



General Assembly

Distr.: General
19 May 2016

Original: English

Human Rights Council

Thirtieth session

Agenda item 1

Organizational and procedural matters

Report of the Human Rights Council on its thirtieth session

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

Contents

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
Part One: Resolutions, decisions and President's statements adopted by the Human Rights Council at its thirtieth session	5
I. Resolutions	5
II. Decisions	6
III. President's statements	7
Part Two: Summary of proceedings	8
I. Organizational and procedural matters	8
A. Opening and duration of the session	8
B. Attendance	8
C. Agenda and programme of work	8
D. Organization of work	8
E. Meetings and documentation	9
F. Visits	9
G. Election of members of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee	10
H. Selection and appointment of mandate holders	10
I. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	10
J. Adoption of the report of the session	11
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	12
A. Update by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights	12
B. Reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General	13
C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	15
III. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development	16
A. Interactive dialogue with special procedures mandate holders	16
B. Panels	24
C. General debate on agenda item 3	27
D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	29
IV. Human rights situations that require the Council's attention	41
A. Interactive dialogue with the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic	41
B. Panel discussion on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, including the issue of international abductions, enforced disappearances and related matters	42
C. General debate on agenda item 4	42
D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	44

V.	Human rights bodies and mechanisms	47
	A. Complaint procedure	47
	B. Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.....	47
	C. Interactive dialogue with the Advisory Committee	47
	D. Open-ended intergovernmental working group on a draft United Nations declaration on the rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas	48
	E. General debate on agenda item 5	48
	F. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	49
VI.	Universal periodic review	53
	A. Consideration of universal periodic review outcomes	53
	B. General debate on agenda item 6	132
	C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	133
VII.	Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories	135
	A. General debate on agenda item 7	135
VIII.	Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action	136
	A. Panels.....	136
	B. General debate on agenda item 8	138
IX.	Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action	140
	A. Interactive dialogue with special procedures mandate holders.....	140
	B. General debate on agenda item 9	140
	C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	141
X.	Technical assistance and capacity-building.....	144
	A. Interactive dialogue on cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights.....	144
	B. Interactive dialogue on technical assistance and capacity-building for human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.....	144
	C. Interactive dialogue on technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in Libya	145
	D. Interactive dialogue with special procedures mandate holders	146
	E. General debate on agenda item 10	148
	F. Consideration of and action on draft proposals	149
Annexes		
I.	Attendance.....	155
II.	Agenda	161
III.	Documents issued for the thirtieth session	162

IV.	Advisory Committee members elected by the Human Rights Council at its thirtieth session and duration of terms of membership	188
V.	Special procedures mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its thirtieth session	189

Part One

Resolutions, decisions and President's statements adopted by the Human Rights Council at its thirtieth session¹

I. Resolutions

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
30/1	Promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka	1 October 2015
30/2	Human rights and unilateral coercive measures	1 October 2015
30/3	Regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights	1 October 2015
30/4	Human rights and indigenous peoples	1 October 2015
30/5	The question of the death penalty	1 October 2015
30/6	The use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination	1 October 2015
30/7	Human rights in the administration of justice, including juvenile justice	1 October 2015
30/8	Contribution of the Human Rights Council to the high-level meeting on HIV/AIDS in 2016	1 October 2015
30/9	Equal participation in political and public affairs	1 October 2015
30/10	The grave and deteriorating human rights and humanitarian situation in the Syrian Arab Republic	1 October 2015
30/11	Review of the mandate of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples	1 October 2015
30/12	Promotion of the right to peace	1 October 2015
30/13	Promotion and protection of the human rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas	1 October 2015
30/14	Contribution of parliaments to the work of the Human Rights Council and its universal periodic review	1 October 2015
30/15	Human rights and preventing and countering violent extremism	2 October 2015
30/16	From rhetoric to reality: a global call for concrete action against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance	2 October 2015
30/17	Forum on people of African descent in the diaspora	2 October 2015

¹ All resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council are subject to editing in accordance with the United Nations Editorial Manual.

<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
30/18	Technical assistance and capacity-building for Yemen in the field of human rights	2 October 2015
30/19	Technical assistance and capacity building in the field of human rights in the Central African Republic	2 October 2015
30/20	Assistance to Somalia in the field of human rights	2 October 2015
30/21	Enhancement of technical cooperation and capacity-building in the field of human rights	2 October 2015
30/22	Technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in the Sudan	2 October 2015
30/23	Advisory services and technical assistance for Cambodia	2 October 2015
30/24	National policies and human rights	2 October 2015
30/25	Promoting international cooperation to support national human rights follow-up systems and processes	2 October 2015
30/26	Technical assistance and capacity-building for human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo	2 October 2015
30/27	Technical cooperation and capacity building for Burundi in the field of human rights	2 October 2015
30/28	The right to development	2 October 2015
30/29	Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order	2 October 2015

II. Decisions

<i>Decision</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
30/101	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Belarus	24 September 2015
30/102	Outcome of the universal periodic review: United States of America	24 September 2015
30/103	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Malawi	24 September 2015
30/104	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Mongolia	24 September 2015
30/105	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Panama	24 September 2015
30/106	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Maldives	24 September 2015
30/107	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Andorra	25 September 2015
30/108	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Bulgaria	25 September 2015
30/109	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Honduras	25 September 2015
30/110	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Liberia	25 September 2015
30/111	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Marshall Islands	25 September 2015
30/112	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Croatia	25 September 2015

<i>Decision</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
30/113	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Jamaica	25 September 2015
30/114	Outcome of the universal periodic review: Libya	25 September 2015
30/115	Follow-up to President's statement PRST 29/1	1 October 2015

III. President's statements

<i>President's statement</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date of adoption</i>
30/1	Reports of the Advisory Committee	1 October 2015
30/2	Promoting the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health through enhancing capacity-building in public health against pandemics	2 October 2015

Part Two

Summary of proceedings

I. Organizational and procedural matters

A. Opening and duration of the session

1. The Human Rights Council held its thirtieth session at the United Nations Office at Geneva from 14 September to 2 October 2015. The President of the Council opened the session.
2. In accordance with rule 8 (b) of the rules of procedure of the Human Rights Council, as contained in part VII of the annex to Council resolution 5/1, the organizational meeting of the thirtieth session was held on 24 August 2015.
3. On 14 September 2015, prior to the opening of the session, the Human Rights Council observed a minute of silence in memory of the late Ambassador and Permanent Representative of South Sudan to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, Alison Monani Magaya.
4. The thirtieth session consisted of 43 meetings over 14 days (see paragraph 14 below).

B. Attendance

5. 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. Agenda and programme of work

6. At the 1st meeting, on 14 September 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted the agenda and programme of work of the thirtieth session.

D. Organization of work

7. At the 1st and 2nd meetings, on 14 September 2015, the President, further to the decision taken at the organizational meeting of the thirtieth session of the Human Rights Council, held on 24 August 2015, outlined the modalities for the clustered interactive dialogues with special procedures mandate holders under agenda item 3. The total duration of each clustered interactive dialogue would not exceed four hours. 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 groups, 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 groups, and two minutes for observers. Should this measure be deemed insufficient to ensure that the total duration not exceed four hours, the speaking time limits would be further reduced to two minutes for all.

8. Also at the 1st meeting, on the same day, the President referred to the decision taken at the organizational meeting of the thirtieth session of the Council, upon the recommendation of the Bureau, concerning the modalities and schedule of the advance inscription on the list of speakers for clustered interactive dialogues with special procedures mandate holders under agenda item 3. The advance inscription for all clustered interactive dialogues with special procedures mandate holders would take place at the beginning of the 2nd meeting.

9. At the same meeting, the President outlined the modalities for general debates, including the speaking time limits which would be three minutes for States Members of the Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

10. Also at the same meeting, the President referred to the recommendation of the Bureau, held on 24 August 2015, concerning the tabling of draft proposals after the tabling deadline. At the organizational meeting of the thirtieth session, the Council had agreed that the agreement by the Council would need to be sought by the sponsor(s) before the proposals could be registered by the secretariat.

11. At the 6th meeting, on 15 September 2015, the President outlined the modalities for panel discussions, including the speaking time limits which would be two minutes for States Members of the Council, observer States and other observers.

