23 March 2016
31/8	Human rights and the environment	23 March 2016
31/9	Adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and the right to non-discrimination in this context	23 March 2016
31/10	The right to food	23 March 2016
31/11	The effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights	23 March 2016
31/12	Promotion of the enjoyment of the cultural rights of everyone and respect for cultural diversity	23 March 2016
31/13	Rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities	23 March 2016
31/14	The role of good governance in the promotion and protection of human rights	23 March 2016
31/15	The right to work	23 March 2016
31/16	Freedom of religion or belief	23 March 2016
31/17	The human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic	23 March 2016
31/18	Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea	23 March 2016

Resolution	*Title*	*Date of adoption*
31/19	Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran	23 March 2016
31/20	Situation of human rights in South Sudan	23 March 2016
31/21	Human rights education and training	24 March 2016
31/22	The negative impact of the non-repatriation of funds of illicit origin on the enjoyment of human rights, and the importance of improving international cooperation	24 March 2016
31/23	Promoting human rights through sport and the Olympic ideal	24 March 2016
31/24	Situation of human rights in Myanmar	24 March 2016
31/25	Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan	24 March 2016
31/26	Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping and stigmatization of, and discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against, persons based on religion or belief	24 March 2016
31/27	Technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in Libya	24 March 2016
31/28	Technical assistance and capacity-building for Mali in the field of human rights	24 March 2016
31/29	Strengthening technical cooperation and advisory services for Guinea	24 March 2016
31/30	Effects of terrorism on the enjoyment of all human rights	24 March 2016
31/31	Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment: safeguards to prevent torture during police custody and pretrial detention	24 March 2016
31/32	Protecting human rights defenders, whether individuals, groups or organs of society, addressing economic, social and cultural rights	24 March 2016
31/33	Right of the Palestinian people to self-determination	24 March 2016
31/34	Human rights situation in the occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem	24 March 2016
31/35	Ensuring accountability and justice for all violations of international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem	24 March 2016
31/36	Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan	24 March 2016
31/37	The promotion and protection of human rights in the context of peaceful protests	24 March 2016

II. Decisions

Decision	*Title*	*Date of adoption*
31/101	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Federated States of Micronesia	16 March 2016
31/102	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Lebanon	16 March 2016
31/103	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Mauritania	16 March 2016
31/104	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Nauru	16 March 2016
31/105	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Rwanda	16 March 2016
31/106	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Nepal	16 March 2016
31/107	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Austria	16 March 2016
31/108	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Australia	17 March 2016
31/109	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Georgia	17 March 2016
31/110	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Saint Lucia	17 March 2016
31/111	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Oman	17 March 2016
31/112	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Myanmar	17 March 2016
31/113	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Saint Kitts and Nevis	17 March 2016
31/114	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Sao Tome and Principe	18 March 2016
31/115	High-level panel on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Human Rights Council	23 March 2016
31/116	Commencement of the third cycle of the universal periodic review	23 March 2016

III. President's statements

President's statement	*Title*	*Date of adoption*
31/1	Situation of human rights in Haiti	24 March 2016

Part Two
Summary of proceedings

I. Organizational and procedural matters

A. Opening and duration of the session

1. The Human Rights Council held its thirty-first session at the United Nations Office at Geneva from 29 February to 24 March 2016. The President of the Human Rights Council opened the session.

2. At the 1st meeting, on 29 February 2016, the President of the General Assembly, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Federal Councillor and Head of the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Didier Burkhalter, addressed the plenary.

3. At the 21st meeting, on 8 March 2016, the Human Rights Council observed the International Women's Day. At the same meeting, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement. At the same meeting, the Representative of Canada, (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, the Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Chile, China, the Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, and Zambia), made a statement. The statement was also supported by the following non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International; International Service for Human Rights; Make Mothers Matter – MMM; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Women's World Summit Foundation.

4. At the 57th meeting, on 22 March 2016, the representative of Belgium made a statement with regards to the attack occurred on the same day in Brussels.

5. In accordance with rule 8 (b) of the rules of procedure of the Human Rights Council, as contained in part VII of the annex to Council resolution 5/1, the organizational meeting on the thirty-first session was held on 15 February 2016.

6. The thirty-first session consisted of 66 meetings over 19 days (see paragraph 39 below).

B. Attendance

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

C. High-level segment

8. At its 1st to 2nd, and 5th to 10th meetings, from 29 February to 2 March 2016, the Human Rights Council held a high-level segment, at which 96 dignitaries addressed the plenary, including 2 heads of state, 2 vice-presidents, 7 deputy prime ministers, 51 ministers, 26 other dignitaries and 8 representatives of observer organizations.

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

(a) At the 1st meeting, on 29 February 2016: the president of Togo, Faure Essozimna Gnassingbe; the Captains Regent of the Republic of San Marino, Lorella Stefanelli and Nicola Renzi; the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Portugal, Augusto Santos Silva; the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Belgium, Didier Reynders; the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign and European Affairs of Slovakia, Miroslav Lajčák; the Deputy Prime Minister of Turkey, Lütfi Elvan; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Paraguay, Eladio Ramón Loizaga Lezcano; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Qatar, Sheikh Mohammed Bin Abdulrahman bin Jassim Al-Thani; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Argentina, Susana Mabel Malcorra; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of France, Jean-Marc Ayrault; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, Bert Koenders; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Liechtenstein, Aurelia Frick; the Administrator of the United Nations Development Program, Helen Clark; the Sécretaire générale of the Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie, Michaëlle Jean; the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Irina Bokova.

(b) At the 2nd meeting, on the same day: the Deputy Prime Minister of Kyrgyzstan, Gulmira Kudaiberdieva; the Vice-President and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Panama, Isabel de Saint Malo de Alvarado; the Minister of Justice of Iraq, Hyder Natiq Jasim; the Minister for Foreign Trade and Development of Finland, Lenita Toivakka; the Minister for Women, Racial Equality and Human Rights of Brazil, Nilma Lino Gomes; the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of Monaco, Gilles Tonelli; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, Bert Koenders, on behalf of the European Union; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Armenia, Edward Nalbandyan; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Nikola Poposki; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Georgia, Mikheil Janelidze; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Luxembourg, Jean Asselborn; the Vice-Minister for Human Rights and Multilateral Affairs of Mexico, Miguel Ruiz Cabañas; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Lithuania, Linas Antanas Linkevičius, the State Secretary and Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Norway, Tore Hattrem; the Executive Director of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), Babatunde Osotimehin.

(c) At the 5th meeting, on 1 March 2016: the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the State of Palestine, Riyad Al Malki; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Sergey Lavrov; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria, Ramtane Lamamra; the Minister of Justice and Human Rights of Angola, Rui Carneiro Mangueira; the Minister

for Human Rights, Equal Opportunities and Legislation of the Czech Republic, Jiří Dienstbier; the Minister for Foreign Minister of Albania, Ditmir Bushati; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Kristian Jensen; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Canada, Stéphane Dion; the Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Botswana, Pelonomi Venson-Moitoi; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Igor Crnadak; the Minister of Justice of Jordan, Bassam Talhouni; the Federal Government Commissioner for Human Rights Policy and Humanitarian Aid of Germany, Bärbel Kofler; the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cyprus, Alexandros N. Zenon; the President of the International Committee of the Red Cross, Peter Maurer; the Secretary-General of the Council of Europe, Thorbjorn Jagland; the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece, Ioannis Amanatidis; the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Slovenia, Dragoljuba Benčina.

(d) At the 6th meeting, on the same day: the Vice-President and Minister of Justice, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs of Zimbabwe, Emmerson D. Mnangagwa; the Deputy Prime Minister for Human Rights of the Equatorial Guinea, Alfonso Nsue Mokuy; the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs and European Integration of Montenegro, Igor Lukšić; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ri Su-yong; the Minister of Justice of the Central African Republic, Saïd Paguindji; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nigeria, Geoffrey Onyeama; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Congo, Jean-Claude Gakosso; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Uruguay, Rodolfo Nin Novoa; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Maldives, Dunya Maumoon; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Eritrea, Osman Mohammed Saleh; the Deputy Attorney-General and Minister of Justice of Ghana, Dominic Ayine; the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Emirates, Anwar Mohamad Gargash; the Minister and President of the Human Rights Commission of Saudi Arabia, Bandar bin Mohammed Al-Aiban; the State Minister, Ministry of Justice of the Sudan, Tahani Ali Mohamed; the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Viet Nam, Ha Kim Ngoc.

(e) At the 7th meeting, on the same day: the Minister for Culture and Democracy of Sweden, Alice Bah Kuhnke; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine, Pavlo Klimkin; the Minister Delegate in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Mauritania, Khadijetou Mbareck Fall; the Secretary of the High Council for Human Rights and Advisor to the Chief of Judiciary of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mohammad Javad Ardeshir Larijani; the Deputy Minister of International Relations and Cooperation of South Africa, Luwellyn Landers.

(f) At the 8th meeting, on 2 March 2016: the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mongolia, Lundeg Purevsuren; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Chile, Heraldo Muñoz; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Poland, Witold Waszczykowski; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Guatemala, Carlos Raúl Morales Moscoso; the Minister of Justice and Human Rights of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Alexis Tambwe Mwamba; the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Sierra Leone, Mohammed Gibril Sesay; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Uganda, Okello Henry Oryem; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Colombia, María Angela Honguín; the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, Evan P. Garcia; the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kazakhstan, Alexei Volkov; the Deputy State Secretary for International Cooperation of Hungary, Ádám Zoltán Kovács; the Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Thailand, Virasakdi Futrakul; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Delcy Rodríguez Gómez; the Special Envoy for Human Rights of Australia, Philip Ruddock; the Parliamentary Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, Masakazu Hamachi; the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Juan Carlos Alurralde; the Deputy Secretary of State of the United States of America, Anthony Blinken; the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Italy, Benedetto Della Vedova.

(g) At the 9th meeting, on the same day: the Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Libya, Hassan A. M. Alsghayr; the Assistant of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bahrain, Abdulla Faisal Al-Doseri; the Vice President of the National Council of equality for Persons with Disabilities of Ecuador, Xavier Torres; the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Spain, Ignacio Ybáñez; the Minister Delegate to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Morocco, Mbarka Bouaida; the Minister of National Unity and Citizenship of Guinea, Khalifa Gassama Diaby; the State Secretary of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Serbia, Roksanda Ninčić; the Director-General of the Multilateral Affairs and International Law Division in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Cuba, Pédro Núñez Mosquera; the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea, Yun Byung-se; the Secretary-General of The Commonwealth, Kamalesh Sharma, the Assistant Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, Laila Bahaa El Din.

10. At the 7th meeting on 1 March 2016, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Japan, Myanmar, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, the Syrian Arab Republic, and Turkey.

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

12. At the 9th meeting, on 2 March 2016, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of: Albania, Chile, China, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, Japan, Serbia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

13. At the same meeting, statements in exercise of a second right of reply were made by the representatives of Albania, Japan, Serbia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Republic of Korea.

High-level panel on human rights mainstreaming

14. At the 3rd meeting, on 29 February 2016, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 16/21, the Council held a high-level panel discussion to interact with heads of United Nations agencies within their respective mandates on specific human rights themes, with the objective of promoting the mainstreaming of human rights throughout the United Nations system, with a focus on "the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and human rights, with an emphasis on the right to development".

15. The Secretary-General of the United Nations, the President of the General Assembly and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made opening statements for the panel. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights moderated the discussion.

16. At the same meeting, the panellists Zamir Akram, Helen Clark, Babatunde Osotimehin, Yannick Glemarec, and Jan Beagle made statements. The Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Botswana, Georgia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Bahrain, Brazil, Denmark (also on behalf of Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), Norway, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation).

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of Association Points-Coeur; Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul; Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd; Dominicans for Justice and Peace - Order of Preachers; International Catholic Migration Commission; International Catholic Peace Movement; Mouvement International d'Apostolate des Milieux Sociaux Independants; Pax Christi International, World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations); Save the Children International (also on behalf of Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches (CCIA/WCC); EuroChild; Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant; International Catholic Child Bureau; International Federation of Social Workers; International Lesbian and Gay Association; International Movement ATD Fourth World; Make Mother Matter – MMM; Plan International, Inc., Terre Des Hommes Federation Internationale; the Consortium for Street Children).

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

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, India (also on behalf of Brazil, Russia, China, South Africa), Namibia, Mexico, Portugal, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC)), Libya, the United States of America.

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights; CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Pacific Disability Forum.

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

High-level panel on the fiftieth anniversary of the adoption and fortieth anniversary of the entry into force of the International Covenants on human rights

21. At the 4th meeting, on 1 March 2016, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 29/1, the Human Rights Council held a high-level panel discussion on the topic, "The fiftieth anniversary of the International Covenants on Human Rights: universality, indivisibility, interdependence and interrelatedness of all human rights", in order to give the fiftieth anniversary of the International Covenants on Human Rights attention commensurate with its historical significance.

22. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Gennady Gatilov made opening statements for the panel.

23. At the same meeting, the panellists Fabián Omar Salvioli, Waleed Sadi, Catarina de Albuquerque, Andrey Klishas, and Sakiko Fukuda-Parr, made statements. The Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Botswana, Kyrgyzstan, the Russian Federation (also on behalf of Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Philippines, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Uganda, Zimbabwe), Slovenia (also on behalf of Austria, Liechtenstein, Switzerland), , South Africa (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Brazil, Finland (also on behalf of Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden), Greece, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation);

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: European Union;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Centre pour les Droits Civils et Politiques - Centre CCPR; Human Rights House Foundation.

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

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Ecuador, France, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Namibia, the Netherlands, the Philippines, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Colombia, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nepal, Pakistan, Romania, the Sudan;

(c) Observer for a national human rights institution: Commission Nationale des Droits de l'Homme de la Mauritanie;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Espace Afrique International; Pacific Disability Forum; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

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

D. General segment

28. At the 10th meeting, on 2 March 2016, a general segment was held, during which the following addressed the Human Rights Council:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic[1] (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations), Namibia, Timor-Leste[2] (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese Language Countries).

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

(b) Representatives of observer States: Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Belarus, Croatia, Estonia, Fiji, Iceland, Malaysia, Mozambique, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Yemen.

(c) Observer for intergovernmental organizations: Gulf Cooperation Council, International Development Law Organization (IDLO), Organization of Islamic Cooperation;

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

(e) Invited members of civil society: Patrick Taran, Mandeep Tiwana, Flavio Luiz Schieck Valente, Snaliah E.G. Mahal (by video message).

29. At the same meeting, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Saudi Arabia.

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

E. Agenda and programme of work

31. At the 12th meeting, on 3 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted the agenda and programme of work of the thirty-first session.

F. Organization of work

32. At the 3rd meeting, on 29 February 2016, the President outlined the modalities for panel discussions which were summarized in the concept notes, which would be two minutes for statements by States Members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.

33. At the 10th meeting, on 2 March 2016, the President outlined the modalities for the general segment, which would be five minutes for statements by States Members of the Council and three minutes for statements by observer States and other observers.

34. At the 27th meeting, on 10 March 2016, the President outlined the modalities for the interactive dialogue on the annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, which would be three minutes for States Members of the Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

35. At the 10th meeting, on 2 March 2016, the Vice-President of the Human Rights Council outlined the modalities for the clustered interactive dialogues with special procedures mandate holders under agenda item 3, pursuant to the practice introduced at the twenty-seventh session of the Human Rights Council. The total duration of each clustered interactive dialogue would not exceed four hours. Each special procedures mandate holder in a cluster would introduce their reports within 15 minutes and respond to questions and make concluding remarks within 15 minutes. As soon as the list of speakers would be available following the electronic registration, the secretariat would calculate the estimated time needed to complete the clustered interactive dialogue with the mandate holders. Should the total duration of a given interactive dialogue be estimated to last less than four hours, the speaking time limits would be five minutes for States Members and three minutes for observer States and other observers. However, if it would be estimated to be more than four hours, the speaking time limits would be reduced to three minutes for States Members and two minutes for observer States and other observers. Should this measure be

deemed insufficient to ensure that the total duration not exceed four hours, the speaking time limit would be further reduced, with a minimum of 1.5 minute per speaker.

36. At the 31st meeting, on 11 March 2016, the President outlined the modalities for the general debates, which would be three minutes for States Members of the Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

37. At the 34th meeting, on 14 March 2016, the President outlined the modalities for individual interactive dialogues with special procedures mandate holders, which would be three minutes for States Members of the Human Rights Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

38. At the 42nd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the President outlined the modalities for the consideration of the outcomes of the universal periodic review under agenda item 6, which would be 20 minutes for the State concerned to present its views; where appropriate, 2 minutes for the national human rights institution with "A" status of the State concerned; up to 20 minutes for States Members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and United Nations agencies to express their views on the outcome of the review, with varying speaking times according to the number of speakers in accordance with the modalities set out in the Appendix to resolution 16/21; and up to 20 minutes for stakeholders to make general comments on the outcome of the review.

G. Meetings and documentation

39. The Human Rights Council held 66 fully serviced meetings during its thirty-first session.

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

H. Visits

41. At the 34th meeting, on 14 March 2016, the Minister of Justice of New Zealand, Amy Adams, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

I. Selection and appointment of mandate holders

42. At its 66th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the Human Rights Council appointed four special procedures mandate holders in accordance with Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21 and its decision 6/102 (see annex IV).

J. Adoption of the report of the session

43. At the 66th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representatives of Australia, Canada, Egypt, Japan, Myanmar, New Zealand, Pakistan, and the United States of America made statements with regard to adopted resolutions.

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

45. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft report (A/HRC/31/2) ad referendum and decided to entrust the Rapporteur with its finalization.

46. Also at the same meeting, the following made statements in connection with the session:

(a) Representative of a State Member of the Human Rights Council: Ghana;

(b) Representative of an observer State: Haiti;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights; International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of Article 19 - International Centre Against Censorship, The; CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Human Rights Watch; International Federation for Human Rights (FIDH)).

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

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

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

48. At the 27th meeting, on 10 March 2015, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement in connection with his annual report (A/HRC/31/3).

49. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 27th, 28th and 29th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the High Commissioner questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, China, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, the Dominican Republic[3] (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States),Ecuador, Egypt[4] (also on behalf of Algeria, Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, China, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Myanmar, the Netherlands (also on behalf of the European Union, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Canada, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Sudan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the Czech Republic, the Republic of Korea, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, Uruguay), the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, the Sudan, the United Arab Emirates, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe), El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of) [5](on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), Kuwait[6] (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco (on behalf of the States members and observers of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan[7] (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Panama, Paraguay, the Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Gulf Cooperation Council), Slovenia, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America[8] (also on behalf of Australia, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Benin, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Dominican Republic, Djibouti, Egypt, Fiji, Greece,

[3] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[4] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[5] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[6] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[7] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[8] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mozambique, Nepal, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Senegal, South Sudan, Spain, the Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, the United States of America, Uruguay (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Colombia), Uzbekistan;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: European Union;

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

(e) Observer for national human rights institutions: International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights (ICC);

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: American Association of Jurists; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc.; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Arab Commission for Human Rights; CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Human Rights Watch; International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR) (also on behalf of Franciscans International); 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 (also on behalf of Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs; Comité International pour le Respect et l'Application de la Charte Africaine des Droits de l'Homme et des Peuples (CIRAC)); International-Lawyers.Org.

50. At the 28th meeting, on the same day, the High Commissioner answered questions and made comments.

51. At the 29th meeting, on the same day, the High Commissioner answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

52. At the 31st meeting, on 11 March 2016, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Burundi, China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Georgia, Malaysia, Morocco, Myanmar, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, the Syrian Arab Republic.

53. Also at the same meeting, statements in exercise of a second right of reply were made by the representatives of Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Morocco, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Syrian Arab Republic.

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

54. At the 31st meeting, on 11 March 2016, the Director of the Research and Right to Development Division of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, presented thematic reports prepared by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Secretary-General under agenda items 2 and 3.

55. At its 31st, 32nd and 33rd meetings, on the same day, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on thematic reports presented by the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights (see Chapter III, section E below).

56. At the 39th meeting, on 15 March 2016, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights presented reports prepared by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights under agenda items 2 and 4 (see Chapter IV, section C below).

57. At the 51st meeting, on 21 March 2016, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights presented reports prepared by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Secretary-General under agenda items 2 and 7 (see Chapter VII, section B below).

58. At the 58th meeting, on 22 March 2016, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights presented the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the mission by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to improve human rights, accountability, reconciliation and capacity in South Sudan, including on the issue of sexual violence (A/HRC/31/49). In accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 29/13, the presentation was followed by an interactive dialogue.

59. At the same meeting, the Minister of Justice of South Sudan, Paulino Wanawilla Unango, made a statement as the State concerned.

60. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 58th meeting, on 22 March 2016, and the 59th meeting, on 23 March 2016, the following made statements and asked the Assistant Secretary-General questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Botswana, China, France, Germany, Ghana, Mexico, Portugal, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Spain, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Denmark, Egypt, Luxembourg, Mozambique, New Zealand, Norway, the Sudan, the United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: European Union;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights; East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project (also on behalf of CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation); Human Rights Watch; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; International Service for Human Rights.

61. At the 59th meeting, on 23 March 2016, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

62. At the 60th meeting, on 23 March 2016, the Deputy United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights introduced country-specific reports submitted by the Secretary-General and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights under agenda item 2 (A/HRC/31/3/Add.1, A/HRC/31/3/Add.2, A/HRC/31/21, A/HRC/31/26).

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

64. During the ensuing general debate, at the 60th and 61st meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Germany, the Netherlands (also on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Serbia, the Republic of Moldova, Ukraine), Switzerland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Canada, Greece, Honduras, Ireland, Norway, Spain, Turkey, the United States of America;

(c) Observer for a national human rights institution: Defensoría del Pueblo de Colombia;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Amnesty International; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Association for the Prevention of Torture; Centre Europe - Tiers Monde - Europe-Third World Centre; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; Colombian Commission of Jurists; Comité Permanente por la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos; Corporacion para la Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos Reiniciar; Human Rights Watch; Humanist Institute for Co-operation with Developing Countries; Indian Council of South America (CISA); International Catholic Child Bureau; International Commission of Jurists; International Fellowship of Reconciliation; International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of Colombian Commission of Jurists); Iraqi Development Organization; Peace Brigades International Switzerland (also on behalf of Oidhaco, Bureau International des Droits Humains - Action Colombie) ; United Nations Watch; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; World Organisation Against Torture;

65. At the 61st meeting, on the same day, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Cyprus, Turkey, and South Sudan.

66. At the 61st meeting, on 23 March 2016, the Deputy United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights presented reports prepared by the High Commissioner under agenda items 2 and 10 (see Chapter X, section E).

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

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

67. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.15, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, Egypt, Malaysia, Namibia, Nicaragua, the Philippines, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Belarus, China, the Congo, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Maldives, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

68. At the same meeting, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made a general comment in relation to the draft resolution.

69. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico and the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

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

In favour:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, France, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Mexico

71. The draft resolution was adopted by 33 votes to 13, with 1 abstention (resolution 31/1).

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

A. Panels

Panel discussion on climate change and the right to health

72. At its 11th meeting, on 3 March 2016, the Human Rights Council held a panel discussion on the adverse impact of climate change on State's efforts to progressively realize the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health and related policies, lessons learned and good practices.

73. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Director-General of the World Health Organization made opening statements for the panel. The Permanent Representative of Viet Nam, Trung Thanh Nguyen, moderated the discussion for the panel.

74. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Dainius Pūras, Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health; Lilibeth C. David, Undersecretary, Department of Health of the Philippines; Cristina Tirado, Adjunct Associate Professor, University of California Los Angeles; and Hindou Oumarou Ibrahim, Coordinator, Association for Indigenous Women and Peoples of Chad. The Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: the Dominican Republic[9] (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), France, the Philippines (on behalf of Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Kenya, Kiribati, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Dominican Republic, the Marshall Islands, the Niger, the Philippines, the Sudan, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen)Portugal, Slovenia (on behalf of Costa Rica Maldives Morocco, Switzerland), South Africa;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Egypt, Iceland (on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden), Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Samoa, the United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: American Association of Jurists; Franciscans International; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

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

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

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Bangladesh, China, El Salvador, Georgia, Maldives, Panama, Paraguay, the Russian Federation, South Africa (also on behalf of the group of African States), the United Arab Emirates;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Brazil, Chile, Ireland, Italy, Malawi, Peru, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Spain, Tunisia;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Righ; Indian Council of South America (CISA); Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture.

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

Annual interactive debate on the rights of persons with disabilities

79. At its 14th meeting, on 4 March 2015, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 28/4, the Council held its annual interactive debate on the rights of persons with disabilities in the form of a panel discussion. The focus of the discussion was on article 11 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities on situations of risk and humanitarian emergencies.

80. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel.

81. At the same meeting, the panellists Catalina Devandas Aguilar, Diane Kingston, Kirstin Lange, Myroslava Tataryn, Setareki Macanawai made statements. The Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, the Dominican Republican[10] (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States)France, India, Kuwait[11] (on behalf of the group of Arab States), Mexico, South Africa (on behalf of the group of African States), Thailand[12] (also on behalf of Belgium, Senegal, Colombia), , the United Arab Emirates;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Israel, Senegal;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Canners International Permanent Committee; Human Rights Watch; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

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

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

[10] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[11] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[12] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Ecuador, Georgia, Indonesia, Paraguay, the Philippines, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Brazil, Canada, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Japan, Libya, Nepal, New Zealand, Spain, the Sudan, Tunisia;

(c) Observer for a United Nations entity, specialized agency and related organization: United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF);

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights; Pan African Union for Science and Technology.

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

Annual full-day meeting on the rights of the child

86. An annual full-day meeting on the rights of the child was held on 7 March 2016, in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 28/19. The meeting was focused on the theme "Information and communications technology and child sexual exploitation", and was informed by the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (A/HRC/31/34). The meeting was divided into two panel discussions: the first panel discussion was held at the 17th meeting, on 7 March 2016; the second panel discussion was held at the 19th meeting, on the same day.

87. The first panel discussion was held at the 17th meeting, on the same day. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The Council then watched a video "Messages of children victims". The Founding Director of Internet Watch Foundation, John Carr, moderated the discussion for the panel.

88. At the same meeting, for the first panel, the following panellists made statements: the Chairperson of the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child; Maud de Boer-Buquicchio, Special Rapporteur on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography; Ernie Allen, Chairperson of the International Advisory Board of the United Kingdom initiative WePROTECT and Founder, former President and Chief Executive Officer of the International Centre for Missing & Exploited Children; and the Acting Head of the Corporate Strategy Division, International Telecommunication Union (ITU). The Council divided the first panel discussion into two slots, both held at the 17th meeting, on the same day.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, the Dominican Republic[13] (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kuwait[14] (on behalf of the group of Arab States), Mexico, the Russian Federation, South Africa (on behalf of the group of African States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Estonia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, the United States of America;

[13] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[14] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

(c) Observer for a United Nations entity, specialized agency and related organization:

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation; Human Rights Advocates Inc.; Terre Des Hommes Federation Internationale.

90. At the end of the first slot for the first panel, at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Canada[15] (on behalf of the States members and observers of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Ecuador, Georgia, India, the Netherlands, the Philippines, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Egypt, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Libya, Peru, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden (on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway), Tunisia;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: International Organization of la Francophonie;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International-Lawyers.Org; Plan International, Inc. (also on behalf of Save the Children International).

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

93. The second panel discussion was held at the 19th meeting, on the same day. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children, Marta Santos Pais, moderated the discussion for the panel.

94. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: the Deputy Director of Private Sector Engagement at the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF); Håkon Fostervold Høydal, Senior feature writer at VG (Verdens Gang AS); Michael Moran, Assistant Director, Vulnerable Communities, International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL); Brittany Smith, EU Policy Lead for Child Safety, Google Inc.; and Gaby Reyes, Founder and Director of Asociación Crecer en Red, Peru. The Council divided the second panel discussion into two slots, both held at the 19th meeting, on the same day.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: the Congo, France, Maldives, Mexico, Slovenia;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Israel, Italy, Uruguay;

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

[15] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa Culture Internationale; International Catholic Child Bureau.

96. At the end of the first slot for the second panel, at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Kyrgyzstan, Portugal, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Argentina, Belarus, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Monaco, Montenegro, Pakistan, the Sudan, Thailand;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: Organization of Islamic Cooperation;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights; European Union of Public Relations; the European Centre for Law and Justice.

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

Panel discussion on the progress in and challenges of addressing human rights issues in the context of efforts to end the HIV/AIDS epidemic by 2030

99. At its 30th meeting, on 11 March 2016, in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 30/8, the Council held a panel discussion on the progress in and challenges of addressing human rights issues in the context of efforts to end the HIV/AIDS epidemic by 2030.

100. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The Council then watched a video, "15 Years of the AIDS Response, 2000-2015".

101. At the same meeting, the Deputy Executive Director of the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) made a keynote statement. The Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, Pedro Afonso Comissário, moderated the discussion for the panel.

102. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Ayu Oktariani, Public Campaign Officer, Indonesia AIDS Coalition; Nana Oye Lithur, Minister for Gender, Children and Social Protection of Ghana; Jorge Bermudez, Vice-President of Health Production and Innovation, Fiocruz, Ministry of Health of Brazil and member of the United Nations Secretary-General's High-level Panel on Access to Medicines; Mark Dybul, Executive Director of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria; and Dainius Pūras, Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health. The Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Brazil[16] (also on behalf of Colombia, Mozambique, Portugal, Thailand), the Dominican Republic[17] (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), India, Kuwait[18] (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Morocco, Pakistan[19] (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Portugal (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese Language Countries);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Colombia, Egypt, Poland, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric AIDS Foundation (also on behalf of Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities)); International Harm Reduction Association (IHRA); the Center for Reproductive Rights, Inc.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Namibia, Panama, Paraguay, Switzerland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malawi, Monaco, Saint Kitts and Nevis, the United States of America, Uruguay;

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: International Labour Organization, World Food Program;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development; International HIV/AIDS Alliance (also on behalf of Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network; Humanist Institute for Co-operation with Developing Countries (HIVOS); International AIDS Society (IAS), Grandmothers Advocacy Network; International Lesbian and Gay Association; International Council of AIDS Service Organizations (ICASO); International Planned Parenthood Federation; the Global Network of People Living with HIV); World Young Women's Christian Association.

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

Panel discussion on the human rights dimensions of preventing and countering violent extremism

106. At its 47th meeting, on 17 March 2016, in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 30/15, the Council held a panel discussion on the human rights dimensions of preventing and countering violent extremism.

107. The Secretary-General of the United Nations (by video message) and the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made opening statements for the panel. The Permanent Representative of Colombia to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, Beatriz Londoño Soto, moderated the discussion for the panel.

[16] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[17] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[18] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[19] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

108. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Nazila Ghanea, Member of the Board of Trustees of the Universal Rights Group and Associate Professor at the University of Oxford; Gastón Garatea, Professor at the Pontifical Catholic University of Peru and former Chair of the National Bureau for the Fight against Poverty; Mehreen Farooq, Senior Fellow at the World Organization for Resource Development and Education; and Ahmed Abbadi, Secretary-General of La Rabita Mohammadia des Oulémas and Professor at Cadi Ayyad University of Marrakesh. The Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Cameroon, Colombia, France, Iraq, Mali, Morocco, Peru, Turkey, Tunisia, the United States of America), Australia[20] (also on behalf of Indonesia, Mexico, the Republic of Korea, Turkey), Ecuador, Kuwait[21] (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Morocco (also on behalf of Costa Rica, Italy, Morocco, the Philippines, Senegal, Slovenia, Switzerland, Thailand), Nigeria, Pakistan[22] (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Norway (also on behalf of Denmark, Iceland, Finland, Sweden), the Syrian Arab Republic, the United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Amnesty International; Article 19 - International Centre Against Censorship, The (also on behalf of American Civil Liberties Union; Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Association for Progressive Communications (APC); Center for Inquiry; CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Human Rights Watch; International Center for Not-for-Profit Law (INCPL); International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Humanist and Ethical Union).

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

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Morocco, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Croatia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Pakistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Tunisia, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Association Miraisme International; Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD); Rencontre Africaine pour la defense des droits de l'homme (also on behalf of Al-Hakim Foundation; Women's Federation for World Peace International); World Jewish Congress.

[20] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[21] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[22] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

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

B. Interactive dialogue with special procedures mandate holders

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

113. At the 12th meeting, on 3 March 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment, John Knox, presented his report (A/HRC/31/52).

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, the Dominican Republic[23] (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan[24] (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), the Philippines, Slovenia, South Africa (also on behalf of the group of African States), Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Egypt, Spain, Tunisia;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation; Center for Environmental and Management Studies; Commission to Study the Organization of Peace; Franciscans International; Friends World Committee for Consultation; Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD); International-Lawyers.Org; Sisters of Mercy of the Americas (also on behalf of Edmund Rice International Limited; Franciscans International; International Presentation Association; Loretto Community (Sisters of Loretto); Food & Water Watch; Temple of Understanding; VIVAT international); Villages Unis (United Villages).

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

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

116. At the 12th meeting, on 3 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context, Leilani Farha, presented her report (A/HRC/31/54 and Add.1-2).

117. At the same meeting, the representative of Cabo Verde and Serbia made statements as the States concerned.

[23] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[24] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

118. Also at the same meeting, the Ombudsman of Serbia made a statement (by video message).

119. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 12th and 13th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, China, Cuba, the Dominican Republic[25] (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, Georgia, Germany, India, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan[26] (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation)[27], Paraguay, Qatar, South Africa (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Brazil, Egypt, Finland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Spain, Tunisia;

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

(d) Observers for national human rights institutions: Scottish Human Rights Commission (by video message);

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities); Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociación Civil; Dominicans for Justice and Peace - Order of Preachers; Espace Afrique International; Human Rights Now; International Lesbian and Gay Association (also on behalf of Allied Rainbow Communities International; Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit - COC Nederland; the Swedish Federation of LGBT Rights, RFSL); Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development.

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

Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders

121. At the 13th meeting, on 3 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, Michel Forst, presented his report (A/HRC/31/55 and Add.1-2).

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

123. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 13th meeting, on 3 March 2016, and the 15th meeting, on 4 March 2016, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Belgium, Botswana, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Morocco, the Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Slovenia, South Africa (on behalf of the group of African States), Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Chile, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, Honduras, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Sierra Leone,

[25] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[26] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[27] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Spain, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, the United States of America, Uruguay, the State of Palestine;

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

(d) Observers for national human rights institutions: Equality and Human Rights Commission, Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission and Scottish Human Rights Commission (by joint video message);

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development; Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement; Asian Legal Resource Centre; Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies; East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project; Human Rights House Foundation; International Association for Democracy in Africa; International Fellowship of Reconciliation; International Service for Human Rights; Iraqi Development Organization; Liberation; Social Service Agency of the Protestant Church in Germany.

124. At the 15th meeting, on 4 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

125. At the 13th meeting, on 3 March 2016, a statement in exercise of the right of reply was made by the representative of China.

Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities

126. At the 15th meeting, on 4 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities, Catalina Devandas Aguilar, presented her report (A/HRC/31/62 and Add. 1-2).

127. At the same meeting, the representative of the Republic of Moldova made a statement as the State concerned.

128. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 15th and 16th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Belgium, Botswana, China, the Congo, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Georgia, Germany, India, Kenya, Kuwait[28] (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan[29] (also on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Panama, Paraguay, Qatar, South Africa (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Belarus, Brazil, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Malaysia, Myanmar, New Zealand, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, the Sudan, Tunisia, the United States of America;

(c) Observer for a United Nations entity, specialized agency and related organization: United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF);

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

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

[28] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[29] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Development Association (also on behalf of Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs; Comité International pour le Respect et l'Application de la Charte Africaine des Droits de l'Homme et des Peuples (CIRAC); Victorious Youths Movement); Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Association Miraisme International; International Catholic Child Bureau; Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development; Pacific Disability Forum; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

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

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

130. At the 15th meeting, on 4 March 2016, the Independent Expert on the enjoyment of human rights by persons with albinism, Ikponwosa Ero, presented her report (A/HRC/31/63).

131. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 15th and 16th 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: Algeria, Belgium, Botswana, Burundi, China, Cuba, France, Kenya, Nigeria, Portugal, South Africa (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Djibouti, Egypt, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Malawi, Mozambique, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Swaziland, Tunisia, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Espace Afrique International; Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD); Rencontre Africaine pour la defense des droits de l'homme; United Nations Watch.

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

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

133. At the 18th meeting, on 7 March 2016, the Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights, Juan Pablo Bohoslavsky, presented his reports (A/HRC/31/60, Add. 1-2 and A/HRC/31/61).

134. At the same meeting, the representatives of China and Greece made statements as the States concerned.

135. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Greek National Commission for Human Rights made a statement by video message.

136. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 18th meeting, on 7 March 2016, and the 20th meeting, on 8 March 2016, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, the Dominican Republic[30] (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), India, Kuwait[31] (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan[32] (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), South Africa (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Egypt, Sierra Leone, the Sudan, Tunisia, the Holy See;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights; International Commission of Jurists; International-Lawyers.Org; Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development; Temple of Understanding (also on behalf of Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd; Franciscans International; Sisters of Charity Federation; Sisters of Mercy of the Americas; Society of Catholic Medical Missionaries).

137. At the 20th meeting, on 8 March 2016, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the right to food

138. At the 18th meeting, on 7 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the right to food, Hilal Elver, presented her report (A/HRC/31/51 and Add.1-3).

139. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Philippines and Morocco made statements as the States concerned.

140. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of the Commission on Human Rights of the Philippines and the Conseil National des Droits de l'Homme du Maroc made statements.

141. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 18th meeting, on 7 March 2016, and the 20th meeting, on 8 March 2016, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, the Dominican Republic[33] (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, France, India, Indonesia, Kuwait[34] (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Kyrgyzstan, Mexico, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan[35] (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), South Africa, Switzerland, Togo, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Burkina Faso, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Libya, Luxembourg, Sierra Leone, the Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey;

(c) Observer for a United Nations entity, specialized agency and related organization: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations;

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

[30] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[31] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[32] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[33] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[34] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[35] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Asian Legal Resource Centre; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; Espace Afrique International; Foodfirst Information and Action Network (FIAN); Human Rights Advocates Inc.; International Commission of Jurists; International Muslim Women's Union; International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations; International-Lawyers.Org; Liberation; Temple of Understanding (also on behalf of Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd; Franciscans International; Sisters of Charity Federation; Sisters of Mercy of the Americas; Society of Catholic Medical Missionaries); Villages Unis (United Villages); World Barua Organization (WBO).

142. At the 20th meeting, on 8 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

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

143. At the 21st meeting, on 8 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, Juan Ernesto Mendez, presented his report (A/HRC/31/57 and Add. 1-6).

144. At the 22nd meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Brazil, Georgia and Ghana made statements as the States concerned.

145. At the same meeting, the representative of the Public Defender of Georgia made a statement by video message.

146. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 22nd meeting, on 8 March 2016, and the 23rd meeting, on 9 March 2016, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria, Bangladesh, China, Cuba, Ecuador, France, Nigeria, Pakistan[36] (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, Togo, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Chile, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Luxembourg, Sierra Leone, Spain, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukraine, the United States of America, Uruguay;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement; Alsalam Foundation; American Civil Liberties Union; Associacao Brasileira de Gays, Lesbicas e Transgeneros; Association for the Prevention of Torture; Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Asociación Civil; Defence for Children International; International Association for Democracy in Africa; International Lesbian and Gay Association (also on behalf of Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland; Swedish Federation of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights – RFSL); United Schools International; World Organisation Against Torture.

[36] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

147. At the 23rd meeting, on 9 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

148. At the 22nd meeting, on 8 March 2016, a statement in exercise of the right of reply was made by the representative of Egypt.

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

149. At the 21st meeting, on 8 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, Maud De Boer-Buquicchio, presented her report (A/HRC/31/58 and Add. 1-3).

150. At the 22nd meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Armenia and Japan made statements as the States concerned.

151. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 22nd meeting, on 8 March 2016, and the 23rd meeting, on 9 March 2016, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria, Bangladesh, Botswana, China, Cuba, the Dominican Republic[37] (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, France, Latvia, Nigeria, Pakistan[38] (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Chile, Croatia, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Monaco, Sierra Leone, Spain, Tunisia, the United States of America;

(c) Observer for a United Nations entity, specialized agency and related organization: United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF);

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Canners International Permanent Committee; Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd (also on behalf of Sisters of Mercy of the Americas); International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; Pan African Union for Science and Technology.

152. At the 23rd meeting, on 9 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special rapporteur on the right to privacy

153. At the 23rd meeting, on 9 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the right to privacy, Joseph Cannataci, presented his report (A/HRC/31/64).

154. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 23rd and 24th 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: Albania, Algeria, Belgium, Brazil[39] (also on behalf of Austria, Germany, Liechtenstein, Norway,

[37] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[38] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[39] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Mexico and Switzerland), China, Cuba, the Dominican Republic[40] (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ecuador, Georgia, Latvia, Paraguay, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Brazil, Denmark, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Norway, Spain;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International; Privacy International.

155. At the 24th meeting, on 9 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief

156. At the 23rd meeting, on 9 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, Heiner Bielefeldt, presented his report (A/HRC/31/18 and Add.1-2).

157. At the same meeting, the representatives of Bangladesh and Lebanon made statements as the States concerned.

158. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 23rd meeting, on 9 March 2016, and the 24th meeting, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria, Belgium, Botswana, China, Cuba, France, Georgia, Germany, Indonesia, Kuwait[41] (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Kyrgyzstan, Morocco, Portugal, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Libya, Montenegro, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Spain, the Sudan, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United States of America, the Holy See;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-khoei Foundation; Alliance Defending Freedom; Article 19 - International Centre Against Censorship, The; Association Miraisme International; British Humanist Association; Center for Inquiry; European Union of Public Relations; International Fellowship of Reconciliation; International Humanist and Ethical Union; Iraqi Development Organization; Jubilee Campaign; Shia Rights Watch Inc.; World Barua Organization (WBO); World Evangelical Alliance.

159. At the 24th meeting, on 9 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

[40] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[41] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

160. At the 25th meeting, on the same day, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of the Russian Federation.

Interactive dialogue with the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, and the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions

161. At the 24th meeting, on 9 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, Maina Kiai, and the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, Christof Heyns, presented their joint compilation report (A/HRC/31/66).

162. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 24th and 25th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteurs questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Belgium, Botswana, China, Cuba, Ecuador, France, Georgia, India, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, South Africa, Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Libya, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Spain, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Centre Europe - Tiers Monde - Europe-Third World Centre (also on behalf of International Association of Democratic Lawyers); Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociación Civil; Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Asociación Civil; East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project; Franciscans International; Human Rights House Foundation; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; Women's Human Rights International Association.

163. At the 25th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteurs answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

164. At the same meeting, a statement in exercise of the right of reply was made by the representative of Ethiopia.

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

165. At the 26th meeting, on 10 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights while countering terrorism, Ben Emmerson, presented his report (A/HRC/31/65).

166. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 26th and 27th 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: Albania, Algeria, Belgium, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, Georgia, Indonesia, Kuwait[42] (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of

[42] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Macedonia, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Afghanistan, Benin, Brazil, Egypt, Estonia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, New Zealand, Pakistan, Serbia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, the United States of America;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alulbayt Foundation; American Civil Liberties Union; East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project; Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD); Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights; Human Rights Now; Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'Homme – IIPJDH; International Commission of Jurists; International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations; People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy; World Muslim Congress.

Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights

167. At the 26th meeting, on 10 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, Karima Bennoune, presented her report (A/HRC/31/59 and Add. 1-2).

168. At the same meeting, the representative of Botswana made a statement as the State concerned.

169. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 26th and 27th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, Georgia, Morocco, Namibia, Panama, Paraguay, Qatar, the Russian Federation, South Africa, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Benin, Brazil, Cyprus, Egypt, Estonia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Serbia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Ukraine;

(c) Observer for a United Nations entity, specialized agency and related organization: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-khoei Foundation; Alsalam Foundation; Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland; International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (OIDEL).

Special Rapporteur on Minority Issues

170. At the 41st meeting, on 15 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on minority issues, Rita Izsák, presented her report (A/HRC/31/56 and Add.1).

171. At the same meeting, the representative of Brazil made a statement as the State concerned.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Bangladesh, China, Georgia, India, Latvia, Mexico, Namibia, Nigeria, the Russian Federation, South Africa, Switzerland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Austria, Azerbaijan, Hungary, Iraq, Mauritania, Nepal, Norway, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sri Lanka, the United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alliance Defending Freedom (also on behalf of Syriac Universal Alliance, The. Federation Syriaque International); Dominicans for Justice and Peace - Order of Preachers; Friends World Committee for Consultation; International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR); Japanese Workers' Committee for Human Rights; Minority Rights Group (also on behalf of Human Rights Watch); Shia Rights Watch Inc; World Jewish Congress.

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

174. At the same meeting, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Armenia, Azerbaijan, and China.

C. Interactive dialogue with Special Representatives of the Secretary-General

Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide

175. At the 13th meeting, on 3 March 2016, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 28/34, the Human Rights Council held an interactive dialogue with the Special Adviser to the United Nations Secretary-General on the prevention of genocide, on the progress made in discharging his duties, which include, inter alia, liaising with the United Nations system on activities for the prevention of genocide and working to enhance the capacity of the United Nations to analyse and manage information relating to genocide or related crimes. An opening statement was delivered by the Special Adviser, Adama Dieng.

176. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 13th meeting, on 3 March 2016, and at the 15th meeting, on 4 March 2016, the following made statements and asked the Special Adviser questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, China, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Ghana, Latvia, Morocco, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Rwanda[43] (also on behalf of the European Union, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, the Netherlands, New

[43] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Sudan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tanzania, the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Uruguay), Slovenia, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Chile, Denmark, Egypt, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Myanmar, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United States of America;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alliance Defending Freedom; Arab Commission for Human Rights; United Schools International.

177. At the 15th meeting, on 4 March 2016, the Special Adviser answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

178. At the 13th meeting, on 3 March 2016, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Armenia and Turkey.

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

Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children

180. At the 20th meeting, on 8 March 2016, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children, Marta Santos Pais, presented her report (A/HRC/31/20).

181. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 20th and 21st meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Representative questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil[44] (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese Speaking Countries), China, Croatia[45] (also on behalf of Austria and Slovenia), Cuba, the Dominican Republic[46] (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States)Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Germany, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, the Russian Federation, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Afghanistan, Angola, Australia, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Egypt, Estonia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Liechtenstein, Malawi, Malaysia, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Spain, Thailand, Tunisia, the United States of America, Zambia;

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

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

(e) Observer for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, European Union;

[44] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[45] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[46] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Defence for Children International; Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society; International Catholic Child Bureau; International Humanist and Ethical Union; Iraqi Development Organization; Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco (also on behalf of International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES), Liberation.

182. At the 21st meeting, on the same day, the Special Representative answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

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

183. At the 20th meeting, on 8 March 2016, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, Leila Zerrougui, presented her report (A/HRC/31/19).

184. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 20th and 21st meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Representative questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil[47] (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese Language Countries)[48], China, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia[49] (also on behalf of Austria and Slovenia), Cuba, , the Dominican Republic[50] (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), France, Georgia, Germany, Kuwait[51] (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan[52] (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Qatar, South Africa, Switzerland Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Afghanistan, Australia, Azerbaijan, Benin, Colombia, Egypt, Estonia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Spain, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the United States of America , the State of Palestine;

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

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

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

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

(g) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-khoei Foundation; Association Miraisme International; Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism; Child Foundation; Colombian Commission of Jurists; Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD); Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Organization for Defending Victims of Violence.

185. At the 21st meeting, on the same day, the Special Representative answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

---

[47] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[48] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[49] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[50] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[51] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[52] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

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

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

187. At the 31st meeting, on 11 March 2016, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 26/9, the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on transnational corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights, with the mandate of elaborating an international legally binding instrument, María Fernanda Espinosa, presented the report of the working group on its first session, held from 6 to 10 July 2015 and dedicated to conducting constructive deliberations on the content, scope, nature and form of the future international instrument (A/HRC/31/50).

E. General debate on agenda item 3

188. At its 31st, 32nd and 33rd meetings, on the same day, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on thematic reports under agenda items 2 and 3, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China (also on behalf of Algeria, Angola, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, the Congo, Cuba, Denmark, Egypt, Fiji, France, Greece, India, Indonesia, Italy, Kyrgyzstan, the Lao's People's Democratic Republic, Malawi, Mexico, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Panama, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Serbia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam), China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Denmark[53] (also on behalf of Chile, Ghana, Indonesia, Morocco), Ecuador, Egypt[54] (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Ecuador, Greece, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Paraguay, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Sri Lanka, the Sudan), El Salvador, Georgia, Ghana, India Iran (Islamic Republic of)[55] (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mexico (also on behalf of Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Indonesia, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Poland, 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, the United States of America, Uruguay), Namibia, the Netherlands (also on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the Republic of Moldova, Ukraine), Pakistan[56] (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso,

[53] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[54] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[55] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[56] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Belarus, Côte d'Ivoire, China, El Salvador, Mauritania, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Uganda), the Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, the Sudan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Turkey, Uruguay, Yemen), Qatar, South Africa, Switzerland, the United States of America[57] (also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Chile, Costa Rica, Egypt, Greece, Iraq, Ireland, Mozambique, Norway (also on behalf of Turkey), Pakistan, Spain, the Sudan, Tajikistan, Tunisia, the United States of America, the State of Palestine;

(c) Observer for United Nations entities, specialized agencies and related organizations: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR);

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

(e) Observer for a national human rights institution: ICC Working Group on Business and Human Rights (by video message);

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs; African Development Association; International Career Support Association; African Regional Agricultural Credit Association; Alliance Defending Freedom (also on behalf of Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, Inc.; Howard Center for Family, Religion and Society; Pure in Heart - America Inc.); Alsalam Foundation; American Association of Jurists; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc.; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Article 19 - International Centre Against Censorship, The; Asian Legal Resource Centre (also on behalf of Franciscans International); Association apprentissage sans frontiers; Association Dunenyo; Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism; Association Solidarité Internationale pour l'Afrique (SIA); Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of Association Points-Coeur; Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul; Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd; Fédération Internationale des Associations Médicales Catholiques (FIAMC); International Catholic Child Bureau; Mouvement International d'Apostolate des Milieux Sociaux Independants (MIAMSI); Pax Romana (International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs and International Movement of Catholic Students); Teresian Association; World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations); Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace; Canners International Permanent Committee; Center for

[57] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Environmental and Management Studies; Center for Inquiry; Centre Europe - Tiers Monde - Europe-Third World Centre (also on behalf of International Association of Democratic Lawyers); Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; Chant du Guépard dans le Désert; Child Foundation, CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Colombian Commission of Jurists (also on behalf of Women's International League for Peace and Freedom); Comision Juridica para el Autodesarrollo de los Pueblos Originarios Andinos – Capaj; Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme; Commission to Study the Organization of Peace; European Centre for Law and Justice, The / Centre Europeen pour le droit, les Justice et les droits de l'homme; European Union of Public Relations; Family Health Association of Iran; Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos; Foodfirst Information and Action Network (FIAN); France Libertes : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand; Friends of the Earth International; Friends World Committee for Consultation; Global Helping to Advance Women and Children; Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD); Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant (also on behalf of Defence for Children International (DCI); Plan International Inc.; Save the Children International; SOS Children's Villages International); Hazrat Javad-al-Aemeh Cultural Charity Institute; Human Rights Advocates Inc.; Human Rights Watch; Il Cenacolo; Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society; Indian Council of Education; Indian Council of South America (CISA); Institute for Policy Studies; Integrated Youth Empowerment - Common Initiative Group (I.Y.E. – C.I.G.); International Association for Democracy in Africa; International Catholic Migration Commission; International Commission of Jurists; International Educational Development, Inc.; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (also on behalf of World Organisation Against Torture); International Federation of University Women (also on behalf of Association Points-Coeur; Foundation for GAIA; International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR); International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (OIDEL); Make Mothers Matter – MMM; Planetary Association for Clean Energy, Inc. The; Servas International; Sovereign Military Order of the Temple of Jerusalem (OSMTH); Teresian Association); International Fellowship of Reconciliation; International Humanist and Ethical Union; International Institute for Non-aligned Studies; International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations; International Muslim Women's Union; International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; Iraqi Development Organization; Japanese Workers' Committee for Human Rights; Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Kiyana Karaj Group; Liberation; Make Mothers Matter – MMM; Minority Rights Group; Organisation pour la Communication en Afrique et de Promotion de la Cooperation Economique Internationale - OCAPROCE Internationale; Organization for Defending Victims of Violence; Pan African Union for Science and Technology; Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation; Peivande Gole Narges Organization; Prahar; Prevention Association of Social Harms (PASH); Rencontre Africaine pour la defense des droits de l'homme; Reporters Sans Frontiers International - Reporters Without Borders International; Save the Children International (also on behalf of Defence for Children International; Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant; Plan International Inc.); Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of Environment; Terre Des Hommes Federation Internationale; the Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims; The Society for Recovery Support; Union of Arab Jurists; United Nations Watch; United Network of Young Peacebuilders (UNOY Peacebuilders) (also on behalf of Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII; Center for Global Nonkilling; Conscience and Peace Tax International (CPTI); International Fellowship of Reconciliation; Servas International); United Schools International; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; Women's Human Rights International Association (also on behalf of International Educational Development, Inc.); World Barua Organization (WBO); World

Environment and Resources Council (WERC); World Evangelical Alliance; World Future Council Foundation; World Jewish Congress; World Muslim Congress; World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations (also on behalf of International Association of Charities).

189. At the 33rd meeting, on the same day, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of India and Pakistan.

F. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Integrity of the judicial system

190. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.1, sponsored by Belarus, Cuba, the Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Burkina Faso, China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Morocco, Sierra Leone and Sri Lanka joined the sponsors.

191. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

192. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/2).

193. At the 66th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of India made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

High-level panel on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Human Rights Council

194. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Switzerland introduced draft decision A/HRC/31/L.2, sponsored by Belgium, Gabon, Germany, Mexico, Nigeria, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Switzerland, Thailand and Uruguay and co-sponsored by Armenia, Georgia and Portugal. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Azerbaijan, Botswana, Cabo Verde, the Congo, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritius, Mongolia, San Marino and Sierra Leone joined the sponsors.

195. 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.

196. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation (also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Myanmar, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, the Sudan, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe) madegeneral comments in relation to the draft resolution.

197. At the same meeting, the draft decision was adopted without a vote (decision 31/115).

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

198. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Mexico introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.3, sponsored by Mexico and co-sponsored by Albania,

Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay. Subsequently, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Egypt, Italy, Lithuania, Maldives, Poland, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Sierra Leone and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

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

200. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/3).

Commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration on the Right to Development

201. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.6, sponsored by the Islamic Republic of Iran (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement) and co-sponsored by Brazil and China. Subsequently, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Paraguay joined the sponsors.

202. 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.

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

204. 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:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Abstaining:

Albania, Belgium, France, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

205. The draft resolution was adopted by 34 votes to 0, with 13 abstentions (resolution 31/4).

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

206. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Portugal introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.7/Rev.1, sponsored by Portugal and co-sponsored by Angola, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Ukraine and Uruguay. Subsequently, Algeria, Armenia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Georgia, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, New Zealand, the Philippines, Rwanda, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia and Viet Nam joined the sponsors.

207. At the same meeting, the representative of South Africa made a general comment in relation to the draft resolution.

208. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/5).

The rights of persons with disabilities in situations of risk and humanitarian emergencies

209. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representatives of Mexico and New Zealand introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.8, sponsored by Mexico and New Zealand and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, the United States of America and Uruguay. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Niger, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Togo, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

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

211. At the same meeting, the representative of Cuba made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

212. At the same meeting, the draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/6).

Rights of the child: information and communications technologies and child sexual exploitation

213. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representatives of the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union) and Uruguay (on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/l.9/Rev.1, sponsored by Argentina, Austria, the Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland,

Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Angola, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Egypt, Georgia, Ghana, Iceland, Israel, Kazakhstan, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, the Philippines, Qatar, the Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Serbia, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey and Ukraine. Subsequently, Algeria, Benin, Botswana, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mongolia, Namibia, Portugal, Rwanda, Sierra Leone and Sri Lanka joined the sponsors.

214. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands orally revised the draft resolution.

215. Also at the same meeting, the President announced that amendment A/HRC/31/L.88 to draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.9/Rev.1 as orally revised had been withdrawn.

216. At the same meeting, the representative of South Africa made a general comment in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

217. At the same meeting, the draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/7).

Human rights and the environment

218. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representatives of Costa Rica, Maldives and Slovenia introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.10, sponsored by Costa Rica, Maldives, Morocco, Slovenia and Switzerland and co-sponsored by Angola, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Fiji, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, Slovakia, Spain, Tunisia, and Yemen. Subsequently, Andorra, Australia, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chad, Chile, the Congo, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Libya, Lithuania, Namibia, New Zealand, the Niger, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, the Sudan, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

219. At the same meeting, the representative of Slovenia orally revised the draft resolution.

220. At the same meeting, the representatives of Bolivia (Plurinational State of) and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made general comments in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

221. At the same meeting, the draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/8).

222. At the 66th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

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

223. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Finland introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.11, sponsored by Brazil, Finland, Germany and Namibia, and

co-sponsored by Andorra, Angola, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, France, Georgia, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Turkey and Uruguay. Subsequently, Algeria, Belarus, Benin, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Haiti, Ireland, Morocco, Qatar, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Ukraine and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

224. At the same meeting, the representative of South Africamade a general comment in relation to the draft resolution.

225. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/9).

The right to food

226. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.14, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Ecuador, Egypt, Honduras, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, South Africa, Thailand, Turkey, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cabo Verde, China, the Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, the Dominican Republic, France, Georgia, Greece, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Monaco, the Niger, Pakistan, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Switzerland and the Syrian Arab Republic joined the sponsors.

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

228. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Plurinational State of Bolivia made a general comment in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

229. At the same meeting, the draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/10).

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

230. At the 62nd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.16, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, Namibia, Nicaragua, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Belarus, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, the Congo, Egypt, Greece, Honduras, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

231. At the same meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

232. 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:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Georgia, Mexico

233. The draft resolution was adopted by 33 votes to 12, with 2 abstentions (resolution 31/11).

Promotion of the enjoyment of the cultural rights of everyone and respect for cultural diversity

234. At the 63rd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.17, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, Egypt, Honduras, Malaysia, Namibia, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Cabo Verde, Chile, China, Cyprus, the Dominican Republic, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Mexico, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

235. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/12).

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

236. At the 63rd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Austria (also on behalf of Senegal and Slovenia) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.18, sponsored by Austria, Senegal and Slovenia, and co-sponsored by Armenia, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Croatia, Denmark, Finland, Georgia, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America. Subsequently, Albania, Benin, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, the Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Latvia, Lithuania, Morocco, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Ukraine and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

237. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/13).

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

238. At the 63rd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Poland introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.19, sponsored by Australia, Chile, Poland, the Republic of

Korea and South Africa, and co-sponsored by Albania, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, the Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Yemen. Subsequently, Afghanistan, Brazil, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Kazakhstan, Maldives, Myanmar, Pakistan, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Sri Lanka and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

239. 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.

240. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/14).

The right to work

241. At the 63rd meeting on 23 March 2016, the representatives of Egypt and Greece introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.32, sponsored by Egypt, Greece, Indonesia, Mexico and Romania, and co-sponsored by Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, China, the Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ecuador, Georgia, Italy, Luxembourg, Maldives, Montenegro, Nigeria, Paraguay, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Spain, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cabo Verde, Costa Rica, Finland, France, Germany, India, Kyrgyzstan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Rwanda, Serbia, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Togo, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

242. At the same meeting, the representatives of Indonesia and Mexico made general comments in relation to the draft resolution.

243. 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.

244. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/15).

Freedom of religion or belief

245. At the 63rd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.35, sponsored by the Netherlands and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of

Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay. Subsequently, Argentina, Cabo Verde, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, France, Guatemala, Honduras, Japan, New Zealand, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea Sri Lanka, Switzerland and Thailand joined the sponsors.

246. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation made a general comment in relation to the draft resolution.

247. 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.

248. At the same meeting, the representative of Saudi Arabia made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

249. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/16).

Human rights education and training

250. At the 64th meeting on 24 March 2016, the representative of Morocco introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.12, sponsored by Costa Rica, Italy, Morocco, the Philippines, Senegal, Slovenia, Switzerland and Thailand, and co-sponsored by Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Libya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mali, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia and Turkey. Subsequently, Albania, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Mexico, Mongolia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), the United Arab Emirates, Ukraine and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

251. At the same meeting, the representative of Morocco orally revised the draft resolution.

252. Also at the same meeting, the President announced that amendment A/HRC/31/L.80 to draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.12 as orally revised had been withdrawn.

253. At the same meeting, the representative of South Africa made a general comment in relation to the draft resolution.

254. 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.

255. At the same meeting, the draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/21).

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

256. At the 64th meeting on 24 March 2016, the representative of South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.24/Rev.1, sponsored by South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States). Subsequently, Bangladesh, Honduras, Indonesia and Sri Lanka joined the sponsors.

257. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico, the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

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

In favour:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Abstaining:

Albania, Belgium, France, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Mexico, Netherlands, Panama, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

259. The draft resolution was adopted by 32 votes to 0, with 15 abstentions (resolution 31/22).

Promoting human rights through sports and the Olympic ideal

260. At the 64th meeting on 24 March 2016, the representative of Greece (also on behalf of Brazil, China, the Congo, Cyprus, Japan, Lebanon, Morocco, the Republic of Korea and the Russian Federation) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.29, sponsored by Brazil, China, the Congo, Cyprus, Greece, Japan, Lebanon, Morocco, the Republic of Korea and the Russian Federation, and co-sponsored by Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Chile, Cuba, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Germany, Ghana, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Montenegro, Namibia, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Serbia, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Timor-Leste, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Austria, Azerbaijan, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Croatia, the Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, Guatemala, Haiti, Indonesia, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Monaco, Mongolia, New Zealand, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Moldova, Slovenia, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

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

262. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/23).

Effects of terrorism on the enjoyment of all human rights

263. At the 64th meeting on 24 March 2016, the representative of Egypt introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.13/Rev.1, sponsored by Angola, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, and Saudi Arabia, and co-sponsored by Algeria, Bahrain, Cameroon, Chad, the Congo, Cuba,

Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Nigeria, Oman, the Philippines, Senegal, Somalia, South Sudan, the Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela withdrew co-sponsorship of the draft resolution. Subsequently, Cabo Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Maldives, the Niger, the Russian Federation and Togo joined the sponsors.

264. At the same meeting, the representative of Morocco made general comments in relation to the draft resolution.

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

266. At the same meeting, the representatives of Belgium, Ecuador, Mexico, the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), South Africa and Switzerland, made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution. In her statement, the representative of Ecuador disassociated the delegation from the consensus on preambular paragraph 8 and operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

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

In favour:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, France, Germany, Latvia, Mexico, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, South Africa, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nigeria, Panama

268. The draft resolution was adopted by 28 votes to 14, with 5 abstentions (resolution 31/30).

Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment: safeguards to prevent torture during police custody and pretrial detention

269. At the 64th meeting on 24 March 2016, the representative of Denmark introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.26/Rev.1, sponsored by Denmark and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Djibouti, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay. Subsequently, Guatemala, Indonesia, Japan,

Maldives, Mongolia, the Netherlands, Rwanda, Serbia and Sierra Leone joined the sponsors.

270. At the same meeting, the representative of Denmark orally revised the draft resolution.

271. Also at the same meeting, the President announced that amendment A/HRC/31/L.82 to draft resolution A/HRC/31/26/Rev.1 as orally revised had been withdrawn.

272. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and Switzerland made general comments in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

273. 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.

274. At the same meeting, the representative of Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of Bahrain, Egypt, Kuwait, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, the Sudan and the United Arab Emirates) made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

275. At the same meeting, the draft resolution as orally revised was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/31).

Protecting human rights defenders, whether individuals, groups or organs of society, addressing economic, social and cultural rights

276. At the 65th meeting on 24 March 2016, the representative of Norway introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.28, sponsored by Norway and co-sponsored by Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Djibouti, France, Georgia, Ghana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia and Uruguay. Subsequently, Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Israel, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Morocco, the Netherlands, Peru, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Ukraine and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

277. At the same meeting, the representative of Norway orally revised the draft resolution.

278. Also at the same meeting, the President announced that amendment A/HRC/31/L.52 to draft resolution A/HRC/31/28 as orally revised had been withdrawn.

279. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced amendments A/HRC/31/L.41, A/HRC/31/L.42, A/HRC/31/L.43, A/HRC/31/L.44, A/HRC/31/L.45, A/HRC/31/L.46, A/HRC/31/L.47, A/HRC/31/L.48, A/HRC/31/L.49, A/HRC/31/L.50, A/HRC/31/L.51, A/HRC/31/L.53, A/HRC/31/L.54, A/HRC/31/L.55, A/HRC/31/L.56, A/HRC/31/L.57, A/HRC/31/L.58, A/HRC/31/L.59, A/HRC/31/L.60, A/HRC/31/L.61, A/HRC/31/L.62, A/HRC/31/L.63, A/HRC/31/L.64, A/HRC/31/L.65, A/HRC/31/L.66, A/HRC/31/L.67, A/HRC/31/L.68. A/HRC/31/L.69, A/HRC/31/L.70 and A/HRC/31/L.71 to draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.28 as orally revised.

280. Amendments A/HRC/31/L.41, A/HRC/31/L.43, A/HRC/31/L.62 were sponsored by China, Cuba, Egypt, Pakistan and the Russian Federation, and co-sponsored by the Islamic Republic of Iran. Subsequently, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors. Amendments A/HRC/31/L.42, A/HRC/31/L.44,

A/HRC/31/L.47, A/HRC/31/L.48, A/HRC/31/L.49, A/HRC/31/L.50, A/HRC/31/L.55, A/HRC/31/L.56, A/HRC/31/L.59, A/HRC/31/L.60, A/HRC/31/L.61, A/HRC/31/L.64, A/HRC/31/L.66, A/HRC/31/L.67, A/HRC/31/L.68, A/HRC/31/L.69, A/HRC/31/L.70 and A/HRC/31/L.71 were sponsored by China, Cuba, Egypt, Pakistan and the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors. Amendments A/HRC/31/L.45, A/HRC/31/L.51, A/HRC/31/L.54, A/HRC/31/L.57 and A/HRC/31/L.63 were sponsored by China, Cuba Egypt, Pakistan and the Russian Federation, and co-sponsored by the Islamic Republic of Iran. Subsequently, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors. Amendments A/HRC/31/L.46, A/HRC/31/L.53 and A/HRC/31/L.58 were sponsored by China, Cuba, Egypt, Pakistan and the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.65 was sponsored by China, Egypt, Pakistan and the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors.

281. At the same meeting, the representatives of Belgium, France, Germany, Latvia, Namibia and Panama (also on behalf of Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay) made general comments in relation to draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.28 as orally revised as well as on the proposed amendments.

282. Also at the same meeting, the Council took action on amendments L.41, L.43, L.46 and L.58 (see also paras. 283-285 below).

283. At the same meeting, the representatives of Germany, Panama, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendments A/HRC/31/L.41, A/HRC/31/L.43, A/HRC/31/L.46 and A/HRC/31/L.58.

284. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendments A/HRC/31/L.41, A/HRC/31/L.43, A/HRC/31/L.46 and A/HRC/31/L.58. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

285. Amendments A/HRC/31/L.41, A/HRC/31/L.43, A/HRC/31/L.46 and A/HRC/31/L.58 were rejected by 14 votes to 22, with 10 abstentions[58].

286. At the same meeting, the representatives of Georgia and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.42.

[58] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.

287. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.42. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Morocco, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

288. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.42 was rejected by 14 votes to 20, with 12 abstentions[59].

289. At the same meeting, the representatives of Latvia, Mexico and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.44.

290. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.44. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Namibia, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

291. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.44 was rejected by 14 votes to 21, with 11 abstentions[60].

292. At the same meeting, the representatives of Georgia and the Netherlands made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.45.

293. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.45. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

[59] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.
[60] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Namibia, Philippines, South Africa, Togo

294. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.45 was rejected by 13 votes to 20, with 13 abstentions[61].

295. At the same meeting, the representatives of Belgium and Latvia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.47.

296. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.47. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Maldives, Namibia, Philippines, South Africa, Togo

297. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.47 was rejected by 15 votes to 21, with 10 abstentions[62].

298. At the same meeting, the representatives of Georgia and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.48.

299. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.48. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama,

[61] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.
[62] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.

Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, India, Kenya, Namibia, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

300. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.48 was rejected by 12 votes to 23, with 11 abstentions[63].

301. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico and the Netherlands made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.49.

302. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.49. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

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

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Namibia, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

303. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.49 was rejected by 13 votes to 22, with 11 abstentions[64].

304. At the same meeting, the representatives of Portugal and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.50.

305. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.50. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

[63] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.
[64] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.

Algeria, Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

306. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.50 was rejected by 13 votes to 22, with 11 abstentions[65].

307. At the same meeting, the representatives of France and Latvia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.51.

308. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.51. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Namibia, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

309. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.51 was rejected by 12 votes to 21, with 13 abstentions[66].

310. At the same meeting, the representatives of Albania and Slovenia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.53.

311. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.53. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

312. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.53 was rejected by 14 votes to 22, with 10 abstentions[67].

[65] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.
[66] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.
[67] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.

313. At the same meeting, the representative of Belgium made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.54.

314. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.54. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Namibia, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

315. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.54 was rejected by 13 votes to 20, with 13 abstentions[68].

316. At the same meeting, the representatives of France and Latvia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.55.

317. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.55. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Nigeria, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

318. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.55 was rejected by 15 votes to 20, with 11 abstentions[69].

319. 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/31/L.56.

320. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.56. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

[68] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.
[69] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

321. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.56 was rejected by 13 votes to 21, with 12 abstentions[70].

322. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.57.

323. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.57. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Indonesia, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Maldives, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

324. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.57 was rejected by 13 votes to 22, with 11 abstentions[71].

325. At the same meeting, the representatives of Georgia and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.59.

326. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.59. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

[70] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.
[71] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

327. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.59 was rejected by 13 votes to 21, with 12 abstentions[72].

328. At the same meeting, the representatives of Albania and Mexico made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.60.

329. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.60. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

330. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.60 was rejected by 11 votes to 21, with 14 abstentions[73].

331. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.61.

332. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.61. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

[72] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.
[73] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Namibia, Philippines, South Africa, Togo

333. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.61 was rejected by 15 votes to 21, with 10 abstentions[74].

334. At the same meeting, the representatives of France 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/31/L.62.

335. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.62. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Philippines, South Africa, Togo

336. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.62 was rejected by 13 votes to 22, with 11 abstentions[75].

337. At the same meeting, the representatives of Panama and Slovenia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.63.

338. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.63. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Philippines, South Africa, Togo

339. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.63 was rejected by 13 votes to 21, with 12 abstentions[76].

[74] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.
[75] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.

340. At the same meeting, the representatives of Albania and Latvia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.64.

341. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.64. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Philippines, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

342. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.64 was rejected by 12 votes to 20, with 14 abstentions[77].

343. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.65. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, India, Nigeria, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

344. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.65 was rejected by 12 votes to 20, with 13 abstentions[78].

345. At the same meeting, the representatives of Albania and Mexico made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.66.

346. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.66. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

[76] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.
[77] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.
[78] The delegations of Cuba and Mongolia did not cast a vote.

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

347. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.66 was rejected by 13 votes to 21, with 12 abstentions[79].

348. At the same meeting, the representatives of Slovenia and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.67.

349. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.67. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Congo, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

350. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.67 was rejected by 13 votes to 22, with 11 abstentions[80].

351. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.68.

352. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.68. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Congo, Cuba, India, Nigeria, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

[79] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.

[80] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

353. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.68 was rejected by 13 votes to 21, with 12 abstentions[81].

354. At the same meeting, the representative of France made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.69.

355. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.69. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Congo, Cuba, India, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

356. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.69 was rejected by 12 votes to 22, with 12 abstentions[82].

357. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.70.

358. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.70. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Congo, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

359. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.70 was rejected by 17 votes to 20, with 9 abstentions[83].

[81] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.
[82] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.
[83] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.

360. At the same meeting, the representative of Latvia made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.71.

361. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.71. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Congo, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Algeria, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Namibia, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

362. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.71 was rejected by 14 votes to 20, with 12 abstentions[84].

363. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Botswana, China, Cuba, Ecuador, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Viet Nam, made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

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

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, South Africa, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Against:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Abstaining:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), El Salvador, Kenya, Namibia, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela

365. Draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.28 as orally revised was adopted by 33 votes to 6, with 8 abstentions (resolution 31/32).

366. At the 66th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representatives of Côte d'Ivoire and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

[84] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.

The promotion and protection of human rights in the context of peaceful protests

367. At the 66th meeting on 24 March 2016, the representatives of Costa Rica, Switzerland and Turkey introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.21, sponsored by Costa Rica, Switzerland and Turkey and co-sponsored by Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Ghana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Tunisia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Croatia, Cyprus, Djibouti, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Japan, Morocco, the Netherlands, Panama, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

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

369. Also at the same meeting, the President announced that the amendments A/HRC/31/L.73 and A/HRC/31/L.77 to draft resolution A/HRC/31/ L.21 as orally revised had been withdrawn.

370. At the same meeting, the representative of China introduced amendments A/HRC/31/L.72, A/HRC/31/L.74, A/HRC/31/L.75, A/HRC/31/L.76, A/HRC/31/L.78 and A/HRC/31/L.79 to draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.21 as orally revised.

371. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.72 was sponsored by China, Cuba, Iran (Islamic Republic of) and the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Egypt. Subsequently, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.74 was sponsored by China, Egypt and the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Bangladesh, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.75 was sponsored by China, Cuba, Iran (Islamic Republic of) and the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Bangladesh, Saudi Arabia an the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors. Amendments A/HRC/31/L.76 and A/HRC/31/L.78 were sponsored by China, Cuba, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of) and the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.79 was sponsored by China, Cuba, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Pakistan and the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors.

372. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Switzerland made a statement in relation to the proposed amendments to draft resolution A/HRC/L.21 as orally revised.

373. At the same meeting, the representatives of France, Namibia, the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and South Africa made general comments in relation to draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.21 as orally revised as well as the proposed amendments.

374. At the same meeting, the representatives of Panama and Slovenia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.72.

375. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.72. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Congo, Cuba, India, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Algeria, Belgium Botswana, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Nigeria, Qatar, Togo

376. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.72 was rejected by 12 votes to 23, with 11 abstentions[85].

377. At the same meeting, the representatives of Albania and Belgium made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.74.

378. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.74. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, India, Kyrgyzstan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Algeria, Belgium Botswana, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Namibia, Nigeria, Togo

379. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.74 was rejected by 12 votes to 23, with 10 abstentions[86].

380. At the same meeting, the representatives of Georgia, the Netherlands and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.75.

381. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.75. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

[85] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.

[86] The delegations of Cuba and Mongolia did not cast a vote.

Against:

Albania, Algeria, Belgium Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Congo, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Nigeria, Togo, Viet Nam

382. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.75 was rejected by 17 votes to 23, with 6 abstentions[87].

383. At the same meeting, the representatives of Paraguay 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/31/L.76.

384. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.76. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Congo, Cuba, India, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Algeria, Belgium Botswana, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Nigeria, Togo

385. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.76 was rejected by 13 votes to 24, with 9 abstentions[88].

386. At the same meeting, the representatives of Georgia and the Netherlands made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.78.

387. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.78. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Cuba, India, Kenya, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Algeria, Belgium Botswana, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

[87] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.
[88] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.

Abstaining:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, South Africa, Togo

388. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.78 was rejected by 13 votes to 23, with 10 abstentions[89].

389. At the same meeting, the representatives of Germany and Latvia made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/31/L.79.

390. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Switzerland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/31/L.79. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bangladesh, Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Kyrgyzstan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Algeria, Belgium Botswana, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Namibia, Nigeria, Qatar, South Africa, Togo

391. Amendment A/HRC/31/L.79 was rejected by 13 votes to 22, with 11 abstentions[90].

392. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Cuba, China, India, Morocco, the Russian Federation and Viet Nam made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

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

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Namibia, Nigeria, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam

394. The draft resolution as orally revised was adopted by 31 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions[91] (resolution 31/37).

[89] The delegation of Mongolia did not cast a vote.

[90] The delegation of Mongolia did not a cast a vote.

395. At the 66th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

[91] The delegation of the Congo did not cast a vote.

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

396. At the 38th meeting, on 15 March 2016, the Chairperson of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic, Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro, presented the report of the Commission (A/HRC/31/68), pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 28/20.

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

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

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

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Croatia, the Czech Republic, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Estonia, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Malaysia, New Zealand, Romania, Senegal, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden (also on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway), Tunisia, Turkey, the United States of America, the Holy See;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alliance Defending Freedom; Allied Rainbow Communities International (also on behalf of International Lesbian and Gay Association); Arab Commission for Human Rights; Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies; Child Foundation; Ecumenical Alliance for Human Rights and Development (EAHRD); Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

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

400. Also at the same meeting, the Chairperson answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

B. Interactive dialogue with special procedures mandate holders

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

401. At the 34th meeting, on 14 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Marzuki Darusman, presented his report (A/HRC/31/70).

402. 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: Albania, Botswana, Cuba, China, France, Germany, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belarus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Japan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lithuania, New Zealand, Norway, Slovakia, Spain, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International; Human Rights Watch; People for Successful Corean Reunification; United Nations Watch.

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

Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea

404. At the 34th meeting, on 14 March 2016, the Human Rights Council heard an oral update of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea, Sheila B. Keetharuth.

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

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

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

(b) Representatives of observer States: Djibouti, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Norway, , the Sudan, the United States of America;

(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 (also on behalf of Reporters Sans Frontiers International - Reporters Without Borders International); Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'Homme- IIPJDH; International Fellowship of Reconciliation; United Nations Watch; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

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

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

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

409. At the 35th meeting, on 14 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ahmed Shaheed, presented his report (A/HRC/31/69).

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

411. 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: Belgium, China, Cuba, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belarus, Canada, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Iraq, Israel, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, the United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Allied Rainbow Communities International; Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism; Baha'i International Community; Child Foundation; Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; Organization for Defending Victims of Violence; Prevention Association of Social Harms (PASH); the Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

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

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

Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar

414. At the 36th meeting, on 14 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, Yanghee Lee, presented her report (A/HRC/31/71).

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

416. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 36th and 37th 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: Albania, Belgium, China, Cuba, France, Ghana, India, the Netherlands, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Gulf Cooperation Council), the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam (also on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belarus, Cambodia, Croatia, the Czech Republic, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Estonia, Ireland, Japan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, the United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International; Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development; Human Rights Now; Human Rights Watch; International Bar Association (also on behalf of International Commission of Jurists); International Educational Development, Inc.; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; Jubilee Campaign.

417. At the 37th meeting, on the same day, the representative of Myanmar made final remarks as the State concerned.

418. At the 37th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

C. General debate on agenda item 4

419. At the 39th meeting, on 15 March 2016, in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 28/22, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights presented the comprehensive report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the role and achievements of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, including on the field-based structure established to strengthen the monitoring and documentation of the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (A/HRC/31/38).

420. At the same meeting, pursuant to Human Rights Council Resolution 29/18, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights provided an oral update on progress in the cooperation between Eritrea and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.

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

422. At its 39th and 40th meetings, on 15 March 2016, 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: Belgium, Canada[92] (also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America), China, Cuba, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of)[93] (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), Myanmar[94] (also on behalf of Belarus, China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, India, Nicaragua, the Sudan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe), the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union), the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Slovenia, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Canada, the Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Eritrea, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Japan, Montenegro, Norway, Solomon Islands, Spain, the Sudan, Ukraine, the United States of America;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs; Africa Culture Internationale; African Development Association; African Regional Agricultural Credit Association; Agence Internationale pour le Developpement; Al-Hakim Foundation; Alliance Defending Freedom; Alsalam Foundation; American Association of Jurists; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc.; Amnesty International; Arab Commission for Human

[92] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[93] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[94] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Rights; Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development; Association Dunenyo; Association Solidarité Internationale pour l'Afrique (SIA); Baha'i International Community; British Humanist Association; Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies; Canners International Permanent Committee; Center for Environmental and Management Studies; Center for Global Nonkilling (also on behalf of Conscience and Peace Tax International (CPTI)); Centre Europe - Tiers Monde - Europe-Third World Centre; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; Chant du Guépard dans le Désert; Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims, The; Child Foundation; CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme; Commission to Study the Organization of Peace; Coordinating Board of Jewish Organisation (also on behalf of B'nai B'rith International); European Union of Public Relations; Family Health Association of Iran; Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos; France Libertes: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand; Freedom House; Helios Life Association; Human Rights Watch; Il Cenacolo; Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society; Indian Council of Education; Indian Council of South America (CISA); Institute for Women's Studies and Research; Integrated Youth Empowerment - Common Initiative Group (I.Y.E. – C.I.G.); International Association for Democracy in Africa; International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL) (also on behalf of Centre Europe - Tiers Monde - Europe-Third World Centre); International Commission of Jurists; International Educational Development, Inc.; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; International Fellowship of Reconciliation; International Humanist and Ethical Union; International Institute for Non-aligned Studies; International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations; International Lesbian and Gay Association; International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR) (also on behalf of Shimin Gaikou Centre (Citizens' Diplomatic Centre for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples)); International Muslim Women's Union; International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; International Service for Human Rights; International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations; Iranian Elite Research Center (also on behalf of Agence pour les droits de l'homme); Iraqi Development Organization; Islamic Women's Institue of Iran; Liberation; Minority Rights Group; Organisation pour la Communication en Afrique et de Promotion de la Cooperation Economique Internationale - OCAPROCE Internationale; Organization for Defending Victims of Violence; Pan African Union for Science and Technology; Peivande Gole Narges Organization; Prahar; Presse Embleme Campagne; Rencontre Africaine pour la defense des droits de l'homme (also on behalf of Espace Afrique International ; Solidarité Suisse-Guinée ; Women's Federation for World Peace International); Society for Development and Community Empowerment; Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of Environment; The Institute on Human Rights and The Holocaust; Touro Law Center; Union of Arab Jurists; United Nations Watch; United Schools International; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; Victorious Youths Movement; Women's Human Rights International Association; World Barua Organization (WBO); World Environment and Resources Council (WERC); World Jewish Congress; World Muslim Congress.

423. At the 41st meeting, on the same day, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Bahrain, Burundi, China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Indonesia, Japan, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

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

D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

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

425. At the 63rd meeting on 23 March 2016, the representatives of Japan and the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.25, sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Canada, Georgia, Iceland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Maldives, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine and the United States of America. Subsequently, Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica, Honduras, Micronesia (Federated States of), New Zealand, Palau, San Marino and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

426. At the same meeting, the representative of Indonesia made general comments in relation to the draft resolution.

427. 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.

428. At the same meeting, the representatives of Bangladesh, Cuba, China, Ecuador, the Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution. In his statement, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela disassociated the delegation from the consensus on the draft resolution.

429. Also at the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/18).

The human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic

430. At the 63rd meeting on 23 March 2016, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (also on behalf of France, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Unites States of America and Turkey) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.5, sponsored by France, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Unites States of America, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Liechtenstein, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine. Subsequently, Bahrain, Canada, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Honduras, Norway, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Switzerland and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors.

431. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Ecuador, the Netherlands, the Russian Federation and Switzerlandmade general comments in relation to the draft resolution.

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

433. 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.

434. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

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

In favour:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Bangladesh, Burundi, Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia, Nigeria, Philippines, South Africa, Viet Nam

436. Draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.5 was adopted by 27 votes to 6, with 14 abstentions (resolution 31/17).

Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

437. At the 63rd meeting on 23 March 2016, the representative of Sweden (also on behalf of the Republic of Moldova, the former Yugoslav Republic of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.27, sponsored by the Republic of Moldova, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, New Zealand, San Marino and Seychelles joined the sponsors.

438. Also at the same meeting, in accordance with rule 116 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela moved the adjournment of the consideration of the draft resolution.

439. Subsequently, the representatives of China and the Russian Federation made statements in favour of the motion. The representatives of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements against the motion.

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

In favour:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, El Salvador, France, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,

Abstaining:

Burundi, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Togo

441. The motion to adjourn the consideration of the draft resolution as orally revised was rejected by 14 votes to 23, with 9 abstentions[95].

442. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made a general comment in relation to the draft resolution.

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

444. 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.

445. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Cuba, China, Mexico, Paraguay, the Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

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

In favour:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, El Salvador, France, Germany, Latvia, Mexico, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Against:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Abstaining:

Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Ghana, Maldives, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Philippines, Togo

447. The draft resolution was adopted by 20 votes to 15, with 11 abstentions[96] (resolution 31/19).

[95] The delegation of Georgia did not cast a vote.

[96] The delegation of Georgia did not cast a vote.

Situation of human rights in South Sudan

448. At the 63rd meeting on 23 March 2016, the representative of Albania (also on behalf of Paraguay, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America), Paraguay and the United States of America introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.33, sponsored by Albania, Paraguay, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, and co-sponsored by Australia, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia and Spain. Subsequently, Andorra, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, San Marino, Senegal, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

449. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America orally revised the draft resolution.

450. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria and the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made general comments in relation to the draft resolution, as orally revised.

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

452. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution. The Chief of the Programme Support and Management Services of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement in relation to the budgetary implications of the draft resolution, as orally revised.

453. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Cuba, Ecuador and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution. In their statements, the representatives of China, Ecuador and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) disassociated their delegations from the consensus on the draft resolution as orally revised.

454. Also at the same meeting, the draft resolution as orally revised was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/20).