12. At the 15th meeting, on 21 September 2015, the President outlined the modalities for individual interactive dialogues, including the speaking time limits which would be three minutes for States Members of the Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

13. At the 22nd meeting, on 24 September 2015, the President outlined the modalities for the consideration of the outcomes of the universal periodic review under agenda item 6, including the speaking time limits 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 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 Council resolution 16/21; and up to 20 minutes for stakeholders to make general comments on the outcome of the review.

E. Meetings and documentation

14. The Human Rights Council held 43 fully serviced meetings during its thirtieth session.

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

F. Visits

16. At the 1st meeting, on 14 September 2015, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sri Lanka, Mangala Samaraweera, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

17. At the same meeting, the Undersecretary for Human Rights at the Ministry of the Interior of Mexico, Roberto Campa, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

18. At the 3rd meeting, on the same day, the Minister of State in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Hugo Swire, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

19. At the 9th meeting, on 16 September 2015, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Montenegro, Igor Lukšić, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

20. At the 10th meeting, on 17 September 2015, the Commissioner for Human Rights and Humanitarian Action of Mauritania, Aichetou Mint M'Haiham, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

G. Election of members of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee

21. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the Human Rights Council elected, pursuant to its resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, four experts to the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee. The Council had before it a note by the Secretary-General (A/HRC/30/17) containing the nomination of candidates for election, in accordance with Council decision 6/102, and the biographical data of the candidates.

22. The candidates were as follows:

<i>Nominating State</i>	<i>Expert nominated</i>
African States	
Ethiopia	Imeru Tamrat Yigezu
Asia-Pacific States	
Saudi Arabia	Ibrahim Abdul Aziz Al Sheddi
Latin American and Caribbean States	
Argentina	Mario Luis Coriolano
Western European and other States	
Austria	Katharina Pabel

23. The number of candidates for each of the regional groups corresponded to the number of seats available in each of these groups. The practice of holding a secret ballot pursuant to paragraph 70 of Council resolution 5/1 was dispensed with and Imeru Tamrat Yigezu, Ibrahim Abdul Aziz Al Sheddi, Mario Luis Coriolano and Katharina Pabel were elected as members of the Advisory Committee by consensus (see annex IV).

H. Selection and appointment of mandate holders

24. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the Human Rights Council appointed three special procedures mandate holders in accordance with Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21 and its decision 6/102 (see annex V).

I. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Follow-up to President's statement PRST 29/1

25. At the 40th meeting, on 1 October 2015, the President of the Human Rights Council introduced draft decision A/HRC/30/L.28, sponsored by the President and the Bureau of the Council. Subsequently, Haiti, Honduras and the Republic of Korea joined the sponsors.

26. At the same meeting, draft decision A/HRC/30/L.28 was adopted without a vote (decision 30/115).

Reports of the Advisory Committee

27. At the 40th meeting, on 1 October 2015, the President of the Human Rights Council introduced draft President's statement A/HRC/30/L.32.

28. At the same meeting, draft President's statement A/HRC/30/L.32 was adopted by the Council (PRST 30/1).

Promoting the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health through enhancing capacity-building in public health against pandemics

29. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the President of the Human Rights Council introduced draft President's statement A/HRC/30/L.43.

30. At the same meeting, draft President's statement A/HRC/30/L.43 was adopted by the Council (PRST 30/2).

J. Adoption of the report of the session

31. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representatives of the Czech Republic, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of) and Switzerland made statements as observer States with regard to adopted resolutions.

32. 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 thirtieth session.

33. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft report (A/HRC/30/2) ad referendum and decided to entrust the Rapporteur with its finalization.

34. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Ghana, Ireland, Nigeria and Sierra Leone made statements.

35. Also at the same meeting, the observers for the Arab Commission for Human Rights and Human Rights Watch (also on behalf of Article 19; Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development; Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies (CIHRS); CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project; Human Rights Law Centre; International Federation for Human Rights (FIDH); International Service for Human Rights; World Organization against Torture) made statements in connection with the session.

36. At the same meeting, the President of the Human Rights Council made a closing statement.

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

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

37. At the 1st meeting, on 14 September 2015, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement providing an update on the activities of his Office.

38. During the ensuing general debate, at the 1st, 2nd and 3rd meetings, on the same day, the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, China, Congo, Cuba, Egypt² (also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mauritania, Myanmar, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sudan, Tajikistan, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe), El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)³ (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg⁴ (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Georgia, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Republic of Moldova, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Maldives, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Sierra Leone, South Africa, Switzerland⁵ (also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Uruguay), The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Burundi, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, Niger, Norway, Philippines, Republic of Moldova, Senegal, Serbia, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Uruguay;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence Internationale pour le Developpement; Al-khoei Foundation; Alsalam Foundation; Americans for Democracy &

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

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.

Human Rights in Bahrain; Amnesty International; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Association Burkinabé pour la Survie de l'Enfance; Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociación Civil (also on behalf of Centro Regional de Derechos Humanos y Justicia de Género); China Society for Human Rights Studies (CSHRS); CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Commission to Study the Organization of Peace; European Union of Public Relations; Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos; Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD); Human Rights House Foundation; Human Rights Watch; Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'Homme- IIPJDH; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; International Service for Human Rights; International-Lawyers.Org; Iraqi Development Organization; Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Liberation; Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development; Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; World Environment and Resources Council (WERC); World Muslim Congress.

39. At the 3rd meeting, on the same day, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Azerbaijan, Bahrain, China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Japan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

40. At the same meeting, on the same day, statements in exercise of a second right of reply were made by the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Japan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Turkey.

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

41. At the 12th meeting, on 17 September 2015, the Officer-in-Charge of the Human Rights Council Mechanisms Division of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) presented thematic reports prepared by OHCHR and the Secretary-General under agenda items 2 and 3, 5, 8.

42. At the same meeting, on the same day, and at the 13th and 14th meetings, on 18 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on thematic reports under agenda items 2 and 3 presented by the Officer-in-Charge of the Human Rights Council Mechanisms Division of OHCHR (see chapter III, section C).

43. At the 21st meeting, on 22 September 2015, and at the 25th meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 5, and at the 30th and 32nd meetings, on 28 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 8, including on thematic reports under agenda items 2 and 5, 8 presented by the Officer-in-Charge of the Human Rights Council Mechanisms Division of OHCHR (see chapter V, section E, and chapter VIII, section B).

44. At the 34th meeting, on 29 September 2015, pursuant to Council resolution 27/27, the Deputy United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights presented the report of the High Commissioner on the efforts of OHCHR to increase and strengthen its technical assistance programmes and activities aimed at improving the human rights situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (A/HRC/30/32) and the study of the High Commissioner on the impact of technical assistance and capacity-building on the human rights situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (A/HRC/30/33).

45. At the same meeting, on the same day, the Human Rights Council held an interactive dialogue on the study presented by Deputy United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (see chapter X, section B).

46. At the 37th meeting, on 30 September 2015, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement by video message to present the report prepared by OHCHR on promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka (A/HRC/30/61), pursuant to Council decision at its organizational meeting, held on 16 February 2015, to defer the consideration of the report until its thirtieth session. In accordance with Council resolution 25/1, the presentation was followed by a discussion on the implementation of that resolution.

47. At the same meeting, the representative of Sri Lanka made a statement as the State concerned.

48. During the ensuing discussion, at the 37th and 38th meeting, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Montenegro, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Fiji, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, Thailand;

(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: Alliance Creative Community Project; Amnesty International; Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development; Association Burkinabé pour la Survie de l'Enfance; Association des Jeunes pour l'Agriculture du Mali; Association Mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit ; CIRID (Centre Independent de Recherches et d'Initiatives pour le Dialogue); CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Human Rights Watch; International Commission of Jurists; International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR); Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada; Liberation; Minority Rights Group; Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation; United Nations Watch; World Evangelical Alliance.

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

50. At the 38th meeting, on 30 September 2015, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights provided an oral update and presented reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General submitted under agenda items 2 and 10.

51. At the same meeting, on the same day, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights provided an oral report and presented a report of the High-Commissioner submitted under agenda items 2 and 10. The Assistant Secretary-General also presented a report of OHCHR submitted under agenda item 2.

52. Also at the same meeting, on the same day, and at the 39th meeting, on 1 October 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 10, including on oral updates and reports under agenda items 2 and 10 presented by the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights (see chapter X, section E).