Situation of human rights in Myanmar

455. At the 64th meeting on 24 March 2016, the representative of the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.30/Rev.1, sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Costa Rica, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and the United States of America. Subsequently, Israel, the Republic of Korea, Serbia and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

456. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Indonesia, the Philippines and Viet Nam made general comments in relation to the draft resolution.

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

458. 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.

459. At the same meeting, the representatives of Cuba, Ecuador, India, the Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution. In their statements, the representatives of Ecuador, the Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) disassociated their delegations from the consensus on the draft resolution.

460. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/24).

V.Human rights bodies and mechanisms

A. Forum on Minority Issues

461. At the 42nd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on minority issues, Rita Izsák, introduced the recommendations adopted by the Forum on Minority Issues at its eighth session, convened on 24 and 25 November 2015 (A/HRC/31/72).

B. Special Procedures

462. At the 42nd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Chairperson of the Coordination Committee of Special Procedures, Michael K. Addo, presented the report on the twenty-second annual meeting of special rapporteurs and representatives, independent experts and working groups of the special procedures of the Human Rights Council, including updated information on the special procedures, which was held in Geneva from 8 to 12 June 2015 (A/HRC/31/39).

C. General debate on agenda item 5

463. At its 42nd meeting, on 15 March, and the 49th meeting, on 18 March 2016, 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: Belgium, China, Cuba, Ghana, the Netherlands (also on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine), the Russian Federation, Uruguay[97] (also on behalf of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Tunisia), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Austria, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Pakistan, the Republic of Moldova, Spain, Tunisia;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: Gulf Cooperation Council;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa Culture Internationale; Agence Internationale pour le Developpement; Alliance Defending Freedom; Alsalam Foundation; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Canners International Permanent Committee; Center for Environmental and Management Studies; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme; Commission to Study the Organization of Peace; European Union of Public Relations; Friends World Committee for Consultation; Fundación Latinoamericana por los Derechos Humanos y el Desarrollo Social; Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD);

[97] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Indian Council of South America (CISA); International Association for Democracy in Africa; International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL) (also on behalf of Centre Europe - Tiers Monde - Europe-Third World Centre); International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations; International Service for Human Rights; Iraqi Development Organization; Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Liberation, Arab Commission for Human Rights; Minority Rights Group; Organization for Defending Victims of Violence; Pan African Union for Science and Technology; Prahar; World Barua Organization (WBO); World Jewish Congress; World Muslim Congress.

VI. Universal periodic review

464. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 60/251, 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 (UPR), the Council considered the outcome of the reviews conducted during the twenty-third session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review held from 2 to 13 November 2015.

465. In accordance with resolution 5/1, the President outlined that all recommendations must be part of the final document of the UPR and accordingly, the State under Review should clearly communicate its position on all recommendations either by indicating that it "supports" or "notes" the concerned recommendations.

A. Consideration of the universal periodic review outcomes

466. In accordance with paragraph 4.3 of President's statement 8/1, the following section contains a summary of the views expressed on the outcome by States under review, Member and Observer States of the Council, as well as general comments made by other relevant stakeholders before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary.

Federated States of Micronesia

467. The review of the Federated States of Micronesia was held on 02 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by the Federated States of Micronesia in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/FSM/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/FSM/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/FSM/3).

468. At its 42nd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the Federated States of Micronesia (see section C below).

469. The outcome of the review of the Federated States of Micronesia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/4), the views of the Federated States of Micronesia concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, as well as its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group (see also A/HRC/31/4/Add.1).

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

470. The Permanent Representative of the Federated States of Micronesia, H. E. Ms. Jane J. Chigiyal stated that the Federated States of Micronesia supported 2 recommendations during the UPR Working Group in November 2015 and took back the remaining 93 recommendations, which were shared with the Task Force on the UPR.

471. She noted that many of the recommendations from the second cycle of the UPR were the same as the ones offered during the first cycle of the UPR, which is an indication

of the challenges that the Federated States of Micronesia face and will continue to face in implementation.

472. She assured the Human Rights Council that the Task Force on the UPR had undertaken a number of consultative activities to raise awareness about the Federated States of Micronesia's commitments as reflected in the addendum (A/HRC/31/4/Add.1), what and how the country needs to do, and to chart a way forward.

473. She emphasized the fact that the Government had supported 63 out of a total of 95 recommendations, and that the remaining 32 noted recommendations formed part of a work-plan that would involve many public awareness activities, and a reassessment of its human, institutional capacities in order to be able to harmonize its policies and mainstream a people-centred approach. She further stated that such an approach would take into consideration its internal process on treaty ratification/accession and implementation, and constitutional reform.

474. She also stressed the importance of taking ownership of the process to ensure that the Federated States of Micronesia lives up to its commitments, and to ensure that the process is sustainable.

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

475. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Federated States of Micronesia, 8 delegations made statements.

476. Fiji welcomed the Federated States of Micronesia's commitment towards removing the reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women as recommended by States during its second cycle review, and its work towards completing its National Gender Policy. At the same time, Fiji urged the Federated States of Micronesia to take concrete and rapid measures to address domestic violence issues and issues of gender inequalities offering to provide assistance or partnership on such matter.

477. Nigeria commended the Federated States of Micronesia on the ratification of the Optional protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, and continuing efforts to review the remaining core human rights treaties for ratification. Nigeria welcomed the Federal Government's efforts along with 4 States in the country towards active engagement to implement its human rights obligations and strengthen the existing human rights mechanisms, including institutions, child rights, and addressing violence against women.

478. Pakistan noted with appreciation the Federated States of Micronesia's commitment to developing socio-economic development plans that take human rights concerns into consideration. Pakistan acknowledged that despite the challenges, the Federated States of Micronesia had committed to continuing to engage with United Nations and development partners to promote and enhance human rights protection in the country.

479. Sierra Leone was encouraged to note the establishment of a Human Rights/UPR Task Force to assist implementation processes regarding the ratification of international instruments. Sierra Leone also noted the Government's intention to seek assistance and collaborate with development partners to devise viable strategies for preventing violence against women, and for empowering women. Sierra Leone commended the country's ongoing efforts to protect the rights of the child, including drafting its second periodic country report with a view to submitting it to the Committee on the Rights of the Child in the near future. However, Sierra Leone encouraged the Government to raise the minimum age of consent to 18 years.

480. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela noted that the Federated States of Micronesia had made the progress in fulfilling its human rights obligations, despite the challenges of geographical dispersion and climate change. It also noted that the Federated States of Micronesia ratified several international human rights instruments, and enacted important laws such as the Law against Trafficking in Persons. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela encouraged the Government to continue strengthening its successful social policies in favour of its people, especially the most vulnerable.

481. China welcomed that the Federated States of Micronesia supported most of the recommendations received, including the one made by China to reduce violence against women. China encouraged the Federated States of Micronesia to gradually implement the supported recommendations, and urged the international community to provide the Federated States of Micronesia with necessary technical assistance and support.

482. Cuba highlighted the progress made on human rights, including disability policy, the ratification of several international human rights instruments and the approval of the Law against Trafficking in Persons. Cuba urged the international community to respond positively to the request for assistance from the Federated States of Micronesia to coordinate their initiatives on human rights. Cuba further noted that the Federated States of Micronesia had taken into account two recommendations made by Cuba, through which Cuba invited the Federated States of Micronesia to continue working towards the creation of a national policy on gender issues and continue to fight the negative consequences of climate change.

483. Estonia welcomed the positive approach taken by the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia to support most recommendations on a wide range of issues, including ratification of core human rights treaties. Estonia also positively noted the Government commitment to tackle human trafficking issues and to strengthen gender equality and empowerment of women, including completing its National Gender Policy. At the same time, Estonia regretted that various recommendations related to domestic violence and violence against women and the removal of reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination against Women had not enjoyed express support from the Government, while taking note of the assurance to continue to implement measures to address these issues.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

484. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Federated States of Micronesia, two other stakeholders made statements.

485. United Nations Watch stated that respect for human rights and the founding principles of the Charter of the United Nations were manifest not only by a government policy and practice but also by the degree to which it supports the promotion and protection of human rights in the international arena. It also noted that the Federated States of Micronesia had taken firm and principled positions in support of peace, human rights and equality principles. While noting that due to its small size, the Federated States of Micronesia has no delegation in Geneva, United Nations Watch expressed concern that a member State of the United Nations is effectively denied the right to participate in the vital day-to-day mechanisms of the United Nations human rights system, including the Human Rights Council and the treaty bodies. On the tenth anniversary of the Human Rights Council, United Nations Watch invited the host country and the United Nations as a whole to find ways and means to ensure the full participation of all member States of the United Nations fulfilling the Charter's promise of equality for all nations, large and small.

486. United Schools International noted that the law of the Federated States of Micronesia provided effective means of addressing reported human rights abuses. It also

noted that in recent years, only judicial delays, incidences of domestic violence, child neglect and allegations of government corruption were reported. United Schools International further stated that there were neither reports of government actions affecting constitutional guarantees on the free exercise of religion nor those of significant societal actions affecting religious freedom.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

487. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 95 recommendations received, 63 enjoy the support of the Federated States of Micronesia, and 32 are noted.

488. The Permanent Representative of the Federated States of Micronesia, H. E. Ms. Jane J. Chigiyal made concluding remarks by thanking all delegations and non-governmental organizations for constructive comments. She stressed that the exercise held today was not only about what the Federated States of Micronesia was not able to do, but also about learning from each other on best practices. The forum provided the venue for the country to forge partnerships to help each other, advance, promote, and safeguard the rights of its people.

489. She further went on to state that the UPR provided the opportunity for the Federated States of Micronesia to review, take stock of its work, and also help lift each other towards the same goals.

490. She reemphasized the fact that one could not talk about human rights without talking about the greatest challenge for the Federated States of Micronesia, namely the adverse impacts of climate change, which speaks to the country's right to develop and exist as a people.

Lebanon

491. The review of Lebanon was held on 2 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Lebanon in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/LBN/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/ LBN/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/ LBN/3).

492. At its 43rd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Lebanon (see section C below).

493. The outcome of the review of Lebanon comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/5), the views of Lebanon concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, as well as its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group *(see also A/HRC/31/5/Add.1)*.

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

494. The Head of delegation, her Excellency Ms. Najla Riachi Assaker, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary and Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United

Nations Office at Geneva, presented the position of Lebanon with regards to the recommendations: out of the 219 recommendations that were presented to Lebanon, 128 were accepted, two were partially accepted and 89 were noted. In sum, Lebanon accepted around 60% of the recommendations. The Lebanese authorities emphasized that they stay faithful towards all their international obligations, especially in the field of human rights, despite the exceptional, hard, and sensitive times Lebanon is experiencing, with fighting terrorism, as well as the effects of the unprecedented number of refugees and Syrian displaced persons on the social, political, financial and economic stability of the country. The delegation affirmed the commitment of Lebanon towards the UPR mechanism, to develop and improve the human rights situation in all states. It also confirmed its respect towards all human rights treaties and its mechanisms, and considered that the continuous cooperation with them is essential to strengthen the human rights situation in the country. They saw this commitment in a wider frame of credibility and transparency, which pushed them to accept the recommendations that could actually be implemented before the next UPR in 2020.

495. The delegation clarified that a high percentage of the noted recommendations could have been accepted, and it would have been easier for Lebanon to accept them, if it was not for the insistence that Lebanon's commitments should always be affiliated with credibility. In this framework, Lebanon will not hesitate to contact the Secretariat of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, responsible for the UPR mechanism, concerning any other additional recommendations that can be applicable, even if they were not accepted in the beginning. Furthermore, they clarified that the majority of the noted recommendations, had not been accepted because their implementation could not be ensured in the upcoming years. Simply, Lebanon has decided to accept what it thinks can fulfill.

496. The delegation also stated that Lebanon looks at the UPR as a mechanism that encourages and stimulates the developments of the human rights situation, and that was their aim to reach during the first UPR. However, the hard times that the region is going through, in addition to what Lebanon in particular is also going through, had undoubtedly affected the situation in a negative way, alongside all the plans to develop the human rights situation in the country.

497. The delegation stated that Lebanon, as described, the "message country", represented a unique model of diversity, and an oasis of coexistence between all different religions and sects, and this is what is needed most in a region where violence, extremism and wars are increasing. Additionally, they noted that the report of the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion and belief, on his visit to Lebanon, which was presented before the Human Rights Council last week, was an additional proof of the fact that there is space for religious freedom in the country despite the hard circumstances; and that they upheld on preserving and strengthening that, as the Lebanese constitution enshrined the general principles of human rights, amalgamating the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in its preamble, this declaration in which Lebanon was one of the key contributors to its draft. Moreover, they stated that freedom of expression, protected constitutionally, is manifested through the Lebanese political life and in the various activities of political parties and unions; it is also expressed through the high number and variety of media, where freedom of political expression is guaranteed.

498. The delegation stated, , that Lebanon is well aware about a number of issues and problems that touch the lives of the citizens, that needs further development. The Lebanese government, therefore, does not spare any effort to try and tackle the situation, despite the limited number of cases which do not represent the overall environment that prevails in the country. That shows the important role played by civil society organizations, as well as human rights activist. The flourishment of these organizations and their effective role is

another proof on the freedoms that they enjoy, and on the conviction of the government of the role they play to promote the culture of human rights, especially monitoring and highlighting violations, and to assist with the clarification of ideas in order to legalize them when necessary.

499. Lebanon reminded that it has never closed its borders to any seeker of safety, or any oppressed, despite the fact that Lebanon has not ratified the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, and despite its limited capacity. They highlighted that the world has recently witnessed the dangerous challenges that were faced by Europe, even with its strong economic and political stability in addition to its vast geography, caused by the flow of thousands of refugees. The delegation further asked how a country as small as Lebanon could endure such situation, and confirmed that Lebanon has been committed and dealt with every aspect of the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, despite not signing it, in a better way than most countries that ratified it, but never abided with its contents.

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

500. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Lebanon, 17 delegations made statements. The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints[98] are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.

501. Afghanistan appreciated Lebanon's strong commitment in spreading the culture of human rights through educational curriculum, awareness-raising campaigns and its continued efforts to strengthen human rights for all citizens without any distinction in the country. Afghanistan also appreciated the attention given by the Government of Lebanon to refugees and to the recommendations related to this matter in order to enhance the legal framework by promoting human rights, security and well-being or refugees and migrants in Lebanon.

502. Albania was satisfied with the steps to implement the National Plan for Human Rights (NHRP) and the law to protect women against domestic violence; appreciated efforts responding to the Syrian refugee situation; and acknowledged the challenges affecting Lebanon including the influx of refugees and threat of terrorism. Finally, Albania encouraged Lebanon to step up the work on implementing all States recommendations including those related to continued efforts to improve the functioning of the educational system, and take necessary measures to ensure effective protection against discrimination to all migrant domestic workers.

503. Algeria congratulated Lebanon for the progress in different areas of human rights particularly in promoting economic, social and cultural rights, the legislative measures on women rights, the bill to establish a national human rights institution, the adoption of a national plan to integrate persons with disabilities and the amendments to the legislation to criminalize torture. They appreciated Lebanon's submission of its overdue report to the human rights treaty bodies. They noted that despite all the difficulties, Lebanon continued to exert its maximum efforts to promote and protect human rights.

504. Armenia appreciated the positive engagement of Lebanon with the Human Rights Council in the UPR process and commended Lebanon for accepting a significant number of recommendations including those made by Armenia, which indicates the commitment of Lebanon to the protection and promotion of human rights in the country. They highly

[98] https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx

appreciated the promotion of diversity and tolerance between different ethnic groups living in Lebanon.

505. Belgium commended Lebanon for accepting the recommendation related to torture, pursuant to article 1 of the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and to fight impunity in this area. They regretted that the three other recommendations they made had not been accepted. They believed that Lebanon should commit towards the abolition of death penalty for all crimes and consider a de jure moratorium on executions. They acknowledged the burden on Lebanon and expressed their solidarity with the people that have generously welcomed an amazing number of refugees who have been the victims of the Syrian conflict. They recommended ratifying the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and its additional protocol and their implementation. They noted that certain discrimination continues to exist against women and refugees from Palestine and recommended the Lebanese government to continue its efforts to rectify this.

506. China appreciated Lebanon constructive engagement with the UPR. China thanked Lebanon for accepting its recommendations to fight terrorism in order to provide a security guarantee for the enjoyment of human rights, to positively consider the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and to protect the rights of persons with disabilities in education, employment and participation on public and political life. China also expressed its concern about the challenges currently faced by Lebanon about terrorist threats in addition to the presence of Syrian refugees and called the international community to provide support to it.

507. Côte d'Ivoire welcomed the interest paid to all recommendations made during the UPR and thanked Lebanon for accepting the recommendations they made. It remained convinced that implementation of recommendations will contribute effectively to the strengthening of measures for the promotion of the enjoyment of all human rights in the country. They welcomed the measure of the government to strengthen security in the country and encouraged Lebanon to continue its efforts and cooperation with all the human rights mechanisms.

508. Cuba recognized the progress made by Lebanon in human rights and particularly the establishment of a National Plan for integration of persons with disabilities as well as the adoption of a national law on domestic violence. It appreciated that the country borne in mind the two recommendations made by Cuba through which it invited Lebanon to continue implementing the program for supporting the poorest families as well as to explore possible measures for reducing the elevated health care costs and the quality discrepancies that exist in the provision of these services.

509. Egypt commended Lebanon for the cooperation with the human rights mechanisms and congratulated them for accepting 128 recommendations. It commended the continuous efforts to promote human rights particularly by hosting more than a million and a half Syrian refugees, about half of its population, in addition to hosting half a million Palestinian refugees since 1948, to become a model for others to learn from. They appreciated the NHRP 2014-2019 and the efforts in providing human rights training programmes and awareness to security and military forces, and the adoption of a large number of laws and the 10 years national strategy for women.

510. Gabon welcomed Lebanon's commitment to follow up on the UPR recommendations they supported during the review. They noticed the efforts to improve human rights particularly to improve the institutional and normative framework, despite the difficult political and economic context. They paid tribute to actions for migrants and efforts to combat terrorism, trafficking in person and torture in places of detention. They encouraged Lebanon to continue its efforts in the pursuance of UPR recommendations.

511. Indonesia was honoured to be member of the Troika during Lebanon´s Review and commended Lebanon's commitment during the process. Indonesia expressed its appreciation for accepting the recommendations they made to redouble its efforts in finalizing the establishment of an independent national human rights institution in accordance with the Paris Principles and to continue its ongoing efforts in adopting various national human rights policies based on the National Human Rights Plan 2014-2019 including the necessary budgetary requirements for the actual implementation of those policies.

512. The Islamic Republic of Iran stated that Lebanon had actively participated in the UPR process which demonstrates the commitment of Lebanon to the work of the Humans Rights Council. The Islamic Republic of Iran indicated as well that two of the recommendation made by the country during Lebanon's review were accepted being a clear manifestation of the commitment of Lebanon in the promotion and protection of human rights.

513. Iraq commended Lebanon for abiding with its obligations under international treaties, its cooperation with the human rights mechanisms, as well as its acceptance of most of the UPR recommendations, including those submitted by Iraq. They welcomed measures taken on policy issues related to freedom of the press, freedom of expression, freedom of religion and belief, education, health and housing, combatting domestic violence, and combatting trafficking in persons. They also commended its efforts to strengthen women's rights and gender equality, strengthening democracy and the independence of the judiciary.

514. Jordan appreciated the acceptance of Lebanon to most of the recommendations made to it during the UPR, including those presented by Jordan. This reflected Lebanon continuous commitment in promoting and protecting human rights and basic freedoms, despite the crises and the great challenges that Lebanon is facing economically and financially, as a result of receiving Syrian refugees. Jordan was confident that Lebanon will continue to intensify its efforts during the coming years to implement the recommendations they accepted.

515. Kuwait appreciated the position of Lebanonon the UPR recommendations. They noted that Lebanon, through its intellectual, multi-cultural and multi-religious diversity, despite the economic and political challenges, and taking into consideration the exceptional circumstances and the fact that they are the recipient of more than 1.5 million Syrians since 2011, was a model to follow in promoting and protecting human rights. They noted the commitment to the cooperation with all United Nations human rights procedures and mechanism and showed its readiness to continue its international cooperation and positive dialogue on all human rights issues.

516. Libya thanked Lebanon for its active participation in the UPR. It commended Lebanon's efforts aimed at promoting and protecting human rights and in confronting all challenges that it faces, despite the difficult circumstances that it is going through. It appreciated Lebanon's acceptance of many recommendations presented to it and wished them success.

517. Malaysia recognized Lebanon's humanitarian assistance to people fleeing conflict and persecution, despite the many economic, social and security challenges it is faced with, and encouraged Lebanon to continue its endeavours in promoting and protecting human rights in the country. Malaysia were pleased that the recommendation made by the country had been accepted in order to encourage Lebanon to continue its positive efforts in ensuring effective implementation of its National Human Rights Plan, including by seeking necessary technical and financial assistance.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

518. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Lebanon, nine other stakeholders made statements. The statements of the stakeholders that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints[99] are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.

519. United Nations Watch noted that the purpose of this review is to make a difference on the ground, by holding governments to account. They asked if human rights activists support or object to the report on Lebanon's human rights record. They quoted six paragraphs from the report that commended or acknowledged the progress and commitment of Lebanon to human rights issues, to say that the truth is the opposite, which is that Lebanon's human rights record received a negative rating, including on civil liberties and political rights and as reported, denying Palestinians their universal human rights, including the freedom to work in numerous professions and to earn a living. They also quoted paragraph 93 of the report and for all of these reasons, they believed that the victims of human rights abuse and terrorism around the world object to the adoption of the report.

520. Arab Commission for Human Rights commended Lebanon acceptance of recommendations to ratify the optional protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, and the Convention on the Rights of persons with Disabilities, as well as the recommendations related to the prevention and criminalization of torture and amend its legislation in accordance with the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment . They called on accelerating the establishment of the national mechanism for the prevention of torture, under the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment . They expressed concern for the fact that Lebanon noted recommendations related to Palestinian refugees, particularly recommendations 40, 167 and 154 relating to registration of refugee children born in Lebanon and issue the necessary documents. They hoped that Lebanon submit its periodic reports to the Human Rights bodies, and establish a national system for reporting and follow-up on implementation of recommendations, in accordance with accepted recommendations. They urged Lebanon to report on the progress of implementation of accepted recommendations and present a mid-term report.

521. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit - COC Nederland, (also on behalf of International Lesbian and Gay Association) noted that Lebanon received seven different recommendations related to sexual orientation and gender issues and were not satisfied with the responses to the decriminalization of homosexuality, calling it ambiguous with no moral or reasonable justification. They questioned the continued arrests if Article 534 is enforced lightly and court rulings are being acknowledged and how they justify the continued utilization of illegal methods to prove homosexuality. They urged Lebanon to uphold human rights and dignity. They stated that the LGBTQ community is frequently targeted by discrimination with limited safeguards in the absence of laws and procedures. They reported police abuse, deprivation of health and work rights and with impunity to perpetrators. They called for immediate end of aggression and harassment against Syrian LGBT refugees.

522. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom recognized that Lebanon has been facing deep socio-political turmoil but still has international obligations to adhere to with respect to women's rights. It was alarmed that Lebanon did not explicitly accept any

[99] https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx

of the recommendation in order to lift its reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women or to amend its discriminatory personal status laws. It urged Lebanon to develop a national action plan according to the UNSCR/1325 and regretted that no recommendations were made by member states on this issue even though Syrian conflict complicates Lebanon´s work. It highlighted that only 3.1% of parliamentary seats are hold by women and no women ministers in the cabinet. It recommended that Lebanon reaches at least 33% gender quota. They were concerned with the number of violations to Palestinian and Syrian refugee women and urged protecting them from gender based violence and to be able to seek redress.

523. Action Canada for Population and Development was concerned that recommendations on LGBTI were noted. Lebanon stated that its law doesn´t criminalizes homosexuality but the organization informed that it has found that police forces still abuse, citing article 534 of the Penal Code. It mentioned that while Lebanon accepted recommendations for the promotion for gender equality the state did not accept specific recommendations related to domestic violence, rape, adultery, abortion, personal status and nationality among others. It urged imposing appropriate criminal penalties for violence incitement for the aforementioned issues furthermore to criminalise marital rape and decriminalise seeking and providing abortion, and to approve a reproductive health education and gender program taking necessary measures to allow LGBTI and women´s right to register and cooperate with the government.

524. International Association for Democracy in Africa expressed that since Lebanon's independence it has been a fundamental actor in the Middle East and in the International Community. Tolerance and the encouragement of diversity as well as the strong political culture have confirmed Lebanon as a world prominence. Separation between branches of the state is a constitutional principle. It indicated that Lebanon is now in its fifth year of the worst humanitarian crisis since the Second World War, the number of refugees have stabilized partly as result of the adoption of border restrictions, however authorities have taken steps forward hosting refugees but they cannot shoulder this situation alone, international support had helped but Lebanon still has many humanitarian needs to fulfil.

525. Amnesty International was disappointed that Lebanon rejected recommendations to enforce the law on The Protection of Women and Family Members form Domestic Violence, to criminalize marital rape, to withdraw reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women and to amend the personal status laws to enable women to obtain a divorce and the custody of their children. It recognized Lebanon's efforts hosting over one million Syrian refugees but rejected the policies implemented for the renewals of residence permits as well as the unwillingness for ratify the 1951 Refugee Convention and its Protocol, and violating the principle of non-refoulement by forcibly returning Syrian refugees. Amnesty regretted Lebanon's rejection to amend the labour code and the visa sponsorship system to ensure legal protection to migrant workers from abuses by their employers.

526. Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development noted that Lebanon has not withdrawn its reservations to the the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women about equal rights with men regarding the nationality of their children and concerning equality in the marriage and family relationships to guarantee women´s rights to property, inheritance and to freely dispose of their own financial resources. It called the Lebanese government to amend the legislative provisions in order to criminalize marital rape. They urged Lebanon complies with article 7 of the convention in order to increase the number of women who can be elected for public office including through temporary special measures in accordance with article 4.1 of the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women.

527. Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture regretted that Lebanon did not support recommendations on the abolition of death penalty and lamented that the country had accepted the same recommendations done during 2010 UPR cycle, mostly remained unimplemented. It expressed that the Syrian refugee crisis is not an acceptable excuse and that the political instability due to the differences and conflicts between politicians and sectorial interests are transforming Lebanon's Human Rights situation in a disaster. They noted issues of slow trails disabled demands and the rights of women to a nationality to her children and rights of Palestinian refugees as a failure of the governments. They called for the establishment of a timetable for the implementation and follow up of the recommendations, to start a serious dialogue with civil society and to create a national mechanism or body to ensure the follow up of the recommendations.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

528. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 221 recommendations received, 128 enjoyed the support of Lebanon, additional clarification was provided on another 2 recommendations, indicating which part of the recommendation was supported and which part was noted, and 91 are noted.

529. In conclusion, the head of delegation appreciated and thanked the secretariat for their efforts, in preparing the report on Lebanon, and the efforts made by the troika, composed of Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Indonesia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on the day of the review. They also thanked all the delegations who participated in the UPR, whether in their reports, or their recommendations, and those who have showed support.

Mauritania

530. The review of Mauritania was held on 3 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Mauritania in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/MRT/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/MRT/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/MRT/3).

531. At its 43rd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Mauritania (see section C below).

532. The outcome of the review of Mauritania comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/6), the views of Mauritania concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, as well as its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group *(see also A/HRC/31/6/Add.1)*.

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

533. Mauritania reiterated its commitment to cooperate with the UPR mechanism, which allowed objective evaluation of the implementation of human rights in the ground.

534. Mauritania highly appreciated the fruitful dialogue resulting in 200 recommendations which were very seriously considered. During the working Group,

Mauritania accepted 136 recommendations. Some of them had been effectively implemented or were under implementation. It noted 58 recommendations, and its position regarding six recommendations was postponed. After a careful consideration and consultation with stakeholders, Mauritania decided to support four and note two of the pending recommendations.

535. Recommendations to ratify international conventions in line with the Constitution and domestic legislation were supported.

536. Recommendation to reform the nationality law to provide women the capacity to transmit citizenship on an equal basis with men (127.5) was not supported. The current legislation does not allow that women transmit citizenship to their children automatically.

537. Recommendation to fully implement the recommendations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (126.6) was also noted, taking into account Mauritania's reservations to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

538. Mauritania expressed commitment to effectively implement supported recommendations. It stated that the recommendations which were not supported were in contradiction with the Constitution and could not be implemented.

539. Mauritania had ratified most of the core international human rights instruments and as well as treaties on the field of humanitarian law. Mauritania indicated that some recommendations were not accepted because they are repetitive, such as recommendations to ratify the second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

540. Mauritania accepted the majority of recommendations related to the protection of women and children. The Government was currently working on implementing a number of policies and strategies to protect children and women such as the family policy and national strategy for the promotion of the rights of women. In this context, Mauritania referred to preventive measures provided by the criminal law and the law on the protection of children.

541. Mauritania indicated that it paid particular attention to finishing the drafting of the law to prevent violence against women and was also working for establishing an increased number of centers for the reintegration of children. The criminal responsibility was set up at 15 years old, and the labor code prohibited the work of children under that age.

542. Mauritania also accepted a number of recommendations to cooperate with international human rights mechanisms and also agreed with the visits of the Special Rapporteur on the contemporary forms of racism, the Working Group on arbitrary detention, the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery and recently, the visit of the Special Rapporteur on Torture. During the current year, the Independent Expert on Extreme Poverty and the Special Rapporteur on violence against women will visit the country.

543. Regarding civil and political rights, the Government is working to implement the recommendations supported, particularly to provide an environment of freedom of expression and prosperity of civil society.

544. Concerning economic and social rights, the third national strategy to fight poverty had been implemented and had allowed to improve the living conditions of the population and help them to deal with food crisis. Mauritania stated that, in the context of special grow and prosperity strategy for 2016-2030, a reform had been implemented in addition to measures to facilitate property. Regarding the right to heath, Government's health policy had been focused on fighting maternal mortality. In the field of education, several

programmes had been adopted specially to help poor and rural categories of the population, with a focus on vulnerable groups such elderly persons.

545. Moreover, Mauritania will continue implementation of the action plan to combat all forms of slavery. In 2015, legislative measures were adopted to criminalize slavery and special courts were established.

546. Mauritania also referred to the action plan to fight racial discrimination, xenophobia and intolerance, and to the two legal frameworks to combat trafficking in persons and trafficking in migrants. In addition, a national committee for human rights was established in 2012.

547. Finally, Mauritania expressed its commitment to continue positive interaction with all human rights mechanisms, and was looking forward to establish a national plan of action, in cooperation with OHCHR and other partners, aimed at implementing the supported recommendations.

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

548. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Mauritania, 17 delegations made statements. The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints[100] are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.

549. Togo thanked Mauritania for accepting its recommendation calling for the separation of minors from adults in detention places. Togo regretted, however, that its recommendation to abolish the death penalty did not enjoy Mauritania's support.

550. Tunisia noted the outcome of the UPR and the recommendations that had been accepted. Tunisia welcomed Mauritania's determination to strengthen human rights, the rule of law and the country's institutions. Tunisia recommended the adoption of the UPR report of Mauritania and wished Mauritania every success.

551. The United Arab Emirates congratulated Mauritania for its commitment towards UPR and for having accepted a number of recommendations. It highly appreciated measures taken in particular regarding economic, social and cultural rights, with a view to guarantee sustainable development and social justice. It hoped that Mauritania will take up all the challenges and pursue its efforts to carry out reforms to guarantee human dignity and to strengthen the rule of law.

552. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed that Mauritania had submitted reports under treaty bodies and ratified most of the international human rights instruments. It noted with satisfaction that the Mauritanian National Human Rights Commission is in conformity with the Paris Principles and thus has been granted with « A » status. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela acknowledged efforts deployed by Mauritania to implement the accepted UPR recommendations.

553. Yemen welcomed Mauritania's efforts to strengthen human rights despite difficulties it faced. It noted with satisfaction that Mauritania had accepted a large number of recommendations and actively promote human rights, which proved its determination to improve human rights in all areas. Yemen also welcomed progress made by Mauritania.

554. Algeria commended Mauritania's commitment to promoting and protecting human rights and thanked Mauritania for the additional information provided. Algeria noted

[100] https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx

progress in Mauritania at several levels, despite lacking financial resources. Algeria thanked Mauritania for implementing its recommendations.

555. Angola appreciated the fact that Mauritania had ratified several human rights instruments, particularly the International Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities and that it had adhered to the mechanisms of the African Union. Angola encouraged Mauritania to continue its institutional and legal reforms by adopting measures to facilitate access to justice for all, to further integrate women into the country's social and political life and to eliminate slavery. Angola noted that Mauritania had adopted effective measures to combat female genital mutilation and to provide equal opportunities for women.

556. Bahrain welcomed the positive and transparent manner in which Mauritania had addressed the different phases of the UPR. Bahrain welcomed Mauritania's efforts to provide health care coverage and promote and protect the rights of women. Bahrain also welcomed Mauritania's attention to children, particularly compulsory primary education, and the fight against trafficking in persons. Bahrain appreciated that Mauritania accepted its two recommendations and encouraged Mauritania to continue to deploy additional efforts to implement the recommendations arising from the UPR.

557. Belgium regretted the fact that none of its recommendations were accepted by Mauritania, including recommendations regarding the death penalty. While Belgium welcomed the continued moratorium on executions, it recommended that Mauritania take additional steps to abolish *de jure* the capital punishment. Belgium noted the commutation of all death sentences to prison sentences. Belgium would have hoped that Mauritania accept its recommendation related to protection of freedom of expression, in particular regarding journalists and human rights defenders. Belgium recommended that Mauritania commit to abolish apostasy from its national legislation.

558. Botswana noted with satisfaction that Mauritania had accepted the majority of recommendations received during its second UPR. According to Botswana, with international cooperation and capacity building, Mauritania can do more to address the implementation challenges. Botswana reiterated its call for support to Mauritania to encourage its efforts in the promotion and protection of human rights.

559. Burundi noted with satisfaction that Mauritania drafted a national strategy for the protection of children and a national plan of action on FGM. Burundi commended Mauritania for its good cooperation with all human rights mechanisms and for the creation of the NHRI. Burundi also welcomed the establishment of the inter-ministerial standing committee that prepares reports to international mechanisms.

560. Chad commended Mauritania for its commitment to the second UPR, in particular its efforts to implement recommendations accepted during its first UPR. Chad noted that Mauritania had a legal and institutional human rights framework that is constantly improved. It noted in particular that slavery and torture were considered crimes against humanity. It also noted that the National Human Rights Commission is recognized by the Constitution, as well as withdraw of the reservation on the Convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women.

561. China commended Mauritania for having accepted the majority of the recommendations, in particular, its recommendations to continue fighting against slavery and implementing the strategy on poverty reduction in order to improve its people's conditions of living. China congratulated Mauritania for its achievements related to the Millennium Development Goals, in particular regarding the right to food. China called the international community to continue providing financial assistance to Mauritania in order the country improves its human rights situation.

562. The Congo thanked Mauritania for having accepted most of recommendations made at its previous UPR. The Congo noted that Mauritania faced major challenges, including economic and climate, which can have a negative impact on the implementation of some of these recommendations and thus require coordinated joint international action. The Congo called the international community and the development partners to continue and increase their assistance to Mauritania.

563. Cote d'Ivoire encouraged Mauritania to implement recommendations to ensure full enjoyment of human rights in the country. Côte d'Ivoire invited Mauritania to consolidate its efforts to promote gender equality and to fight against discrimination stereotypes. It encouraged Mauritania to continue its fruitful cooperation with human rights mechanisms.

564. Cuba congratulated Mauritania for progress in implementing human rights, including accession to a number of international human rights instruments. Cuba appreciated that Mauritania accepted its recommendation to continue measures to eradicate contemporary forms of slavery. Cuba wished Mauritania success in the implementation of accepted recommendations.

565. Djibouti welcomed the fact that Mauritania accepted most of the recommendations made to Mauritania during the 23rd session of the UPR. Djibouti noted with satisfaction that its recommendations related to women's rights had enjoyed the support of Mauritania. Djibouti welcomed the efforts to promote and protect human rights, in particular those to combat racial discrimination.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

566. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Mauritania, 12 other stakeholders made statements. The statements of the stakeholders that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints[101] are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.

567. The National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) commended Mauritania's acceptance of many recommendations. It acknowledged the project for a National Plan of Action. NHRC commended the recent adoption of a draft law on gender-based violence as well as on the establishment of the mechanism to prevent torture. NHRC recommended that Mauritania continue the on-going harmonisation process of the domestic legislation and international instruments, to reinforce the capacities of the NHRC and Civil Society. NHRC also recommended to provide Mauritania with technical and financial assistance to promote and protect human rights, as well and in in its fight against terrorism and extremism.

568. United Nations Watch expressed concern at the persistence of slavery in Mauritania and the lack of sufficient measures taken by Mauritania to end this practice, and its reluctance to recognize the reality. It also expressed concern at attacks against human rights defenders, lack of respect of freedom of expression, including for the Media, and discriminatory practices.

569. CIRAC welcomed Mauritania's implementation of several recommendations from its 1st UPR and its commitments in crucial sectors, including free mandatory education, the national strategy for food security and the fight against corruption and poverty. CIRAC noted high priority initiatives taken by Mauritania, such as the adoption of a consolidated road map to combat trafficking of human beings and all contemporary forms of slavery. CIRAC further noted Mauritania's significant advances in the promotion of economic and

[101] https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx

social rights such as the expansion of health coverage and access to employment for the most vulnerable sectors of the population.

570. The Arab Commission for Human Rights welcomed the acceptance of recommendations to ratify the UNESCO Convention against discrimination in education. ACHR congratulated Mauritania for its intention to continue improving human rights. It regretted however that Mauritania did no support the recommendation to implement recommendations from the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women and regarding protection of children in detention. ACHR noted that Mauritania had ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and called upon Mauritania to implement a national mechanisms to fight against torture. It recommended to Mauritania to reconsider its position regarding recommendations noted.

571. Minority Rights Group welcomed Mauritania's adoption of the recommendations to strengthen the legal framework for combatting violence against women and hoped that tangible follow-up steps will be taken. MRG regretted that Mauritania did not accept to abolish the discriminatory provisions of the Code on Personal Status against women. While noting positive steps, such as the criminalization of slavery in 2015, not sufficient measures had been taken to combat slavery. In particular, it regretted that none cases of slavery submitted to the courts had been processed. MRG regretted that Mauritania had never considered to take actions to identify and massively liberate slaves.

572. Indian Council of South America (CISA) welcomed recognition of the country's cultural and linguistic diversity in the Constitution, and that slavery and torture are considered crimes against humanity. CISA regretted that discriminatory provisions of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women had not been removed. CISA recommended that Mauritania continue its efforts to submit its overdue reports to treaty bodies. It also recommended Mauritania to construct a viable roadmap to address slavery, work with the special procedures, and strengthen its judicial system. CISA moreover recommended Mauritania to seek assistance to implement recommendations related to education, human rights and poverty. CISA finally recommended that Mauritania introduced a human rights based approach to all climate changes policies and programmes.

573. IHEU remained deeply concerned about the embedded nature of slavery in Mauritania. IHEU emphasized the situation faced by anti-slavery activists. IHEU noted in particular the case of M'Kheitir, a writer who was sentenced to death in December 2014 for "apostasy" after publishing an article highlighting/criticizing the indentured servitude in Mauritanian society. IHEU recommended that Mauritania respect the work of anti-slavery activists. IHEU called on Mauritania to cease its harassment, intimidation and ill-treatment of anti-slavery campaigners and to remove the crime of apostasy from national legislation and and release M'Kheitir immediately.

574. African Development Association (ADA) noted Mauritania's adoption of a national strategy to combat discrimination against women in order to better integrate women in social life by incorporate a gender perspective into public policy. ADA also acknowledged the implementation of pertinent economic programmes aimed at empowering women in the spheres of work and family. ADA noted Mauritania's efforts to facilitate women's access to health care, education and public service setting the retirement age at 60. ADA noted the establishment of free and mandatory education for children of age to attend school. ADA called on the Human Rights Council to assist Mauritania in its courageous and innovative initiatives to outlaw the slavery practices.

575. Victorious Youth Movement noted the concrete initiatives taken by Mauritania to prioritize the promotion of human rights, such as the creation of the national agency

Tadamoun to end slavery, the establishment of a National Day for the Struggle against Slavery and the Third Strategic Framework for Poverty Reduction. Victorious noted several improvements deserving support from the institutional partners of Mauritania, such as the programmes aimed at fighting youth unemployment and ending disparities between urban and rural areas, and the promotion of information and communication techniques. Victorious referred to progress in sectors relating to economic, social, and cultural rights.

576. Amnesty International expressed concern about the gap between the law and its implementation. Despite the 2015 law, there have been delays in slavery cases brought before the Public Prosecutor. AI noted that while Mauritania committed to investigate allegations of torture and ill-treatment and excessive use of force by the police, it did not support a recommendation to do so through an independent process and to bring those responsible to justice. AI urged Mauritania to reconsider recommendations to prevent the arbitrary arrest, detention and release of human rights defenders; and to create a safe and enabling environment in which human rights defenders can operate safely and freely. AI called on Mauritania to immediately and unconditionally release all prisoners of conscience and to ensure that human rights defenders, journalists and other civil society activists can carry out their legitimate activities without intimidation, hindrance or harassment.

577. Association Jeunesse Action Development (AJAD) welcomed Mauritania's implementation of the recommendations from the first UPR cycle relating to the repatriation and reintegration of Mauritanian displaced peoples. AJAD commended the organized return of more than 24.000 Mauritanians as part of the March 25, 2012 operations in the presence of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. AJAD noted Mauritania's continued efforts to combat torture and particularly the specific mention for the protection of minors and juvenile justice. They recommended that Mauritania continue its efforts aimed at reinforcing national cohesion and discourage extremist views.

578. Agir en Faveur de l'Environment welcomed the recent visit made by the United Nations Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. The visit demonstrated the openness of Mauritania's government and its real willingness to cooperate with all international mechanisms, including the UPR. It recommended that Mauritania strengthen the capacities of civil society in promoting and protecting human rights; to provide technical and financial support to Mauritania in order to accelerate the implementation of the Road Map for the eradication of the legacy and contemporary forms of slavery; and that Mauritania accelerate the adoption of the law on gender-based violence.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

579. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 200 recommendations received, 140 enjoy the support of Mauritania and 60 are noted.

580. Responding to comments and questions received related to the death penalty, Mauritania referred to the de facto moratorium. Since 1995, not death penalty sentence had been carried out in Mauritania. It also indicated that slavery had been abolished and was considered as crime against humanity. Mauritania's Government was working, jointly with OHCHR, to implement the roadmap on the recommendations of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery. Mauritania confirmed its determination to fight against the vestige of this phenomenon.

581. Mauritania also indicated that human rights defenders had been detained as a result of a judicial decision and they were in very good conditions. Mauritania confirmed its commitment regarding respect of civil and political rights.

582. Mauritania confirmed the importance of UPR. They thanked the working, group, the troika and all states for their comments and recommendations. They also thanked the national committee for human rights and NGOs for their contributions.

583. Mauritania reaffirmed its determination to implement all the recommendations that have been accepted. Since UPR is an ongoing process, Mauritania will continue consideration of recommendations that have not been supported.

Nauru

584. The review of Nauru was held on 3 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Nauru in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/NRU/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/NRU/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/NRU/3).

585. At its 43rd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Nauru (see section C below).

586. The outcome of the review of Nauru comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/7), the views of Nauru concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, as well as its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group *(see also A/HRC/31/7/Add.1)*.

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

587. The delegation of Nauru, represented by Mr. Filipo Masaurua, Senior Government Lawyer on Human Rights and Gender at the Department of Justice and Border Control of Nauru, provided responses to the recommendations received at the November 2015 twenty-third session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, as reflected in documents A/HRC/31/7 and A/HRC/31/7/Add.1.

588. At the outset, the delegate stated that Nauru supported recommendation 87.30 and will ensure that minors have access to education in a safe environment in line with its obligations under the Convention on the Rights of the Child and other international human rights instruments.

589. The Government of Nauru supported the recommendations to ratify core Human Rights instruments and will prepare strategies for treaty ratification and accession with the advice and support from the Working Group on Treaties. Nauru will hold consultations and awareness programs on treaties with communities and relevant stakeholders before taking steps towards ratification.

590. Nauru has to date sought and received support for capacity building from the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, Pacific Regional Office. Nauru will continue to seek assistance from United Nations agencies and regional partners towards the implementation and fulfillment of its human rights obligations.

591. The Government was committed to ensuring that the treaties ratified, particularly CRC, the Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination against Women

and Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities are incorporated in national laws. To this end, the Government is working with relevant government departments and offices to ensure that principles contained in ratified treaties are incorporated in national policies and laws, and it is also working with its regional partners on the development of specific stand-alone legislation on domestic violence and disability.

592. Nauru supported the recommendation on the Working Group on Treaties. The Department of Justice and Border Control and the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade are currently supporting the work of the Working Group on Treaties.

593. Nauru supported recommendations on the establishment of a national human rights institution and is holding discussions with regional and international partners for this purpose. The model of the institution will also depend on the outcomes of discussions with local communities, relevant partners and stakeholders, probably to begin in the second quarter of 2016. Partners identified in the development of the national human rights institution includes and are not limited to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, APF, PIFS and SPC.

594. The Government supported recommendations on women´s rights and domestic violence. In partnership with UNDP MCO, it recently completed a one-week meeting on Women's Practice Parliament with the aim of encouraging more women to stand in the upcoming elections. Currently, discussions and consultations are being held regarding the development of standalone domestic violence legislation. Further, there exists a Nauru Women's Plan of Action aimed at improving the quality of women's lives. This Plan of Action has identified 16 thematic issues, in which eliminating violence against women is a key theme. Also, the new Criminal Code will contain provisions that aim at reducing violence in any form or manner including gender based violence.

595. Nauru has extended an open invitation to all mandate holders to visit Nauru and therefore it supported recommendations in this connection. Representatives of the Government met with assistants of Special Procedures mandate holders in 2015. To date Nauru has received requests for invitations from the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants and the Chairperson- Rapporteur of the Working Group on the use of mercenaries.

596. The Government supported recommendations on children's rights. Additional work and support will ensure that the principles of the Convention on the Rights of the Child are incorporated in national laws and policies. A Division of Child Protection Services was established in 2015, aimed at providing stronger and efficient technical, policy and support service on children's issues in Nauru. This newly established Division - currently resourced and housed by the Ministry of Home Affairs - has the mandate of establishing national systems and processes to respond effectively to cases of child abuse and neglect.

597. Nauru supported recommendations on disability and informed that discussions are ongoing with the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat and the UNESCAP on the development of specific stand-alone disability legislation.

598. The Government supported recommendations on health and education and will continue to work with the Department of Education and the Department of Health to strengthen its programs and social policies, including nutrition, giving priority to the neediest sectors of the population. It will also ensure that proper human and financial resources are provided for implementing these recommendations.

599. Nauru supported recommendations on climate change and will continue to work with the relevant department in ensuring that its commitment to the UNFCC is facilitated and that a human rights dimension is added to the ongoing and future work on climate change. The Government is committed to ensuring that adequate human and financial

resources are provided to allow the Climate Change Unit to function effectively and to provide quality service on national activities.

600. Regarding the report of the Subcommittee on the Prevention of Torture, the Government noted this recommendation and will make public the report upon discussions with cabinet and relevant government departments.

601. Nauru noted recommendations made on decriminalizing sexual behavior between consenting adults of the same sex. The Government reiterated that Nauru is a Christian state and as such will maintain its religious doctrines when dealing with issues relating to this kind of recommendations. However, it should be noted that the Criminal Code does not criminalize sexual behavior between consenting adults of the same sex in private. Internal discussion and consultations with relevant stakeholders are being planned on the revision of the criminal code to consider these issues and to ensure that the citizens of Nauru are properly informed and educated.

602. The Government noted recommendations on the abolition of the death penalty and will continue to work with relevant authorities and departments on the progressive removal of the death penalty following a regular constitutional process and national consultations between Government and relevant stakeholders. The new Criminal Code does not recommend death as a penalty for any crime.

603. Nauru supported the recommendation on the Regional Processing Centre and informed the Human Rights Council that the Centre is compliant with international norms, standards and guidelines. Places of detention currently available in Nauru, including prisons and police detention centres, do follow the United Nations Minimum Standards Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners.

604. Nauru noted the recommendations on the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association, and assured the Council that Nauruans enjoy such rights. The Government was aware of the controversy surrounding Section 244A of the Criminal Code and reiterated that further consultations will be needed before making amendments. The laws of Nauru will take precedence in line with national commitments to creating a safe and protective environment for the nation and its people.

605. Nauru noted recommendations on the access to internet and informed the Council that internet is free and made available to the people of Nauru including foreigners.

606. The Government of Nauru noted the recommendation on visa fees for foreign journalists.

607. The Government noted the recommendation on legislative framework protecting activists in the civil society against reprisals, in particular journalists and human rights defenders, and is calling on international community to provide support in this area.

608. The Government noted the recommendations provided on the independence of the judiciary and informed the Human Rights Council that the judiciary is independent and functioning. The judiciary, headed by a Chief Justice supported by two judges and a resident magistrate, functions independently with its own staff. The daily functions, mandate and work of the judiciary are the responsibility of the Chief Registrar. The Chief Justice acts and functions independently and in accordance with his constitutional duties.

609. The Government of Nauru noted the recommendations on asylum seekers, refugees and migrants and informed the Council that protection and support is provided for refugees currently in Nauru. The Community Liaison Office, employed by the Government, acts as a conduit between government, communities and the refugee community. Social support is also provided by the Government and other contracted social services organizations. This has been ongoing since the inception of the Regional Processing Centre. The Government

also reiterated that it operates the Regional Processing Centre as an open centre whereby asylum seekers and refugees are able to move freely in Nauru.

610. In this context, the Government received visits from the Sub Committee on the Prevention of Torture and has allowed visits to the centres by the OHCHR Pacific Regional Office. The Government is expecting more visits from special mandate holders in 2016 and 2017.

611. The Government, together with Transfield Services' Welfare, provides and maintains improvements to the conditions of housing and adequate security at all the places of accommodation for refugees and asylum seekers. Both refugees and asylum seekers are free to move within the community, have also been employed in local businesses and have started operating their own businesses.

612. Transfield Services' Welfare team provides education, recreation, cultural programs and activities within Regional Processing Centre 2 and more recently into Regional Processing Centre 3. The delivery within Regional Processing Centre 3 is supplementary to the current programs and activities that are on offer by Save the Children. One of the purposes of the case management and meaningful activities program is to ensure transferees can remain engaged with their status resolution process. These services form part of a holistic, integrated approach to maintaining the wellbeing of the centres and its people.

613. The Government stated that unaccompanied minors are under the guardianship and protection of the Minister for Justice and Border Control. Children are enrolled and attend local schools in Nauru. They are afforded the same treatment as other Nauruan children in relation to education, health, sports and other related activities.

614. Additionally, protection for women from gender based violence is provided through the Nauru Police Force with support from the Australia Police Force and other service providers. The Government is committed to ensuring that women refugees are given the same priority as Nauruan women in relation to gender based violence. Refugee women have access to the women's shelter that is currently housed under the Department for Women.

615. Finally, the delegate thanked the Council's President and all those delegations and stakeholders who provided comments to Nauru's UPR. The Government also thanked regional partners for their assistance to Nauru in its ongoing human rights endeavors, and called on the international community to provide technical and financial assistance with regards to the implementation of its human rights commitments.

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

616. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Nauru, seven delegations made statements.

617. Fiji acknowledged Nauru's commitment ensuring that a human rights dimension is added to the ongoing and future work on climate change, with adequate human and financial resources. Fiji noted that Nauru has noted Fiji recommendation on guaranteeing human rights for asylum seekers, in particular for women and girls at risk of gender based violence. Fiji urged Nauru to intensify efforts to ensure protection to women and girls and a zero tolerance approach on gender violence.

618. The Maldives appreciated Nauru's support to both of its recommendations and was encouraged by Nauru's commitment to furthering persons with disabilities rights through, inter alia, the recent ratification of the Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and steps to create a stand-alone specific legislation.

619. Pakistan commended the Government of Nauru for accepting the majority of the recommendations made during the UPR session, and appreciated Nauru's efforts to promote and protect the rights of its citizens, including women, children and persons with disabilities. Pakistan recommended the Council to adopt the report of the Working Group on the UPR on Nauru with a consensus.

620. Samoa welcomed the acceptance of a large number of recommendations and strides taken by Nauru in becoming a party to the core human rights treaties. The visit of the Subcommittee on the Prevention of Torture further reaffirmed the notion of state accountability of Nauru and its commitments to its human rights obligations. Samoa encouraged Nauru to, inter alia, continue efforts in the training of public officials on the rights of asylum seekers and refugees.

621. Sierra Leone was encouraged by Nauru's commitment in engaging with partners to face common challenges such as, among others, climate change. Sierra Leone was pleased to note that most of the recommendations it made have enjoyed Nauru's support. However, it hoped that Nauru would still consider constitutional amendments with the aim at abolishing the death penalty in the near future. Sierra Leone joined the support for the adoption of the report of the Working Group on the UPR on Nauru.

622. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela noted progress in school enrolment and the strategy against school drop-off through the application of the Annual Operative Plan on Education. In spite of current economic challenges, Nauru made efforts to respect its commitments on human rights and the international community should bring its support and cooperation to these efforts. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela recommended to the Council the adoption of the UPR WG report on Nauru.

623. Cuba acknowledged the priority that Nauru is giving to the effective implementation of human rights, including national policies for the protection of persons with disabilities, youth and women. Cuba appreciated the adoption by Nauru of the majority of the recommendations made, including two recommendations made by Cuba on the drafting of specific legislation on the elimination of discrimination against women, and on disabilities. Cuba recommended to the Council the adoption of the report of the Working Group on the UPR on Nauru.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

624. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Nauru, six other stakeholders made statements.

625. Edmund Rice International, in a joint statement with Franciscans International, expressed concern at the fact that Nauru noted recommendations concerning the safeguard of rights of asylum seekers and refugees, including women and children. They stated that they had received allegations of physical and sexual abuse occurring in certain facilities and recommended that Nauru, inter alia, properly investigate and prosecute allegations of sexual and other forms of assault against children and women .

626. International Service for Human Rights stated that freedom of expression, the Press, the independence of judiciary and the civil society have been under attack in Nauru over the last three years, and deeply regretted that Nauru merely noted rather than supported most of the recommendations on these lines. International Service for Human Rights urged Nauru to embrace these recommendations and for States with influence with Nauru to be guided by these principles.

627. Franciscans International stated that Nauru is a climate change vulnerable state and that its existence is at stake due to the adverse impact of climate change. Franciscans International recommended the Government of Nauru to adopt a participatory approach in

the discussion on mitigation policies, by providing a platform for community level involvement, especially for those – like women - who are most vulnerable to the adverse impact of climate change. It also recommended enhancing efforts for international cooperation.

628. International Association for Democracy in Africa stated that the Constitution of Nauru affords women formal equality before the law, but that there is little documentation of domestic violence against women and children. Through a number of measures, the Government has been striving for women's empowerment. UN Women is helping to better inform decision-makers at national and local government levels by providing them with technical assistance.

629. Amnesty International was disappointed that Nauru noted recommendations to allow access for international media organizations and to reduce the visa fees. Amnesty International made two requests to visit the country since the UPR Working Group session of November 2015, to no avail. It remained concerned about the safety and well-being of refugees and asylum seekers in light of credible reports of sexual violence and harassment against them and was disappointed that Nauru noted recommendations in this respect. Finally, Amnesty International regretted that Nauru noted recommendations on the independence of the judiciary, access to internet and social media.

630. International Lesbian and Gay Association was disappointed at the fact that Nauru noted recommendations on the decriminalization of same-sex sexual relations. International Lesbian and Gay Association stated that Nauru Criminal Code, in its Sections 208, 209 and 211 indeed criminalizes sexual behaviour between consenting adults of the same sex in private, with imprisonment with hard labour for up to fourteen years. As a result, LGBT people on the island are placed in a more vulnerable situation with regard to violence, being less willing to go to the police when themselves would be open to scrutiny.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

631. The President stated that based on the information provided, out of 108 recommendations received, 80 enjoy the support of Nauru and 28 are noted.

632. The delegate of Nauru thanked the Council for the fruitful debate and for the constructive experience of the universal periodic review, and stated that all valid recommendations and comments will be taken into consideration.

Rwanda

633. The review of Rwanda was held on 4 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Rwanda in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/RWA/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/RWA/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/RWA/3).

634. At its 44th meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Rwanda (see section C below).

635. The outcome of the review of Rwanda comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/8), the views of Rwanda concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, as well as its voluntary commitments and replies

presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group *(see also A/HRC/31/8/Add.1)*.

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

636. The delegation stated that the Universal Periodic Review Mechanism was important to Rwanda as it presented a good opportunity for self-assessment in its holistic quest to continuously improve as a country. Rwanda was always happy to share its success stories and any challenges that it may face.

637. The delegation thanked the 89 States that have participated in the review and extended its gratitude to the troika, the United Arab Emirates, Nigeria and the Plurinational State of Bolivia, and the Secretariat for their immense efforts in the preparation of the report of the Working Group. The delegation also thanked members of the civil society who contributed constructively to the universal periodic review of Rwanda.

638. Rwanda has reviewed the 83 distinct thematically clustered recommendations that had been received during the review, the responses to which are contained in the Addendum (A/HRC/31/8/Add.1). In accordance with the Constitution, national laws as well as international obligations already undertaken, Rwanda accepted only those recommendations for which implementation are possible within the next four years.

639. Recommendations that enjoyed the support of Rwanda in full are those where both the spirit and principle behind those recommendations are supported and could be implemented.

640. Rwanda also supported recommendations to take actions that are already taken, or being taken and intend to continue taking, without in any way implying that the ongoing or prior efforts have been insufficient or that these actions are necessarily legally required.

641. Recommendations that did not enjoy the support of Rwanda are generally those that Rwanda are not able to commit to implement at this stage, whether or not the Government agrees with the principles behind those recommendations, or where the Government has recently reviewed its position on the issue in question; or where assertions made have been rejected.

642. Of the 83 recommendations received, 50 have been accepted which the Government will endeavor to implement before the next review. Twenty-six recommendations enjoyed the support of Rwanda in principle but could not be accepted for implementation at this time because it was not possible to guarantee that the requirements necessary for the implementation of those recommendations will be readily available within the reporting period. Seven recommendations did not enjoy the support of Rwanda as they are not compatible with the Constitution and national law.

643. The implementation of the accepted recommendations has already begun. A stakeholders' consultation was held on 17th December 2015 on the outcome of the November 2015 review. The consultation was well attended with representation from Government, civil society as well as representatives of some of the recommending States.

644. A road map for the implementation of the 50 accepted recommendations was developed by the National Treaty Body Reporting Task force which is a platform that brings together Government and civil society organizations to jointly consider implementation of Rwanda's human rights obligations. All of the Government institutions concerned have accepted responsibility to implement the recommendations in their domain.

645. To encourage greater civil society participation, the Government has made an open call to all civil society organizations working on human rights issues in Rwanda to partner with Government in the implementation of the recommendations. This approach will go a long way in continuing to strengthen the interaction between Government and civil society in the country.

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

646. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Rwanda, 16 delegations made statements. The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints[102] are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.

647. Pakistan expressed appreciation for the decision of Rwanda to accept the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Pakistan. It valued the constructive engagement of Rwanda with the human rights machinery. The commitment of Rwanda to human rights is evident from the positive measures that had been taken over the years.

648. Paraguay referred to recommendation 134.25 on a national monitoring system for human rights recommendations expressed its readiness to cooperate technically with Rwanda establish this system. Paraguay welcomed the acceptance of recommendation 133.37 on ensuring an adequate standard of living for children in vulnerable children, which was a sign of the commitment of Rwanda to protect the human rights of persons in situations of vulnerability.

649. Senegal welcomed the steps taken by Rwanda to implement 63 of the 67 recommendations from the review in 2011; and also the progress made in combating poverty. It also welcomed the decision of Rwanda to become party to eight international instruments promoting human rights.

650. Sierra Leone was pleased to observe that the intention of the Government of Rwanda to consolidate efforts aimed at preventing the trafficking of child refugees. Rwanda should put in place measures and laws to eliminate child, early and forced marriages and expedite the ratification and domestication of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance .

651. South Africa commended the efforts to strengthen the institutional framework for human rights and welcomed improvements in access to justice and the rule of law and to education. It encouraged Rwanda to ensure effective application of the gender equality legislation and the implementation of policy to achieve equality between men and women and measures to reduce the high rate of maternal mortality and improve access to maternal health information and services.

652. The Sudan expressed appreciation for the efforts to promote and protect human rights and thanked Rwanda for accepting the two recommendations made by the Sudan.

653. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland recognised the substantial progress made by Rwanda in delivering economic and social rights but that this progress was not matched by access to political and civil rights. It welcomed the acceptance of the recommendation it had made in on detention and the use of the transit and rehabilitation centres. It expressed disappointment that Rwanda did not support its recommendation to ensure the civilian nature of the refugee camps.

[102] https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx

654. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the implementation of the majority of the accepted UPR recommendations. Rwanda has ratified major human rights instruments and has submitted its reports to treaty bodies. It noted major progress in education guaranteeing access to universal primary education and also delivering 140 000 computers to schools. It encouraged Rwanda to continue to promote its social policies with a view to achieving full inclusion of the most vulnerable sectors of the population.

655. Albania noted reforms in the media sector, and an expansion of the rights and freedoms of association and assembly. It called of action to address the issues contained in the 77 recommendations that did not enjoy the support of Rwanda, among them the two recommendation made by Albania on reducing the high rate of maternal mortality and on promoting the traditional and indigenous knowledge of the Batwa.

656. Angola noted efforts to strengthen human rights, as well as the implementation of legislation and policies to protect children against exploitation and abuse, as well as the steps taken to promote affordable education, to eradicate gender-based violence, and to foster gender equality.

657. Armenia noted that Rwanda had accepted a vast number of recommendations, including those made by Armenia. This is an indicator Rwanda's commitment to human rights. Armenia commended Rwanda for its engagement and contribution to the prevention of Genocide.

658. Belgium stated that important results have been achieved in the areas of gender and economic rights. Additional efforts should be made to ensure unhindered exercise of civil and political liberties by civil society and the media. Military and administrative detention centres, should fully comply with legislation and international standards. Although the two recommendations made by Belgium on these areas have not been accepted, Rwanda should continue to work on these areas. It called for a forum comprising the Government and development partners to engage in dialogue on governance and human rights.

659. Botswana commended Rwanda for its commitment to human rights and the acceptance of a majority of the recommendations is commendable. It noted with appreciation Rwanda's commitment to address human rights violations, including ensuring accountability and redress for victims. Botswana welcomed the resources channelled towards the development of a quality, independent and impartial judicial system.

660. Chad welcomed the outstanding efforts made by Rwanda to fulfil its international human rights obligations with a view to promoting and protecting human rights. It encouraged Rwanda to continue its cooperation with the human rights mechanisms and wished Rwanda success in the implementation of accepted recommendations.

661. China welcomed the constructive engagement of Rwanda in the UPR process. It thanked Rwanda for accepting the recommendations made by China and hope that Rwanda will continue to develop its economy, to ensure employment of youth, improve working conditions and increase investment in education. As a developing country, Rwanda faced many challenges in the area of human rights. China hoped that the international community will provide help to Rwanda.

662. The Congo noted with satisfaction that Rwanda was a party to eight major international human rights instruments. Rwanda also ratified the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the Optional Protocol to the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The Congo welcomed the progress made in the implementation of recommendations from the first review. Additional efforts are necessary as part of the social integration of minorities.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

663. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Rwanda, 10 other stakeholders made statements.

664. The National Commission for Human Rights of Rwanda welcomed the positive developments since the first review, such as the implementation of recommendations. It noted progress towards the passing of numerous laws to strengthen the right to information, the freedoms of expression and association, and also noted the revision of the law on Genocide ideology. It called for the abrogation of the provisions in the Penal Code on defamation and on solitary confinement; to expedite the adoption on the draft bills on family, matrimonial regimes and succession that were before Parliament; and to accelerate the adoption of the National Human Rights Action Plan.

665. International Service for Human Rights noted the degrading situation where human rights defenders are harassed, arbitrarily arrested and even murdered in impunity. They raised that journalist and political opposition are suffering legal intimidation through the use of overly broad laws and that NGO laws are abused to interfere and undermine human rights organisations. While welcoming amendments to the Media Law and commitments to ensure that Genocide Law is not misused, they urged Rwanda to review its legal framework to ensure all laws conform with international standards.

666. Franciscans International encouraged Rwanda to reconsider the recommendation made by Latvia to ensure that children with disabilities, children belonging to minority groups, children of indigenous peoples and refugee children also enjoy their right to education. They noted that the current national education system lacks infrastructure and resources necessary for effective teaching and learning, and urged the government to increase funding in education to uphold the right to free, universal, and quality education for all children. They strongly encouraged Rwanda to ensure the registration of all children immediately after birth.

667. East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project and CIVICUS denounced the systematic campaign for substituting the leaders of human rights organizations for others favourable to the government. They stated that very few organizations work free and independently and that they had to face intimidation and reprisals, such as administrative harassment and public discredit and denunciation through pro-governmental media.

668. Action Canada called upon Rwanda to eliminate all barriers to safe abortion and raised the issue of poor women and girls being victims of sexual torture and oppression. They also called upon Rwanda to ensure women's freedom of opinion and expression; to address the issue of unfair trials in courts, harassment and reprisals that human rights defenders face; and to develop and implement a National Human Rights Action Plan.

669. Article 19 - International Centre Against Censorship, The commended Rwanda's new policy to strengthen media self-regulation, however, they noted that Rwanda's legal framework is still used to illegitimately restrict the right to freedom of expression and that many provisions of the Media Law fail to meet international standards and must be amended. They called upon Rwanda to create a safe and enabling environment where human rights defenders, journalists and civil society could operate freely and unhindered.

670. Human Rights Watch noted that civil society groups, opposition parties and independent media have very limited space to operate freely, and stated that opposition parties struggle to carry out their activities and several opposition leaders remain in prison. They welcomed the acceptance of a recommendation to conduct investigations into cases of alleged arbitrary arrest, detention and enforced disappearance. They also draw attention to the fact that Rwanda recently withdrew its declaration allowing individuals and non-governmental organizations direct access to the African Court.

671. Canners International Permanent Committee noted that the 2013 parliamentary elections saw 64% of the seats taken by female candidates. They commended Rwanda for the development of Vision 2020, a document that provides the general objectives and policy goals to move towards agricultural development and industrialization. It noted that Rwanda is on track to meet most of the Millennium Development Goals by the end of 2015.

672. Rencontre Africaine pour la Defense des Droits de l'Home expressed concern for the lack of freedom of expression and the threats that political opponents outside the country face. They urged the authorities to create an inclusive social dialogue with a view to instituting a genuine democracy, and encouraged Rwanda to respect the right to pacific demonstration and ensure the separation of powers. They called upon Rwanda to immediately and unconditionally release all political prisoners.

673. Africa Culture International commended Rwanda for developing the country's infrastructure and economy and for a number of positive reforms, especially in the justice sector. However, they noticed breaches in Rwanda's international human rights obligations, particularly with regard to freedom of expression, freedom of association and freedom of assembly. They encouraged Rwanda to prioritize the development and promotion of Human rights, Women and Child protection in the country.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

674. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 229 recommendations received, 152 enjoy the support of Rwanda and 77 have been noted.

675. The delegation thanked all of the stakeholders who have engaged with Rwanda in this review process since it had begun. The Government of Rwanda was grateful for the expression of interest in Rwanda.

676. Rwanda has much to be proud of and the Government has enthusiastically welcomed the opportunity to share its success stories. The achievements that Rwanda has recorded in the last 22 years were a direct dividend of the country's deliberate policy and practice of holistically guaranteeing all fundamental human rights. The human rights journey is always a journey towards perfection.

677. The delegation stated that Rwanda does what it promises to do and the Government intends to fully implement the 50 accepted recommendations in the next four years. Those recommendations include commitments to improve the Civil and Political as well as the Economic, Social and Cultural rights situation in Rwanda. They are equal, indivisible, universal and inalienable. Rwanda has learnt from experience that real development must be inclusive of the development and enjoyment of all of the fundamental human rights.

678. Rwanda is always happy to engage with the Human Rights Council on human rights issues. However, the primary reason Rwanda continues to deliver on her human rights undertakings is not because the Council is making recommendations every four years. Rwanda undertakes and delivers on her human rights obligations because the Rwandan people do not deserve less than any other people in our world, and the Government needs no prompting to take the necessary actions.

679. The Government is constantly engaging with the population in order to jointly deliver on what is right and legal as well as in the best interest of the present and the future of our Country. The achievements recorded in the areas of, inter alia, civil, political, social, economic and cultural rights in the last 2 decades testify to the tenacity of this Government-Citizen mutual engagement.

Nepal

680. The review of Nepal was held on 4 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Nepal in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/NLP/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/NLP/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/NLP/3).

681. At its 44th meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Nepal (see section C below).

682. The outcome of the review of Nepal comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/9), the views of Nepal concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, as well as its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group *(see also A/HRC/31/9/Add.1)*.

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

683. During the opening remarks, the Chief Secretary of the Government of Nepal, H.E. Dr. Somlal Subedi, introduced the Nepalese delegation and presented additional information on Nepal's human rights situation to this Council.

684. The delegation shared their views on the recommendations received during the UPR Working Group Session held in November 2015 and an update of the subsequent progress we made since then.

685. Nepal indicated that it had held extensive discussions with the national human rights institutions, civil society organizations and the media in respect of the recommendations received during the interactive dialogue. Relevant government institutions were also consulted.

686. Nepal supported 32 recommendations listed under paragraph 121 of the UPR Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review report. 115 recommendations listed under paragraph 122 of the report also enjoyed their support because they were issues either under implementation or in the process of implementation. Nepal took note of the recommendations listed under paragraph 124 of the report.

687. In relation to the 30 recommendations listed under paragraph 123 of the Working Group report, five enjoyed Nepal's support and 25 recommendations were noted.

688. Hence, of the total 195 recommendations received, Nepal accepted 152 recommendations and took note of the rest.

689. Nepal looked at all the recommendations received. So far as the recommendations related to ratification of some additional international treaties were concerned, Nepal stated that it had pursued the strategy of developing requisite policy, legal and institutional infrastructures, and building and strengthening the implementation capacity before taking up additional treaty obligations. Nepal believed that effective implementation of a treaty is as important as joining it. Therefore, Nepal's focus is building more capacity for effective implementation.

690. Nepal is now engaged in making legal infrastructures to give effect to the Constitution of Nepal promulgated in 2015. The Constitution is founded on inclusive democratic norms and values, and it includes such distinguished features as multi-party democracy, fundamental rights, periodic elections, independent judiciary and the rule of law. The Constitution envisions federal democratic republican system of governance, with inclusive and proportional participation to develop Nepal as a prosperous nation.

691. Nepal's Legislature-Parliament made a first amendment to the Constitution on 23rd January 2016 to address the concerns of Madhesh-based political parties to make it more inclusive. The amendment further ensures proportional inclusion of women, Dalits, indigenous nationalities, Madheshis, Tharus, Muslims, minorities, persons with disabilities, and marginalized and disadvantaged people in the State structures. It also ensures the delineation of electoral constituencies based on population as well as geography. The remaining issues, if any, will be addressed through political dialogue and consensus. They will also be further addressed in the course of implementation of the Constitution through different tiers of government to be designed and operationalized. It was noted that this amendment addresses the feelings underlying a number of recommendations made by the Members and Observer States.

692. A comprehensive set of civil and political as well as economic, social and cultural rights guaranteed by the Constitution form the core of fundamental rights, guaranteeing principles of equality and non-discrimination.

693. Realization of the ideals and aspirations embodied in the Constitution, which are in line with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the human rights treaties to which Nepal is a party, depends on its effective implementation. This is challenging for a resource and capacity constrained country like Nepal.

694. Now that Nepal has embarked upon federal structure, with inclusive state restructuring to end discrimination and inequality in any form, Nepal is putting in place legislative and institutional frameworks that ensure gender responsive and inclusive approach to the implementation of the Constitution.

695. A steering committee, with a mandate of coordination among relevant ministries, has reviewed the existing laws to find out legal gaps, identify laws that are inconsistent with the constitutional provisions, and areas requiring new laws under the Constitution. A preliminary assessment indicated that a number of federal, state and local laws should be enacted to give effect to the Constitution. This calls for expeditious legal reforms on almost all of the existing legislations.

696. Nepal is fully committed towards ensuring transitional justice. Two separate Rules for the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and Commission on Investigation of Enforced Disappeared Persons have been approved by the Council of Ministers in line with the Supreme Court's ruling of 26th February 2015. The rules that specifically elaborate measures for effective implementation of the Transitional Justice Mechanisms include: (a) cases sub judice in courts of law are not to be transferred to the Commissions; (b) reconciliation between the victim and the perpetrator can be made only with informed prior consent of the victim; (c) recommendation for amnesty may be made only with prior consent of the victim and; (d) the Commissions are empowered to forward cases directly to the Office of the Attorney General for prosecution against the offenders.

697. In relation to remaining issues, if any, Nepal will take action as necessary and appropriate, including the revision of the Act on the Enforced Disappearances Enquiry, Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 2014. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission has organized consultations in 52 districts and the Commission on Enforced Disappeared Persons in 40 districts to receive feedbacks from the victims and stakeholders. They are

currently in the process of receiving complaints regarding the enforced disappearances and human rights violations committed during the conflict period.

698. The National Reconstruction Authority formed to address the post-earthquake reconstruction and rebuilding has already integrated and carried forward Nepal's previous efforts and has started its operations. It will do everything in its capacity to address the needs of the victims as well as the rebuilding of damaged infrastructures.

699. Nepal reiterated the importance of strict adherence to the principles of universality, objectivity and non-selectivity by all human rights mechanisms under the United Nations. Furthermore, Nepal is committed to the UPR mechanism, and to a constructive engagement with the United Nations human rights system for respect to the universal values of human rights and their protection and promotion.

700. Nepal is always open to your constructive comments, observations and suggestions. It has embarked upon the process of implementing the high ideals and values of human rights embodied in the Constitution.

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

701. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Nepal, 14 delegations made statements. The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints[103] are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.

702. Maldives expressed its appreciation for the constructive engagement of Nepal in the UPR process. Maldives appreciated Nepal’s support on both of its two recommendations. It was encouraged by the country’s commitment to continuing the improvement of health and education. Given the resource and capacity constraints of least-developed countries, Maldives encouraged Nepal to avail assistance of the OHCHR and bilateral partners towards the implementation of the recommendations.

703. Sri Lanka acknowledged the constructive spirit in which Nepal engaged in its review during the second cycle of the UPR process. It noted that Nepal supported recommendations made by Sri Lanka. It recognised that the promulgation of the new Constitution and the action through a Task Force to introduce amendments to 93 Acts has paved the way to strengthening national mechanisms for human rights.

704. Paraguay valued that Nepal had accepted its recommendation regarding the establishment of a follow-up system for international recommendations as a tool for promoting and protecting human rights. Paraguay expressed its willingness to provide technical cooperation. It further welcomed the acceptance of recommendations relating to human rights education programs for the police and the formulation of public policies aimed at promoting the application of the law against Discrimination and the Untouchability based on the caste system.

705. Sierra Leone commended Nepal for their disaster response efforts after the earthquake and their collaboration with international partners in order to develop adapted prevention strategies. Sierra Leone noted that three of its recommendations have enjoyed the support of Nepal, as a demonstration of Nepal’s willingness to promote human rights standards nationally.

706. Singapore welcomed Nepal’s acceptance of two recommendations that Singapore made regarding the continued implementation of policy measures to ensure that quality

[103] https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx

healthcare is accessible to all, and to continue pursuing policies aimed at increasing enrolment in schools, in particular for girls, indigenous children and minorities. Singapore encouraged Nepal to continue efforts to improve the lives of its citizens, and to protect and promote their rights.

707. Pakistan appreciated the Nepal's acceptance of 152 recommendations, including the recommendations formulated by Pakistan. It valued the constructive engagement of Nepal with the human rights machinery, including with treaty bodies and the UPR mechanism. Nepal has made concerted efforts to promote and protect the rights of its citizen despite the challenges posed by natural disasters.

708. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland noted that the adoption of a new Constitution was a milestone in Nepal and the recent amendments are a step towards resolving differences on the Constitution. It welcomed progress on its previous recommendations on torture and transitional justice and urged Nepal to adopt legislation in line with the Convention against Torture. It expressed disappointment that Nepal did not accept its recommendation to form an independent complaints commission for investigating cases against security forces.

709. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the cooperation of Nepal with the universal periodic review mechanism. It was pleased by progress during the last five years in the area of poverty reduction, both in urban and rural zones. It congratulated Nepal for its second review cycle and encouraged it to continue working in favour of the most vulnerable through its public policies.

710. Afghanistan thanked Nepal for its positive engagement with the universal periodic review. It appreciated progress made in the area of strengthening the institutional structure for the protection and promotion of human rights. It congratulated Nepal for its acceptance of a large number of recommendations, including that of Afghanistan, aimed at accelerating the process of consideration of the bill on education. Afghanistan encouraged the Nepal to continue its efforts including in the implementation of the recommendations from the universal periodic review.

711. Botswana noted with satisfaction measures taken to criminalise gender based violence, child marriages and racial discrimination among others. Botswana commended Nepal for the conclusion of the peace process and the political transition, which lead to the adoption of a new Constitution. It was encouraged by Nepal's commitment towards upholding and implementing the new Constitution despite economic and development challenges.

712. China welcomed the constructive engagement of Nepal with the universal periodic review mechanism and commended it for its positive response to recommendations received. It welcome Nepal's acceptance of China's recommendations relating to the prioritization of poverty reduction within the national development plan. China called on the international community to use the opportunity of the Agenda 2030 to provide increased humanitarian development assistance to the country.

713. Cuba highlighted the acceptance of recommendations received by Nepal, which reflects its commitment and engagement with the universal periodic review mechanism. It welcomed Nepal's acceptance of two recommendations formulated by Cuba, aimed at reducing poverty and the implementation of the National Human Rights Action Plan. Cuba reiterated its call to the international community to continue supporting Nepal in their development and human rights efforts, in particular following the earthquake.

714. India noted with appreciation that Nepal accepted nearly 80% of the total recommendations. It noted that the right to development is a fundamental human right and that a climate of political stability, consensus and predictability is a pre-requisite for

Nepal's socio-economic development, particularly in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake in 2015. India viewed the two recent Constitutional amendments passed by the Nepali Parliament in January 2016, as positive developments and hoped that other remaining issues would be similarly addressed in a constructive spirit and a defined time-framework.

715. The Lao People's Democratic Republic noted Nepal's strong commitment as reflected by its acceptance of a large number of recommendations, including two of its recommendations on implementing ongoing policies to guarantee quality education to the multi-ethnic people, and enhancing measures to protect the rights of children, women and other groups. It commended progress made in enhancing gender equality, promoting education, accessing to medical and health care services, addressing domestic violence and combating human trafficking.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

716. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Nepal, 11 other stakeholders made statements. The statements of the stakeholders that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints[104] are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.

717. The National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) believed that the full implementation of its recommendations, and observations and comments made by United Nations human rights bodies would be instrumental. UPR recommendations should be implemented and issues of the conflict victims and transitional justice addressed. The NHRC indicated that Nepal should ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families without any reservation.

718. Lutheran World Federation (LWF) reiterated its support to collaborate with Nepal in implementing accepted recommendations. They will continue providing platforms for government and non-governmental stakeholders to come together; discuss key challenges; and collectively implementing solutions.

719. World Evangelical Alliance and Pax Romana drew attention to the continued restriction on freedom of religion in Nepal despite the new progressive constitution of 2015. They called upon Nepal to amend article 26 (3) of the new constitution to ensure that every citizen has full freedom of religion, and to form an inter-religious commission to deal with practical complexities on the ground with members nominated by communities.

720. International Commission of Jurists was concerned that Nepal has yet to implement recommendations accepted during its first cycle, including several that reflect its international legal obligations regarding the new Constitution, investigation and prosecution of serious crimes, and establishment of credible transitional justice mechanisms. It called on Nepal to reconsider its position, and implement recommendations relevant to amending, inter alia, the TRC Act 2014, in line with international standards and Supreme Court orders; establish a credible transitional justice process; prevent, investigate and respond effectively to any use of excessive force by security forces and; ensure prompt, independent and impartial investigations and, prosecution in cases of unlawful killings.

[104] https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx

721. Save the Children International, delivering a statement on behalf of Plan International and World Vision International regretted Nepal's rejection of recommendations calling on the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure. It noted that children should also benefit from the possibility to make complaints. It was of the view that children's issues are best dealt by a specialized body. It appreciated Nepal's willingness to consult with civil society in the UPR process and looked forward to continued cooperation in follow-up.

722. International Lesbian and Gay Association welcomed the inclusion in the Constitution of the right to equality, including specific protection for sexual and gender minorities. Despite advances in recent years, it noted that sexual and gender minorities still face marginalization in the laws. It urged Nepal to monitor and evaluate the implementation of recommendations on sexual orientation and gender identity issues, which they stand ready to work with the government to implement.

723. World Organisation against Torture and REDRESS valued Nepal's commitment to implement a 'zero-tolerance policy against torture and ill-treatment in any form'. It noted however that torture is still widespread and still not made a specific crime under its criminal law. It urged Nepal to reconsider its decision to reject the recommendation to ratify 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. They noted that the transitional justice process remains deeply flawed. They called on Nepal to cooperate fully with United Nations mechanisms and to issue standing invitations to relevant special procedures.

724. Jubilee Campaign expressed concern that recommendations encouraging Nepal to amend the section of the Constitution that curtails religious freedom did not enjoy its support. It noted that section 26 (3) of the Constitution is inconsistent with international human rights law as it limits the freedom of the individual to convert from one faith to another and the freedom to peacefully express and share their faith with others, and urged Nepal to amend it. It further encouraged Nepal to extend a standing invitation to United Nations special procedures.

725. Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development regretted that Nepal had not supported recommendations to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment , the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. It expressed concern on the failure to accept recommendations on setting up an independent mechanism to investigate and prosecute security forces. It urged Nepal to heed the recent call by the High Commissioner for Human Rights to conduct an independent investigation into violence in the Terai region. It expressed concern by the lack of political will to expedite progress towards a credible transitional justice process.

726. International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism voiced concern on the human rights of Dalits in Nepal. It noted that though Nepal accepted the recommendations related to caste, all nine recommendations were categorized as 'already implemented or in the process of implementation', however Dalits are yet to enjoy their basic human rights. It also noted that Dalits were systematically excluded from emergency aid and recovery efforts. It urged Nepal to ensure the full implementation of all nine recommendations through effective enforcement of the law and inclusion of Dalits in the earthquake recovery efforts.

727. Action Canada for Population and Development noted that while women in Nepal have had a right to access safe abortion services since 2002, this right remains unfulfilled due to a lack of knowledge about the law among the general populace; a lack of human

resources including certified doctors and nurses, particularly in rural and remote areas; financial obstacles; cultural taboos and stigma; and geographical barriers, among others. It noted that despite the Supreme Court's instruction, a comprehensive safe abortion law has not been enacted.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

728. The Human Rights Council President stated that based on the information provided by Nepal, out of 195 recommendations received, 152 enjoyed the support of Nepal and 43 were noted.

729. The delegation thanked all the Members and Observer States as well as other stakeholders for their meaningful participation. Nepal indicated that it would take the invaluable concerns, suggestions and recommendations into consideration.

730. Nepal considered the UPR as a constructive mechanism to review the overall human rights situation of a country on an equal footing through a participatory and transparent manner. Nepal believes in continuous and constructive engagement with the United Nations human rights mechanisms and compliance with the international norms and standards of human rights.

731. Nepal reiterated that in the process of implementing the new Constitution, it is engaged in reviewing and revising the existing laws as well as framing new legislations. Hence, this interactive dialogue is valuable in providing meaningful insights into more effective legislations, policies and programs. Nepal's efforts will be further concentrated to make development more sustained and people-oriented.

732. Nepal is implementing the fourth periodic action plan on human rights and will continue updating and implementing it in the days to come.

733. Finally, the delegation requested all stakeholders, including the United Nations and development partners to extend its constructive support to for capacity enhancement and economic development which will help full implementation of the recommendations.

Austria

734. The review of Austria was held on 9 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Austria in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/AUT/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/AUT/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/AUT/3).

735. At its 44th meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Austria (see section C below).

736. The outcome of the review of Austria comprises the report of the Working Group on the universal periodic review (A/HRC/31/12), the views of Austria concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, as well as its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group *(see also A/HRC/31/12/Add.1)*.

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

737. The delegation stated that Austria's engagement in the area of human rights at the international level has always been guided by a spirit of cooperation and dialogue. Austria has continued to see the universal periodic review as an opportunity to demonstrate its commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights at the international and regional level as well as at the national level. The review has provided the Government with a unique opportunity to reexamine the human rights situation in the country. Austria has ensured a high standard in protection of human rights. At the same time, the full realization of human rights for all persons has remained a goal, an aspiration and a constant struggle.

738. Austria has been facing a tremendous challenge to its human rights situation by the influx of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants. The delegation expressed the commitment of Austria to its obligations under the 1951 Refugee Convention. Austria has been facing a situation where its capacities for processing effectively asylum applications and for providing shelters to asylum seekers have been stretched to the limit, forcing sometimes the Government to take temporary measures to restrict the influx to a manageable size. Those measures were taken in conformity with international obligations of Austria. It was hoped that the European Council of the European Union would comprehensively address the ways on how to tackle the migration crisis in its meeting of March. Austria would continue to show solidarity and contribute with considerable financial aid to reduce the human suffering as well as increase protection for the most vulnerable persons, in particular women and children.