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Situation of human rights in Yemen

53. As notified to the secretariat, draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.4/Rev.1, sponsored by the Netherlands and co-sponsored by Belgium, the Czech Republic, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Montenegro and Poland, was withdrawn by the sponsors on 30 September 2015, prior to its consideration by the Human Rights Council.

Promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka

54. At the 40th meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of the United States of America introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.29, sponsored by Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, and co-sponsored by Albania, Australia, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Poland, Romania and Sri Lanka. Subsequently, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

55. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made general comments in relation to the draft resolution.

56. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Sri Lanka made a statement as the State concerned.

57. 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.

58. At the same meeting, the representatives of Ghana and South Africa made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

59. Also at the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 30/1).

60. At the same meeting, the representative of India made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

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

A. Interactive dialogue with special procedures mandate holders

Working Group on arbitrary detention

61. At the 3rd meeting, on 14 September 2015, the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the Working Group on arbitrary detention, Seong-Phil Hong, presented the Working Group's reports (A/HRC/30/36 and Add.1-3, A/HRC/30/37).

62. At the same meeting, the representatives of Germany, Italy and New Zealand made statements as the States concerned.

63. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 3rd meeting, on 14 September 2015, and the 4th meeting, on 15 September 2015, the following made statements and asked the Chairperson-Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, France, Ireland, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kyrgyzstan, Mauritania, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Senegal, Sudan, Switzerland, Tunisia, Ukraine, State of Palestine;

(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 a national human rights institution: Canadian Human Rights Commission (by video message);

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence Internationale pour le Developpement; Al-khoei Foundation; Allied Rainbow Communities International (also on behalf of International Lesbian and Gay Association and Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit - COC); Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Article 19 – The International Centre Against Censorship; Center for Environmental and Management Studies; Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Asociación Civil (also on behalf of Association for the Prevention of Torture); Defence for Children International; France Libertes : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand; Franciscans International; International Commission of Jurists; International Service for Human Rights; United Schools International; World Environment and Resources Council (WERC); World Muslim Congress.

64. At the 4th meeting, on 15 September 2015, the Chairperson-Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

65. At the 5th meeting, on 15 September 2015, a statement in exercise of the right of reply was made by the representative of Nicaragua.

Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery, including its causes and its consequences

66. At the 3rd meeting, on 14 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery, including its causes and its consequences, Urmila Bhoola, presented her report (A/HRC/30/35 and Add.1-2).

67. At the same meeting, the representatives of Belgium and the Niger made statements as the States concerned.

68. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 3rd meeting, on 14 September 2015, and the 4th meeting, on 15 September 2015, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, El Salvador, Gabon, India, Ireland, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Chile, Denmark, Fiji, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mauritania, Philippines, Senegal, Tunisia, Holy See;

(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 Sovereign Military Order of Malta;

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-khoei Foundation; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; International Commission of Jurists.

69. At the 4th meeting, on 15 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

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

70. At the 5th meeting, on 15 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence, Pablo De Greiff, presented his report (A/HRC/30/42 and Add.1).

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

72. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 5th meeting, on 15 September 2015, and the 7th meeting, on 16 September 2015, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, Brazil, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador⁶ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Estonia, France, Germany, Japan, Latvia, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan (on behalf of the

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

Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Republic of Korea , Sierra Leone, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Nepal, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uruguay;

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

(d) Observers for the International Committee of the Red Cross and the Sovereign Military Order of Malta;

(e) Observer for a national human rights institution: Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission (by video message);

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International; Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development (also on behalf of Franciscans International and International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR)); Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Asociación Civil; International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR); Pax Romana (International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs and International Movement of Catholic Students).

73. At the 7th meeting, on 16 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Working Group on enforced or involuntary disappearances

74. At the 5th meeting, on 15 September 2015, the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the Working Group on enforced or involuntary disappearances, Ariel Dulitzky, presented the Working Group's report (A/HRC/30/38 and Add.1-5).

75. At the same meeting, the representatives of Croatia, Montenegro and Serbia made statements as the States concerned.

76. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo made a statement.

77. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 5th meeting, on 15 September 2015, and the 7th meeting, on 16 September 2015, the following made statements and asked the Chairperson-Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador⁷ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), France, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea , Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Nepal, Poland, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukraine, Uruguay;

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

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence Internationale pour le Developpement ; Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development (also on behalf of Franciscans International and International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR)); Beijing Children's Legal Aid and Research Center; Canners International Permanent Committee; Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Asociación Civil; Franciscans International; Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; International Association for Democracy in Africa; International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR); International Service for Human Rights; Iraqi Development Organization (also on behalf of Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain and the Bahrain Centre for Human Rights); Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture (also on behalf of the International Centre to Promote Freedoms and Rights); World Muslim Congress.

78. At the 5th meeting, on 15 September 2015, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Japan and Serbia.

79. 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 and Japan.

80. At the 7th meeting, on 16 September 2015, the Chairperson-Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

81. At the 9th meeting, on 16 September 2015, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Albania and Serbia.

82. At the same meeting, statements in exercise of a second right of reply were made by the representatives of Albania and Serbia.

Independent Expert on the enjoyment of all human rights by older persons

83. At the 7th meeting, on 16 September 2015, the Independent Expert on the enjoyment of all human rights by older persons, Rosa Kornfeld-Matte, presented her report (A/HRC/30/43 and Add.1-4).

84. At the 8th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Austria, Mauritius and Slovenia made statements as the States concerned.

85. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 8th and 9th meetings, on 16 September 2015, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, China, Cuba, Ecuador⁸ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, Estonia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay (also on behalf of MERCOSUR), Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Benin, Chile, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Georgia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mali, Philippines, Singapore, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, Holy See;

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

- (c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, European Union;
- (d) Observer for the Sovereign Military Order of Malta;
- (e) Observers for national human rights institutions: European Network of National Human Rights Institutions; National Human Rights Commission of the Republic of Korea (by video message);
- (f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa Culture Internationale; Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace; Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit - COC Nederland (also on behalf of International Lesbian and Gay association; Swedish Federation of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights – RFSL); Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD); HelpAge International; International Longevity Center Global Alliance, Ltd.; Iranian Elite Research Center; Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association.

86. At the 9th meeting, on 16 September 2015, the Independent Expert answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Working Group on the use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination

87. At the 7th meeting, on 16 September 2015, the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the Working Group on the use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination, Elzbieta Karska, presented the Working Group's report (A/HRC/30/34 and Add.1-2).

88. At the 8th meeting, on the same day, the representative of Côte d'Ivoire made a statement as the State concerned.

89. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 8th and 9th meetings, on 16 September 2015, the following made statements and asked the Chairperson-Rapporteur questions:

- (a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), China, Cuba, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);
- (b) Representatives of observer States: Chile, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Philippines, Ukraine;
- (c) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: European Union;
- (d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa Culture Internationale; Alsalam Foundation; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism; International Commission of Jurists; Liberation; Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development; World Barua Organization (WBO).

90. At the 9th meeting, on 16 September 2015, the Chairperson-Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the implications for human rights of the environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes

91. At the 9th meeting, on 16 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the implications for human rights of the environmentally sound management and disposal of

hazardous substances and wastes, Baskut Tuncak, presented his report (A/HRC/30/40 and Add.1-2).

92. At the same meeting, the representative of Kazakhstan made a statement as the State concerned.

93. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 9th meeting, on 16 September 2015, and the 10th meeting, on 17 September 2015, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador⁹ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, France, India, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, South Africa;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Benin, Chile, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kyrgyzstan, Switzerland;

(c) Observer for a United Nations entity, specialized agency and related organization: United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE);

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: China Society for Human Rights Studies (CSHRS); Human Rights Now; International Committee for the Indians of the Americas (Switzerland); Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

94. At the 10th meeting, on 17 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation

95. At the 9th meeting, on 16 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation, Léo Heller, presented his report (A/HRC/30/39 and Add.1-2).

96. At the same meeting, the representative of Kenya made a statement as the State concerned.

97. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights made a statement by video message.

98. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 9th meeting, on 16 September 2015, and the 10th meeting, on 17 September 2015, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Ecuador¹⁰ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, India, Indonesia, Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Spain¹¹ (also on behalf of

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

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.