739. The preparation of the national report was conducted through an open and transparent process, which was steered by the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs in close coordination with the Austrian Federal Chancellery, and with the participation of the Human Rights Coordinators of the other Federal Ministries and provinces as well as with the full involvement of non-governmental organizations and other independent institutions. The draft report was published on the website of the Foreign Ministry and civil society organizations were able to present their comments concerning the draft report. The Government appreciated the critical assessment it received and took a commitment to continue the open dialogue in the area of human rights.

740. The review in the working group that was accompanied with the questions, remarks and recommendations created an opportunity to have an assessment of the human rights situation by other states and thus, it provided the government with another perspective on strengths and weaknesses of the current situation.

741. During the dialogue in the working group, Austria received total 229 recommendations on various human rights issues. Austria accepted 135 recommendations and could not support 23 recommendations during the working group. The Government held extensive consultations related to 71 recommendations that were pending for a position of Austria after the working group. The consultations pointed that Austria was in a position to support additional 27 recommendations. The Government provided written comprehensive explanations regarding its position on all the remaining 71 recommendations.

742. Furthermore, the delegation provided additional clarifications regarding 7 recommendations. Concerning four recommendations on reservations made by Austria to several international human rights conventions, the delegation reiterated that those reservations were made in accordance with the object and purpose of those conventions. At the same time, competent authorities have been continuously reviewing the possibility of withdrawing some of the reservations. However, a withdrawal of the reservations to article

10 and article 14 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights has not been envisaged with the explanations provided in a written document attached to the report of the working group. Nevertheless, Austria aimed to support all the recommendations calling for a withdrawal of reservations, while taking into account the above mention clarification concerning the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

743. The delegation provided another clarification concerning three recommendations, which included ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. As ratification of the former has not been currently envisaged, a part of those recommendations related to the protocol could not be accepted. At the same time, Austria accepted a part of those recommendations, calling for the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure.

744. The Government considered the universal periodic review an ongoing process, which did not end at the adoption of the outcome of the review. Austria had been continuously engaged in the follow-up to the recommendations since its first review of 2011. A group of human rights coordinators of all Federal Ministries and of the Governments of the nine Austrian provinces has been in place to follow up the implementation of the recommendations. Since the first review, the dialogue with representatives of civil society has continued and intensified. A steering group on the universal periodic review, consisting of representatives from the Government and some non- governmental organizations was also created to evaluate the implementation of the recommendations.

745. The delegation expressed the commitment of Austria to continue this transparent and inclusive follow-up process for its second cycle of the universal periodic review and expressed appreciation for constructive contribution expected from representatives of civil society in this process. Austria will submit a mid-term report to provide an update on the implementation of the recommendations, as it did during its first review.

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

746. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Austria, 14 delegations made statements.

747. The Sudan thanked Austria for comprehensive presentation and additional information provided. It appreciated that Austria accepted two out of three recommendations put forward by the Sudan.

748. Tajikistan noted Austria’s commitment to take strategic measures to strengthen national human rights protection mechanism. It noted the cooperation with civil society and the national plan of action for human rights, as well as efforts to integrate asylum seekers and refugees.

749. Afghanistan commended Austria for accepting recommendations to ensure the full inclusion of children belonging to minorities, asylum seekers and migrants by providing equal access to health, education and social services. It noted with appreciation the commitment of Austria to strengthen further rights of children.

750. Albania, in view of the current influx of refugees, expressed hope that Austria would contribute to the coordination efforts of European countries to face this humanitarian, economic and security challenge. It noted with appreciation that Austria accepted the recommendations made by Albania to build an equal and adequate pension system for women and to improve situation of asylum seekers.

751. Botswana noted the acceptance by Austria of the majority of recommendations received during the review. It commended Austria for its measures taken to address the challenges faced by the influx of refugees and asylum seekers from countries affected by conflicts. Botswana also appreciated measures taken in the areas of criminal responsibility and juvenile justice.

752. China welcomed Austria's acceptance of the majority of the recommendations, including those made by Chine. It expressed its hope that Austria would attach a great importance to the implementation of the relevant recommendations to bring its official development assistance to the internationally agreed target of 0.7 per cent of the GNI in order to help developing countries to eliminate poverty and achieve sustainable development. It hoped that Austria would strengthen its anti-discrimination policies and legislations in order to prevent racism, racial discrimination and xenophobia.

753. The Council of Europe evoked some of the challenges faced by Austria that were highlighted by the various monitoring bodies of the Council of Europe, notably discrimination of minorities, curtailed rights of asylums seekers and racist rhetoric. It called on Austria to ratify the Additional Protocol to the Convention on Cybercrime, which criminalized racist and xenophobic acts committed through computer systems and the Additional Protocol to the Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism.

754. Cuba thanked Austria for accepting the two recommendations made by Cuba on combatting racism, xenophobia, violence against women and domestic violence.

755. Greece thanked Austria for supporting the recommendation made by Greece to protect victims of human trafficking. It expressed concern that measures taken by Austria had resulted in refugees being stranded along the Western Balkans migratory route. Those measures could obstruct refugees from applying for international protection according to the 1951 Refugee Convention.

756. The Islamic Republic of Iran expressed concern about discrimination in law and practice against religious and ethnic minorities, in particular against Muslims. It highlighted a need to improve the investigation into alleged human rights violations by law enforcement officials, including by establishing an independent mechanism to investigate allegations of human rights violations.

757. Iraq commended Austria for accepting the majority of recommendations put forward during the review. It welcomed the measures taken by Austria to harmonize national legislation with its international commitments, promote gender equality and the right of women and of persons with disabilities and to combat racial discrimination, hate speech and incitements to violence.

758. Libya noted with satisfaction the acceptance by Austria of the majority of the recommendations put forward during the review. It commended Austria for numerous important steps taken that would contribute to translating human rights concepts into reality, and expressed hope that the country would enjoy further progress and prosperity.

759. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) welcomed recent legal amendments to address some of the recommendations made by OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights in its electoral observation report, but reminded that several of them had yet to be addressed. It encouraged Austria to engage in a constructive dialogue on its law on recognition of adherents to Islam as a religious society, containing some discriminatory provisions.

760. Sierra Leone noted with appreciation that Austria had revised and domesticated laws relating to the criminalisation of hate crimes, in line with international instruments. It was hoped that the country would develop anti-trafficking strategies and continue working with other countries to end trafficking in persons.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

761. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Austria, 3 other stakeholders made statements.

762. Canners International Permanent Committee stated that all citizens were equal before the law in Austria. The basic rights and freedoms guaranteed in the Federal Constitution had been first accorded more than a century ago. The European Convention on the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms supplemented the Constitutional law. Austria was one of the developed economic nations with impressive indicators.

763. Rencontre Africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme highlighted the importance of improving situation of asylum seekers and consolidating the status of refugees in view of the intensification of the migratory influx and an increase of hatred, violence and racism. It welcomed the legal measures taken to combat hate speech and incitement of hatred. Austria was encouraged to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of Migrant Workers and Members of their Families.

764. Africa Culture Internationale commended Austria for the progress made in closing the gender gap on the labour market and for the diversification of opportunities, as well as reducing the pay gap between women and men. It recommended that Austria take further efforts to eliminate discrimination based on migration and protect the rights of migrants and their children in Austria.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

765. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 229 recommendations received, 158 enjoyed the support of Austria while 64 were noted. Additional clarification on 7 recommendations was provided, indicating which part of those recommendations was supported and which part was noted.

766. In conclusion, the delegation of Austria thanked all participants of the review for their constructive and informative discussions, and in particular for interventions of representatives of civil society. The Government would closely consider their comments in the follow-up process.

767. Austria has taken the universal review process seriously and considered the recommendations as an important input for its ongoing efforts to improve human rights situation. Austria had many achievements. However, it has still faced many challenges, in particular taking into account the current refugee crisis. Austria has already received a large number of refugees and provided financial and other assistances to other affected countries, like Greece. It has not closed its borders. At the same time, the delegation stated that the 1951 Geneva Refugee Convention does not contain a right of free choice for the country of asylum while passing through other safe countries on the way.

768. The Government intended to maintain high standards of human rights and thus, would continue to work hard to succeed in its endeavor. The universal periodic review process would continue to play a pivotal role in this process.

Australia

769. The review of Australia was held on 9 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Australia in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/AUS/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/AUS/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/AUS/3).

770. At its 45th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Australia (see section C below).

771. The outcome of the review of Australia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/14 and Corr.1), the views of Australia concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, as well as its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group *(see also A/HRC/31/14/Add.1)*.

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

772. Australia stated that it viewed the UPR as an important opportunity to reflect on its human rights record and had carefully considered each of the 290 recommendations received, consulting with relevant departments and Ministers at federal, state and territory level to the extent possible. Australia thanked civil society for their involvement in its UPR. Australia had also actively engaged with civil society, holding a forum for that purpose on 9 December 2015 and inviting public submissions.

773. Australia emphasized that its response to UPR recommendations was an on-going process and dialogue. The 290 recommendations received touched on a wide range of human rights, with a key focus on immigration and asylum seeker issues, the rights of Indigenous Australians, gender, and the rights of persons with disability. Australia accepted 150 recommendations in its formal response. Australia noted other recommendations. In some instances, recommendations were noted by Australia for further consideration. Australia stated that any subsequent future actions would be presented in its on-going reporting.

774. Australia highlighted that it would implement its voluntary commitment to work with the Australian Human Rights Commission to develop a public and accessible process for monitoring progress against UPR recommendations, including a periodic statement on progress against the recommendations on behalf of the Australian Government.

775. Australia reported that it had accepted recommendations in two broad circumstances: on the basis that new action would be taken to implement them; and where existing law, policy or action already addressed the substance of a recommendation. Highlighting two new actions, Australia stated that it would undertake a national consultation on the implementation of the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights during 2016; and would move to withdraw its reservation to the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women concerning the exclusion of women from combat roles, including repealing the related exemption from Australian anti- discrimination legislation.

776. Australia highlighted its on-going commitment to promote and protect the rights of older people domestically and internationally. In February 2016, the Australian Government had announced a new Australian Law Reform Commission inquiry into laws and frameworks to safeguard older Australians from abuse.

777. Australia referred to the appointment by the Government in February 2016 of Ms Kate Jenkins as Australia's new Sex Discrimination Commissioner, a statutory appointment within the Australian Human Rights Commission.

778. The delegation reported on the Government's commitment to address the scourge of family violence with the launching in March 2016 of the South West Sydney Domestic Violence Unit, the first of 12 specialist domestic violence units to include targeted assistance to Indigenous women, and those facing cultural and linguistic barriers, as part of the Australian Government's $100 million Women's Safety Package.

779. Australia referred to the announcement in March 2016 of the Government's commitment to women holding overall 50 per cent of Australian Government board positions, with at least 40 per cent representation of women and 40 per cent men on individual boards. The new target would commence on 1 July 2016.

780. Reporting on another important development, Australia referred to its recent appointment of the Hon. Philip Ruddock MP as Australia's new Special Envoy for Human Rights. Mr Ruddock was an experienced parliamentarian and minister, part of Australia's delegation to the UPR and would promote Australia's candidacy for a seat on the Human Rights Council for 2018-2020.

781. Australia mentioned that it had accepted recommendations where existing law, policy or action already addressed the substance of a recommendation such as recommendations related to human trafficking. Additionally, the National Anti-Racism Partnership Strategy and the Racial Discrimination Act were cited as examples of laws and action in combatting racial discrimination. Australia stated that it was committed to building a unified nation, acknowledging the unique contributions of Indigenous cultures and the contributions of all Australians, both migrant and Australian-born, to its social cohesion and economic prosperity.

782. Australia stated that many accepted recommendations called for it to continue or strengthen its on-going efforts such as those to reduce the gender pay gap and strengthen women's roles in leadership and managerial positions; and to implement the National Plan to Reduce Violence Against Women and their Children.

783. Australia reported that it continually reviewed its disability legislation, standards and policies to ensure they were robust and effective in upholding the rights of people with disability and that an independent review of the National Disability Insurance Scheme legislation was tabled in Parliament in March 2016 and would be considered by Government.

784. Regarding challenges that Australia continued to face, the delegation noted that Australia had accepted 37 recommendations regarding protection and promotion of the human rights of Indigenous Australians. In February 2016, the Prime Minister of Australia, the Hon. Malcolm Turnbull MP delivered the 2016 Closing the Gap report, which highlighted Australia's commitment to closing the gap between outcomes for Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians and to report on progress in an objective, measurable and publicly accessible way.

785. Australia indicated that it had endeavoured to make clear the reasons for noting particular recommendations. Some recommendations had been noted for further consideration. Australia stated that it would continue to consider those recommendations, and would provide updates through its on-going monitoring processes and Australia's mid-term report to the Human Rights Council. By way of example, Australia stated that the Australian Government supported the principles of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and was considering its ratification. Australia explained that as states and territories managed most Australian places of detention their support was required and they were being consulted on ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

786. Australia indicated that it had noted other recommendations where the response was dependent on future decisions of the Australian public through a referendum concerning the recognition of Indigenous Australians in Australia's Constitution and a plebiscite on legalising same-sex marriage.

787. Australia had noted other recommendations that would not be considered further at this time, for example, regarding the ratification of international instruments on migrant workers' rights or protection from enforced disappearance. The Australian Government considered that Australia's laws and policies were generally consistent with the obligations in those Conventions.

788. Additionally, Australia stated that it did not propose to alter its federal model of Parliamentary supremacy through the introduction of a judicially enforceable Human Rights Act.

789. Australia also reported that it had noted recommendations to cease mandatory immigration detention, turning back boats where it was safe to do so, or transferring people who arrived illegally by boat to other countries for processing and settlement. The Australian Government stated that it remained committed to its immigration and border protection policies, which protected the integrity of its regular and safe global migration programme – the largest, per capita in the world – and severely damaged the insidious people smuggling trade.

790. Concerning noted recommendations regarding children in immigration detention, the delegation stated that it was the position of the Australian Government that children were not held in immigration detention centres, but were accommodated in alternative places of detention. As at 17 March 2016, there were 35 children accommodated in alternative places of detention, and that number was down from a peak of almost 2000 children in mid-2013.

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

791. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Australia, 16 delegations made statements. The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints[105] are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.

792. Lao People's Democratic Republic appreciated that Australia had extended its aid programme to support capacity building on human rights related issues. It welcomed achievements made by Australia in promoting the rights of persons with disability and gender equality. It welcomed Australia's commitment to promote the rights of indigenous people.

793. Libya commended the commitment of Australia to render the country fairer and more inclusive, particularly with the implementation of the closing the gap initiative to overcome the deprivation experienced by the indigenous population.

794. Malaysia noted Australia's commitment particularly in holding a referendum to recognize Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians, as well as offering humanitarian support and assistance to people affected by war in Syria and Iraq. Malaysia hoped that Australia would favourably consider Malaysia's recommendations pertaining to closing the gap between indigenous and non-indigenous Australians in health, education, employment opportunities and access to justice, as well as combating racial discrimination, xenophobia and prejudices against members of religious and ethnic minorities.

[105] https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx

795. Maldives was pleased that Australia accepted most recommendations made by Maldives and welcomed the appointment of the new Special Envoy for Human Rights.

796. Nigeria thanked Australia for providing an update on the recommendations received. Nigeria appreciated that most recommendations had been accepted.

797. Paraguay welcomed Australia's commitment to set up a public and accessible follow-up system of the implementation of UPR recommendations and the setting up of a permanent national mechanism to strengthen its cooperation with the United Nations human rights system. Paraguay expressed its availability to provide technical cooperation, on the basis of its own experience. Paraguay acknowledged Australia's commitment to the promotion and protection of the human rights of indigenous peoples, including the right to consultation, as well as the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment .

798. Sierra Leone commended Australia for establishing a National Plan to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children, which would have an independent evaluation mechanism. Australia's substantial financial commitment to ending domestic violence and assisting victims and indigenous women was noteworthy. While it was encouraging that Australia would provide humanitarian assistance to over 240 000 refugees, Sierra Leone hoped Australia would consider reassessing its border protection policies and off-shore asylum-seeking procedures.

799. Sri Lanka noted initiatives taken by Australia in securing the rights of indigenous peoples, by providing constitutional recognition. It encouraged Australia to continue to promote and protect the human rights of migrants, refugees and asylum seekers in accordance with its international commitments, particularly its efforts to enhance policies and procedures to protect affected children.

800. Tajikistan welcomed measures taken by Australia to improve legislative reform, including strengthening measures to protect the elderly and the regional normative basis to combat human trafficking and transnational crime.

801. Viet Nam appreciated the support of Australia to the majority of UPR recommendations made, including the two recommendations from Viet Nam.

802. Afghanistan acknowledged that many recommendations made enjoyed Australia's support and wished it well in their implementation, particularly those regarding immigration and asylum-seekers.

803. Albania commended Australia for, inter alia, the appointment of a full-time Human Rights Commissioner and on measures towards ensuring multiculturalism. Albania strongly encouraged Australia to continue the further improvement of indigenous peoples' human rights, for ratifying protocols of core human rights conventions and undertaking relevant safe measures for migrants trying to reach Australia.

804. Armenia appreciated that Australia accepted a vast number of recommendations, including the recommendation made by Armenia. Armenia particularly appreciated Australia's engagement and contribution to the prevention of genocide efforts at the international level.

805. Botswana commended legislative and policy measures taken to address trafficking of persons, slavery and family violence. Botswana appreciated that Australia continued to cooperate with special procedures and other human rights mechanisms. It welcomed efforts to empower persons with disabilities, including through the establishment of the National Disability Scheme.

806. China welcomed Australia's commitment to effectively combat human trafficking and eliminate contemporary forms of slavery and hoped for its speedy implementation.

Regretting that several recommendations on the rights of indigenous peoples did not enjoy Australia's support, China hoped for the implementation the United Nations Declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples and the development of a national strategy to eliminate discrimination against of indigenous people. China called upon Australia to properly deal with all refugees, migrants and asylum seekers arriving in the country and effectively guarantee their rights and to engage in international cooperation for human rights so as to address the root causes of illegal migration.

807. Fiji urged Australia to address the shortcomings regarding the situation of migrants identified by both its national Human Rights Commission and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, so that Australia's international obligations were fully met. Notwithstanding the non-acceptance of Fiji's recommendation on climate change, Fiji urged Australia to take a fair share of responsibility in climate mitigation efforts.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

808. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Australia, 11 other stakeholders made statements. The statements of the stakeholders that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints[106] are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.

809. Australian Human Rights Commission acknowledged the Government's engagement with the Commission and civil society throughout the UPR process and its commitment to a transparent mechanism for monitoring future progress. Noting that the Government had accepted 150 recommendations on the ground that its laws already addressed the human rights at issue, the Commission stated that current approaches were inadequate, for example in reducing the overrepresentation of indigenous peoples in the criminal justice system. It urged the adoption of targeted strategies and full consultation with indigenous Australians to close the gap in incarceration rates. Noting that the detention of those with cognitive and other disabilities, juveniles, asylum seekers and Indigenous people were a common concern of UPR recommendations, the Commission urged the ratification and implementation of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment . It stated that the single issue prompting most UPR recommendations concerned Australia's asylum seeker laws, especially offshore processing centres and that around 3000 remained in mandatory indefinite detention which violated Australia's human rights obligations. The Commission reiterated its call for strict time limits on detention and for access to judicial review.

810. Edmund Rice International in a joint statement with Franciscans International expressed deep concern at the announcement of Australia that it had no plans to cease its policies of mandatory detention. They stated that Australia was the only country in the world to detain children arriving on its shores as a first option. They referred to refugees' personal experiences and reported on concerns at the welfare and safety of asylum seekers, especially women and children, in offshore detention centres. They urged that Australia stop refoulement, cease financing offshore processing centres, establish more humane alternatives to detention for children and their families arriving by boat and ensure faster processing of asylum claims in accordance with international human rights standards.

811. International Service for Human Rights in a joint statement with Human Rights Law Centre welcomed Australia's commitment to elaborate a National Action Plan on Business and Human Rights and to develop a process for monitoring progress against UPR recommendations. They regretted that Australia noted or would not consider further a range

[106] https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx

of recommendations, which appeared inconsistent with the pillars of Australia's Human Rights Council candidacy for 2018 and urged development of a human rights act, extending the mandate of the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Human Rights and ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. They expressed concern at regression in respect for freedoms of expression and assembly and called for consideration and implementation of the recommendations of the Human Rights Law Centre's report on "Safeguarding Democracy".

812. Sisters of Mercy in a joint statement with Franciscans International expressed particular concern at the devastating human rights impacts reportedly experienced due to coal seam gas mining in Chinchilla, including damage to potable water and failure to monitor the safety of locally grown food. They called on the Government to reconsider its refusal to adopt an enforceable human rights act. They called for improved federal legislation to require corporate due diligence and ensure access to justice and urged Australia to heed the testimony of the community in Chinchilla at a recent Senate Inquiry on this issue to inform domestic legislation and policy.

813. Franciscans International in a joint statement with Centre Europe – Tiers Monde welcomed adoption of the recommendation made by Ecuador concerning human rights violations committed by Australian enterprises in their territories and in Third States. They stated that such a commitment was important as there had reportedly been an increase in human rights violations resulting from the business activities of an Australian-based corporation. They recommended the establishment of a clear mechanism to ensure effective access to justice, including a dispute mechanism for communities and peoples affected by Australian companies operating abroad, and to officially respect the primacy of human rights over free trade agreements.

814. Save the Children welcomed the commitment to increase the intake of refugees in response to the humanitarian crisis in Syria and the acceptance of recommendations calling for an immediate end to mandatory detention of migrant children and respect for the best interests of the child. Save the Children commented on the Government's response that children were not held in immigration detention but rather in alternative places of detention by stating that such places were often within closed centres, with restricted access to visitors, security guards and no right to move freely. It called on the Government to release the 88 children held in all forms of immigration detention facilities in Australia and the 54 children held in Nauru. Save the Children reported that sending children to offshore processing centres violated their rights and urged the implementation of recommendations calling for transparent and independent monitoring of all offshore processing centres.

815. International Lesbian and Gay Association in a joint statement with Human Rights Law Centre welcomed Australia's statement in support of the diversity of families but also called for the harmonization of laws relating to adoption and reproduction. They reported that marriage remained a key area of inequality and was concerned that a plebiscite on this issue was costly and unnecessary and that a parliamentary vote could end the discrimination entrenched in the law. They urged Australia to take action against non-therapeutic sterilization without consent, with reference to people with intersex variations. They called on Australia to ensure that states and territories allowed change of sex on birth certificates without invasive and unnecessary surgery.

816. Human Rights Watch reported that member states from every corner of the globe criticized Australia's asylum laws and refugee policies, particularly abuses related to Australia's offshore processing centres, during Australia's second periodic review. Human Rights Watch stated that sending people seeking asylum to remote detention camps in the Pacific did not outsource Australia's legal obligations under the Refugee Convention. While welcoming Australia's increased acceptance of Syrian refugees, Human Rights

Watch stated that the Australian Government must remain committed to ensuring all people were treated fairly and in accordance with its international obligations.

817. Amnesty International noted two dominant human rights issues: pervasive discrimination experienced by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples and Australia's treatment of refugees and asylum seekers. Amnesty International reported that indigenous young people were hugely overrepresented in juvenile detention caused by on-going disadvantage that had its origins in colonial Australia. Amnesty International stated that Australia should set measurable targets to significantly reduce indigenous incarceration rates and was deeply concerned that Australia rejected recommendations to raise the minimum age of criminal responsibility even to 12 years and to repeal mandatory sentencing. Amnesty International noted that Australia had rejected all recommendations calling for an end to offshore processing and claimed that those places were fit for purpose. It stated that international human rights organizations and journalists must be granted access to offshore processing centres which were financed and effectively controlled by Australia.

818. Pan African Union for Science and Technology described Australia's system of Government as embracing religious tolerance and freedom of speech and association, its economic growth and high human development index, and the reduction of gender disparities through government measures.

819. National Association of Community Legal Centres welcomed the Government's acceptance of 150 recommendations. However, it was concerned that some recommendations were accepted on the basis that they were consistent with existing law, policy or action and that that would mean no meaningful action would be taken to fully implement the recommendation. It stated that Australia's response did little to indicate new and meaningful engagement or action on addressing the overrepresentation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders in the justice system or proper funding of or consultation with national Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander bodies. It expressed concern at the lack of willingness to implement recommendations highlighting grave concerns at Australia's approach to refugees and asylum seekers, mandatory sentencing and access to services. It welcomed the Government's commitment to address family violence and called for substantial increases in funding for domestic and family violence services. It welcomed Australia's commitments for a recommendation monitoring mechanism and acknowledged the Government's engagement with civil society during the UPR process.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

820. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 290 recommendations received, 150 enjoy the support of Australia, and 140 are noted.

821. The delegation thanked all participants and highlighted Australia's on-going engagement with the UPR process. Australia reiterated its voluntary commitment to work with the Australian Human Rights Commission to develop a public and accessible process for monitoring Australia's progress against UPR recommendations; and to make a periodic statement on progress against recommendations.

Georgia

822. The review of Georgia was held on 10 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Georgia in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/GEO/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/GEO/2 and Corr.1);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/GEO/3).

814. At its 45th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Georgia (see section C below).

823. The outcome of the review of Georgia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/15 and Corr.1), the views of Georgia concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, as well as its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group *(see also A/HRC/31/15/Add.1)*.

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

824. The delegation of Georgia stated that after careful review of all 203 recommendations it had supported 191 of them. It noted that Georgia had ratified most of the United Nations human rights treaties and had supported all recommendations relating to accession to the remaining international human rights instruments.

825. All recommendations related to the cooperation with human rights mechanisms had been supported. Georgia was committed to fulfilling its reporting obligations had developed an inclusive national reporting process. Georgia also planned to include the recommendations from the UPR and treaty bodies in a National Action Plan for the Protection of Human Rights for 2016-17. This Plan was being finalized in consultation with civil society representatives and international organizations.

826. Georgia had accepted the recommendations on engagement with the international community to ensure that international human rights monitoring mechanisms had access to Abkhazia, Georgia and the Tskhinvali region/South Ossetia, Georgia. It emphasized the increasingly acute need for effective human rights monitoring in these occupied regions, given the imminent threat of a further deterioration in the human rights situation in these territories.

827. Recommendations on the strengthening of measures for the protection of IDPs had been supported. While IDPs from Georgia's occupied regions continued to be denied their right to return to their homes, the Government had been working hard to provide them with adequate housing. An action plan and strategy on IDPs for 2015-2016 had been developed in consultation with the IDPs themselves and with NGOs.

828. Georgia had supported recommendations on equality and non-discrimination. A new Anti-discrimination Law, which explicitly prohibited all forms of discrimination, had been enacted with wide consultations. The budget of the Office of the Public Defender, whose tasks include monitoring of the implementation of the law, had been considerably increased. Georgia would also reinforce the equality provisions in the new National Action Plan on Human Rights for 2016-17 with a particular focus on minority groups. The Plan reaffirmed Georgia's commitment to address violence and hate speech against minorities and provided for the effective implementation of the equality legislation. Georgia also planned to appoint and train specialized police officers for the investigation of hate crimes in all police regions.

829. Georgia supported all the recommendations concerning freedom of religion or belief, freedom of expression and the right to peaceful assembly Georgia. Among its

responses it would promote interreligious and intercultural dialogue and tolerance. It had already undertaken relevant steps for safeguarding media freedom.

830. All recommendations in respect to women's rights, combatting against domestic violence and violence against women had been supported. The new National Action Plan on Human Rights for 2016-17 had further strengthened efforts to promote gender equality and the political participation of women. Georgia would soon ratify the Istanbul Convention and a new Action Plan on violence against women and domestic violence was being developed. Provisions allowing marriage from the age of 16 with the consent of parents or guardians had been removed. The minimum age for marriage in Georgia was now 18 years.

831. Georgia outlined the reforms to prevent and punish acts of torture and ill-treatment, including the consultations on the establishment of independent investigative mechanisms and noted that its commitments had been reaffirmed in a newly-adopted anti-torture action plan.

832. All recommendations related to the penitentiary system had been supported. Comprehensive reforms aimed at the improvement of the relevant legislation and the management systems. Significant progress had also been made towards eliminating overcrowding. Internal monitoring mechanisms had been strengthened. The reforms had also included the juvenile justice system. Prison infrastructure for female convicts had been upgraded, including the creation of a special "Mother and Child Unit".

833. Georgia had also supported the recommendations concerning the fight against trafficking in human beings. It restated its policies and provided more details of the related measures. In relation to the prevention of trafficking in children, especially those in street situations, Parliament had begun discussing a legislative package aimed at the creation a legal framework to provide children them with identification documents and strengthen the other protection measures.

834. Recommendations on strengthening the independence of the judiciary had been supported. In 2015, a third phase of reforms had been launched and new set of legislative amendments were being considered by Parliament. Pretrial detention was now only being used in exceptional cases and legislative amendments passed in July 2015 had introduced the regular judicial review of pretrial detention decisions. In relation to prosecutorial reform, the measures implemented included the appointment of a new Chief Prosecutor in November under new procedures with increased transparency.

835. Georgia was finalizing its initial state report under the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and had supported all recommendations relating to persons with disabilities. Further work was proceeding to strengthen the relevant institutional mechanisms and harmonize its legislation and practices with the Convention.

836. Georgia supported the recommendations concerning the enhancement of the social dialogue and the protection and promotion of the economic rights of the labour force, for example through the establishment of an efficient labour inspection mechanism. In 2013 the Universal Healthcare Programme had been introduced. Ninety per cent of population, including women, were current beneficiaries of the Programme. Other relevant measures related to the protection of patients' rights, maternal and child health promotion. Recommendations were also being considered regarding the state financing of programmes for the supply of contraceptives and the provision of respective counselling services.

837. Georgia had supported recommendations with respect to ethnic and religious minorities. The new State Strategy and Action Plan for Civic Equality and Integration 2015-20 had been built upon earlier experiences and had introduced some new approaches.

The Strategy paid special attention to the social and economic integration of Georgia's Roma population.

838. The recommendations on the right to education had been supported and were either implemented or are in the process of implementation. Georgia enumerated the relevant provisions in legislation and policy and noted that the Government was carrying out all the necessary steps to encourage the attendance of girls.

839. Georgia had supported the recommendations on the repatriation of people who were forcibly displaced in the former USSR in the 1940s and had finished drafting an Action Plan on the Implementation of the State Strategy for the Repatriation of forcefully exiled persons. In relation to persons holding refugee and humanitarian status the relevant legislation had been strengthened and aligned with international standards. The Migration Strategy and Action Plan for 2016-20 detailed the measures being taken.

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

840. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Georgia, 16 delegations made statements.

841. China thanked Georgia for accepting its recommendations and hoped that Georgia would further improve access to and the quality of education and raise the enrolment rate of vulnerable children, including girls and those from ethnic minorities. China also hoped that Georgia, through the implementation of its national strategy, will promote interreligious and cultural dialogue and inclusion.

842. The Council of Europe recalled some of the issues raised by its monitoring bodies. These included a lack of independence as well as deficiencies in the functioning of the judicial system; excessive use of force by the police and alleged abuses, including ill-treatment, in some prisons. It invited Georgia accede to the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages and the Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism and requested information on the prospects for ratification of the Third Optional Protocol to the the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

843. Libya welcomed Georgia's efforts in the promotion and protection of human rights, in particular the legislative amendments. Libya also thanked Georgia for its acceptance many of the recommendations which were delivered during the review. This reflected Georgia's positive commitment to the UPR as well as its determination to improve human rights.

844. Malawi applauded Georgia for its continued cooperation with the Council, and for promoting good practices, as demonstrated by its submission of a mid-term report and the extension of a standing invitation to the special procedures. It also welcomed Georgia's written responses to the recommendations and believed that this practice should be encouraged. It also encouraged Georgia to remain steadfast and redouble its efforts to implement all the outstanding recommendations which it has supported in the first two cycles and to reconsider, if appropriate, those which it had noted.

845. Nigeria appreciated that most of the recommendations had been supported by Georgia, including its own and stated that this further demonstrated the commitment of Georgia to continue to strengthen its efforts in the promotion and protection of the human rights of all its citizens.

846. The OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights noted that in January 2016 the Georgian Parliament had adopted amendments on redrawing constituency boundaries, which addressed one of its long-standing recommendations, but it had concerns including about the lack of transparency in the process. It recommended the reform of the

National Communications Commission in relation to the regulation of media coverage during elections. It welcomed its fruitful cooperation with the Georgian institutions and recommended that Georgia took note of a number of recommendations contained in its 2014 Trial Monitoring Report.

847. Paraguay appreciated Georgia's support for all the recommendations which it had made. It highlighted in particular the recommendation which related to setting up a national system for follow-up to recommendations from international human rights bodies which it considered to be particularly important. It also expressed its willingness to offer assistance in the implementation of this recommendation.

848. The Russian Federation was deeply concerned that for reasons of politics Georgia had again ignored the recommendations it had made during the UPR. It recalled that these recommendations concerned important issues such as combatting torture, discrimination, racism and hate speech; ensuring the rights of minorities; and investigating serious violations of human rights. It emphasized that this demonstrated that Georgia continued on the path of politicization and confrontation to the detriment of the rights and interests of its own population.

849. Sierra Leone noted Georgia had supported a large majority of the recommendations it had received and that some of them had been already implemented. Sierra Leone furthermore commended Georgia for its recently enacted legislation which set the minimum age for marriage at 18 and thus effectively ended child marriage.

850. Tajikistan welcomed the activities which had been completed during the review which would contribute to furthering Georgia's achievements in the protection and promotion of human rights. It stated that the national report again demonstrated the country's constructive participation, including its cooperation with civil society and the special procedures. It noted the adoption legislation relating to non-discrimination, legal reform, societal integration and promoting tolerance.

851. UN Women commend the improvements in legislation concerning violence against women and girls, including domestic violence, and the improvements in the response to violence against women. It called on Georgia to ratify the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence and to intensify efforts to provide services to victims of gender-based violence and domestic violence. It urged Georgia to tackle discriminatory practices, such as gender-biased sex selection and encouraged Georgia to take concrete measures for women's political and economic empowerment.

852. UNICEF welcomed the adoption of the juvenile justice code and improvements to the benefit system which were projected to reduce the number of children living in extreme poverty. It encouraged Georgia to accelerate improvements in the quality of perinatal and primary healthcare for mothers and children and expressed concern about the significant levels of malnutrition which affected them. It called on Georgia to introduce actions such as the enrichment of flour, promotion of breastfeeding and the provision of micronutrient supplementation for infants and offered its assistance in these measures. It welcomed Georgia's support for the recommendation to ratify the Third Optional Protocol to the the Convention on the Rights of the Child and urged that this be done as a matter of priority.

853. Albania commended Georgia on its commitments to advance the protection and promotion of human rights and its positive engagement with the UPR and the Special Procedures. It also commended the recent progress in improving legislation, building institutional democracy and changing institutional cultures. It was pleased to note the large number of recommendations which had been supported, including the two recommendations from Albania.

854. Algeria noted that Georgia had adopted the National Human Rights Strategy (2014-2020), had initiated significant reforms in the judiciary and the prison system since 2012 and had taken steps to combat trafficking in persons and torture. It noted the acceptance by Georgia of most of the recommendations.

855. Armenia appreciated that Georgia had accepted most of the recommendations, including its own. It also appreciated highly the two countries' mutual cooperation in the areas of the promotion and protection of human rights at the national and international levels. It hoped that their cooperation in the area of the promotion of the rights of the Armenian minorities in Georgia would expand further in the same constructive manner.

856. Botswana welcomed the adoption by Georgia of the National Human Rights Strategy and Action Plan and the Law on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination. It commended Georgia's efforts in addressing women's rights through the adoption of the Law on Gender Equality and the Action Plan for Combating Domestic Violence and Implementing Measures for the Protection of Victims of Domestic Violence. It also welcomed Georgia's continued cooperation with human rights mechanisms.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

857. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Georgia, 8 other stakeholders made statements.

858. The Public Defender's Office of Georgia was glad to note that the Government had actively collaborated with it during the whole UPR process. It noted that the majority of the recommendations had immediately been supported, but highlighted a number of points for consideration. Firstly, there was a need for the establishment of an independent investigatory mechanism for any instances of torture, inhuman or degrading treatment committed by law enforcement officers, including in penitentiaries. Secondly, an efficient labour inspection mechanism needed to be created to ensure safe working conditions and the harmonization of national legislation with international standards. Thirdly, there needed to be a fair process for the appointment and promotion of judges. Lastly it stated that Georgia still needed to make efforts to fight successfully against domestic and gender-based violence, to strengthen the anti-discrimination legislation and to take all possible measures for the protection of human rights in the occupied territories.

859. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit - COC Nederland commended Georgia for having supported most recommendations concerning sexual orientation, gender identity and expression. However, it disagreed that some had already been implemented or were in the process of implementation. It welcomed the commitment to assign and train police officers who would specialize in the investigation of hate crimes, but urged that NGOs be included in the process. It noted that no significant improvements had been made to the Anti-Discrimination Law and expected Georgia to consider feedback from civil society to improve and include a legal-binding implementation mechanism. It called for the establishment of a swift, transparent and accessible mechanism for legal gender recognition and for Georgia to support public campaigns to combat hate speech and the stigmatization of LGBT persons.

860. Action Canada for Population and Development noted that Georgia had accepted a range of recommendations relating to sexual and reproductive health and rights. It encouraged the Government to work closely with civil society organizations on their implementation and to ensure that the areas which were crucial to protect, respect and rights of women and girls related to the sexual and reproductive health are implemented. These areas included the provision of comprehensive sexuality legislation in formal and informal settings; the improvement of data collection on women and girls' access to quality health services; the decriminalization of drug use and ensuring sustainable harm reduction services

are adopted for women; the liberalization of laws and policies on sex work; and providing access to sustainable prevention, treatment and cares services for sexually or blood transmitted diseases.

861. The International Catholic Child Bureau appreciated Georgia's cooperation with the UPR. It was concerned at recent information showing that there was high public tolerance towards violence against children and a high rate of such violence. It commended Georgia's efforts in responding to past UPR recommendation in this field, but was concerned that hidden sexual abuse existed, including through the use of information and communication technologies. It therefore made recommendations to Georgia, including that Georgia modify its legislation in conformity with the Council of Europe Convention on the Protection of Children against Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse; that it increase public awareness of violence against children and child sexual abuse with a special emphasis on children with disabilities; and strengthen the capacities and expertise of law enforcement officials in child-friendly investigations.

862. Amnesty International welcomed the acceptance of the recommendation concerning the establishment of an institution to investigate and prosecute human rights abuses and violations committed by law enforcement and security forces as it considered that the current practice lacked independence and impartiality. It noted the acceptance of recommendations to implement international fair trial standards and limit the use of pretrial detention, but remained concerned at reports of political interference in the judiciary, including the concerns identified by the OSCE. It urged Georgia to adhere fully to international fair trial standards and ensure that prolonged detention or other custodial measures were used only when justified in law. Noting that the related recommendations were reported by Georgia to be "already implemented or in the process of being implemented" it urged Georgia to take immediate and effective steps to ensure full respect for and protection of the rights of LGBTI persons.

863. The Pan African Union for Science and Technology noted that Georgia had made progress in sustaining democracy, human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the adoption of the National Human Rights Strategy and Action Plan, improvements to the prison system and the protection of children's rights. It also noted the human rights commitments contained in Georgia's Association Agreement with the EU and that the EU had acknowledged progress but had highlighted the need to ensure judicial independence, increase accountability and democratic oversight of law enforcement agencies. The speaker also noted the adoption of an anti-discrimination law in 2014, but that some had criticized the law for a lack of efficient implementation mechanisms. It also noted the progress in improving healthcare in prisons and the halving of the prison population through pardons and an amnesty.

864. The Swedish Association for Sexuality Education welcomed Georgia's commitments, including the acceptance of recommendations concerning sexual and reproductive health and rights and urged Georgia to ensure their effective implementation. It was particularly concerned about the effective protection of LGBT persons in Georgia. It encouraged Georgia to further prevent discrimination by combatting hate speech in public service and by promoting secular, evidence-based education on gender relations, sexuality and equality. It also encouraged the Georgia to effectively address the major economic and social obstacles hindering women and girl's access to information and family planning services, including contraception and safe abortion, as well as HIV/AIDs prevention and treatments.

865. The Human Rights House Foundation noted the active participation of civil society in the review. It welcomed the steps taken by Georgia to address cases of torture and other inhuman and degrading treatment, but considered that Georgia must undertake additional efforts to ensure the efficiency and impartiality of investigations conducted in the

penitentiary system. Georgia must create an independent investigative mechanism for the prompt, unbiased and competent investigation of such allegations and ensure protection for victims during the investigation process. It welcomed the adoption of the anti-discrimination plan but Georgia should further improve its anti-discrimination legislation in order to ensure adequate protection against discrimination in practice and create and implement a strategy to prevent and effectively investigate politically-motivated dismissals from public service. It was also concerned about widespread cases of discrimination against LGBT people in Georgia.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

866. The Vice-President stated that based on the information provided out of 203 recommendations received, 191 enjoyed the support of Georgia and 12 had been noted.

867. The delegation of Georgia thanked the delegations for their valuable recommendations and noted that some steps had already been undertaken towards addressing the issues outlined by the participants.

868. Georgia also expressed its gratitude to everyone involved in the UPR process in Georgia, particularly the Office of the Public Defender and NGOs. It also thanked the United Nations' presence.

869. In closing, Georgia expressed its determination to continue to work to comply with its international human rights obligations and to pursue its close co-operation with all actors, including NGOs, in its efforts. It stated that the UPR will continue to constitute an important element in these efforts and pledged to submit a mid-term report to provide information on the progress in the implementation of the recommendations.

Saint Lucia

870. The review of Saint Lucia was held on 5 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Saint Lucia in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/LCA/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/LCA/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/LCA/3).

871. At its 45th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Saint Lucia (see section C below).

872. The outcome of the review of Saint Lucia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/10), the views of Saint Lucia concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, as well as its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group *(see also A/HRC/31/10/Add.1)*.

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

873. The delegation of Saint Lucia presented the response of its Government to the recommendations put forward by member States during the UPR review of November 2015. In that review the delegation indicated that all the 121 recommendations received

would be considered by the relevant stakeholders, with the aim of accepting those that seemed readily attainable by the State.

874. The delegation recalled that the Government had accepted 91 recommendations, partially accepted 1 and noted 29. The 91 accepted recommendations represented what the Government believed it could achieve within the 4 years and a half period prior to the next review with the rationale behind this trend of thought being twofold. Firstly, it was the Government's belief that it had a head start in certain areas where progress had already been made. Secondly some of the recommendations fell firmly in line with the vision which the Government had for the country and, therefore, the policies necessary for their implementation would not be far removed from the State's established mandate.

875. As pertained to the recommendations which were noted, the delegation indicated that the Government believed that Saint Lucia would find it difficult to take action to implement those in question within the same 4 years and a half period for varying reasons. However, the Government had not relegated the noted recommendations to being unachievable, and, in fact, some could well be acted upon inside the aforementioned timeline. Nevertheless, a definitive stance could not be taken on them at the moment of the adoption of the report by the Council.

876. The delegation pointed out that the Government believed that it was already on its way to meeting its obligations in several areas covered in the recommendations. An example of this was the issue of gender equality where, it recalled, that, according to a report released by the ILO in 2015, 52.3 percent of managerial positions in Saint Lucia were held by women. Such an achievement did not occur by accident, but rather by the introduction of progressive policies and initiatives which supported the growth of Saint Lucian women.

877. Yet the Government realized that this was no reason to rest on its laurels as women were still faced with issues which hindered their general wellbeing. Domestic violence was one such issue which Saint Lucia was tackling with the current revamp of the Domestic Violence Legislation. The net result of such a revamp was likely to be harsher penalties for perpetrators of such crimes and the ability for the State to prosecute such incidences without the need of a victim complaint.

878. The delegation informed the Council of further changes to the State's legislation. Family law legislation was currently being examined with amendments likely addressing some of the recommendations put forward, such as removing the legal distinction between children born within and outside of marriage. Also, instruments of ratification had been drafted and should be deposited shortly for the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol to the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

879. In concluding, the delegation indicated that further in an effort to bolster Saint Lucia's capacity to not only ratify human rights instruments but also to integrate them into domestic legislation, the Government had gone about doubling the number of legislative drafters within the drafting unit.

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

880. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Saint Lucia, 11 delegations made statements.

881. The Maldives noted that Saint Lucia was a fellow member of the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), acknowledged the work of the Government in its commitment to the UPR and applauded the commendable progress made. It was pleased to see that the Government accepted 92 recommendations including the two put forward by Maldives and

expressed understanding of the challenges and constraints faced by Saint Lucia as a small island developing State.

882. Nigeria commended the engagement of the country with the UPR, including the update on the recommendations received. Nigeria noted the efforts of the Government in strengthening the promotion and protection of the human rights of its citizens, despite numerous challenges. It urged Saint Lucia to maintain its cooperation with the Human Rights Council and its commitment to promote and protect the human rights of its people.

883. Pakistan valued the constructive engagement of Saint Lucia with the human rights machinery including the UPR mechanism which reflected the commitment of the Government with the promotion and protection of the human rights of its citizens. Pakistan acknowledged the efforts of the Government despite various challenges it was facing at and appreciated its decision in making every effort to implement recommendations that were made during the UPR session.

884. Paraguay recognized the willingness of the Government to accept most of the recommendations put forward by Paraguay and considered that such acceptance would contribute to guarantee human rights in Saint Lucia. Paraguay drew attention to recommendation 88.52 aimed at establishing a system of monitoring the implementation of international human rights recommendations and felt certain that its establishment would strengthen the capacity of reporting to the various international human rights mechanisms. Paraguay expressed its readiness to provide technical cooperation to Saint Lucia, on the basis of its national experience.

885. Saint Kitts and Nevis applauded the efforts of Saint Lucia to enhance human rights on the ground, to fulfil its obligations under the human rights instruments to which it was a party and to report to United Nations treaty bodies. It viewed with admiration the formation of the Constitutional Reform Committee and the progress it had achieved. It welcomed Saint Lucia's will and dedication of resources to the overall cause of enhancing the standard of living of all its citizens and its accomplishments of incorporating some aspects of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda into its domestic plan. It encouraged Saint Lucia to not waver in seeking out and accessing available technical and other assistance from willing partners to bolster its own national endeavours.

886. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines commended Saint Lucia for accepting a substantive number of recommendations. It welcomed, in particular, that the Government had accepted recommendations to ratify core international human rights treaties to which it was not yet a party and to align its national legislation to give effect to its international human rights obligations. It also recognised the efforts of Saint Lucia at strengthening its national legislative framework in combating domestic and gender based violence. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines encouraged the Government to bolster an approach to human rights that fostered coordination and promoted inclusivity of civil society and other key stakeholders.

887. Sierra Leone considered that Saint Lucia, as a relatively young nation, had made good progress in promoting human rights nationally and felt encouraged by the commitment shown to the UPR process, as well as by its active engagement with the States during their review in 2015. It commended the various measures undertaken by the Government to protect fundamental freedoms, as evidenced by the acceptance of the recommendations which enjoyed its support. It encouraged, however, Saint Lucia to ratify and domesticate international human rights instruments, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. Sierra Leone noted that the Government remained committed to addressing international partnerships in order to establish sustainable methodologies for mitigating climate change.

888. UN Women noted with appreciation that Saint Lucia accepted all the recommendations made in the interactive dialogue on fighting poverty and social inequality, and on expanding its social programmes to the most disadvantaged persons, especially women and children. The Government had conducted a gender aware beneficiary analysis of its Public Assistance Programme, with support from the United Nations joint Programme on Social Protection. UN Women encouraged the Government to implement the recommendations put forward in order to make the Public Assistance Programme more gender responsive. It welcomed Saint Lucia's commitment to the full implementation of all the provisions enshrined in the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women, as affirmed during the universal periodic review.

889. Cuba welcomed the additional information provided by Saint Lucia in relation to all recommendations. It recalled that during the UPR of Saint Lucia, Cuba noted the country's progress in empowering women and the efforts to promote and protect the rights of vulnerable groups such as persons with disabilities and the elderly. Cuba had made two recommendations on health and social protection, which, it considered, would contribute to improve the promotion and protection of economic, social and cultural rights in Saint Lucia.

890. The Bahamas commended Saint Lucia for supporting 92 of the 121 recommendations received and was pleased to note, among them, the one it put forward on bilateral and international partnerships. The Bahamas trusted that the full implementation of this recommendation would yield opportunities for technical cooperation and assistance, which could support the efforts of the Government in implementing other key recommendations. It encouraged the Government to continue building its capacities to identify areas of need, such as legislative drafting. The Bahamas was pleased by the significant progress achieved by Saint Lucia in the area of human rights protection and, indeed, by the notable commitments undertaken during the review, notwithstanding existing challenges and vulnerabilities.

891. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela recalled that Saint Lucia participated in a frank and constructive dialogue during its second UPR, which clearly set out the achievements and challenges of the country in the field of human rights. It added that the successful policy of social sensitivity shown by the Government had been reflected in public assistance programs that provided financial support and medical care to more than 2,400 poor households. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela encouraged Saint Lucia to further strengthen its successful social policies in favour of its people, especially the neediest sectors, with the international assistance and cooperation that the country might require.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

892. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Saint Lucia, 3 other stakeholders made statements.

893. Action Canada for Population and Development welcomed that the Government accepted a recommendation calling to enact comprehensive legislation that fully guarantees the application of the principle of non-discrimination and ensure the full enjoyment of all human rights by every member of society. It also acknowledged that the Government had strengthened its efforts to prevent discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity and continued its engagement with civil society organizations representing lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) persons to implement further anti-discrimination and awareness raising programs. It regretted, however, that Saint Lucia noted all recommendations related to the repeal of laws and Penal Code provisions prohibiting and punishing consenting sexual relations between adults of the same sex. These provisions not only generated many forms of discrimination, exclusion and violence

but also served as an impediment for LGBTI persons in accessing their fundamental rights including health, education and justice. It reminded the Government that human rights were universal, inalienable, indivisible, interdependent and interrelated and urged it to repeal laws that criminalised persons based on their gender identity or sexual orientation and to affirm the rights of LGBTI persons.

894. Amnesty International welcomed that the Government had accepted recommendations to ratify a number of core international human rights treaties, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and its optional protocol, as well as the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and its optional protocol. It noted, however, that Saint Lucia accepted similar recommendations during its first UPR and failed to implement them and urged the Government to act promptly to ratify these core international human rights standards. Amnesty International was also pleased to note that Saint Lucia accepted recommendations to enact comprehensive legislation to guarantee the principle of non-discrimination and to ensure the full enjoyment of all human rights by every member of society. It was concerned, however, by reports from LGBTI local activists on continued acts of violence and discrimination. While Saint Lucia had observed a *de facto* moratorium on the use of the death penalty for 20 years, the Government had failed to draw attention to the very serious human rights concerns inherent in the death penalty and to promote its abolition. In this context, Amnesty International, was disappointed by the decision of the Government to reject recommendations to establish a moratorium on executions with a view to abolishing the death penalty ant to ratify the second optional protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

895. The Pan-African Union for Science and Technology recalled that Saint Lucia was a multiparty, parliamentary democracy and that its Constitution guaranteed basic freedoms such as life, liberty, security of the person, equality before the law, freedom of conscience, of expression and of assembly and association. The Government generally respected religious freedom in law and practice. Saint Lucia had one of the lowest levels of corruption in the West Indies and the country had taken a number of measures directed at improving the utilisation of natural resources. It added that agriculture was the main economic activity of the island and that tourism had recently become an equally important economic activity.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

896. The President stated that based on the information provided, out of 121 recommendations received, 91 enjoyed the support of Saint Lucia, 29 were noted and detailed clarification was provided on 1 recommendation, indicating which part of that recommendation was supported and which part was noted.

897. The delegation thanked all speakers for their worthwhile contributions and announced that Saint Lucia would undertake to meet its obligations with fervour as the Government understood that achieving them would not only please the Council but also be of great importance to its people.

898. In meeting its obligations, the Government understood that a formal structure was needed in monitoring its human rights objectives. Although Saint Lucia was unable to commit to a National Human Rights Institution due to financial constraints, it was more than willing to accept assistance from the international community to aid with the creation of an efficient human rights management system. The delegation added that, UNDP had agreed to hold a workshop in Saint Lucia, meeting with the relevant stakeholders with the hope of introducing such a structure.

899. In conclusion the delegation thanked all who contributed in making its participation possible, and assured the Council that its trust in an island nation meeting its obligations had not been displaced.

Oman

900. The review of Oman was held on 5 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Oman in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/OMN/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/OMN/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/OMN/3).

901. At its 46th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Oman (see section C below).

902. The outcome of the review of Oman comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/11), the views of Oman concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, as well as its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group *(see also A/HRC/31/11/Add.1)*.

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

903. The delegation of Oman stated that due to its deep belief in the viability of the UPR and the importance of this mechanism for the development of human rights, the Sultanate of Oman had been keen since the first cycle to engage positively with the UPR. Therefore, Oman has always assigned the necessary means and expertise to fully engage with the UPR. The delegation recalled that the National Human Rights Commission had assigned a part of its voluntary contributions to develop the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council.

904. The delegation noted that the amendment made to the national Constitution in 2011 was the outcome of Oman's positive engagement towards the UPR.

905. The delegation stated that the Government had established specialised national committees to consult, debate and prepare for the accession to conventions that Oman had accepted to accede to and to lift reservations when possible. Oman has taken steps to accede to the International Covenant on Social, Economic and Cultural Rights, the Convention against Torture and the Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance. Furthermore, the Sultanate had made progress towards the withdrawal of its reservation of Article 15, paragraph 4, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

906. The delegation recalled that the Sultanate had received 233 recommendations during the UPR Working Group last November. All these recommendations were examined carefully and discussed in a participatory manner, whether through the legal committee established for this purpose or through liaison officers in ministries, administrations and departments as well as with civil society organisations and the National Human Rights Commission.

907. The delegation underlined that Oman accepted fully or partially 169 recommendations, did not support 36 and noted 28. Oman accepted 30 recommendations related to the accession to international human rights instruments, showing that the Sultanate is on its way, slowly but surely, to accede to many more treaties and conventions.

908. The delegation noted that Oman supported recommendations on the rights of women and children and added that the efforts undertaken in this field had been highlighted by the United Nations Expert on the Rights of the Child during the discussion of the third and fourth periodic reports of Oman on the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child last January.

909. The delegation stated that the Sultanate, keen to strengthen the rights of the persons with disabilities, accepted 7 recommendations on this issue.

910. The delegation noted that 17 recommendations had been accepted by Oman in the domain of development and that the authorities were studying the possibility of acceding to the Convention against Discrimination in Education and were willing to cooperate with UNESCO in this regard.

911. Regarding the recommendations on human rights organisations, rights to freedom of assembly, association and expression and on the participation of women in political life, the delegation noted that the Sultanate supported 23 recommendations, which demonstrated that the Government was keen to provide political rights, freedom of expression and support to civil society organisations.

912. The delegation stated that Oman accepted 5 recommendations on good governance, crime control and fight against terrorism.

913. In the humanitarian field, respect of privacy, enjoyment of labour rights and religious tolerance, the delegation reiterated Oman's respect and actions.

914. The delegation explained that the Sultanate could not accept 7 recommendations on the International Criminal Court and 8 on the abolition of the death penalty. Oman applies the provisions of the international law regarding guarantees related to capital punishment and has postponed executions. The death sentence is rarely used and only for major crimes.

915. The delegation stated that making reservations is a right guaranteed to all States and that many of the reservations made by Oman concerned the detailed formulation of certain recommendations. The majority of these reservations concerned recommendations that contravened the policies or culture of the Sultanate, or were considered premature.

916. The delegation noted that the Sultanate was continuing to develop human rights, had achieved much progress in this respect and was keen to reach the highest level possible in the human rights promotion and protection. It added that the recommendations accepted were in conformity with the Constitution, the teachings of the Islamic Sharia and the Omani society and culture.

917. In conclusion, the delegation stated that the question of human rights and the respect of others' dignity, religion and believes were issues of great importance for Oman, which will spare no efforts to achieve further freedoms and rights. The delegation added that the regional challenges were beyond the responsibility and capabilities of the Sultanate and that there was a collective responsibility to deal with them, affirming the important role played by Oman in establishing peace through quiet diplomacy and dialogue.

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

918. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Oman, 17 delegations made statements. The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints[107] are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.

919. Malaysia acknowledged the continuous efforts made by Oman in improving the overall situation of human rights in the country. It positively noted the judicial reforms undertaken and welcomed the various messages put in place to ameliorate the rights of women and children. Malaysia encouraged the Government to continue its positive measures in the advancement of the rights of women and children in the country, including by ensuring the effective implementation of its policies and programmes and to enhance its awareness raising campaign to combat negative stereotype against women and prohibit violence against women. Finally, Malaysia urged Oman to accept and implement the recommendations of the review in the endeavour to promote and protect the rights of its citizens.

920. Mauritania appreciated that the Sultanate would accede to a certain instruments, such as the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and the International Convention on the Protection of All Persons against Enforced Disappearance. It expressed its full confidence that Oman would redouble its efforts to implement the recommendations that it had accepted.

921. Pakistan appreciated the decision of Oman to accept the majority of the recommendations that had been made during the UPR Working Group, including those made by Pakistan. It highly valued the constructive engagement of Oman with the human rights mechanisms. Pakistan also commended the Government for the achievement made in economic and social development that would further contribute to the promotion and protection of the rights of its citizens.

922. Qatar stated that the interactive dialogue during the Working Group session in November had demonstrated that the promotion and protection of human rights were among the most important political priorities that the Sultanate aimed to achieve. It applauded the Sultanate's positive interaction with the UPR mechanism and its cooperation with the Human Rights Council's mechanisms as well as its respect of its international human rights obligations. This is reflected by the acceptance of Oman of the majority of the UPR recommendations, in particular those proposed by Qatar.

923. Saudi Arabia praised the various efforts exerted by the Sultanate in the protection of human rights and appreciated its continuous cooperation with the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council. It noted the accomplishments achieved by Oman in the field of human rights, policies and laws. Saudi Arabia commended the Sultanate for its acceptance of 169 recommendations out of 233 and called out for the continuation of its efforts in order to promote and protect human rights in all levels.

924. Singapore appreciated Oman's acceptance of the recommendations that Singapore had made on improving access to education for persons with disabilities and strengthening the delivery of healthcare services. It encouraged Oman to continue to make every effort in implementing the UPR accepted recommendations in the coming years and to remain steadfast in its efforts to improve the lives and welfare of its citizens.

[107] https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx

925. The Sudan praised the efforts undertaken by the Sultanate to promote and protect the human rights of its citizens, particularly the institutional and legislative developments made during the first UPR cycle.

926. Swaziland congratulated Oman for the great strides that it had made to implement the UPR recommendations from the first cycle. According to Swaziland, it is obvious that the Sultanate is fully committed in upholding, observing and respecting all the fundamental principles of human rights. In 2012, the Government established several ministerial steering committees with the primary objective of implementing all the recommendations of the Human Rights Council. Furthermore, Oman ratified almost all the international human rights treaties and integrated the provisions of these treaties and conventions into national legislation. Finally, Swaziland stated that Oman had amended its Constitution so as to be in line and conform to the United Nations human rights standards.

927. Tajikistan noted the measures undertaken by Oman to strengthen human resources through human rights training and the developing of a human rights culture. This is reflected by the improvement of the educational system and the status of women in society; the strengthening of the international cooperation to combat trafficking in persons and the support and protection given to the victims of this traffic as well as the financial support provided after national disasters.

928. Togo welcomed the numerous measures undertaken by Oman in the promotion and protection of the human rights. It also noted with satisfaction that Oman accepted the majority of the UPR recommendations that had been proposed by the delegations.

929. Tunisia commended Oman for its spirit of cooperation and its positive interaction with the UPR Working Group and welcomed the firm determination of the Sultanate to make further efforts to promote and protect human rights.

930. The United Arab Emirates commended the hard work carried out by the Sultanate to promote fundamental freedoms, the cultural of human rights and the measures taken to protect the dignity of individuals and the principle of equal opportunity. It welcomed the commitment made by the Sultanate to promote social justice in all spheres and to consolidate good governance and rule of law. The United Arab Emirates also welcomed the political determination of Oman to implement recommendations.

931. Uzbekistan stated that Oman's national report demonstrated that the Sultanate placed a serious attention to the UPR mechanism. It commended Oman for its constructive cooperation with the Human Rights Council and was pleased to note the steady improvements and developments of the legislative and institutional basis in the area of human rights, including for the promotion and protection of the rights of children, women, persons with disability and elder persons.

932. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela commended Oman for the clear achievements in education of girls and women. It noted that the enrolment of girls in school had increased of 50 per cent and of 55 per cent in universities and that women represented 43 per cent of civil servants and 20 per cent in the private sectors. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela added that Oman had shown efforts in the promotion of measures for the most vulnerable groups.

933. Yemen expressed its appreciation of the success achieved by the Sultanate in the field of human rights and the acceptance by Oman of a large number of recommendations. This reflects Oman's commitments in the promotion and protection of human rights in civil, political, economic social and cultural areas.

934. Afghanistan welcomed the fact that many of the UPR recommendations had enjoyed the support of Oman and that it had accepted the recommendation made by Afghanistan to ratify the UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education. It also commended

Oman for its commitment to build a dialogue between various stakeholders on human rights issues. Afghanistan appreciated Oman's continued efforts in empowering women and providing them with equal access in education and labour market.

935. Algeria welcomed the legal reforms that had led to the guaranty of the independence of the judiciary and the fight against corruption; to the advancement of the protection of the provisions of the international humanitarian law as well as to the strengthening of the labour rights and the rights of the child. It encouraged Oman to continue the implementation of its plan for the year 2025 regarding the rights of children, women and persons with disability. Algeria noted that Oman had accepted the majority of the recommendations, including those proposed by Algeria, and wished that it would accelerate the accession to international conventions.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

936. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Oman, 5 other stakeholders made statements.

937. The Arab Commission for Human Rights commended Oman for its acceptance of the recommendations related to the ratification of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. Oman should take all legislative measures in order to ratify the Optional Protocol of the Convention against Torture and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Arab Commission for Human Rights praised the positive interaction of Oman with the UPR process, as well as for the introduction of various amendments to its Constitution in 2011. It expressed concern about the implementation of recommendations, the fact that Oman noted some recommendations and for the lack of clarity regarding Oman's response to some recommendations. Finally, the Arab Commission for Human Rights stated that Oman should establish a national assistance to follow-up the implementation of the recommendations.

938. Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain expressed concern at the human rights situation in Oman. Since 2011, authorities have arrested the documented number of 216 persons in charges relating to freedom of assembly with the argument of disturbing public peace. The Judiciary regularly violates due process, imposing arbitrary sentences on individuals. Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain was also concerned at the increasing restriction of freedom of assembly, freedom of expression and access to information in Oman. Human rights defenders, journalists and bloggers are among the most vulnerable; they face arrest and arbitrary imprisonment for expressing their disappointment with the human rights situation and the repressive practices of the security forces. It urged Oman to guarantee under all circumstances the freedom of human rights defenders to carry out their legitimate activities without fear of reprisals. Finally, Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain called out for the ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

939. Human Rights Watch (HRW) stated that the concerns regarding freedom of expression and assembly raised during the first UPR in 2011 had remained in 2016. HRW has documented a pattern in which Omani security forces harass activists and prosecute pro-reform activists and critics on vague charges. Omani laws continue to criminalize insulting the "Sultan's rights or authority" and undermining the "prestige of the State", charges that are often used by courts to prosecute activists. Last February, Omani courts sentenced two online activists to prison for their social media posts. HRW remained also concerned that all public gatherings required advance official approval. It noted that the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and association had echoed many of these concerns. It regretted that the Omani Citizenship

Law, which allows Omani women married to non-Omani men to confer citizenship to their children, continued to impose discriminatory restrictions. HRW was also concerned that migrant workers in Oman remained vulnerable to exploitation and abuse, due in part to the visa-sponsorship system.

940. Amnesty International (AI) welcomed the cooperation of Oman with the UPR process. It was disappointed by Oman's decision to reject recommendations to guarantee the rights to freedom of expression, association and assembly, and those regarding the investigation of cases of excessive use of force against demonstrators and supporting civil society organizations. The fact that Oman has both accepted and rejected recommendations to review current legislation that fails to protect these rights sends a mixed message. AI has documented a pattern of harassment of activists, journalists and bloggers by the authorities. It urged the Government to guarantee the exercise of the right to freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly and to release all prisoners of conscience. AI regretted Oman's negative responses to recommendations to implement the recommendations of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and association. It was also disappointed that Oman rejected recommendations to establish a moratorium on the death penalty with a view to its abolition in law.

941. Africa Culture Internationale commended Oman for the positive substantial advancement in the transformation of the country, and for developing the country's infrastructure and economy according to the previous UPR. It thanked Oman for a number of positive reforms in various sectors, especially its engagement with the United Nations mechanisms, and for considering the promotion of human rights by adopting some recommendations from the previous review, improving the infrastructure of the judicial system and enacting legal reforms aimed at promoting free trials. Africa Culture Internationale noticed the continuous existence of breaches in Oman's international human rights obligations, particularly with regard to freedoms of expression, association and assembly, as well as the continuous repression of women rights. It encouraged Oman to prioritize the development and promotion of human rights, women's participation in political activities and child protection in the country.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

942. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 233 recommendations received, 169 enjoy the support of Oman, and 64 are noted.

943. The delegation of Oman reiterated its thanks for all who participated in the session and for all the support and interest that the Sultanate had received.

944. The delegation also extended its thanks to the international non-governmental organisations whose opinions would be examined. However, it noted that some NGOs lacked accuracy in their description of the situation in Oman due to a lack of knowledge of the system and legislation in the country. For example, the rights to freedom of expression and to peaceful assembly are granted in the Constitution and no laws in the country restrict these rights. The delegation added that the right to peaceful assembly did not permit undermining the right of others or the destruction of infrastructures.

945. The delegation noted that it was keen to shed more light on Oman's reality in order to show a true picture of the Sultanate. It added that the Government was open to all objective and honest opinions that would improve the well-being of its citizens or those of other countries. The Sultanate exerts all possible efforts, provides all necessary means and resources and listens to experience from regional and international experts in the area of human rights. The delegation stated that no country had achieved perfection in this field and that it was a work in progress.

946. In conclusion, the delegation reiterated Oman's willingness to implement the recommendations. It recalled that the Sultanate accepted 169 recommendations out of 233, namely 73 per cent. This does not necessarily mean that the other recommendations have been rejected; but that they need further examination to be sure that none clash with Oman's legislation and culture.

Myanmar

947. The review of Myanmar was held on 6 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Myanmar in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/MMR/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/MMR/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/MMR/3).

948. At its 46th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Myanmar (see section C below).

949. The outcome of the review of Myanmar comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/13), the views of Myanmar concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, as well as its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group *(see also A/HRC/31/13/Add.1)*.

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

950. The delegation of Myanmar underlined that, among several mechanisms designated to promote and protect human rights situations of Member States, Myanmar firmly believed that only the UPR mechanism equitably provided equal treatment to all Member States.

951. The delegation stated that, during the review of Myanmar in November 2015, 93 Member States made a total of 281 recommendations, out of which 124 recommendations enjoyed the immediate support of Myanmar, while 69 did not. Myanmar took 88 recommendations back home for further consideration.

952. The delegation indicated that many recommendations were made on ratifying the core international human rights instruments; strengthening the national human rights institution; advancement of women; elimination of all forms of discrimination; abolishing death penalty; strengthening religious tolerance; access to healthcare and education, and other human rights issues.

953. Myanmar had given serious consideration to all recommendations, which would largely contribute to the reinforcement of its endeavours in promoting and protecting human rights. The delegation stressed that many of the recommendations were already in the process of implementation.

954. Reporting on the 88 deferred recommendations, the delegation stated that they had been given very careful consideration on the basis of their merit, objective and the principle. Myanmar had also examined them against the situation on the ground, taking into consideration the historic, social, cultural and traditional values of the people of Myanmar as well as the state sovereignty. The delegation also indicated that many recommendations

fell within the domestic jurisdiction of the State. Some recommendations needed to be sequenced in their implementation, because of capacity constraints. Against this backdrop and after careful consideration, the delegation stated that Myanmar had decided to accept 42 additional recommendations.

955. According to the delegation, Myanmar accepted recommendation No. 144.31, as the National Human Rights Commission and the Myanmar Press Council are functioning as independent entities with the objective of defending and safeguarding the rights of citizens and journalists.

956. Furthermore, Myanmar also accepted recommendations No. 144.73 and No. 144.74. They are related to guarantees in law and in practice that lawyers and judges can perform their professional functions without improper interference. These duties and functions are already stipulated in the Section 19(a), 354(c) and Section 3(a) of the Union Judiciary Law.

957. The delegation stated that new Media Law and the Printing and Publishing Enterprise Law of 2014 are serving the interests of the people, however, that they must respond to the advancement of information technology, international standards and future challenges. Therefore, Myanmar accepted the related recommendations. They are recommendations No. 144.80 and 144.81.

958. Regarding the protection of human rights defenders and journalists, the delegation informed that the State Constitution already guaranteed the fundamental rights of all citizens. As such, Myanmar accepted the recommendations on creating and maintaining a safe and enabling environment for the civil society, human rights defenders and journalists. These recommendations are No. 144.82, 144.83 and 144.84. Myanmar believed that there is a merit to review relevant laws so that they respond to the present day requirements and international norms and practices.

959. All in all, the delegation stated that Myanmar had accepted 42 additional recommendations.

960. The delegation indicated that Myanmar was unable to accept the remaining 46 recommendations because they are in contradiction with the State Constitution of Myanmar. They are infringing upon the national sovereignty, and also conflicting with the national legislations. However, the delegation stressed that, as things are changing in the right direction in the country, a window of opportunity may arise to revisit these recommendations in the future.

961. The delegation summarised that Myanmar had accepted a total of 166 recommendations out of the 281 recommendations that it had received during the 2nd cycle of UPR process.

962. The delegation then informed about the preparations being made by the current government to transfer the responsibilities of State to the new government. The new President had just been elected, and the present government had laid down a firm foundation for the promotion and protection of human rights in the interests of the people. In spite of human rights challenges common to all, Myanmar is committed to address these issues in the best interests of its people, and in line with its international obligations.

963. In concluding, the delegation thanked all States that engaged with Myanmar objectively and constructively during the UPR working group session last November.

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

964. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Myanmar, 17 delegations made statements. The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints[108] are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.

965. Brunei Darussalam commended the intention of Myanmar to implement an action plan under the Myanmar Early Childhood Care and Development Policy to ensure sustainable development of children with disabilities. It was also encouraged by the ratification by Myanmar of core international human rights instruments. It looked forward to continuing to work closely with Myanmar to promote and protect human rights through the ASEAN regional framework.

966. Cambodia appreciated continuous efforts and commitments of Myanmar to promote and protect human rights through strengthening the rule of law, governance, and public administration. It also commended the advancement that Myanmar had made in political, administrative, social and judicial reforms. Cambodia welcomed acceptance by Myanmar of a majority of recommendations, including its own concerning the enhancement of peace, development and democracy.

967. China thanked Myanmar for accepting its recommendations on continuing efforts to preserve national, cultural and religious diversity so as to promote harmony among ethnic groups and religions and increasing the amount of spending on health with special attention to women and children so as to achieve relevant Millennium Development Goals as soon as possible. It hoped that economic growth will allow social and economic progress and improve people's livelihood.

968. Cuba noted that measures had been introduced to move forward in areas such as employment, education and food. It invited Myanmar to continue the momentum on reforms to meet the populations' socio-economic needs and recommended that Myanmar adopt measures to ensure that economic growth is consistent across regions and to tackle corruption effectively.

969. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea was encouraged by continued commitments of Myanmar to the promotion and protection of human rights after the 23rd session of the UPR Working Group. It welcomed the acceptance by Myanmar of many recommendations, including those it had made, which demonstrated the will of Myanmar to pursue efforts in the field of human rights.

970. Ethiopia noted with satisfaction Myanmar's acceptance of a significant number of recommendations, including its own, concerning peace talks among people to avoid ethnic and religious conflicts, scaling up national reconciliation process and focusing on economic development to bring about sustainable peace and to ensure enjoyment of human rights in the country. It commended Myanmar for the improvements in the areas of economic and social reforms.

971. India commended Myanmar for the constructive manner to engage with its UPR review, which witnessed a high degree of participation, and for accepting 166 recommendations. India commended Myanmar's remarkable democratic transition with the 2015 elections and believed that Myanmar deserved the acknowledgment of the international committee for its steadfast will and its constructive engagement with United Nations mechanisms.

[108] https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx

972. Indonesia congratulated Myanmar for holding credible, transparent and democratic elections in 2015. It noted Myanmar's acceptance of its recommendation to continue efforts to promote tolerance, harmony and respect of human rights among all communities in Myanmar, including through possible review of legal frameworks, human rights' education, interfaith dialogues and cooperation involving all segments in society.

973. The Islamic Republic of Iran commended the active participation of Myanmar in the UPR mechanism. It also noted efforts of Myanmar on legislative reforms. It appreciated that Myanmar had considered its recommendations in a constructive manner for implementing them.

974. Japan commended Myanmar for the efforts towards a smooth transition to the new government following last November's historic election, for signing the ceasefire agreement with eight ethnic minority groups and releasing political prisoners. It noted about the remaining challenges, including the situation of ethnic and religious minorities, particularly those in Rakhine State. It encouraged Myanmar to ensure that specific groups are not legally and socially marginalized.

975. The Lao People's Democratic Republic commended Myanmar for amending and enacting a number of domestic laws, regulations, and ratifications of some core international human rights conventions, including the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, thus creating favourable conditions and platforms for people to exercise their fundamental rights and freedoms. It also welcomed socio-economic developments, including access to health care services, education and enhancing gender equality.

976. Latvia urged Myanmar to ensure respect for human rights and democratic space in the post-election environment to protect those wishing to work with the new government. Latvia also urged Myanmar to ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. Latvia welcomed Myanmar's commitment to engage closely with treaty bodies and special procedures mandate holders, however, regretted that Myanmar did not accept its recommendation to extend a standing invitation to all Special Procedures.

977. Malaysia noted the progress made by Myanmar towards inclusive development, through empowering women, adopting policies and programmes for universal and free education, and increasing public health resources. It welcomed the acceptance by Myanmar of its recommendations calling for increasing efforts to combat human trafficking and promoting inter-ethnic and inter-faith harmony. It urged Myanmar to take all actions to end discrimination against Rohingya and other minorities.

978. Mongolia welcomed the acceptance by Myanmar of recommendations to ratify key international human rights instruments and commended Myanmar's commitment to further deepen democratic reforms, protect the rights of women, children and persons with disabilities, eliminate all forms of discrimination and combat human trafficking. It also commended Myanmar's willingness to promote dialogue among all groups and segments of society. It suggested that Myanmar reconsider other recommendations, including on the abolition of death penalty.

979. The Philippines noted Myanmar's advances in several reforms, including free, fair, transparent and multi-party general elections, establishment of social laws to counter violence against women and implementation of free and universal primary education. It appreciated the acceptance by Myanmar of its recommendation to consider accession to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families.

980. The Russian Federation noted that the recent political change in Myanmar was facilitating progress on a number of human rights fronts. It also indicated that the

November 2015 review had confirmed once again Myanmar's openness and willingness to discuss sensitive issues and to cooperate with the global community.

981. Sierra Leone commended Myanmar for a landmark national reconciliation process, following the 2015 ceasefire and the continued commitment to engaging in political dialogue with various stakeholders. It encouraged Myanmar to pursue efforts aimed at inclusive dialogue, political stability and establishing legitimate accountability. It hoped that Myanmar would, in the near future, consider establishing a moratorium on the death penalty.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

982. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Myanmar, 11 other stakeholders made statements. The statements of the stakeholders that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints[109] are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.

983. United Nations Watch was alarmed by the treatment of the Rohingya community and called on Myanmar to repeal the discriminatory 1982 Citizenship Law and grant them citizenship. It also regretted that Myanmar had rejected the recommendation of Ireland to grant the Special Rapporteur on Human Rights in Myanmar unrestricted access to the Rakhine region. Furthermore, it was concerned with the unequal and discriminatory treatment of minorities in general, exemplified by the recent passing of the so-called "Race and Religion Laws." It was also dismayed that Myanmar had rejected recommendations to end violence and bigotry against minorities, as well as multiple recommendations from countries, including Australia, Canada, Czech Republic, and Denmark to repeal these unjust laws.

984. The Lutheran World Federation reiterated its support and desire to collaborate with the Government of Myanmar in implementing accepted recommendations to improve the human rights situation, particularly, strengthening the rule of law; improving protection of all; promoting religious and ethnic harmony and understanding; improving women's rights; enhancing access to clean and safe water; improving access to land and land rights; ensuring all acquire birth registration; and resolving key issues relating to the right to nationality. It called upon Myanmar to continue working closely with all national stakeholders in the implementation and monitoring of the UPR recommendations.

985. International Federation for Human Rights Leagues welcomed Myanmar's acceptance of recommendations concerning the ratification of key international human rights instruments and the reform of the National Human Rights Commission. However, it noted that those recommendations had been made during the first UPR and remained unaddressed. It regretted that Myanmar refused to acknowledge ongoing discrimination against ethnic and religious minorities and to accept all 27 recommendations with specific reference to Muslim Rohingya. It also noted that Myanmar had not accepted recommendations calling for the amendment of the Peaceful Gathering and Demonstration Law; release of all political prisoners; issuance of a standing invitation to the special procedures; opening of an the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights country office; and abolition of the death penalty.

986. Franciscans International, in its joint statement, expressed concern about rejection of recommendations on human rights of minorities and drew particular attention to the four laws on the "Protection of Race and Religion". It indicated that these laws were discriminatory towards women and religious minorities and called on the new government

[109] https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/31stSession/Pages/default.aspx

of Myanmar to repeal these laws without further delay. It also expressed concern about the situation of internally displaced persons due to conflicts, in particular, in Rakhine and Kachin States. It urged the new government of Myanmar to establish policies and to take concrete measures to address the internal conflicts, while promoting and protecting the human rights for all, including the ethnic and religious minorities.

987. International Lesbian and Gay Association observed that Myanmar had not accepted the recommendations made by Australia and Spain to repeal or revise the protection of race and religion laws and section 377 of the Criminal Code to ensure that the rights of women, religious minorities, and the LGBTI community are protected. It indicated that LGBTI people in Myanmar were subject to discrimination based on their sexual orientation, gender identify and expression. It therefore called on Myanmar to: amend section 377 of the Criminal Code; stop abusing the 1945 Police Act; stop police operations that target gay men and transgender women; and provide awareness-raising programmes to law enforcement officials.

988. International Bar Association's Human Rights Institute, in its joint statement, called on Myanmar to implement the recommendations to reform the Bar Council Act to allow for the Bar Council to become a truly independent and self-governing association. It called for the right of lawyers and judges to join self-governing associations to be enshrined in law, and that the right of the first Independent Lawyers' Association of Myanmar (ILAM) to register as an association be respected. Furthermore, it called upon Myanmar to engage in a consultation process with the legal profession and other stakeholders in relation to the revision of the Bar Council Act. It also urged improvement of legal education and continuation of legal professional development.

989. Jubilee Campaign remained concerned that Myanmar had not accepted recommendations addressing the rights of Rohingya minority. Since 2012, hate speech and violence against Muslim Rohingyas and other religious minorities had increased, forcing displacement of thousands of Rohingyas to flee the country, risking their lives in boats on the open sea. The 1982 Citizenship Law had continued to strip the Rohingyas of their citizenship rights. It urged Myanmar to repeal discriminatory legislation. It also noted ethnic conflict against Kachin and Shan peoples had left at least 140,000 civilians displaced. It also urged Myanmar to declare a nationwide ceasefire and halt violations of human rights by security forces.

990. Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development reiterated its call for the release of all political prisoners, amendment of repressive laws, and civil society space. It noted Myanmar's failure to accept recommendations on ending violence and discrimination against ethnic and religious minorities, including the Rohingya, and urged Myanmar to amend or repeal the 1982 Citizenship Act and four laws on Race and Religion. It called on Myanmar to ensure an inclusive peace process with greater representation of women; submit reports due to Treaty Bodies; and immediately accept pending requests for country visits by the Special Rapporteur. It also called for a comprehensive action plan for the implementation of UPR recommendations, in full consultation and cooperation with independent rights-based civil society.

991. Article 19 - International Centre Against Censorship, The urged the new government to ratify the main international human rights treaties, particularly the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. It remained alarmed at arrests and arbitrary detention of protesters, human rights defenders, Internet users, and journalists. It was disappointed that Myanmar had not supported many of the recommendations to reform existing and newly-adopted laws that illegitimately restricted the right to freedom of expression. It urged the new government to initiate reforms to its legal framework, in particular the Penal Code. It also stated that Myanmar should do much more to address advocacy of national, racial and religious hatred that constituted incitement to

discrimination. It also noted that women faced particular obstacles in exercising their rights to freedom of expression and public participation.

992. Human Rights Watch acknowledged significant reform Myanmar had made since its previous UPR, however, noted that numerous rights-abusing laws remained. The judiciary remained corrupt. The military was above civilian control and continued to enjoy impunity. About 100 political prisoners were in the country, while another 400 people faced criminal charges for asserting their freedom of expression. The signing of a partial nationwide ceasefire in October 2015 with eight ethnic armed groups had not ended armed conflict. So-called "Race and Religion Protection Laws" imperilled the rights of religious minorities. The Rohingya Muslim minority had been disenfranchised during the elections of November 2015. The 1982 Citizenship Act denied them the citizenship. It noted the need for a full OHCHR office in the country with a reporting and technical assistance mandate.

993. Amnesty International expressed its profound concern at Myanmar's rejection of all 27 recommendations relating to the situation of Rohingya. While Myanmar accepted one recommendation to "continue to release" prisoners of conscience, it was disappointed that Myanmar had rejected seven other recommendations calling for the release of remaining prisoners of conscience. Nearly 100 prisoners of conscience were behind bards despite recent amnesties and hundreds of human rights activists were on trial, charged solely for the peaceful exercise of their rights. It urged Myanmar to implement, without delay, accepted recommendations to amend laws restricting freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly. It welcomed the acceptance of recommendations to provide redress to victims of land confiscations and urged Myanmar to enact and enforce legislation to prohibit forced evictions and to strengthen environmental safeguards to protect against any infringements of human rights caused by the extractive and manufacturing industries.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

994. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 281 recommendations received, 166 enjoy the support of Myanmar while 115 are noted.

995. The delegation of Myanmar thanked for the enthusiasm and active participation of States and stakeholders and stated that, in their interventions, Myanmar recognized its shared, common objective of the promotion and protection of human rights for the people of Myanmar. In response to their interventions, the delegation made the following observations:

996. First, when Myanmar speaks and works on human rights issues, the respect for state sovereignty must be observed at all times.

997. Second, national circumstances should be taken into careful consideration. Historic, social, cultural and traditional values play an important role in advancing human rights. There is no one-size-fits-all formula.

998. Third, capacity constraints pose a real challenge to many developing countries, including Myanmar. For instance, with regard to considering joining the remaining core human rights treaties, Myanmar has to prioritise and sequence its objectives simply because Myanmar is very much preoccupied with democratic reforms and development priorities.

999. Fourth, Myanmar will study and consider all the views and issues expressed here in this room as it implements the accepted recommendations.

1000. Fifth, Myanmar has come a long way to bring about better human rights for its people. However, more needs to be done. Myanmar will continue to work to address the remaining challenges. Towards this end, Myanmar will continue to cooperate with its international partners and all other stakeholders, including civil society organizations in the country.

1001. Lastly, Myanmar is committed to the promotion and protection of human rights. This commitment and spirit will always prevail in its society.

Saint Kitts and Nevis

1002. The review of Saint Kitts and Nevis was held on 11 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Saint Kitts and Nevis in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/KNA/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/KNA/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/KNA/3).

1003. At its 46th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Saint Kitts and Nevis (see section C below).

1004. The outcome of the review of Saint Kitts and Nevis comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/16), the views of Saint Kitts and Nevis concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, as well as its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group *(see also A/HRC/31/16/Add.1)*.

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

1005. The delegation of Saint Kitts and Nevis stated that it felt privileged to participate in the UPR, which encourages increased focus on human rights nationally, greater accountability of, and within government, and a more consolidated approach to the provision and monitoring of human rights as prescribed by international legal instruments.

1006. It asserted that Saint Kitts and Nevis' presentation constituted its formal response to the recommendations offered during the interactive dialogue of the 2nd UPR Cycle at the 23rd Session of the Working Group.

1007. From a total of 133 recommendations, Saint Kitts and Nevis accepted 58 which pertained to programmes and initiatives already being implemented and those which could be feasibly implemented over a relatively reasonable period of time, and well in advance of the third cycle. Seventy five (75) recommendations were noted due to the fact that they will require greater commitment of resources, prolonged assessment of the implications on the overall national agenda, and consultation with multi-stakeholders before the next cycle.

1008. Due to fiscal and human resource constraints, the delegation emphasized that although Saint Kitts and Nevis was not always able to comply with internationally accepted practices, it remained willing and had accepted the recommendations which it deemed attainable so that achievements of the second UPR cycle would have surpassed those of the first.