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Maldives, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine and Uruguay);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Benin, Chile, Egypt, Eritrea, Fiji, Georgia, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kyrgyzstan, Mali, Panama, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, State of Palestine;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: American Association of Jurists; Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Human Rights Now; Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; Arab Commission for Human Rights (also on behalf of Centre Independent de Recherches et d'Initiatives pour le Dialogue (CIRID)); International-Lawyers.Org; BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; Villages Unis (United Villages).

99. At the 10th meeting, on 17 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Independent Expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order

100. At the 10th meeting, on 17 September 2015, the Independent Expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order, Alfred de Zayas, presented his report (A/HRC/30/44).

101. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 10th and 12th meetings, on 17 September 2015, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), China, Cuba, El Salvador, Namibia, Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

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

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence pour les droits de l'homme; Centre Europe - Tiers Monde - Europe-Third World Centre (also on behalf of International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL)); Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; Commission to Study the Organization of Peace; Indian Council of South America (CISA); Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'Homme-IIPJDH; International Committee for the Indians of the Americas (Switzerland); International Human Rights Association of American Minorities (IHRAAM); Iranian Elite Research Center; Liberation; Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

102. At the 12th meeting, on 17 September 2015, the Independent Expert answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the negative impact of the unilateral coercive measures on the enjoyment of human rights

103. At the 10th meeting, on 17 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the negative impact of the unilateral coercive measures on the enjoyment of human rights, Idriss Jazairy, presented his report (A/HRC/30/45).

104. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 10th and 12th meetings, on 17 September 2015, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), China, Cuba, Namibia, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Belarus, Egypt, Eritrea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Syrian Arab Republic, State of Palestine;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa Speaks; Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD); Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development.

105. At the 12th meeting, on 17 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples

106. At the 18th meeting, on 22 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples, Victoria Lucia Tauli-Corpuz, presented her report (A/HRC/30/41 and Add.1).

107. At the same meeting, the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Alexey Tsykarev, presented the reports of the Expert Mechanism (A/HRC/30/52, A/HRC/30/53 and A/HRC/30/54) (see chapter V, section B).

108. Also at the same meeting, the Representative of the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Indigenous Populations, Mirna Cunningham, made a statement.

109. At the 20th meeting, on the same day, the representative of Paraguay made a statement as the State concerned.

110. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur and the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the Expert Mechanism questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Ecuador¹² (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, Estonia, France, Ireland, Namibia, Russian Federation, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, Guatemala, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Nepal, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Ukraine;

¹² 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: International Labour Organization;

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

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

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence pour les droits de l'homme; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; China NGO Network for International Exchanges (CNIE); Franciscans International; Indian Council of South America (CISA); Indian Law Resource Centre (also on behalf of National Congress of American Indians; Native American Rights Fund); Indigenous World Association; International Fellowship of Reconciliation; Iranian Elite Research Center; Liberation; Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association; Minority Rights Group; Shimin Gaikou Centre (Citizens' Diplomatic Centre for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples); Syriac Universal Alliance, The Federation Syriaque International; World Barua Organization (WBO).

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

112. Also at the same meeting, the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

B. Panels

Biennial panel discussion on the issue of unilateral coercive measures and human rights

114. At the 11th meeting, on 17 September 2015, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 27/21 and Corr.1, and pursuant to Council decision at its organizational meeting held on 26 May 2015 to postpone the panel discussion until its thirtieth session, the Council held its biennial panel discussion on the issue of unilateral coercive measures and human rights.

115. The Chief of the Rule of Law, Equality and Non-Discrimination Branch of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. Former Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative for the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations in Geneva, Seyed Mohammad Kazem Sajjadpour, moderated the discussion for the panel.

116. At the same meeting, the panellists Aslan Abashidze, Mohamed Ezzeldine Abdel Moneim and Idriss Jazairy made statements.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), China, Ecuador¹³ (on behalf of the Community

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

of Latin American and Caribbean States), Iran (Islamic Republic of)¹⁴ (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Egypt, Nicaragua;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD); Iranian Elite Research Center; Organization for Defending Victims of Violence.

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

119. The following made statements during the second speaking slot:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Cuba, Pakistan, Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belarus, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Sudan, Zimbabwe;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa Speaks; Agence pour les droits de l'homme; Indian Council of South America (CISA); International-Lawyers.Org; Society Studies Centre (MADA ssc); Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

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

Annual half-day discussion on the human rights of indigenous peoples

121. At the 19th meeting, on 22 September 2015, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 18/8 and 27/13, the Council held a half-day panel discussion on the follow-up to and implementation of the outcome of the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples, and its implications for the achievement of the ends of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

122. The Chief of the Rule of Law, Equality and Non-Discrimination Branch of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples, Victoria Lucia Tauli-Corpuz, moderated the discussion for the panel.

123. At the same meeting, the panellists Albert Kwokwo Barume, Myrna Cunningham Kain, Alejandro González Cravioto and Jannie Lasimbang made statements.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Brazil, El Salvador, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Finland (also on behalf of Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), Peru, Philippines, Poland, Spain, Ukraine;

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

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Defence for Children International; Indigenous World Association; Native American Rights Fund (also on behalf of Indian Law Resource Center and National Congress of American Indians).

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

126. The following made statements during the second speaking slot:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Congo, Estonia, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Canada, Chile, Guatemala, Malaysia, New Zealand, Holy See;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Federation of University Women; International Fellowship of Reconciliation; United Schools International.

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

Panel discussion on a human rights-based approach to good governance in the public service

128. At the 23rd meeting, on 24 September 2015, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 25/8, the Council held a panel discussion on a human rights-based approach to good governance in the public service.

129. The Director of the Human Rights Treaties Division of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The Director of the Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law, Anne Peters, moderated the discussion for the panel.

130. At the same meeting, the panellists Adetokunbo Mumuni, Taekyoon Kim, Safak Pavey, Mariana González Guyer and Jan Pastwa made statements.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Bangladesh, France, Morocco (on behalf of the States members and observers of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Poland¹⁵ (also on behalf of Australia, Chile, Republic of Korea and South Africa), Qatar, Russian Federation;

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

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant (also on behalf of Geneva Infant Feeding Association (IBFAN-GIFA), Plan International, Inc. and Save the Children International).

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

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

133. The following made statements during the second speaking slot:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria, China, Estonia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Ireland, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belgium, Colombia, Ecuador, Georgia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Senegal, Singapore, Turkey;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa Speaks; Agence pour les droits de l'homme; Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD); Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'Homme- IIPJDH.

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

C. General debate on agenda item 3

135. At the 12th meeting, on 17 September 2015, the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on the international regulatory framework on the regulation, monitoring and oversight of the activities of private military and security companies, Abdul Samad Minty, presented the report of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on its fourth session (A/HRC/30/47).

136. At the same meeting, the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the working group on the right to development, Zamir Akram, provided an oral update on its sixteenth session (see the note by the Secretariat, A/HRC/30/46).

137. At the same meeting, on the same day, and at the 13th and 14th meetings, on 18 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on thematic reports and oral updates under agenda items 2 and 3, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Cuba, Estonia, India, Indonesia, Iran¹⁶ (Islamic Republic of) (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), Ireland, Latvia, Latvia (also on behalf of Albania, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Uruguay), Luxembourg¹⁷ (on behalf of the European Union, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Montenegro, Morocco (on behalf of Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic,

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.