1009. Of the recommendations proposed during the 23rd Session of the Working Group, the majority pertained to the scope of Saint Kitts and Nevis' international obligations. In fact, 43 of the 133 of the recommendations, (representing 32%) called for the ratification of human rights core instruments and respective protocols. This percentage highlighted not only the importance of these instruments to the international community, but also the significance of that single act of ratification. Saint Kitts and Nevis was also cognizant of the

relevance of the instruments and their ratification. The delegation underscored that the stark reality was however, that Saint Kitts and Nevis on its own was unable to comply and was in need of international technical assistance.

1010. It added, though, that a submission for approval regarding Saint Kitts and Nevis' ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities was currently with the Cabinet and hoped that within the second quarter of 2016 it will be concluded.

1011. Additional recommendations concerned the implementation of international human rights obligations, cooperation with human rights mechanisms including treaty bodies as well as the creation of an institutional and human rights infrastructure. The delegation stated it recognized that a proper structure must be created to follow up, monitor and implement recommendations and highlighted its participation in a training activity on treaty body reporting sponsored by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and UNDP. It also mentioned that two sensitization workshops would be conducted following the workshop.

1012. It is envisaged that a multi-sector core group will be formulated that will be responsible specifically for following up on the recommendations, monitoring implementation, and also research, consult and as appropriate, recommend ratification of core human rights instruments. This group would also be responsible for heightening awareness not only about the UPR process but also regarding reporting to treaty bodies. The sensitization seminar and formulation of the group will take place within the next two months. The delegation also underscored that the Bahamian experience offered some best practices which would be modelled when formulating the core body in Saint Kitts and Nevis.

1013. The delegation encouraged Member states and other Non-state bodies to partner with them in its efforts to realise full implementation of the recommendations emanating from its 2nd cycle review.

1014. The delegation expressed that in principle, Saint Kitts and Nevis did not object to issuing open and standing invitations to special procedures of the HRC. However, Saint Kitts and Nevis believed that after the core group was institutionalised, the special procedures could be invited to evaluate and assess its program of work and assist that body with further improvement in its mandate and work.

1015. On recommendations on gender equality, Saint Kitts and Nevis continued to make significant strides in ensuring that both men and women were afforded equal rights in the areas of work, education, and access to health and social services, for example. However, the legal framework should continue to be strengthened, and more initiatives be implemented, especially in the area of equal pay for equal work.

1016. The delegation draw the Council's attention to the paragraphs relating to this issue in its Addendum, including a reference to the Domestic and Sexual Violence Complaints and Response Protocol. It stated that following approval by the Cabinet, it was fully implemented.

1017. According to the last (2011) census of Saint Kitts and Nevis, females accounted for 51% of the total population of 47,196. Forty three (43%) of the total number of households (15,680) were headed by females. Further, provisional 2015 employment data illustrated that of a total labour force of 25,866 workers, a total of 13,530 were females –representing 52 percent of the workforce.

1018. It underscored that the Head of Government had reiterated his Administration's commitment "to continue to foster a dynamic environment that will accelerate the economic, educational, social and political advancement of women in Saint Kitts and Nevis".

1019. The delegation highlighted among other issues, the increase in staff of the Department of Gender Affairs and the fact that domestic violence continued to be an area of focus for the government, and men were becoming more aware through training regarding gender based violence.

1020. It pointed out that the result of 1999/2000 and 2007/2008 surveys revealed that the Federation had significantly reduced its level of poverty. Whereas the 1999/2000 Country Poverty Assessment revealed that thirty and a half (30.5) percent of the nationals in Saint Kitts and thirty two (32) percent in Nevis were poor, by 2007/2008, the poverty rate for the Federation had fallen by almost ten (10) percent.

1021. It emphasized that Saint Kitts and Nevis was successful in achieving its Millennium Development Goal in significantly reducing poverty levels and through its robust and social protection strategies, continued to decrease the number of persons living below the poverty line.

1022. The delegation of Saint Kitts and Nevis was pleased to advise that the National Child Protection Protocol was now operational and was being implemented, in order to provide an effective and efficient framework to protect children who are, or who are likely to be, victims of abuse and neglect. It provided the minimum standards for prevention, investigation, reporting, judicial intervention, care, treatment and support of each case of child abuse and neglect. The Protocol also provided guidance to the agencies and professionals involved in child abuse cases.

1023. The delegation asserted that although public sector workers enjoyed a national health scheme, many citizens did not, and it was the Government's desire to be able to introduce a National Health Scheme in the near future. To this end, a committee had been formalised to devise a plan for comprehensive health coverage. A health management information system was now operationalized at public health institutions in the Federation. It also mentioned the health smart card and the fact that the country will soon have aces to state-of-the-art cancer treatment centre.

1024. Spanning a five-year period (2013-2107), the National Social Protection Strategy was being implemented and the Social Protection Bill was soon to be tabled in Parliament.

1025. The Federation established all–inclusive education, health and social security systems beginning in the late 1960s that resulted in relatively high average rates of human and social development. It had made major progress in the provision of education services to its population, particularly with regard to primary and secondary education. The soon-to-be-completed Education Policy Review of the Saint Kitts and Nevis Education sector, currently being undertaken by UNESCO, will assist the Federation in "developing a meaningful competency driven curriculum that has at its centre 21st Century skills."

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

1026. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Saint Kitts and Nevis, 11 delegations made statements.

1027. Malawi noted efforts made by the government of Saint Kitts and Nevis to improve its economy by implementing stringent fiscal measures aimed at reducing debt, creating conditions for sustainable economic growth, higher standards of living and poverty alleviation. It further recognized policy and legislative reforms initiated with the aim of complying with recommendations. It encouraged the Government to continue pursuing efforts aimed at fully implementing the recommendations it had accepted and to continue paying attention and having in contemplation the recommendations it had noted.

1028. Maldives thanked the government for supporting 58 recommendations and noting 75 out of the 133 recommendations made. It appreciated the support of Saint Kitts and Nevis on all three of its recommendations and was greatly encouraged by the country's commitment to furthering the development of health, education and gender equality within its borders. It encouraged the Government to continue in its efforts toward promoting human rights in the country.

1029. Pakistan stated that despite the paucity of resources and challenges posed by the global financial crises and its spill over effects, Saint Kitts and Nevis had accepted 58 recommendations received in the UPR session. Pakistan highly valued the constructive engagement of Saint Kitts and Nevis with the UPR Working Group and wished them success in the implementation of accepted recommendations.

1030. Paraguay valued the acceptance of recommendations made by its country, namely recommendation 91.17 on strengthening the cooperation with treaty bodies and the presentation of pending national reports and recommendation 91.16 on considering the possibility of establishing a national system to follow-up international recommendations. Paraguay considered that both recommendations and particularly the one on the national system to follow-up on recommendations would contribute significantly to the continuing process of human rights promotion and protection through the implementation of recommendations that in turn favoured compliance of international obligations assumed by the country. It expressed its willingness to provide technical cooperation to achieve the implementation of this recommendation.

1031. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines applauded the Government of Saint Kitts and Nevis for accepting recommendations to increase its efforts at human rights education and training. It was further commended for accepting to adopt legislative measures on gender equality. Understanding the challenges that it faced in the fulfilment of its human rights obligations as a result of the global economic crisis, it encouraged Saint Kitts and Nevis to continue to undertake steps to strengthen its national human rights framework. It called upon the international community and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to grant the request for assistance to Saint Kitts and Nevis as expressed in its Universal Periodic Review report to enable it to meet its human rights obligations.

1032. Samoa was pleased by the progress made by the Government of Saint Kitts and Nevis and commended them on aligning their national legislation with its current international treaty obligations. It also recognized the Government's measures to combat and eliminate all forms of discrimination and violence against women and girls, despite the many economic and social challenges Saint Kitts and Nevis was faced with.

1033. Sierra Leone highlighted that of the three recommendations they had made, only one recommendation enjoyed the support of Saint Kitts and Nevis. While it understood the many financial and technical constraints faced by Saint Kitts and Nevis, it encouraged the government to implement into national legislation those recommendations which would further promote the enjoyment of human rights at all levels of society. It urged Saint Kitts and Nevis once again to increase the age of criminal responsibility to 18 and to institute a moratorium on the death penalty.

1034. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the openness and willingness expressed by the Government of Saint Kitts and Nevis during the reviews process, with concrete answers to the questions made. This brother country had promoted important initiatives in favour of those most needed, carrying out plans programs and social projects focused on the family welfare. Saint Kitts and Nevis had completed successfully its second review, showing an undeniable commitment with human rights. It encouraged the Government of Saint Kitts and Nevis to continue boosting and strengthening its correct social policies in favour of its people, with special emphasis on the most vulnerable sectors.

1035. The Bahamas commended Saint Kitts and Nevis on the recent accomplishments highlighted in the Addendum to the Report of the UPR Working Group. It highlighted the efforts being undertaken to build capacity in the area of human rights reporting as well as the regional and bilateral engagements and public-private partnerships which were serving to bolster the efforts of the government in promoting equality, non-discrimination and the right to education. The Bahamas was pleased to note that Saint Kitts and Nevis had pledged support to 58 of the 133 recommendations it had received, including the recommendation made by the Bahamas. It trusted that the full implementation of this recommendation would serve to further strengthen the existing framework of human rights protection in the country. It further welcomed the acceptance of recommendations relating to the right to security and an adequate standard of living, the right to health, the right to education and the rights of persons with disabilities. It acknowledged significant progress made by Saint Kitts and Nevis, despite the inherent challenges and vulnerabilities it faced.

1036. Cuba recognized the effort of the Government of Saint Kitts and Nevis to improve the quality of life of its citizens, through the implementation of social programs in the areas of construction, health, social security, as well as the approval of new laws that favour the welfare of its population. It highlighted the number of accepted recommendations, including two made by Cuba in which it invited Saint Kitts and Nevis to persist in the full application of the law on equal salary to guarantee equality between men and women, and regarding the national Strategy of Social protection in order to achieve effective provision of social services to its citizens.

1037. Gabon welcomed the efforts made by the Government of Saint Kitts and Nevis to ensure the promotion and protection of human rights and the rule of law. It particularly welcomed the reforms at the legal and administrative level, as well as the creation of human rights promotion and protection bodies. Gabon welcomed, among others, measures to improve the living standards of its citizens, and to prohibit corporal punishment as a disciplinary tool of children enrolled in public schools.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

1038. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Saint Kitts and Nevis, two other stakeholders made statements.

1039. Allied Rainbow Communities International welcomed the Saint Kitts and Nevis government's acceptance of the recommendation to ratify the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol to the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, including the optional protocols. This was a positive step towards ensuring the country was fully compliant with international standards. However Saint Kitts and Nevis noted all recommendations calling on the repeal of the law to decriminalize same sexual activity between consenting adults and penal provisions that discriminate against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people which also includes prohibition of discrimination on any basis inclusive of sexual orientation and gender identity. It remained concerned that the government noted the recommendation to enact comprehensive legislation that fully guarantees the application of the principle of non-discrimination and ensure the full enjoyment of all human rights by every member of society, with no indication of commitment or will to ensure equality and justice for all. It called on Saint Kitts and Nevis to honour their 2011 commitment regarding a consultative process to engage the public on this issue. It asked the government to engage in the legislative reform to guarantee non-discrimination against persons on the basis of health, gender, disability and sexual orientation and collaborate with civil society organizations such as the Saint Kitts and Nevis Association of Persons with Disabilities and the Saint Kitts and Nevis Alliance for Equality, to reach populations which were most affected. It called on the government to recognize a popular mandate was not needed to ensure security, justice and

equality for all, in particular its lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and disabilities communities.

1040. The European Union of Public Relations asserted that Saint Kitts and Nevis was an electoral democracy. The federal government consisted of the prime minister, the cabinet, and the unicameral National Assembly. Saint Kitts and Nevis had generally implemented its anticorruption laws effectively. A Financial Intelligence Unit investigated financial crimes, such as money laundering and the financing of terrorism. Constitutional guarantees of freedom of expression were generally respected. It affirmed that the government owned the sole local television station, to which the opposition faced some restrictions on access. In addition to both government and private radio stations, there was one privately owned daily newspaper, and political parties published weekly newspapers. Internet access was not restricted. Freedom of religion was constitutionally protected and academic freedom was primarily honoured. The right to form civic organizations was generally respected, as was the freedom of assembly. Workers could legally form unions, though a union could engage in collective bargaining only if more than 50 per cent of the company's employees were union members. The right to strike, while not specified by law, was recognized and primarily respected in practice. The judiciary was largely independent, and legal provisions for a fair and speedy trial were generally observed. In 2015, macroeconomic conditions improved significantly over 2013 and 2014 and the economy recorded two years of strong growth, averaging about six per cent annually, the strongest in the region by far.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

1041. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 133 recommendations received, 58 enjoy the support of Saint Kitts and Nevis and 75 are noted.

1042. In its concluding statement, the delegation thanked all for the recommendations made in the best interest of human rights in general. It expressed appreciation to the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights for its continued assistance and other international agencies who will partner with the government as it seeks to implement the recommendations of the second cycle.

1043. Saint Kitts and Nevis reiterated its commitment to the UPR process and looked forward with renewed anticipation to sharing its achievements with the Human Rights Council over the next few years.

1044. Finally, it reminded of its pledge to submit a mid-term report which will highlight the advances made to that date.

Sao Tome and Principe

1045. The review of Sao Tome and Principe was held on 11 November 2015 in conformity with all the relevant provisions contained in relevant Council resolutions and decisions, and was based on the following documents:

(a) The national report submitted by Sao Tome and Principe in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/STP/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/STP/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/23/STP/3).

1046. At its 49th meeting, on 18 March 2016, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Sao Tome and Principe (see section C below).

1047. The outcome of the review of Sao Tome and Principe comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/31/17), the views of Sao Tome and Principe concerning the recommendations and/or conclusions, as well as its voluntary commitments and replies presented before the adoption of the outcome by the plenary to questions or issues that were not sufficiently addressed during the interactive dialogue in the Working Group.

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

1048. On the absence of the delegation of Sao Tome and Principe in the room, the President stated that, since all positions of the Government of Sao Tome and Principe regarding the recommendations it received during its universal periodic review were clear, the Council would proceed with the adoption of the outcome.

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

1049. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Sao Tome and Principe, 14 delegations made statements.

1050. Ethiopia noted with satisfaction Sao Tome and Principe's acceptance of a significant number of recommendations including those related to reporting to Treaty Bodies and improving of the quality of education. Ethiopia commended the progress made in the areas of economic and social reforms to promote and protect human rights. It encouraged Sao Tome and Principe to continue its engagement with the Human Rights Council.

1051. Gabon noted the considerable efforts made by the Government to ensure the promotion and protection of human rights and improve the institutional and normative framework. Gabon lauded the measures taken to promote children's rights and gender equality. It commended Sao Tome and Principe's full cooperation with the Human Rights Council mechanisms and procedures. It encouraged its efforts to implement the UPR recommendations.

1052. Maldives noted that 146 recommendations were made during the interactive dialogue and Sao Tome and Principe accepted the majority of them. It appreciated the commitments to furthering the rights of the disabled, addressing climate change and improving the accessibility and quality of the education. It encouraged the Government to continue its efforts toward promoting human rights in the country.

1053. Nigeria applauded Sao Tome and Principe's continued engagement with the UPR mechanism and its strengthening efforts to promote human rights through the acceptance of the majority of the recommendations. It wished the country every success in the implementation of all the accepted recommendations.

1054. Pakistan commended the work of Sao Tome and Principe in addressing a number of human rights issues especially with regard to the rights of the child. It appreciated the acceptance of the majority of the 146 recommendations. It praised the constructive engagement with the UPR Working Group.

1055. Sierra Leone appreciated Sao Tome and Principe's intention to ratify several international conventions following the National Assembly's approval and by its commitment to legal reform. It applauded the efforts to improve the economic situation by developing strategies to attract Foreign Direct Investments and enhancing domestic growth and economic diversification. Sierra Leone reiterated its recommendation to raise the age of marriage to 18 in conformity with the provisions of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

1056. Togo praised the full cooperation of the country with the UPR mechanism. It thanked Sao Tome and Principe to have accepted the recommendation related to the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography. It wished success for the implementation of the accepted recommendations.

1057. UNICEF welcomed the Government's decision to create a National Institution for Human Rights that will monitor the situation of children's rights and report to the Committee on the Rights of the Child. It stressed the need for a specialized, independent and multi-sectoral body to monitor respect for the rights of children. UNICEF welcomed the adoption of a National Strategy and Policy on Child Protection. It urged to finalize and approve the draft framework law on the reform of early education. It mentioned the stagnant rate of neonatal mortality since 2009 and the adolescents easy access to alcoholic beverages despite the prohibition of sale to minors. UNICEF welcomed the accepted recommendations to ratify the first two Optional Protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

1058. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela congratulated the Government of Sao Tome and Principe for its cooperation with the UPR and for its acceptance of the majority of the recommendations it had received. It highlighted the ratification of important human rights instruments during the review period as well as has taken steps to create a National Human Rights Institution in accordance with the Paris Principles.

1059. Angola commended the progress made in the justice system, particularly in the context of the judicial reform and the harmonisation of the national laws and the international human rights norms. It welcomed the establishment of socio-economic policies to diversify its economy to address the needs primary needs and guarantee their economic, social and cultural rights. Angola lauded Sao Tome and Principe's commitment to ratify international human rights conventions to which it has not yet acceded.

1060. Brazil praised Sao Tome and Principe's constructive participation in the second cycle of the UPR as a sign of its engagement with the international human rights system. Brazil highlighted the progress made since the presentation of its first national report in 2011. It reiterated its traditional and long-standing willingness to cooperate with Sao Tome and Principe and share experiences.

1061. Chad noted with appreciation the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women, Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights. It wished full success in the implementation of its accepted recommendations.

1062. The Congo congratulated Sao Tome and Principe for its national report at the second UPR cycle and its transparent policy for the promotion and protection of human rights. It highlighted the important challenges faced by Sao Tome and Principe and its reliance on international assistance from development partners.

1063. Cuba lauded Sao Tome and Principe for having accepted almost all the 146 recommendations submitted during the review, including two from his country in relation with the right to food and the rights of people with disabilities. It hoped that the implementation of these recommendations would be beneficial for the country to continue the progress in promoting and protecting human rights of all its population.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

1064. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Sao Tome and Principe, two other stakeholders made statements.

1065. Commission to Study the Organization of Peace highlighted the commendable results achieved by Sao Tome and Principe in the field of social indicators such as access to

education. It referred to the project Quality Education and its progress in the implementation of the planned activities. The project helped the government to enhance the quality of education by improving the system of in-service teacher training and strengthening education human resources management. Commission to Study the Organization of Peace praised the country's human rights record, particularly with regard to women's rights, religious freedom, free and fair elections and peaceful transfer of power.

1066. Rencontre Africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme (RADDHO) mentioned the review of the Criminal Code in 2012, the reforms in the justice sector to improve the judicial system and the establishment of a 30% female quota in the Parliament as progress made by Sao Tome and Principe since its first national report in 2011. Raddho however deplored the gaps in the family code authorizing corporal punishment at home. It also urged efforts to issue birth certificates to newly born without fees. It also stressed that Sao Tome and Principe had not ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Optional Protocol to the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the three Optional Protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Raddho called for an harmonisation of domestic laws with the international human rights standards. It concluded by encouraging to take measures to mitigate the effect of climate change.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

1067. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 146 recommendations received, 144 enjoy the support of Sao Tome and Principe and two are noted.

B. General debate on agenda item 6

1068. At the 49th meeting, on 18 March 2016, 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: China, Georgia, Ghana, Indonesia, Kuwait[110] (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan[111] (also on behalf of Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, the Netherlands (also on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine), Nicaragua, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam), South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), , Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Iran (Islamic Republic of), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Regional Agricultural Credit Association; Alsalam Foundation; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Center for Environmental and Management Studies; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; Colombian

[110] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[111] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Commission of Jurists; Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Asociación Civil; Foodfirst Information and Action Network (FIAN); Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD); Humanist Institute for Co-operation with Developing Countries; Indian Council of South America (CISA); International Bar Association (also on behalf of International Commission of Jurists; Lawyers for Lawyers); International Educational Development, Inc.; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; International Service for Human Rights; Iraqi Development Organization; Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Liberation; Prahar; Rencontre Africaine pour la defense des droits de l'homme; United Nations Watch; UPR Info; World Barua Organization (WBO); World Environment and Resources Council (WERC).

1069. At the same meeting, a statement in exercise of the right of reply was made by the representative of Honduras.

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Federated States of Micronesia

1070. At the 42nd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/101 without a vote.

Lebanon

1071. At the 43rd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/102 without a vote.

Mauritania

1072. At the 43rd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/103 without a vote.

Nauru

1073. At the 43rd meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/104 without a vote.

Rwanda

1074. At the 44th meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/105 without a vote.

Nepal

1075. At the 44th meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/106 without a vote.

Austria

1076. At the 44th meeting, on 16 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/107 without a vote.

Australia

1077. At the 45th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/108 without a vote.

Georgia

1078. At the 45th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/109 without a vote.

Saint Lucia

1079. At the 45th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/110 without a vote.

Oman

1080. At the 46th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/111 without a vote.

Myanmar

1081. At the 46th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/112 without a vote.

Saint Kitts and Nevis

1082. At the 46th meeting, on 17 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/113 without a vote.

Sao Tome and Principe

1083. At the 49th meeting, on 18 March 2016, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 31/114 without a vote.

Commencement of the third cycle of the universal periodic review

1084. At the 63rd meeting, on 23 March 2016, the President of the Human Rights Council introduced draft decision L.4, sponsored by the President of the Council.

1085. At at the same meeting, the draft decision was adopted without a vote (decision 31/116).

VII. Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories

A. Interactive dialogue with the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967

1086. At the 51st meeting, on 21 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967, Makarim Wibisono, presented his report (A/HRC/31/73).

1087. At the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made a statement as the State concerned.

1088. Also at the same meeting, the Independent Commission for Human Rights of the State of Palestine made a statement.

1089. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Kuwait[112] (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan[113] (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Brazil, Chad, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, New Zealand, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Zimbabwe;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: ADALAH - Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel; Al-Haq; International-Lawyers.Org; Law in the Service of Man (also on behalf of BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights); Norwegian Refugee Council; The Institute on Human Rights and The Holocaust; Touro Law Center; Union of Arab Jurists; United Nations Watch; World Jewish Congress.

1090. At the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made final remarks as the State concerned.

1091. Also at the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

1092. At the 51st meeting, on 21 March 2016, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights introduced the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the implementation of Human Rights Council resolutions S-9/1, S-12/1 and 29/25 (A/HRC/31/40 and Add.1). Pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 28/26, the Deputy High Commissioner also presented the report of the

[112] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[113] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

High Commissioner on the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report of the independent international fact-finding mission on the implications of the Israeli settlements on the civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights of the Palestinian people throughout the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem (A/HRC/31/42), and the report of the Secretary-General on the Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan (A/HRC/31/43). The Deputy High Commissioner also introduced the reports of the Secretary-General on the human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem (A/HRC/31/44), pursuant to Council resolution 28/27, and on the matter of human rights in the Occupied Syrian Golan (A/HRC/31/41), pursuant to Council resolution 28/24.

1093. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and the State of Palestine made statements as the States concerned.

C. General debate on agenda item 7

1094. At its 52nd meeting, on 21 March 2016, 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: Algeria, China, Cuba, Ecuador, Ghana, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)[114] (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), Kuwait[115] (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Maldives, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan[116] (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Chile, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, Yemen;

(c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: Gulf Cooperation Council;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: ADALAH - Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel; Al-Haq; American Association of Jurists; Amuta for NGO Responsibility; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies (also on behalf of Al Mezan Centre for Human Rights; Al-Haq; BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights; Law in the Service of Man); Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims, The; Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches; Coordinating Board of Jewish Organisation (also on behalf of B'nai B'rith International); European Union of Jewish Students; Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos; Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD); Human Rights Now; Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'Homme- IIPJDH; International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL); International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations; International-Lawyers.Org; Khiam Rehabilitation Center

[114] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[115] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[116] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

for Victims of Torture; Law in the Service of Man (also on behalf of BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights); Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development; Norwegian Refugee Council; Organization for Defending Victims of Violence; The Palestinian Return Centre Ltd; Union of Arab Jurists; United Nations Watch; World Jewish Congress.

D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan

1095. At the 64th meeting on 24 March 2016, the representative of Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.31, sponsored by Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Namibia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Belarus, Cabo Verde, Chile, Costa Rica and Kuwait (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) joined the sponsors.

1096. At the same meeting, the representative of Cuba made a general comment in relation to the draft resolution.

1097. At the same meeting, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

1098. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

1099. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Abstaining:

Albania, Belgium, Botswana, France, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

1100. The draft resolution was adopted by 31 votes to 0, with 16 abstentions (resolution 31/25).

Right of the Palestinian people to self-determination

1101. At the 66th meeting on 24 March 2016, the representative of Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.36, sponsored by Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Kuwait (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Namibia, Switzerland and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Austria, Belarus, Brazil,

Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden joined the sponsors.

1102. At the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made a statement as the State concerned.

1103. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/33).

Human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem

1104. At the 66th meeting on 24 March 2016, the representative of Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.37, sponsored by Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Kuwait (on behalf of the Group of Arab States),Namibia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Cabo Verde, Chile, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, Portugal, Slovenia and Sweden joined the sponsors.

1105. At the same meeting, the representatives of Cuba, Paraguay, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates made general comments in relation to the draft resolution.

1106. At the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made a statement as the State concerned.

1107. 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.

1108. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Paraguay, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Georgia, Germany, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, South Africa, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Abstaining:

Botswana, Ghana, Paraguay, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo

1109. The draft resolution was adopted by 42 votes to 0, with 5 abstentions (resolution 31/34).

Ensuring accountability and justice for all violations of international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem

1110. At the 66th meeting on 24 March 2016, the representative of Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.38, sponsored by Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Kuwait (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Chile, Iceland, Ireland,

Luxembourg, Malta, Namibia, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

1111. At the same meeting, the representatives of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates made general comments in relation to the draft resolution.

1112. At the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made a statement as the State concerned.

1113. 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.

1114. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Paraguay, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burundi, China, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, South Africa, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Abstaining:

Albania, Botswana, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, India, Latvia, Netherlands, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

1115. The draft resolution was adopted by 32 votes to 0, with 15 abstentions (resolution 31/35).

1116. At the 66th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of Germany (also on behalf of Latvia, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan

1117. At the 66th meeting on 24 March 2016, the representative of Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.39, sponsored by Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Kuwait (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Namibia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Cabo Verde, Chile and Croatia joined the sponsors.

1118. At the same meeting, the representatives of Qatar and Saudi Arabia made general comments in relation to the draft resolution.

1119. At the same meeting, the representative of Israel made a statement as the State concerned.

1120. 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.

1121. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

1122. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Paraguay, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Abstaining:

Albania, Belgium, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Latvia, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

1123. Draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.39 was adopted by 32 votes to 0, with 15 abstentions (resolution 31/36).

1124. At the 66th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representatives of Ecuador and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

VIII. Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

A. General debate on agenda item 8

1125. At its 52nd and 53rd meetings, on 21 March 2016, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 8, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China (also on behalf of Bahrain, Belarus, Burundi, Cambodia, China, Cuba, Egypt, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Maldives, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and the State of Palestine), Cyprus[117] (also on behalf of Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, the Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, the Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, the Netherlands, the Niger, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Swaziland, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe and the State of Palestine), El Salvador (also on behalf of Albania, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, France, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Norway, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), El Salvador (also on behalf of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Ghana, India, Morocco, the Netherlands (also on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Serbia, the former

[117] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine), Pakistan[118] (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Portugal (also on behalf of Argentina, Belgium, Chile, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Mexico, Paraguay, Spain, Uruguay), the Russian Federation, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland (also on behalf of Albania, Brazil, Colombia, Greece, Guatemala, Mexico, Norway, Paraguay, Uruguay), Ukraine[119] (also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America,), the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Greece, Ireland, Israel, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Spain, the United States of America;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa Culture Internationale; African Development Association; African Regional Agricultural Credit Association; Agence Internationale pour le Developpement; Al-Hakim Foundation; Alsalam Foundation; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace; Canners International Permanent Committee; Center for Environmental and Management Studies; Center for Inquiry; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociación Civil (also on behalf of Centro Regional de Derechos Humanos y Justicia de Genero); Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme; Commission to Study the Organization of Peace; Ecumenical Alliance for Human Rights and Development (EAHRD); Espace Afrique International, European Union of Public Relations; Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos; Friends World Committee for Consultation; Human Rights Watch (also on behalf of International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; International Service for Human Rights); Indian Council of Education; International Association for Democracy in Africa; International Fellowship of Reconciliation; International Humanist and Ethical Union; International Institute for Non-aligned Studies; International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations; International Service for Human Rights; International-Lawyers.Org; Iraqi Development Organization; Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Liberation; Pan African Union for Science and Technology; Prahar; United Schools International; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; Victorious Youths Movement; United Nations Watch; World Environment and Resources Council (WERC); World Muslim Congress.

1126. At the 53rd meeting, on the same day, a statement in exercise of the right of reply was made by the representative of the Russian Federation.

[118] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[119] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

IX. Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action

A. Panels

Panel discussion on the incompatibility between democracy and racism

1127. At its 48th meeting, on 18 March 2016, in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 29/20, the Council held a panel discussion on the human rights dimensions of preventing and countering violent extremism.

1128. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made opening statements for the panel. The Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Sierra Leone to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, Yvette Stevens, moderated the discussion for the panel.

1129. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Ronaldo Crispim Sena Barros, Special Secretary for the Promotion of Racial Equality Policies, Brazil; Jerome Jamin, Professor at the Law Faculty of Liège University, Belgium; and Emine Bozkurt, Member of the Board of Advisers of the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance and former Member of the European Parliament. The Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

1130. During the ensuing panel discussion for the first slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Belgium, Georgia, Pakistan[120] (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Uruguay[121] (also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Egypt, the United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Friends World Committee for Consultation; International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR); Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development.

1131. At the end of the first slot, at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

1132. During the ensuing panel discussion for the second slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, Cuba, the Dominican Republic[122] (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and

[120] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[121] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[122] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Caribbean States), France, Germany, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Panama, Portugal, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Chile, Colombia, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Pakistan, Spain;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights; International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations; Iraqi Development Organization (also on behalf of Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc); United Nations Watch.

1133. At the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

B. Debate on the state of racial discrimination worldwide

1134. At the 50th meeting, on 18 March 2016, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 70/140, the Human Rights Council held a debate on the state of racial discrimination worldwide, at the occasion of the commemoration of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

1135. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the debate.

1136. At the same meeting, the following panellists made statements: Abdul Samad Minty, Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Elaboration of Complementary Standards and former Permanent Representative of South Africa to the United Nations Office and other International Organisations at Geneva; Doudou Diène, Chair of the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience and former Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance; Margarette May Macaulay, Commissioner, Rapporteur on the Rights of Women and Rapporteur on the Rights of Afro-descendants of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights; and Mireille Fanon Mendès-France, Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent, made statements. The Council divided the debate into two slots.

1137. During the ensuing discussion for the first slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, Cuba, France, Namibia, Pakistan[123] (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Portugal, the Dominican Republic[124] (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), the Russian Federation, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Brazil, the United States of America;

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

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Commissioner for Fundamental Rights of Hungary (by video message);

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Indian Council of South America (CISA); International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations.

[123] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[124] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

1138. At the end of the first slot, at the same meeting, the keynote speakers answered questions and made comments.

1139. During the discussion for the second slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Mexico, Nigeria, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Armenia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights; International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; International-Lawyers.Org; Japanese Workers' Committee for Human Rights; World Jewish Congress.

1140. At the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

C. General debate on agenda item 9

1141. At the 53rd meeting, on 21 March 2016, the Chief of the Anti-Racial Discrimination Section of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights presented, on behalf of the Chairperson - Rapporteur of the Intergovernmental Working Group on the Effective Implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, Mohamed Siad Douale, the report of the Working Group on its thirteenth session, held from 5 to 16 October 2015 (A/HRC/31/75).

1142. At the same meeting, the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the Ad Hoc Committee on the elaboration of complementary standards to strengthen and update international instruments against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance in all their aspects, Abdul Samad Minty, presented the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on its seventh session, held from 13 to 24 July 2015 (A/HRC/31/74).

1143. At the 53rd and 54th meetings, on the same day, 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: Albania, China, Cuba, the Dominican Republic[125] (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Georgia, Ghana, India, Kuwait[126] (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine), Pakistan[127] (also on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), the Russian Federation, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Azerbaijan, Brazil, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Turkey;

[125] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[126] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[127] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Regional Agricultural Credit Association; Agence Internationale pour le Developpement; Alsalam Foundation; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace; Canners International Permanent Committee; Center for Environmental and Management Studies; Center for Inquiry; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims, The; Commission to Study the Organization of Peace; European Union of Jewish Students; European Union of Public Relations; Indian Council of Education; International Association for Democracy in Africa; International Humanist and Ethical Union; International Institute for Non-aligned Studies; International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations; International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (also on behalf of International-Lawyers.Org); International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations; Iraqi Development Organization; Liberation; Organization for Defending Victims of Violence; Pan African Union for Science and Technology; Prahar; Rencontre Africaine pour la defense des droits de l'homme; Sikh Human Rights Group; The Society for Recovery Support; Tiye International; Touro Law Center, The Institute on Human Rights and The Holocaust; United Nations Watch; United Schools International; World Barua Organization (WBO); World Environment and Resources Council (WERC); World Muslim Congress.

D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping and stigmatization of, and discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against, persons based on religion or belief

1144. At the 64th meeting on 24 March 2016, the representative of Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.34, sponsored by Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) and Turkey, and co-sponsored by Australia. Subsequently, Argentina, Cabo Verde, Honduras and Sri Lanka joined the sponsors.

1145. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made general comments in relation to the draft resolution.

1146. Also at the same meeting, the Chief of the Programme Support and Management Services of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement in relation to the budgetary implications of the draft resolution.

1147. The draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/26).

X. Technical assistance and capacity-building

A. Annual thematic panel discussion on technical cooperation in the promotion and protection of human rights

1148. At the 56th meeting, on 22 March 2016, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 30/21, the Human Rights Council held its annual thematic panel discussion on technical cooperation in the promotion and protection of human rights, with a focus on the theme "Technical cooperation and capacity-building to promote and protect the rights of all migrants, including women, children, older persons and persons with disabilities. The panel discussion was informed by the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (A/HRC/31/80).

1149. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Thailand to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, Thani Thongphakdi, moderated the discussion for the panel.

1150. At the same meeting, the panellists Peggy Hicks, Director of the Research and Right to Development Division at the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Kristina Touzenis, Head of the International Migration Law Unit at the International Organization for Migration, Paola Cogliandro, Deputy Head of the Office for Migration Policy at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Italy, Phusit Prakongsai, Director of the Bureau of International Health at the Ministry of Public Health of Thailand, and Yasmina Antonia Filali, President of the Fondation Orient-Occident in Morocco, made statements. The Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

1151. During the ensuing panel discussion for the first slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, the Dominican Republic[128] (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ecuador, Germany, Kuwait[129] (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Morocco, Paraguay, Qatar;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Egypt, Greece, the United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociación Civil (also on behalf of Centro Regional de Derechos Humanos y Justicia de Genero); Human Rights Watch; Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'Homme- IIPJDH.

1152. At the end of the first slot, at the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made comments.

1153. During the discussion for the second slot, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the panellists questions:

[128] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[129] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Ghana, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, the Philippines, Switzerland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belarus, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, Colombia, Libya, Myanmar, Peru, Sweden, the Sudan, Turkey;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights; International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

1154. At the same meeting, the panellists answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

B. Enhanced interactive dialogue on the situation of human rights in Burundi

1155. At the 55th meeting, on 22 March 2016, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 30/27 on technical cooperation and capacity-building for Burundi in the field of human rights, and S-24/1 on preventing the deterioration of the human rights situation in Burundi, the Council held an enhanced interactive dialogue on the situation of human rights in Burundi.

1156. At the same meeting, in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 30/27, the United Nations Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights presented an oral update on the implementation of that resolution.

1157. Also at the same meeting, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution S-24/1, the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, Christof Heyns, presented an oral update on the mission by existing independent experts to investigate the human rights situation in Burundi.

1158. Also at the same meeting, the Minister of Human Rights, Social Affairs, and Gender of Burundi, Martin Nivyabandi, the Permanent Representative of the African Union in Geneva, Jean-Marie Ehouzou, and the President of the Association pour la protection des droits humains des personnes détenues (APRODH), Pierre Claver Mbonimpa, made statements.

1159. Also at the same meeting, the Commission Nationale Indépendante des droits de l'Homme of Burundi made a statement.

1160. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 55th and 56th 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: Albania, Algeria, Belgium, China, France, Germany, Ghana, Mexico, the Netherlands, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Austria, Canada, the Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Gabon, Greece, Ireland, Japan, Libya, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Rwanda, Senegal, Spain, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International; CIRID (Centre Independent de Recherches et d'Iniatives pour le Dialogue); CIVICUS -

World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Dominicans for Justice and Peace - Order of Preachers (also on behalf of Franciscans International); Espace Afrique International; Human Rights Watch; International Service for Human Rights; World Evangelical Alliance.

1161. At the 55th meeting, on 22 March 2016, the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

1162. At the 57th meeting, on the same day, the Minister of Human Rights, Social Affairs, and Gender of Burundi, the Permanent Representative of the African Union in Geneva, and the President of the Association pour la protection des droits humains des personnes détenues (APRODH), answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

C. Interactive dialogue on cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights

1163. At the 58th meeting, on 22 March 2016, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 29/23, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights provided an oral update on the situation of human rights in Ukraine.

1164. At the same meeting, the representative of Ukraine made a statement as the State concerned.

1165. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Assistant Secretary-General questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Belgium, China, France, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, the Netherlands, the Russian Federation, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Ireland, Lithuania, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United States of America;

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

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Human Rights House Foundation; Human Rights Watch; International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL); International Fellowship of Reconciliation; Minority Rights Group; United Nations Watch; World Federation of Ukrainian Women's Organizations.

1166. At the same meeting, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

D. Interactive dialogue with special procedures mandate holders

Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic

1167. At the 54th meeting, on 21 March 2016, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic, Marie-Thérèse Keita Bocoum, presented an oral update to the Human Rights Council.

1168. At the same meeting, the representative of the Central African Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

1169. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 54th meeting, on 21 March 2016, and the 55th meeting, on 22 March 2016, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Belgium, Botswana, China, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Morocco, the Netherlands, Portugal, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Chad, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Libya, Luxembourg, Mali, Mozambique, New Zealand, Norway, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, the Sudan, the United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights, Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, Rencontre Africaine pour la defense des droits de l'homme, Save the Children International, World Evangelical Alliance (also on behalf of Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities).

1170. At the 55th meeting, on 22 March 2016, the Independent Expert answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Independent expert on capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights

1171. At the 57th meeting, on 22 March 2016, the Independent Expert on capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights, Mohammed Ayat, presented his report (A/HRC/31/78).

1172. At the same meeting, the representative of Côte d'Ivoire made a statement as the State concerned.

1173. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Belgium, Botswana, China, the Congo, France, Ghana, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), Togo, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, Mali, Senegal, Spain, the Sudan, the United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Catholic Child Bureau; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; International Service for Human Rights; Rencontre Africaine pour la defense des droits de l'homme; World Organisation Against Torture.

1174. At the same meeting, the representative of Côte d'Ivoire made final remarks as the State concerned.

1175. Also at the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Haiti

1176. At the 59th meeting, on 23 March 2016, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Haiti, Gustavo Gallón, presented his report (A/HRC/31/77).

1177. At the same meeting, the representative of Haiti made a statement as the State concerned.

1178. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Brazil[130] (also on behalf of Argentina, Canada, Colombia, Chile, France, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru, the United States of America, Uruguay), China, Cuba, the Dominican Republic[131] (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), France, Morocco, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

(b) Representatives of observer States: Brazil, Chile, Spain, the United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Human Rights Watch; International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL); International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; United Nations Watch.

1179. At the same meeting, the representative of Haiti made final remarks as the State concerned.

1180. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Mali

1181. At the 59th meeting, on 22 March 2016, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Mali, Suliman Baldo, presented his report (A/HRC/31/76).

1182. At the 60th meeting, on the same day, the representative of Mali made a statement as the State concerned.

1183. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 59th and 60th meeting, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, Belgium, Botswana, China, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Ghana, Morocco, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), , Togo, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Benin, Chad, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, Estonia, New Zealand, Norway, Senegal, Spain, the Sudan, the United States of America;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Catholic Child Bureau; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; Rencontre Africaine pour la defense des droits de l'homme; United Nations Watch.

[130] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.
[131] Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

1184. At the 60thh meeting, on 23 March 2016, the representative of Mali made final remarks as the State concerned.

1185. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

E. General debate on agenda item 10

1186. At the 61st meeting, on 23 March 2016, the Deputy United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights introduced country-specific updates and reports of the High Commissioner submitted under agenda item 10 (A/HRC/31/46, A/HRC/31/47 and A/HRC/31/48).

1187. At the same meeting, the representatives of Afghanistan, Guinea, Libya and Yemen made statements as the States concerned.

1188. During the ensuing general debate, at the 61st and 62nd meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of Angola, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, South Africa, Timor-Leste, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe), China, France, Germany, India (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Thailand, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe), Maldives, Morocco (also on behalf of Bahrain, the Central African Republic, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Guinea, Jordan, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, the United Arab Emirates), the Netherlands (also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America), the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine), Qatar, South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Canada, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Senegal, Thailand, the United States of America;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation; American Association of Jurists; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Amnesty International; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Asian Legal Resource Centre; Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies (also on behalf of CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Human Rights Watch; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; World Organisation Against Torture); Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; Conseil de

jeunesse pluriculturelle (COJEP); Ecumenical Alliance for Human Rights and Development (EAHRD); Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos; France Libertes : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand; Human Rights Watch; International Fellowship of Reconciliation; International Lesbian and Gay Association; Iraqi Development Organization; Liberal International (World Liberal Union); Liberation; Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development; Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés (OIPMA); Rencontre Africaine pour la defense des droits de l'homme; Touro Law Center, The Institute on Human Rights and The Holocaust; United Nations Watch.

1189. At the 62nd meeting, on the same day, a statement in exercise of the right of reply was made by the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

F. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in Libya

1190. At the 64th meeting on 24 March 2016, the representative of South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.20, sponsored by South Africa (on behalf of the group of African States) and co-sponsored by Ecuador, France, Italy, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovakia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Japan, Kuwait (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

1191. At the same meeting, the representative of Libya made a statement as the State concerned.

1192. 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.

1193. At the same meeting, the representatives of Ecuador and Switzerland made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution.

1194. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/27).

Technical assistance and capacity-building for Mali in the field of human rights

1195. At the 64th meeting on 24 March 2016, the representative of South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States), introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.22, sponsored by South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States) and co-sponsored by Austria, France, Germany, New Zealand, Poland, and Slovakia. Subsequently, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

1196. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made a general comment in relation to the draft resolution.

1197. At the same meeting, the representative of Mali made a statement as the State concerned.

1198. 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.

1199. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/28).