Democratic Republic, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen and State of Palestine), Namibia, Netherlands, Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore¹⁸ (also on behalf of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Brunei Darussalam, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam and Yemen), South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia (also on behalf of Austria and Slovenia), Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Myanmar, Philippines, Republic of Moldova, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Zimbabwe;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf, Council of Europe;

(d) Observers for national human rights institutions: Canadian Human Rights Commission, International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights (ICC);

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs; Africa Speaks; African Development Association; Agence Internationale pour le Développement; Agence pour les droits de l'homme; Alliance Defending Freedom; All-Russian public organization "Russian Public Institute of Electoral Law"; Alsalam Foundation; American Civil Liberties Union; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Amnesty International; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Article 19 - International Centre Against Censorship, The; Asian Legal Resource Centre; Association Dunenyo; Association of World Citizens; Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of American Association of Jurists; Arab Commission for Human Rights (ACHR); Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities); Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul; Dominicans for Justice and Peace - Order of Preachers; International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (OIDEI); International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES; Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco (IIMA); New Humanity; Pax Romana (International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs and International Movement of Catholic Students)); British Humanist Association; Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace; Canners International Permanent Committee; Center for

¹⁸ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Environmental and Management Studies; Center for Inquiry; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; China Society for Human Rights Studies (CSHRS); Colombian Commission of Jurists; Comité International pour le Respect et l'Application de la Charte Africaine des Droits de l'Homme et des Peuples (CIRAC); Comité Permanente por la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos; 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; Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos; Franciscans International (also on behalf of Edmund Rice International); Friends World Committee for Consultation; Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD); Human Rights Now; Human Rights Watch; Indian Law Resource Centre; International Association for Democracy in Africa; International Catholic Child Bureau (also on behalf of Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd; Defence for Children International (DCI); World Organization against Torture (OMCT)); International Commission of Jurists; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; International Humanist and Ethical Union; International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (OIDE) (also on behalf of Brahma Kumaris World Spiritual University (BKWSU); Foundation for GAIA; Institute for Planetary Synthesis; International Federation of University Women; International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR); International Organization for the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORM); Make Mothers Matter – MMM; New Humanity; Planetary Association for Clean Energy; Servas International; Soka Gakkai International; Soroptimist International; Sovereign Military Order of the Temple of Jerusalem (OSMTH); Teresian Association); International Service for Human Rights; International-Lawyers.Org; Iranian Elite Research Center; Iraqi Development Organization; Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Liberal International (World Liberal Union); Liberation; Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association; Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés (OIPMA); Organization for Defending Victims of Violence; Pan African Union for Science and Technology; Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation; Pax Romana (International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs and International Movement of Catholic Students) (also on behalf of World Evangelical Alliance); Prahar; Reporters Sans Frontiers International - Reporters Without Borders International; Russian Peace Foundation; Save the Children International; Sikh Human Rights Group; Society for Threatened Peoples; 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.

138. At the 14th meeting, on 18 September 2015, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Chile, India, Malaysia, Myanmar and Pakistan.

D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Human rights and unilateral coercive measures

139. At the 40th meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.2, sponsored by the Islamic Republic of Iran (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement). Subsequently, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Brazil and the Russian Federation joined the sponsors.

140. At the same meeting, the representatives of Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments in relation to the draft resolution.

141. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council) made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

142. 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 Council), a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

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

Against:

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

143. Draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.2 was adopted by 33 votes to 14, with 0 abstentions (resolution 30/2).

144. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Argentina made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights

145. At the 40th meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of Belgium introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.3, sponsored by Armenia, Belgium, Mexico, Senegal and Thailand, and co-sponsored by Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland and Turkey. Subsequently, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Czech Republic, Georgia, Honduras, Indonesia, Norway, Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, Sweden and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

146. 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.

147. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 30/3).

148. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Japan made general comments.

Human rights and indigenous peoples

149. At the 40th meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of Guatemala, also on behalf of Mexico, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.8, sponsored by Guatemala and Mexico, and co-sponsored by Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines and Poland. Subsequently, Armenia, Cabo Verde, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Honduras,

Lithuania, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

150. At the same meeting, the representatives of France and the United States of America made general comments in relation to the draft resolution.

151. 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.

152. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 30/4).

153. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Japan made general comments.

The question of the death penalty

154. At the 40th meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representatives of Belgium and the Republic of Moldova introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.11/Rev.1, sponsored by Belgium, Benin, Costa Rica, France, Mexico, Mongolia, the Republic of Moldova and Switzerland, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua and San Marino joined the sponsors.

155. At the same meeting, the representative of Saudi Arabia, also on behalf of Bangladesh, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, China, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Malaysia, Pakistan, Oman, Qatar, Singapore, Sudan and the United Arab Emirates, introduced amendment A/HRC/30/L.34 to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.11/Rev.1. Amendment A/HRC/30/L.34 was sponsored by Saudi Arabia and co-sponsored by Bangladesh, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, China, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Malaysia, Pakistan, Oman, Qatar, Singapore, the Sudan and the United Arab Emirates.

156. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Egypt, also on behalf of Bangladesh, China, Malaysia, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and Singapore, introduced amendment A/HRC/30/L.35 to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.11/Rev.1. Amendment A/HRC/30/L.35 was sponsored by Egypt and co-sponsored by Bangladesh, China, Malaysia, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and Singapore.

157. At the same meeting, the representative of China, also on behalf of Egypt, Malaysia, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and Singapore, introduced amendment A/HRC/30/L.36 to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.11/Rev.1. Amendment A/HRC/30/L.36 was sponsored by China and co-sponsored by Bangladesh, Egypt, Malaysia, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and Singapore.

158. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Argentina, Botswana, France, Mexico, Namibia and the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union) made general comments in relation to the draft resolution and the amendments.

159. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Ireland and Sierra Leone made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/30/L.34.

160. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Sierra Leone, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/30/L.34. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Botswana, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Japan, Maldives, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Congo, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ireland, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherland, Paraguay, Portugal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ghana, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Morocco, Republic of Korea, United States of America

161. Amendment A/HRC/30/L.34 was rejected by 17 votes to 20, with 8 abstentions.¹⁹

162. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico and Montenegro made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/30/L.35.

163. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representatives of Mexico and Montenegro, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/30/L.35. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Botswana, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Maldives, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Congo, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ireland, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherland, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, South Africa, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ghana, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Morocco

164. Amendment A/HRC/30/L.35 was rejected by 16 votes to 22, with 7 abstentions.²⁰

165. At the same meeting, the representatives of Germany and Paraguay made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/30/L.36.

166. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/30/L.36. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

¹⁹ Two delegations did not cast a vote.

²⁰ Two delegations did not cast a vote.

Bangladesh, Botswana, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Japan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Congo, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ireland, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherland, Paraguay, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ghana, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Maldives, Morocco, Republic of Korea, United States of America

167. Amendment A/HRC/30/L.36 was rejected by 14 votes to 22, with 9 abstentions.²¹

168. At the same meeting, the representatives of Botswana, Indonesia, Japan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, South Africa and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.11/Rev.1.

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

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Against:

Bangladesh, Botswana, China, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Japan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, United States of America

Abstaining:

Cuba, Ghana, Kenya, Maldives, Morocco, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Viet Nam

170. Draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.11/Rev.1 was adopted by 26 votes to 13, with 8 abstentions (resolution 30/5).

The use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination

171. At the 41st meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of Cuba, also on behalf of Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, South Africa, Sudan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.15, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, South Africa, the Sudan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola,

²¹ Two delegations did not cast a vote, and the representative of Saudi Arabia subsequently stated that there had been an error in the delegation's vote and that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft text.

Chile, Namibia, Nicaragua, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

172. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council) made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

173. 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 Council), a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Mexico

174. Draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.15 was adopted by 32 votes to 14, with 1 abstention (resolution 30/6).

175. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Argentina made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

176. At the same meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made general comments.

Human rights in the administration of justice, including juvenile justice

177. At the 41st meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of Austria introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.16, sponsored by Austria, and co-sponsored by Andorra, Armenia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey and Uruguay. Subsequently, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Georgia, Haiti, Maldives, Malta, Morocco, Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Serbia, Tajikistan, Thailand and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

178. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 30/7).

179. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representatives of Japan, Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Kuwait, Pakistan, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates) and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote after the vote. In its statement, the representative of Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Kuwait, Pakistan, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates) disassociated the delegations from the consensus on preambular paragraph 7 of the draft resolution. In its

statement, the representative of Japan disassociated the delegation from the consensus on operative paragraph 24 of the draft resolution.

Contribution of the Human Rights Council to the high-level meeting on HIV/AIDS in 2016

180. At the 41st meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of Brazil, also on behalf of Colombia, Portugal and Thailand, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.17, sponsored by Brazil, Colombia, Portugal and Thailand, and co-sponsored by Angola, Australia, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Djibouti, El Salvador, Estonia, Georgia, Haiti, Honduras, Japan, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

181. 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.

182. At the same meeting, the representatives of Pakistan (on behalf of the States Members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation except Albania) and Albania made statements in explanation of vote before the vote. In its statement, the representative of Pakistan disassociated the States Members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation except Albania from the consensus on preambular paragraph 3 and operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

183. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 30/8).