1200. At the 64th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the representative of the Russian Federation made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Strengthening technical cooperation and advisory services for Guinea

1201. At the 64th meeting on 24 March 2016, the representative of South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/31/L.23, sponsored by South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States) and co-sponsored by France, Germany, New Zealand and Spain. Subsequently, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Haiti, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

1202. At the same meeting, the representative of South Africa (on behalf of the Group of African States) orally revised the draft resolution.

1203. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made a general comment in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

1204. At the same meeting, the representative of Guinea made a statement as the State concerned.

1205. At the same meeting, the draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote (resolution 31/29).

Situation of human rights in Haiti

1206. At the 64th meeting, on 24 March 2016, the President of the Human Rights Council introduced draft President's statement A/HRC/31/L.40 as orally revised.

1207. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Haiti made a statement as the State concerned.

1208. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft President's statement.

1209. Also at the same meeting, the draft President's statement as orally revised, was adopted by the Council (PRST 31/1).

Annex I

Attendance

Members

Albania
Algeria
Bangladesh
Belgium
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)
Botswana
Burundi
Congo
Côte d'Ivoire
Cuba
China
Ecuador
El Salvador
Ethiopia
France
Georgia
Germany
Ghana
India
Indonesia
Kenya
Kyrgyzstan
Latvia
Maldives
Mexico
Mongolia
Morocco
Namibia
Netherlands
Nigeria
Panama
Paraguay
Philippines
Portugal
Qatar
Republic of Korea
Russian Federation
Saudi Arabia
Slovenia
South Africa
Switzerland
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Togo
United Arab Emirates
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
Viet Nam

States Members of the United Nations represented by observers

Afghanistan
Andorra
Angola
Argentina
Armenia
Australia
Austria
Azerbaijan
Bahamas
Bahrain
Belarus
Benin
Bhutan
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Brazil
Brunei Darussalam
Bulgaria
Burkina Faso
Cambodia
Cameroon
Canada
Central African Republic
Chad
Chile
Colombia
Costa Rica
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Democratic People's Republic of Korea
Democratic Republic of the Congo
Denmark
Djibouti
Dominican Republic
Egypt
Equatorial Guinea
Eritrea
Estonia
Fiji
Finland
Gabon
Greece
Guatemala
Guinea
Haiti
Honduras
Hungary
Iceland
Iran (Islamic Republic of)
Iraq
Ireland
Israel
Italy
Japan
Jordan
Kazakhstan
Kuwait
Lao People's Democratic Republic
Lebanon
Lesotho
Libya
Liechtenstein
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Madagascar
Malawi
Malaysia
Mali
Malta

Mauritania
Micronesia (Federated States of)
Monaco
Montenegro
Mozambique
Myanmar
Nauru
Nepal
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Norway
Oman
Pakistan
Peru
Poland
Republic of Moldova
Romania
Rwanda
Saint Kitts and Nevis
Saint Lucia
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Samoa
San Marino
Sao Tome and Principe
Senegal
Serbia
Sierra Leone
Singapore
Slovakia
South Sudan
Spain
Sri Lanka
Sudan
Swaziland
Sweden
Syrian Arab Republic
Tajikistan
Thailand
Timor-Leste
Tunisia
Turkey
Turkmenistan
Uganda
Ukraine
United Republic of Tanzania
United States of America
Uruguay
Uzbekistan
Yemen
Zambia
Zimbabwe

Non-Member States represented by observers

Holy See
State of Palestine

United Nations

Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
United Nations Development Programme
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
United Nations Environment Programme
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
United Nations Office for Project Services
United Nations Population Fund
UN Women

Specialized agencies and related organizations

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
International Labour Organisation
International Organization for Migration
International Telecommunication Union
World Food Program
World Health Organization

Intergovernmental organizations

African Union
Commonwealth Secretariat
Cooperation Council for Arab States of the Gulf
Council of Europe
European Union
International Development Law Organization
International Organization of la Francophonie
League of Arab States
Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
Organization of Islamic Cooperation
The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria

Other entities

International Committee of the Red Cross
Sovereign Military Order of Malta

National human rights institutions, international coordinating committees and regional groups of national institutions

Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission
Australian Human Rights Commission
Commission on Human Rights - Philippines
Commision nationale independante des droits de l'homme - Burundi
Commission nationale des droits de l'homme de Mauritanie
Conseil national des droits de l'homme Maroc
Defensoría del Pueblo – Colombia
Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain (joint video statement)
German Institute for Human Rights
Greek National Commission for Human Rights
Human Rights Commission of Malaysia (SUHAKAM) (videostatement)
ICC Working Group on Business and Human Rights (video statement)
Independent Commission for Human Rights of the State of Palestine
International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights (ICC)
Office of the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights, Hungary (by video message)
National Commission for Human Rights – Rwanda
National Committee for Human Rights – Qatar
National Human Rights Commission of …Nepal
National Human Rights Commission of Nigeria
National Human Rights Commission of the Republic of Korea
Office of the People's Advocate - Albania
Office of Public Defender (Ombudsman) of Georgia
Protector of Citizens of the Republic of Serbia (Ombudsman) (by videostatement)
Scottish Human Rights Commission (joint video statement)
Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights

Non-governmental organizations

ACT Alliance – Action by Churches Together
Action Canada for Population and Development
Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs
ADALAH - Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel
Africa Culture Internationale
African Commission of Health and Human Right Promoters
African Development Association
African Regional Agricultural Credit Association
African-American Society for Humanitarian Aid and Development
Agence Internationale pour le Développement
Agence pour les droits de l'homme
Al-Hakim Foundation
Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man
Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement
Al-khoei Foundation
Alliance Defending Freedom
Allied Rainbow Communities International
All-Russian Public Organization "Russian Public Institute of Electoral Law"
Alsalam Foundation
Alulbayt Foundation

Al-Zubair Charity Foundation
American Association of Jurists
American Civil Liberties Union
Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc
Amnesty International
Amuta for NGO Responsibility
Anglican Consultative Council
Appui aux femmes démunies et enfants marginalisés au Kivu
Arab Commission for Human Rights
Arab NGO Network for Development
Arab Organization for Human Rights
Arab Penal Reform Organization
Article 19 – The International Centre against Censorship
Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact
Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development
Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development
Asian Legal Resource Centre
Asian-Eurasian Human Rights Forum
Association "Paix" pour la lutte contre la Contrainte et l'injustice
Association apprentissages sans frontieres
Association Burkinabé pour la Survie de l'Enfance
Association Dunenyo
Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism
Association for Progressive Communications (APC)
Association for the Prevention of Torture
Association for the Victims of the world
Association Mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit
Association Miraisme International
Association Panafrica
Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII au Developpement
Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Resource Rights
Baha'i International Community
Bangwe et Dialogue
B'nai B'rith
Brahma Kumaris World Spiritual University (BKWSU)
British Humanist Association
Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies
Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace
Canners International Permanent Committee
Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities)
Center for Global Nonkilling
Center for Inquiry
Center for Legal and Social Studies
Center for Reproductive Rights, Inc., The
Centre de Documentation, de Recherche et d'Information des Peuples Autochtones (doCip)
Centre Europe - Tiers Monde – Europe - Third World Centre
Centre for Environmental and Management Studies
Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy
Centre indépendant de recherches et d'initiatives pour le dialogue
Centre pour les Droits Civils et Politiques Centre CCPR
Chant du Guépard dans le Désert
Charitable Institute for Protecting Social Victims
Child Development Foundation
Child Foundation
China Association for Preservation and Development of Tibetian Culture (CAPDTC)
China NGO Network for International Exchanges (CNIE)
China Society for Human Rights Studies (CSHRS)
Chinese Association for International Understanding
CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation
Colombian Commission of Jurists
Comision Juridica para el Autodesarrollo de los Pueblos Originarios Andinos Capaj
Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Asociación Civil
Comité International pour le Respect et l'Application de la Charte Africaine des Droits de l'Homme et des Peuples (CIRAC)
Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches
Commission to Study the Organization of Peace

Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul
Congregation of our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd
Conseil de jeunesse pluriculturelle (COJEP)
Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations
Corporacion para la Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos Reiniciar
Defence for Children International
Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order of Preachers
Drepavie
East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project
Eastern Sudan Women Development Organization
Ecumenical Alliance for Human Rights and Development (EAHRD)
Edmund Rice International Limited
Espace Afrique International
European Centre for Law and Justice, The/ Centre Europeen pour le droit, les Justice et les droits de l'homme
European Union of Jewish Students
European Union of Public Relations
Family Health Association of Iran
Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos
Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit COC Nederland
Fondation des Oeuvres pour la Solidarité et le Bien Etre Social - FOSBES ONG
Fondation pour l'étude des relations internationales et du développement
Foodfirst Information and Action Network (FIAN)
Forum Azzahrae pour la Femme Marocaine
Forum Réfugiés-Cosi
Foundation ECPAT International (End Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and Trafficking in Children for Sexual Purposes)
Foundation for GAIA
France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand
Franciscans International
Freedom House
Freedom Now
Friedrich Ebert Foundation
Friends of the Earth International
Friends World Committee for Consultation
Fundación Latinoamericana por los Derechos Humanos y el Desarrollo Social
Geneva for Human Rights – Global Training
Geneva International Model United Nations (GIMUN)
Global Helping to Advance Women and Children
Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD)
Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant
Hazrat Javad-al-Aemeh Cultural Charity Institute
Helios Life Association
Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights
Himalayan Research and Cultural Foundation
Human Rights Advocates, Inc.
Human Rights House Foundation
Human Rights Information and Training Center
Human Rights Information and Documentation Systems International
Human Rights Now
Human Rights Watch
Humanist Institute for Co-operation with Developing Countries
Il Cenacolo
Imam Ali’s Popular Students Relief Society
Inclusion International
Indian Council of Education
Indian Council of South America (CISA)
Ingénieurs du Monde
Institute for Planetary Synthesis
Institute for Policy Studies
Institute for Women’s Studies and Research
Integrated Youth Empowerment - Common Initiative Group (I.Y.E. – C.I.G.)
International Association Against Torture
International Association for Democracy in Africa
International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL)
International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists
International Bar Association
International Career Support Association
International Catholic Child Bureau
International Catholic Migration Commission
International Center for Not-for-Profit Law (INCPL)
International Commission of Jurists
International Committee for the Indians of the Americas (Incomindios Switzerland)
International Council of Jewish Women
International Educational Development,Inc.
International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (FIDH)

International Federation for the Protection of the Rights
of Ethnic, Religious, Linguistic & Other Minorities
International Federation of Acat (Action by Christians for the Abolition of Torture)
International Federation of University Women
International Fellowship of Reconciliation
International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission
International Human Rights Association of American Minorities
International Humanist and Ethical Union
International Institute for Non-Aligned Studies
International Institute for Peace, Justice and Human-Rights IIPJHR
International Islamic Federation of Student Organizations
International Lesbian and Gay Association
International Movement against all Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR)
International Movement ATD Fourth World
International Movement for Fraternal Union among Races and Peoples
International Muslim Women's Union
International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (OIDEL)
International Organization for the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination
International Peace Bureau
International Planned Parenthood Federation
International Service for Human Rights
International Solidarity for Africa
International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES
International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations
International-Lawyers.Org
Iranian Elite Research Center
Iraqi Development Organization
Islamic Human Rights Commission
Islamic Women's Institute of Iran
Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco
IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association
Japanese Workers' Committee for Human Rights
Jossour Forum des Femmes Marocaines
Jubilee Campaign
Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture
Kiyana Karaj Group
Korean Assembly for Reunion of Ten-million Separated Families
Korean Bar Association
La Brique
Liberal International (World Liberal Union)
Liberation
L'Observatoire Mauritanien des Droits de l'Homme et de la Démocratie
Lutheran World Federation
Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development
Make Mothers Matter International
Maryam Ghasemi Educational Charity Institute
Migrants Rights International (MRI)
Nazra for Feminist Studies
Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational and Transparty
Norwegian Refugee Council
Omega Research Foundation
Organisation des Jeunes pour le Monde d'Avenir
Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés (OIPMA)
Organisation Marocaine des Droits Humains
Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de
promotion de la coopération economique internationale
OCAPROCE Internationale
Organization for Defending Victims of Violence
Pacific Disability Forum
Palestinian Return Centre
Pan African Union for Science and Technology
Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation
Peace Brigades International Switzerland
Peivande Gole Narges Organization
People for Successful Corean Reunification
People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy
Permanent Committee for the Defense of Human Rights
Plan International, Inc.
Prahar
Prevention Association of Social Harms (PASH)
Privacy International
Rencontre africain pour la défense des droits de l’homme
Reporters Sans Frontiers International – Reporters without Borders International
Réseau International des Droits Humains (RIDH)
Save the Children International
Save the Climat
Servas International
Shia Rights Watch Inc
Sikh Human Rights Group

Social Service Agency of the Protestant Church in Germany
Society for Development and Community Empowerment
Society for Threatened Peoples
Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of Environment
Society Studies Centre (MADA ssc)
Soka Gakkai International
Solidarité Suisse-Guinée
SOS Kinderdorf International
Susila Dharma International Association
Swedish Association for Sexuality Education
Terre des Hommes Fédération Internationale
The Society for Recovery Support
Tiye International
Touro Law Center, The Institute on Human Rights and The Holocaust
Union of Arab Jurists
United Nations for Education, Universal Science and Human Rights
United Nations Watch
United Network of Young Peacebuilders (UNOY Peacebuilders)
United Schools International
UPR Info
Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitic
Victorious Youths Movement
Villages Unis (United Villages)
Women’s Federation for World Peace International
Women’s Human Rights International Association
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
Women's World Summit Foundation
World Barua Organization
World Blind Union
World Environment and Resources Council (WERC)
World Evangelical Alliance
World Federation of Ukrainian Women's Organizations
World Future Council Foundation
World Jewish Congress
World Muslim Congress
World Organization against Torture
World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations
World Young Women's Christian Association

Annex II

Agenda

Item 1. Organizational and procedural matters

Item 2. Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General

Item 3. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development

Item 4. Human rights situations that require the Council's attention

Item 5. Human rights bodies and mechanisms

Item 6. Universal periodic review

Item 7. Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories

Item 8. Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

Item 9. Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action

Item 10. Technical assistance and capacity-building

Annex III

[English, French and Spanish only]

Documents issued for the thirty-first session

Documents issued in the general series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
A/HRC/31/1	1	Annotations to the agenda for the thirty-first session of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/31/1/Corr.1	1	Corrigendum
A/HRC/31/2	1	Report of the Human Rights Council on its thirty-first session
A/HRC/31/3	2	Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/3/Add.1	2	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the activities of his office in Guatemala
A/HRC/31/3/Add.2	2	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the situation of human rights in Colombia
A/HRC/31/4	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on the Federated States of Micronesia
A/HRC/31/4/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/31/5	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Lebanon
A/HRC/31/5/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/31/6	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Mauritania
A/HRC/31/6/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/31/7	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Nauru
A/HRC/31/7/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/31/8	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Rwanda
A/HRC/31/8/Add.1	6	Addendum

Documents issued in the general series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
A/HRC/31/9	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Nepal
A/HRC/31/9/Corr.1	6	Corrigendum
A/HRC/31/9/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/31/10	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Saint Lucia
A/HRC/31/10/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/31/11	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Oman
A/HRC/31/11/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/31/12	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Austria
A/HRC/31/12/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/31/13	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Maynmar
A/HRC/31/13/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/31/14	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Australia
A/HRC/31/14/Corr.1	6	Corrigendum
A/HRC/31/14/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/31/15	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Georgia
A/HRC/31/15/Corr.1	6	Corrigendum
A/HRC/31/15/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/31/16	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Saint Kitts and Nevis
A/HRC/31/16/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/31/17	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Sao Tome and Principe
A/HRC/31/18	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, Heiner Bielefeldt
A/HRC/31/18/Add.1	3	Mission to Lebanon
A/HRC/31/18/Add.2	3	Mission to Bangladesh

Documents issued in the general series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
A/HRC/31/18/Add.3	3	Mission to Lebanon: Comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, Heiner Bielefeldt
A/HRC/31/18/Add.4	3	Mission to Bangladesh: Comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, Heiner Bielefeldt
A/HRC/31/19	3	Annual report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, Leila Zerrougui
A/HRC/31/20	3	Annual Report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children, Marta Santos Pais
A/HRC/31/21	2	Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the question of human rights in Cyprus
A/HRC/31/22	2	Special Fund established by the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment: note by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/31/23	2	United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture: report of by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/31/24	2	Conclusions and recommendations of special procedures: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/31/25	2	Measures taken to implement Human Rights Council resolution 9/8 and obstacles to its implementation, including recommendations for further improving the effectiveness of, harmonizing and reforming the treaty body system: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/31/26	2	Report of the Secretary-General on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran
A/HRC/31/27	2, 3	Rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities: annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/28	2, 3	Outcome of the panel discussion on a human rights-based approach to good governance in the public service: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/29	2, 3	Impact of the arbitrary deprivation of nationality on the enjoyment of the rights of children concerned,

Documents issued in the general series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
		and existing laws and practices on accessibility for children to acquire nationality, inter alia, of the country in which they are born, if they otherwise would be stateless: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/31/30	2, 3	Thematic study on the rights of persons with disabilities under article 11 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, on situations of risk and humanitarian emergencies: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/31	2, 3	Question of the realization in all countries of economic, social and cultural rights: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/31/32	2, 3	Realization of the right to work: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/33	2, 3	Follow-up on investment on children's rights: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/34	2, 3	Information and communications technology and child sexual exploitation: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/34/Corr.1	2, 3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/31/35	2, 3	Situation of migrants in transit: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/36	2, 3	Analytical study on the relationship between climate change and the human right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/31/37	2, 3	Protection of the family: contribution of the family to the realization of the right to an adequate standard of living for its members, particularly through its role in poverty eradication and achieving sustainable development: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/38	2, 4	Role and achievements of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights with regard to the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea: report of the Office of the United Nations High

Documents issued in the general series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
		Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/39	2, 5	Report of the twenty-second annual meeting of special rapporteurs/representatives, independent experts and working groups of the special procedures of the Human Rights Council (Geneva, 8 to 12 June 2015), including updated information on the special procedures: note by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/40	2, 7	Implementation of Human Rights Council resolutions S-9/1 and S-12/1: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/40/Add.1	2, 7	Addendum- Implementation of the recommendations contained in the reports of the independent commission of inquiry on the 2014 Gaza conflict and of the United Nations Fact-Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict
A/HRC/31/41	2, 7	Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/31/42	2, 7	Implementation of the recommendations contained in the report of the independent international fact-finding mission on the implications of Israeli settlements on the civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights of the Palestinian people throughout the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/43	2, 7	Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the Occupied Syrian Golan: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/31/44	2, 7	Human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/31/45	2, 8	Outcome of the panel discussion on the impact of the world drug problem on the enjoyment of human rights: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/46	2, 10	Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the situation of human rights in Afghanistan and on the achievements of technical assistance in the field of human rights in 2015

Documents issued in the general series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
A/HRC/31/47	2, 10	Investigation by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on Libya: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/48	2, 10	Situation of human rights in Guinea: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/49	2	Assessment mission by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to improve human rights, accountability, reconciliation and capacity in South Sudan: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/50	3	Report on the first session of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on transnational corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights, with the mandate of elaborating an international legally binding instrument
A/HRC/31/51	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to food, Hilal Elver: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/31/51/Add.1	3	Mission to the Philippines
A/HRC/31/51/Add.2	3	Mission to Morocco
A/HRC/31/51/Add.3	3	Mission to the Philippines: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to food, Hilal Elver
A/HRC/31/51/Add.4	3	Mission to Morocco: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to food, Hilal Elver
A/HRC/31/52	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/31/53	3	Summary report of the Special Rapporteur on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment on the expert seminar on the effective implementation of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment, challenges thereto and the way forward

Documents issued in the general series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
A/HRC/31/54	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/31/54/Add.1	3	Mission to Cabo Verde
A/HRC/31/54/Add.2	3	Mission to Serbia and Kosovo
A/HRC/31/54/Add.3	3	Mission to Cabo Verde: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context
A/HRC/31/54/Add.4	3	Mission to Serbia and Kosovo: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context
A/HRC/31/55	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, Michel Forst
A/HRC/31/55/Add.1	3	Observations on communications transmitted to Governments and replies received
A/HRC/31/55/Add.2	3	Mission to Burundi
A/HRC/31/55/Add.3	3	Mission to Burundi: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, Michel Forst
A/HRC/31/56	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on minority issues, Rita Izsák
A/HRC/31/56/Add.1	3	Mission to Brazil
A/HRC/31/56/Add.2	3	Mission to Brazil: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur on minority issues, Rita Izsák
A/HRC/31/57	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, Juan E. Méndez
A/HRC/31/57/Add.1	3	Observations on communications transmitted to Governments and replies received
A/HRC/31/57/Add.2	3	Follow up report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment on his follow-up visit to

Documents issued in the general series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
		the Republic of Ghana
A/HRC/31/57/Add.3	3	Mission to Georgia
A/HRC/31/57/Add.4	3	Mission to Brazil
A/HRC/31/57/Add.4 /Corr.1	3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/31/57/Add.5	3	Mission to Georgia: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, Juan E. Méndez
A/HRC/31/57/Add.6	3	Mission to Brazil: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, Juan E. Méndez
A/HRC/31/58	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography
A/HRC/31/58/Add.1	3	Mission to Japan
A/HRC/31/58/Add.2	3	Mission to Armenia
A/HRC/31/58/Add.3	3	Mission to Japan: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography
A/HRC/31/58/Add.4	3	Mission to Armenia: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography
A/HRC/31/59	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, Karima Bennoune
A/HRC/31/59/Corr.1	3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/31/59/Add.1	3	Mission to Botswana
A/HRC/31/59/Add.2	3	Mission to Botswana: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, Karima Bennoune
A/HRC/31/60	3	Report of the Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights, Juan Pablo Bohoslavsky
A/HRC/31/60/Add.1	3	Mission to China
A/HRC/31/60/Add.2	3	Mission to Greece

Documents issued in the general series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
A/HRC/31/60/Add.3	3	Mission to China: comment by the State on the report of the Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights, Juan Pablo Bohoslavsky
A/HRC/31/60/Add.4	3	Mission to Greece: comments by the State on the report of the Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights, Juan Pablo Bohoslavsky
A/HRC/31/61	3	Final study on illicit financial flows, human rights and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development of the Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights
A/HRC/31/62	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities
A/HRC/31/62/Add.1	3	Mission to the Republic of Moldova: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities
A/HRC/31/62/Add.2	3	Mission to the Republic of Moldova
A/HRC/31/63	3	Report of the Independent Expert on the enjoyment of human rights by persons with albinism, Ikponwosa Ero
A/HRC/31/64	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to privacy, Joseph A. Cannataci
A/HRC/31/65	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, Ben Emmerson
A/HRC/31/66	3	Joint report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association and the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions on the proper management of assemblies
A/HRC/31/67	3, 5	Progress report of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee on its research-based report

Documents issued in the general series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
		on the activities of vulture funds and the impact on human rights
A/HRC/31/68	4	Report of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/31/69	4	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran
A/HRC/31/70	4	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea
A/HRC/31/70/Corr.1	4	Corrigendum
A/HRC/31/71	4	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar
A/HRC/31/71/Add.1	4	Observations by Myanmar on the report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar
A/HRC/31/72	5	Recommendations of the Forum on Minority Issues at its eighth session: Minorities and the criminal justice system (24 and 25 November 2015)
A/HRC/31/73	7	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967
A/HRC/31/74	9	Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Elaboration of Complementary Standards on its seventh session
A/HRC/31/75	9	Report of the Intergovernmental Working Group on the Effective Implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action on its thirteenth session
A/HRC/31/76	10	Report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Mali
A/HRC/31/77	10	Report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Haiti
A/HRC/31/78	10	Report of the Independent Expert on capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d'Ivoire in the field of human rights
A/HRC/31/79	3, 4, 7, 9, 10	Communications report of Special Procedures
A/HRC/31/80	2, 10	Technical cooperation and capacity-building to promote and protect the rights of all migrants,

Documents issued in the general series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
		including women, children, older persons and persons with disabilities: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/81	2, 3	Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/82	2, 3	Outcome of the Human Rights Council panel discussion on unilateral coercive measures and human rights: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

Documents issued in the conference room papers series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
A/HRC/31/CRP.1	4	Out of sight, out of mind: deaths in detention in the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/31/CRP.2	3	Regional workshop on the situation of Roma in the Americas
A/HRC/31/CRP.3	2, 10	Investigation by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on Libya: detailed findings
A/HRC/31/CRP.4	2,3	Relationship between climate change and the human right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health: informal summary of inputs received
A/HRC/20/CRP.5	4	Supplementary information on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran
A/HRC/20/CRP.6	2	Assessment mission by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to improve human rights, accountability, reconciliation and capacity in South Sudan: detailed findings
A/HRC/20/CRP.7	10	Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the situation of human rights in Ukraine

Documents issued in the Government series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
A/HRC/31/G/1	4	Note verbale dated 17 December 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Georgia to the United Nations

Documents issued in the Government series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
		Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the Office of the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/31/G/2	2	Nota verbal de fecha 24 de diciembre de 2015 dirigida a la Oficina del Alto Comisionado de las Naciones Unidas para los Derechos Humanos por la Misión Permanente de Guatemala ante la Oficina de las Naciones Unidas en Ginebra y otros Organismos Internacionales con sede en Ginebra
A/HRC/31/G/3	4	Letter dated 20 January 2016 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/31/G/4	2, 10	Note verbale dated 16 February 2016 from the Permanent Mission of Ukraine to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights – Secretariat of the United Nations Human Rights Council
A/HRC/31/G/5	4	Letter dated 26 February 2016 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Republic of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/31/G/6	4	Letter dated 18 February 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Georgia to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the President of the Human
A/HRC/31/G/7	6	Letter dated 17 March 2016 from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Azerbaijan to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/31/G/8	2	Note verbale dated 22 March 2016 from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Turkey to the United Nations office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/G/9	3	Note verbale dated 22 March 2016 from the Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations Office and other international Organizations in Geneva addressed to the Secretariat

Documents issued in the Government series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
		of the Human Rights Council

Documents issued in the national institution series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
A/HRC/31/NI/1	3	Written submission by the Azerbaijan Human Rights Commissioner (Ombudsman)
A/HRC/31/NI/2	5	Written submission by the Azerbaijan Human Rights Commissioner (Ombudsman)
A/HRC/31/NI/3	6	Written submission by the Rwanda National Commission for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/NI/4	3	Información presentada por la Red de Instituciones Nacionales para la Promoción y Protección de los Derechos Humanos del Continente Americano
A/HRC/31/NI/5	3	Información presentada por la Red de Instituciones Nacionales para la Promoción y Protección de los Derechos Humanos del Continente Americano
A/HRC/31/NI/6	3	Información presentada por la Red de Instituciones Nacionales para la Promoción y Protección de los Derechos Humanos del Continente Americano
A/HRC/31/NI/7	3	Información presentada por la Red de Instituciones Nacionales para la Promoción y Protección de los Derechos Humanos del Continente Americano
A/HRC/31/NI/8	3	Información presentada por la Red de Instituciones Nacionales para la Promoción y Protección de los Derechos Humanos del Continente Americano
A/HRC/31/NI/9	3	Written submission by the Greece National Commission for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/NI/10	3	Informations communiquées par le Conseil National des Droits de l'Homme du Maroc
A/HRC/31/NI/11	3	Informations communiquées par le Conseil National des Droits de l'Homme du Maroc
A/HRC/31/NI/12	3	Informations communiquées par le Conseil National des Droits de l'Homme du Maroc
A/HRC/31/NI/13	1	Comité International de Coordination des Institutions Nationales pour la Promotion et la Protection des Droits de l'Homme
A/HRC/31/NI/14	1	Written submission by the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for

Documents issued in the Government series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
		the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights (ICC)
A/HRC/31/NI/15	1	Comité Internacional de Coordinación de la Instituciones Nacionales para la Promoción y la Protección de los Derechos Humanos (CIC)
A/HRC/31/NI/16	1	Written submission by the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights (ICC)
A/HRC/31/NI/17	6	Written submission by the Nepal National Commission for Human Rights
A/HRC/31/NI/18	3	Written submission by the Azerbaijan Human Rights Commissioner (Ombudsman)

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
A/HRC/31/NGO/1	3	Written statement submitted by the World Muslim Congress, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/2	7	Written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/3	9	Written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/4	3	Written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/5	3	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/6	3	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
		organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/7	3	Exposé écrit présenté par le Chant du Guépard dans le Désert, organisation non gouvernementale doté du statut consultative spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/8	3	Written statement submitted by the Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of Environment, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/9	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/10	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/11	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/12	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/13	5	Written statement submitted by Reporters Sans Frontiers International – Reporters Without Borders International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/14	3	Written statement submitted by the Child Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/15	7	Written statement submitted by the Child Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/16	5	Written statement submitted by the Friends World Committee for Consultation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/17	3	Exposición escrita presentada port la Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
A/HRC/31/NGO/18	7	Written statement submitted by the Arab Association for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/19	7	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/20	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/21	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/22	3	Written statement submitted by the Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/23	4	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'Homme – IIPJFH, organisation non gouvernementale doté du statut consultative spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/24	3	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'Homme – IIPJFH, organisation non gouvernementale doté du statut consultative spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/25	3	Joint written statement submitted by the Association for Progressive Communications (APC), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, the American Civil Liberties Union, Amnesty International, Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, Human Rights Watch, International Commission of Jurists, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, International Humanist and Ethical Union, International PEN, International Press Institute, International Service for Human Rights, Privacy International, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Article 19 - International Centre Against Censorship, the World Association of Newspapers, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/26	7	Written statement submitted by the Arab Association for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
		in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/27	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/28	4	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/29	7	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/30	7	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/31	7	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/32	7	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/33	7	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/34	8	Written statement submitted by the Modern Advocacy, Humanitarian, Social and Rehabilitation Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/35	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/36	7	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/37	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
		Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/38	3	Exposé écrit présenté par Drepavie, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/39	2	Exposé écrit présenté par Drepavie, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/40	2	Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/41	4	Written statement submitted by the Korean Assembly for Reunion of Ten-million Separated Families, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/42	5	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/43	9	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/44	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/45	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/46	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/47	2	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/48	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
A/HRC/31/NGO/49	3	Written statement submitted by Privacy International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/50	4	Written statement submitted by International Educational Development, Inc., a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/51	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/52	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/53	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/54	3	Joint written statement submitted by OIDEL, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status, Arigatou International, Brahma Kumaris World Spiritual University, International Association for Religious Freedom, New Humanity and ONG HOPE International, non-governmental organizations in general consultative status, Al-Hakim Foundation, Asia-Pacific Human Rights Information Center, Association Points-Cœur, Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers, Equitas International Centre for Human Rights Education, Foundation for GAIA, International Catholic Child Bureau, International Council of Jewish Women, International Federation of University Women, International Network for the Prevention of Elder Abuse, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco – IIMA, Latter-Day Saint Charities, Mothers Legacy Project, Planetary Association for Clean Energy, Sovereign Military Order of the Temple of Jerusalem – OSMTH, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status and Lucis Trust Association and Soka Gakkai International, non-governmental organizations on the roster

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
A/HRC/31/NGO/55	3	Written statement submitted by the Association Miraisme International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/56	4	Written statement submitted by the Korean Bar Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/57	3	Written statement submitted by the Association Miraisme International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/58	3	Written statement submitted by the Association Miraisme International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/59	3	Written statement submitted by the Association Miraisme International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/60	3	Written statement submitted by the International Commission of Jurists, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/61	3	Written statement submitted by the Hazrat Javad-al-Aemeh Cultural Charity Institute, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/62	3	Written statement submitted by Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europe, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/63	7	Written statement submitted by The Palestinian Return Centre Ltd, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/64	6	Written statement submitted by International Commission of Jurists, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/65	3	Exposé écrit présenté par France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/66	2	Written statement submitted by the International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR), non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/67	4	Written statement submitted by Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
A/HRC/31/NGO/68	4	Written statement submitted by Alsalam Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/69	4	Written statement submitted by Iraqi Development Organization, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/70	4	Written statement submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/71	3	Written statement submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/72	4	Written statement submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/73	2	Written statement submitted by the International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR), non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/74	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/75	6	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/76	4	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/77	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/78	4	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/79	4	Written statement submitted by International Educational Development, Inc., a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/80	3	Exposición escrita presentada por la Asociacion Cubana de las Naciones Unidas (Cuban United Nations Association), organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
		especial
A/HRC/31/NGO/81	7	Exposición escrita presentada por la Asociacion Cubana de las Naciones Unidas (Cuban United Nations Association), organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/31/NGO/82	3	Exposición escrita presentada por la Asociacion Cubana de las Naciones Unidas (Cuban United Nations Association), organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/31/NGO/83	3	Written statement submitted by the Society Studies Centre (MADA ssc), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/84	7	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/85	4	Written statement submitted by the International Federation of Liberal Youth, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/86	4	Written statement submitted by Reporters Sans Frontiers International - Reporters Without Borders International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/87	3	Written statement submitted by the Iranian Elite Research Center, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/88	3	Written statement submitted by the International Alliance of Women, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/89	4	Written statement submitted by the Imam Ali’s Popular Students Relief Society, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/90	3	Written statement submitted by the Imam Ali’s Popular Students Relief Society, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/91	3	Written statement submitted by the Imam Ali’s Popular Students Relief Society, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/92	4	Written statement submitted by the Imam Ali’s Popular Students Relief Society, a non-governmental

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
		organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/93	3	Written statement submitted by the Imam Ali's Popular Students Relief Society, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/94	4	Written statement submitted by Nazra for Feminist Studies, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/95	10	Written statement submitted by the American Association of Jurists, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/96	4	Written statement submitted by the American Association of Jurists, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/97	4	Joint written statement submitted by the Shimin Gaikou Centre (Citizens' Diplomatic Centre for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples), International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR), non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/98	2	Written statement submitted by the Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/99	4	Written statement submitted by the World Muslim Congress, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/100	7	Written statement submitted by Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/101	3	Written statement submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/102	10	Exposé écrit présenté par Franciscans International, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif général
A/HRC/31/NGO/103	3	Written statement submitted by by the Norwegian Refugee Council, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/104	6	Written statement submitted by the International Bar Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
A/HRC/31/NGO/105	9	Exposé écrit présenté par le Centre Européen pour le droit, les Justice et les droits de l'homme (The European Centre for Law and Justice), organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/106	3	Written statement submitted by the Federal Union of European Nationalities, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/107	4	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/108	5	Written statement submitted by The European Centre for Law and Justice (Centre Européen pour le droit, les Justice et les droits de l'homme), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/109	4	Written statement submitted by the Iranian Elite Research Center, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/110	3	Joint written statement submitted by Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities), New Humanity, non-governmental organizations in general consultative status, Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, Alliance Defending Freedom, Association Points-Coeur, Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, International Association of Charities, International Catholic Child Bureau, International Volunteer Organization for Women Education Development, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, Mouvement International d'Apostolate des Milieux Sociaux Independants, Teresian Association, World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/111	3	Written statement submitted by the Iranian Elite Research Center, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/112	4	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
A/HRC/31/NGO/113	7	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/114	3	Written statement submitted by the Arab NGO Network for Development, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/115	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/116	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/117	2	Written statement submitted by the Arab NGO Network for Development, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/118	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/119	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/120	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/121	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/122	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/123	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/124	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/125	4	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
A/HRC/31/NGO/126	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/127	4	Written statement submitted by the Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/128	3	Written statement submitted by Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/129	7	Written statement submitted by the Norwegian Refugee Council, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/130	6	Written statement submitted by the Arab NGO Network for Development
A/HRC/31/NGO/131	2	Written statement submitted by the Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation
A/HRC/31/NGO/132	2	Written statement submitted by submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/133	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by Liberal International (World Liberal Union), non-governmental organizations in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/133 /Corr.1	3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/31/NGO/134	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by the International Catholic Child Bureau, non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/135	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by the International Catholic Child Bureau, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/136	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by the International Catholic Child Bureau, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/137	4	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Marangopoulos Foundation for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
A/HRC/31/NGO/138	5	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/139	4	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/140	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Human Rights Watch, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/141	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/142	5	Written statement submitted by submitted by the European Centre for Law and Justice (Centre Europeen pour le droit, les Justice et les droits de l'homme), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/143	6	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Foundation for Aboriginal and Islander Research Action Aboriginal Corporation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/144	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by Auspice Stella, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/144 /Corr.1	3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/31/NGO/145	1	Joint written statement submitted by New Humanity, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII ant others
A/HRC/31/NGO/146	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/147	3	Joint written statement submitted by submitted by Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, International Catholic Child Bureau, World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations,

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
		non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/148	8	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/149	4	Exposición escrita presentada por la Comité Permanente por la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/31/NGO/150	3	Exposición escrita presentada por la Comité Permanente por la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/31/NGO/151	7	Written statement submitted by submitted by Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/152	7	Written statement submitted by submitted by Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/153	7	Written statement submitted by submitted by Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/154	9	Written statement submitted by submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/155	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by Global Helping to Advance Women and Children, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/156	3	Joint written statement submitted by International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, non-governmental organizations in general consultative status, International-Lawyers.Org, Arab Organization for Human Rights, General Arab Women Federation, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Organisation Mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale, Organisation pour la Communication en Afrique et de Promotion de la Cooperation Economique Internationale -

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
		OCAPROCE Internationale, Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, Inc., World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/157	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by Jossour Forum des Femmes Marocaines, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/158	4	Joint written statement submitted by the Nonviolent Radical Party, the Transnational and Transparty, non-governmental organization in general consultative status, the Women's Human Rights International Association, non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/159	10	Exposé écrit présenté par International Catholic Child Bureau, une organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/160	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of Environment, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/161	4	Written statement submitted by submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/162	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/163	4	Written statement submitted by submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/164	2, 8	Written statement submitted by submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/165	3	Joint written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/166	4	Joint written statement submitted by the Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational and Transparty, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, the Women's Human Rights International Association, France Libertes : Fondation Danielle

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
		Mitterrand, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, the International Educational Development, Inc., Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/167	7	Written statement submitted by submitted by Adalah – The Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/168	4	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/169	4	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/170	4	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Society for Development and Community Empowerment (SDCE), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/171	7	Written statement submitted by submitted by the BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/172	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by Liberation, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/173	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by the World Barua Organization (WBO), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/174	4	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Integrated Youth Empowerment - Common Initiative Group (I.Y.E. – C.I.G.), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/175	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/176	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by The Article 19 - International Centre Against Censorship, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/177	4	Written statement submitted by submitted by People

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
		for Successful Corean Reunification, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/178	4	Written statement submitted by submitted by the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/179	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Association for Progressive Communications (APC), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/180	4	Exposé écrit présenté par Society of Iranian Women Advocating Sustainable Development of Environment, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/181	9	Written statement submitted by submitted by Servas International, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/182	4	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/183	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/184	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/185	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/186	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/187	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/188	5	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/189	4	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
		organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/190	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/191	9	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/192	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/193	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Society for the Protection of Unborn Children (SPUC), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/194	3	Exposición escrita presentada por la Asociacion Cubana de las Naciones Unidas (Cuban United Nations Association), organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/31/NGO/195	6	Joint written statement submitted by Franciscans International, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, Edmund Rice International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/196	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/197	6	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/198	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/199	3	Exposé écrit présenté par le Global Network For Rights And Development, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
A/HRC/31/NGO/200	6	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Observatoire Mauritanien pour les Droits de l'Homme et la Démocratie, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif special
A/HRC/31/NGO/201	6	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Observatoire Mauritanien pour les Droits de l'Homme et la Démocratie (OMADHD), organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif special
A/HRC/31/NGO/202	6	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Observatoire Mauritanien pour les Droits de l'Homme et la Démocratie, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif special
A/HRC/31/NGO/203	6	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Observatoire Mauritanien pour les Droits de l'Homme et la Démocratie, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif special
A/HRC/31/NGO/204	6	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Observatoire Mauritanien pour les Droits de l'Homme et la Démocratie, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif special
A/HRC/31/NGO/205	6	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association Mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif special
A/HRC/31/NGO/206	6	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association Mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif special
A/HRC/31/NGO/207	6	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association Mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif special
A/HRC/31/NGO/208	6	Written statement submitted by submitted by The Association Mauritanienne pour la Promotion du Droit, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/209	4	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Association Mauritanienne pour la Promotion du Droit, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/210	6	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association "Paix" pour la lutte contre la Contrainte et l'injustice, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
		consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/211	6	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association "Paix" pour la lutte contre la Contrainte et l'injustice, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/212	6	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association "Paix" pour la lutte contre la Contrainte et l'injustice, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/213	6	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association "Paix" pour la lutte contre la Contrainte et l'injustice, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/214	6	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association "Paix" pour la lutte contre la Contrainte et l'injustice, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/215	6	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association "Paix" pour la lutte contre la Contrainte et l'injustice, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/216	3	Exposé écrit présenté par Rencontre Africaine pour la defense des droits de l'homme, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/217	6	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association "Paix" pour la lutte contre la Contrainte et l'injustice, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/218	7	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions (ICAHD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/219	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/220	3	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights (JKCHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/221	4	Written statement submitted by submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
		(JKCHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/222	6	Exposé écrit présenté par l'Association Mauritanienne pour la santé de la mère et de l'enfant, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/31/NGO/223	9	Joint written statement submitted by International-Lawyers.Org, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, the General Arab Women Federation, Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Organisation Mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale, the Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, the International Educational Development, Inc., World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/224	3, 7	Joint written statement submitted by International-Lawyers.Org, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, the General Arab Women Federation, the Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, Inc., the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/225	3	Joint written statement submitted by International-Lawyers.Org, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, Inc., World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/226	7	Joint written statement submitted by International-Lawyers.Org, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, the General Arab Women Federation, the Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
		Development, Inc., the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/227	3	Written statement submitted by International-Lawyers.Org, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, the General Arab Women Federation, the Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Organisation Mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale, the Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, Inc., the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/31/NGO/228	3, 4	Written statement submitted by International-Lawyers.Org, the Arab Organization for Human Rights, the General Arab Women Federation, the Indian Movement "Tupaj Amaru", the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Organisation Mondiale des associations pour l'éducation prénatale, the Union of Arab Jurists, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, Inc., the World Peace Council, non-governmental organizations on the roster, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/229	3	Written statement submitted by Shia Rights Watch Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/230	4	Written statement submitted by the Iranian Elite Research Center, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/231	3	Written statement submitted by the International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/31/NGO/232	4	Exposición escrita presentada por la Asociación HazteOir.org, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/31/NGO/233	5	Exposición escrita presentada por la Asociación HazteOir.org, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

Symbol	*Agenda item*	
A/HRC/31/NGO/234	9	Written statement submitted by Auspice Stella, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

Annex IV

Special procedures mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its thirty-first session

Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (member from Eastern European States)

Alexey Tsykarev (Russian Federation)

Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (member from Latin American and Caribbean States)

Erika Yamada (Brazil)

Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises (member from Asia-Pacific States)

Surya Deva (India)

Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967

Stanley Michael Lynk (Canada)