Equal participation in political and public affairs

184. At the 41st meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of the Czech Republic, also on behalf of Botswana, Indonesia, the Netherlands and Peru, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.27/Rev.1, sponsored by Botswana, the Czech Republic, Indonesia, the Netherlands and Peru, and co-sponsored by Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey and the United States of America. Subsequently, Armenia, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Georgia, Ghana, Haiti, Honduras, Japan, Lithuania, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Serbia, Switzerland, Ukraine and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

185. At the same meeting, the representatives of Namibia and the United States of America made general comments in relation to the draft resolution. In its statement, the representative of Namibia disassociated the delegation from the consensus on operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

186. 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.

187. At the same meeting, the representatives of Pakistan (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates), the Russian Federation and South Africa made statements in explanation of vote before the vote. In their statements, the representatives of Pakistan (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates) and the Russian Federation disassociated the delegations from the consensus on operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

188. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 30/9).

Human rights and preventing and countering violent extremism

189. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representatives of Colombia and Morocco, also on behalf of Albania, Bangladesh, Cameroon, France, Iraq, Mali, Peru, Tunisia, Turkey and the United States of America, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.25/Rev.1²², sponsored by Albania, Bangladesh, Cameroon, Colombia, France, Iraq, Mali, Morocco, Peru, Tunisia, Turkey and the United States of America, and co-sponsored by Algeria, Australia, Benin, Burundi, Canada, the Central African Republic, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Fiji, Hungary, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Italy, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine. Subsequently, Bahrain, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Egypt, Finland, Georgia, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Japan, Kuwait, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, New Zealand, Nigeria, Portugal, Qatar, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Somalia and the United Arab Emirates joined the sponsors.

190. At the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced amendments A/HRC/30/L.37, A/HRC/30/L.38, A/HRC/30/L.39 and A/HRC/30/L.40 to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.25/Rev.1. Amendments A/HRC/30/L.37, A/HRC/30/L.39 and A/HRC/30/L.40 were sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Belarus, China, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Pakistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Amendment A/HRC/30/L.38 was sponsored by the Russian Federation and co-sponsored by Belarus, China, Pakistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

191. Also at the same meeting, the representative of China introduced amendments A/HRC/30/L.41 and A/HRC/30/L.42 to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.25/Rev.1. Amendments A/HRC/30/L.41 and A/HRC/30/L.42 were sponsored by China and co-sponsored by Belarus, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Pakistan, the Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

192. At the same meeting, the President of the Council announced that draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.25/Rev.1 had been orally revised, and that the amendments A/HRC/30/L.41 and A/HRC/30/L.42 to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.25/Rev.1 had been withdrawn by the sponsors.

193. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Albania, Algeria and Namibia made general comments in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised and the amendments A/HRC/30/L.37, A/HRC/30/L.38, A/HRC/30/L.39 and A/HRC/30/L.40.

²² Operative paragraph 7 of the text originally submitted by the sponsors, prior to editing, read 'in line with national strategies'.

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

195. At the same meeting, the representatives of France and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/30/L.37.

196. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/30/L.37. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Bangladesh, Botswana, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherland, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Brazil, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, Namibia

197. Amendment A/HRC/30/L.37 was rejected by 14 votes to 26, with 7 abstentions.

198. At the same meeting, the representatives of France and Morocco made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/30/L.38.

199. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Morocco, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/30/L.38. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Bangladesh, Botswana, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherland, Nigeria, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Brazil, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Namibia

200. Amendment A/HRC/30/L.38 was rejected by 10 votes to 27, with 10 abstentions.

201. At the same meeting, the representatives of Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/30/L.39.

202. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/30/L.39. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, India, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Bangladesh, Brazil, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherland, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Botswana, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, Indonesia, Namibia, Nigeria

203. Amendment A/HRC/30/L.39 was rejected by 11 votes to 26, with 10 abstentions.

204. 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 amendment A/HRC/30/L.40.

205. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/30/L.40. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Against:

Albania, Bangladesh, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherland, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Botswana, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, Namibia, Nigeria

206. Amendment A/HRC/30/L.40 was rejected by 14 votes to 25, with 8 abstentions.

207. At the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil, Cuba, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.25/Rev.1 as orally revised.

208. 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, Argentina, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, India,

Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam

Against:

Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Abstaining:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, El Salvador, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Pakistan

209. Draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.25/Rev.1 as orally revised was adopted by 37 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions (resolution 30/15).

210. At the 43rd meeting, on the same day, the representatives of China and Ireland (also on behalf of Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Iceland, Mexico, Poland, Sweden and Switzerland) made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

The right to development

211. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative the Islamic Republic of Iran²³ (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.12, sponsored by the Islamic Republic of Iran (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement) and co-sponsored by China. Subsequently, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Armenia, Brazil, El Salvador and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

212. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Cuba, India, Sierra Leone, South Africa and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments in relation to the draft resolution.

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

214. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Japan, the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council) and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

In favour:

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

Against:

Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Latvia, Montenegro, Netherlands, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

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

Abstaining:

Albania, Japan, Portugal, Republic of Korea

216. Draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.12 was adopted by 33 votes to 10, with 4 abstentions (resolution 30/28).

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

218. At the same meeting, the representatives of Japan and the Republic of Korea made general comments.

Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order

219. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative Cuba, also on behalf of Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.14, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Cabo Verde, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Haiti, Indonesia, Namibia Nicaragua, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and South Africa joined the sponsors.

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

221. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council) and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

222. 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 Council), a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as orally revised. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Mexico, Paraguay

223. Draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.14 as orally revised was adopted by 31 votes to 14, with 2 abstentions (resolution 30/29).

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

225. At the same meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made a general comment.

226. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria and South Africa made statements in general comments and explanation of vote after the vote on all resolutions adopted under agenda item 3.

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

227. At the 15th meeting, on 21 September 2015, 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/30/48), pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 28/20.

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

229. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 15th meeting, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Chairperson questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria, Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, Estonia, France, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Latvia, Maldives, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

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

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Allied Rainbow Communities International; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies; International Commission of Jurists; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (FIDH); Syriac Universal Alliance, The Federation Syriaque International; Union of Arab Jurists; United Nations Watch.

230. At the 15th meeting, on the same day, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic made final remarks as the State concerned.

231. At the same meeting, the Chairperson answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

232. At the 17th meeting, on the same day, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Lebanon, the Syrian Arab Republic and Turkey.

233. At the same meeting, on the same day, statements in exercise of a second right of reply were made by the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Turkey.

B. Panel discussion on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, including the issue of international abductions, enforced disappearances and related matters

234. At the 16th meeting, on 21 September 2015, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 28/22, the Council held a panel discussion on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, including the issue of international abductions, enforced disappearances and related matters.

235. The former Chair of the Commission of Inquiry on human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Michael Kirby, made an opening statement and moderated the discussion for the panel.

236. At the same meeting, the panellists Marzuki Darusman, David Hawk, Koichiro Iizuka and Kwon Eun-kyoung made statements.

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

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, China, Cuba, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Czech Republic, Liechtenstein, Norway;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Human Rights Watch; United Nations Watch.

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

240. The following made statements during the second speaking slot:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Estonia, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lithuania, Myanmar, New Zealand, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Conscience and Peace Tax International (CPTI) (also on behalf of Center for Global Nonkilling); World Evangelical Alliance.

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

C. General debate on agenda item 4

242. At the 17th meeting, on 21 September 2015, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 28/22, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights provided an oral update on the role and achievements of OHCHR, including on the field-based structure

in the Republic of Korea to strengthen the monitoring and documentation of the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

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

244. At the 17th meeting, on 21 September 2015, and the 18th meeting, on 22 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 4, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, Cuba, France, Germany, Ghana, Iran (Islamic Republic of)²⁴ (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg²⁵ (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Liechtenstein, Montenegro), Montenegro, Netherlands, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Georgia, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Norway, Slovenia, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Ukraine;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs; Africa Culture Internationale; Africa Speaks; African Development Association; Agence Internationale pour le Développement; Agence pour les droits de l'homme; Al-Hakim Foundation; Alliance Defending Freedom; All-Russian public organization "Russian Public Institute of Electoral Law"; Alsalam Foundation; American Association of Jurists; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Amnesty International; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development; Asian Legal Resource Centre (also on behalf of International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (FIDH)); Association Dunenyó; Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism; Baha'i International Community; British Humanist Association; Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies; Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace; Canners International Permanent Committee; Center for Inquiry; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Comité International pour le Respect et l'Application de la Charte Africaine des Droits de l'Homme et des Peuples (CIRAC); Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme; Commission to Study the Organization of Peace; European Humanist Federation; European Union of Public Relations; Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos; France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand; Franciscans International; Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD); Human Rights House Foundation; Human Rights Watch; Indian Council of South America (CISA); International Association for Democracy in Africa; International Career Support Association; International Educational Development, Inc.; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; International Fellowship of Reconciliation; International Humanist and Ethical Union; International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR); International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations; Iranian Elite Research Center; Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Lawyers for Lawyers (also on behalf of International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (FIDH) and Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada); Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada (also on behalf of Asian Legal Resource

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

²⁵ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Centre, Lawyers for Lawyers and World Organization against Torture (OMCT)); Liberation; Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development; Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association; 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; Prahar; Presse Embleme Campagne; Rencontre Africaine pour la defense des droits de l'homme; Shimin Gaikou Centre (Citizens' Diplomatic Centre for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples); Society for Threatened Peoples; Union of Arab Jurists; United Nations Watch; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; Women's Human Rights International Association; World Barua Organization (WBO); World Environment and Resources Council (WERC); World Evangelical Alliance; World Jewish Congress; World Muslim Congress.

245. At the 17th meeting, on 21 September 2015, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Bahrain, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Myanmar, Pakistan, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

246. 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 and Japan.

247. At the 18th meeting, on 22 June 2015, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Iraq, Lithuania, the Philippines and Thailand.

D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

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

248. At the 41st meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, also on behalf of France, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and the United States of America, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.5/Rev.1, sponsored by France, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, and co-sponsored by Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Subsequently, Andorra, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Georgia, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Spain, Switzerland and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

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

250. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Lebanon introduced amendment A/HRC/30/L.33 to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.5/Rev.1 as orally revised. Amendment A/HRC/30/L.33 was sponsored by Lebanon.

251. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union), the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia and the United States of America made general comments in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised and the amendment.

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

253. At the same meeting, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/30/L.33.

254. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/30/L.33. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

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

255. Amendment A/HRC/30/L.33 was rejected by 10 votes to 21, with 16 abstentions.²⁶

256. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Brazil, Cuba, Pakistan and the Russian Federation made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.5/Rev.1 as orally revised.

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

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

²⁶ The representative of Maldives subsequently stated that there had been an error in the delegation's vote and that it had intended to vote against the draft text.

258. Draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.5/Rev.1 as orally revised was adopted by 29 votes to 6, with 12 abstentions (resolution 30/10).

259. At the same meeting, the representative of Argentina made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

V. Human rights bodies and mechanisms

A. Complaint procedure

260. At the 14th meeting, on 18 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held a closed meeting of the complaint procedure.

261. At the 15th meeting, on 21 September 2015, the President made a statement on the outcome of the meeting, stating that the Human Rights Council had examined, in its closed meeting, the report of the Working Group on Situations on its 15th and 16th sessions under the complaint procedure established pursuant to Council resolution 5/1. The President added that no case had been referred by the Working Group on Situations to the Human Rights Council for action at the 30th session.

B. Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

262. At the 18th meeting, on 22 September 2015, the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Alexey Tsykarev, presented the reports of the Expert Mechanism (A/HRC/30/52, A/HRC/30/53 and A/HRC/30/54).

263. At the 20th meeting, on the same day, the Human Rights Council held an interactive dialogue on the human rights of indigenous peoples under agenda items 3 and 5 (see chapter III, section A).

C. Interactive dialogue with the Advisory Committee

264. At the 21st meeting, on 22 September 2015, the Chairperson of the Advisory Committee, Obiora Chinedu Okafor, presented the reports of the Committee (A/HRC/30/49, A/HRC/30/50 and A/HRC/30/51).

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Greece²⁷ (also on behalf of Brazil, Congo, Cyprus, Japan, Lebanon, Morocco, Republic of Korea and the Russian Federation), Ireland, Morocco, Republic of Korea (also on behalf of Chile, Egypt and Romania), Russian Federation, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representative of an observer State: Egypt;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights; Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism; International NGO Forum on

²⁷ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Indonesian Development; United Cities and Local Governments; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

266. At the same meeting, the Chairperson of the Advisory Committee answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

D. Open-ended intergovernmental working group on a draft United Nations declaration on the rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas

267. At the 21st meeting, on 22 September 2015, the Vice-Chair of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on a draft United Nations declaration on the rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas, Luis Espinosa, presented the report of the working group on its 2nd session held from 2 to 6 February 2015 (A/HRC/30/55).

E. General debate on agenda item 5

268. At the 21st meeting, on 22 September 2015, and the 25th meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 5, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ecuador²⁸ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ethiopia, Ghana (also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Ukraine, United States of America and Uruguay), Ireland, Latvia (also on behalf of Albania, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay), Luxembourg²⁹ (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Montenegro, Namibia, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

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.

- (b) Representatives of observer States: Cyprus, Egypt, Hungary, Kyrgyzstan, Nicaragua, Norway, Slovenia (also on behalf of Austria, Liechtenstein and Switzerland), Togo;
- (c) Observer for a United Nations entity, specialized agency and related organization: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO);
- (d) Observer for an intergovernmental organization: Council of Europe;
- (e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa Culture Internationale; Agence Internationale pour le Developpement; Alliance Defending Freedom; Alsalam Foundation; American Association of Jurists; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Association of World Citizens; Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of Center for Global Nonkilling; Institute for Planetary Synthesis; Institute of Global Education; International Association of Democratic Lawyers; International Network for the Prevention of Elder Abuse (INPEA); International Peace Bureau; International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES; Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco (IIMA); Pax Romana (International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs and International Movement of Catholic Students); United Network of Young Peacebuilders (UNOY Peacebuilders)); Canners International Permanent Committee; Center for Environmental and Management Studies; Centre Europe - Tiers Monde - Europe-Third World Centre; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociación Civil; CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Comité Permanente por la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos; Commission to Study the Organization of Peace; Conscience and Peace Tax International (CPTI) (also on behalf of Center for Global Nonkilling); European Union of Public Relations; Foodfirst Information and Action Network (FIAN); Franciscans International; Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'Homme- IIPJDH; International Association for Democracy in Africa; International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL); International Association of Schools of Social Work; International Federation of Rural Adult Catholic Movements; International Service for Human Rights (also on behalf of Amnesty International; CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; International Commission of Jurists; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; World Organization against Torture (OMCT)); International-Lawyers.Org; Iraqi Development Organization; Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Liberation; Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association; Organisation pour la Communication en Afrique et de Promotion de la Cooperation Economique Internationale - OCAPROCE Internationale; Pan African Union for Science and Technology; Prahar; Rencontre Africaine pour la defense des droits de l'homme; United Schools International; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; Villages Unis (United Villages); World Barua Organization (WBO); World Environment and Resources Council (WERC); World Muslim Congress.

F. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Review of the mandate of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

269. At the 41st meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of Mexico, also on behalf of Guatemala, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.9, sponsored by Mexico and Guatemala, and co-sponsored by Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines and the United States of America. Subsequently, Cabo Verde, Canada, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Haiti,

Lithuania, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Poland, Slovenia, Spain and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

270. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a general comment in relation to the draft resolution.

271. 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.

272. Also at the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 30/11).

273. At the same meeting, the representative of Japan made a general comment.

Promotion of the right to peace

274. At the 41st meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.13, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, the Philippines, South Africa, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Cabo Verde, China, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Malaysia, Namibia, Nicaragua, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

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

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

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

In favour:

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Albania, Portugal

278. Draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.13 was adopted by 33 votes to 12, with 2 abstentions (resolution 30/12).

Promotion and protection of the human rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas

279. At the 41st meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, also on behalf of Cuba, Ecuador and South Africa, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.19, sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador and South Africa, and co-sponsored by Angola, Argentina, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Nicaragua, Paraguay, the Sudan, Switzerland, Togo, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Egypt, Honduras, Sierra Leone and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

280. At the same meeting, the representatives of Cuba, South Africa and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments in relation to the draft resolution.

281. 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.

282. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of the Netherlands (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Council) and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

In favour:

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

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

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

284. Draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.19 was adopted by 31 votes to 1, with 15 abstentions (resolution 30/13).

285. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Republic of Korea made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

Contribution of parliaments to the work of the Human Rights Council and its universal periodic review

286. At the 41st meeting, on 1 October 2015, the representative of Ecuador introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.23, sponsored by Ecuador, Italy, Maldives, Morocco, the Philippines, Romania and Spain, and co-sponsored by Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Chile, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Ireland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Montenegro, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Slovenia, Thailand, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Albania, Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Costa

Rica, Finland, Georgia, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Serbia, Sri Lanka, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

287. 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.

288. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 30/14).

289. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Japan made a general comment.

VI. Universal periodic review

290. 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, the Council considered the outcome of the reviews conducted during the twenty-second session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) held from 4 to 15 May 2015.

291. 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

292. 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.

Belarus

293. The review of Belarus was held on 4 May 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 Belarus in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/BLR/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/BLR/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/BLR/3).

294. At its 22nd meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Belarus (see section C below).

295. The outcome of the review of Belarus comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/3), the views of Belarus 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/30/3/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

296. The delegation of Belarus stated that the country had traditionally attached great importance to the UPR as an important international mechanism for the objective assessment of the situation of human rights in all states of the world.

297. Belarus stated that it had undertaken serious efforts in the preparation of its national report. An inter-agency plan had been adopted for the implementation of first cycle recommendations. Progress had been reviewed regularly by a wide group of stakeholders including the executive government, academics, civil society and the United Nations

Country Team. Furthermore, in 2012 Belarus submitted a mid-term report on the implementation of the recommendations. Four rounds of consultations had been held with civil society in the last year to consider the implementation process. These consultations had strengthened the partnership between the State institutions and civil society. The second national report was prepared in collaboration with civil society within this framework. High-ranking representatives of the full range of key ministries and departments had presented the second national which itself demonstrated the importance attached to the issue at the national level. Belarus had presented a wide range of information on the protection of human rights in its report.

298. Belarus thanked all the delegations which participated in its UPR and particularly appreciated those delegations which had provided an objective assessment and had commended its efforts.

299. Belarus noted that some recommendations received referred to the so-called “political prisoners”. Belarus had repeatedly emphasized that there had never been political prisoners in the country. Those which some had called political prisoners had in fact committed criminal offences for which they were serving the appropriate sentences. Nevertheless, there had recently been a change, notably in August when the President had pardoned six persons whom some had called “political prisoners” and thus Belarus considered the respective UPR recommendations to be irrelevant.

300. Some other recommendations referred to the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus. Belarus emphasized that its position was well-known: It did not consider him to be a mechanism for cooperation in respect of human rights because of the evident political motives behind the creation of the mandate. Belarus thus did not consider the corresponding recommendations to be relevant or binding. At the same time Belarus remained open to cooperation with the special procedures of the Human Rights Council. A series of thematic mandates had been invited and Belarus intended to extend this list. Belarus would continue to cooperate with human rights protection mechanisms.

301. Turning to recommendations concerning the abolition of the death penalty, Belarus stated that under the Constitution the death penalty was an exceptional temporary measure. For example, it was not applied to women or anyone under 18 or over 65 years of age. Those sentenced could appeal to the President for commutation. The parliamentary group on the death penalty, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and other national institutions were working to raise public awareness on the issue and contribute to gradual change in public opinion. Nevertheless, the latest opinion polls indicated that a significant part of the public in Belarus supported its retention. Belarus emphasized that it had never voted against resolutions on a moratorium on the death penalty in the United Nations General Assembly and it was committed to the global trend towards gradual abolition.

302. In relation to the majority of those recommendations which it had noted, Belarus stated that it had proceeded on the basis that it does not reject them, but could not support them because it would not be able to implement them fully within the next five years. Nevertheless, Belarus was prepared to move forward and to cooperate actively with interested international and national partners, including civil society. This concerned, for example, important issues such as the abolition of the death penalty.

303. Belarus stated that it was continually working to improve its legislation and practice. Belarus consequently supported recommendation 129.24 in the part concerning the adoption of comprehensive legislation aimed at combatting direct and indirect discrimination. It also supported recommendation 129.72 in the part relating to the simplification of NGO registrations; recommendation 129.81 in the part relating to ensuring the protection of human rights defenders; recommendation 129.90 in the part concerning measures to prevent the detention and prosecution of peaceful demonstrators or their ill-

treatment by the police in connection with the exercise of their right to freedom of expression and freedom of assembly. Belarus also accepted recommendation 129.5 in the part relating to the conducting an investigation into the disappearance of famous public figures that occurred in 1999 and 2000, with the aim of bringing those responsible to justice. This investigation was being carried out and had not been closed. Belarus took note of the other parts of the recommendations.

304. Belarus drew attention to a series of positive developments, starting with the recent work towards accession to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities meaning it would happen soon. Belarus therefore supported recommendation 129.7 in the part which concerned accession to the Convention. Overall, Belarus had already acceded to six international instruments in the past five years.

305. Belarus mentioned that it had been actively studying the possibilities for the creation of a national human rights institution. In 2014 it hosted a seminar on the theme in collaboration with international partners in which many countries had participated. The outcome was academic research into the effective functioning of such an institution and the feasibility of introducing an ombudsman in Belarus.

306. Belarus stated that the concept of “torture” had been introduced into the Penal Code in accordance with the Convention against Torture and this would permit more effective consideration of such complaints. Places of detention were being reconstructed in order to improve the conditions of detainees. However, the large financial resources needed meant that all the work could not be performed immediately.

307. Belarus noted that in June 2015 the Law on Alternative Service was adopted which enabled young people who did not wish to perform military service for their religious convictions to work instead in social services, hospitals or other civilian institutions.

308. Belarus also emphasized that wide social consultations were being carried out on draft laws for combatting corruption, on culture and against anti-tobacco use. 2015 had seen elaboration of many fundamental State plans and programmes. Belarus had already elaborated its National Strategy on Sustainable Socio-Economic Development until 2030.

309. Presidential elections would take place in October 2015 and Belarus stated that all possible was being done to ensure an open, fair and transparent election atmosphere. Various international observers would be present.

310. Belarus highlighted the incorporation of generally-recognized principles of international law into the Constitution and noted that national legislation was finalized in accordance with them.

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

311. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Belarus, 18 delegations made statements. The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.³⁰

312. Myanmar thanked Belarus for its presentation and appreciated its constructive engagement and active participation in the UPR process. It was pleased to note the acceptance of recommendations, including its own.

313. Pakistan thanked Belarus for the updated information and appreciated the acceptance of the majority of the recommendations, including those from Pakistan. It

³⁰<https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/30thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

valued the constructive engagement of Belarus with the human rights machinery and the UPR mechanism.

314. The Russian Federation noted with satisfaction the acceptance of the majority of the recommendations, including those it had submitted. It mentioned the constructive approach of Belarus to the UPR and underlined the country's progress in strengthening human rights protection, notably in the fields of social and economic rights, the rights of members of vulnerable groups, reforms to the justice system, simplified registration for NGOs and civil society participation in the life of the State. It noted also that Belarus had acceded to six international human rights instruments during the first UPR cycle.

315. Rwanda commended Belarus for its progress in protecting and promoting human rights since the first review. It welcomed the acceptance of most of the recommendations made during its review and the steps taken to further enhance its efforts to protect human rights through its relevant policies and action plans.

316. Sierra Leone noted the high number of recommendations supported by Belarus and acknowledged the progress made since the first cycle. It encouraged Belarus to consider instituting a moratorium on the death penalty, noting the debate on its replacement inside Belarus. Sierra Leone commended Belarus for the invitations extended to the Special Procedures. It understood that there were constraints that often hampered the complete implementation of recommendations, but hoped that those recommendations would be duly implemented once the constraints had been reviewed.

317. The Sudan thanked Belarus for its comprehensive presentation. It welcomed the positive engagement of Belarus with the UPR and appreciated the acceptance of most of the recommendations, including the 2 from the Sudan.

318. The Syrian Arab Republic appreciated the constructive engagement of Belarus in the UPR and the acceptance of a large number of recommendations. It was confident that this would contribute to national efforts to improve the situation of human rights, especially through the judicial reform process. In particular, it wished Belarus success in implementing the National Strategy on Sustainable Economic Growth to 2020.

319. Tajikistan congratulated Belarus for the information provided and noted that this was strong evidence of the systematic work of Belarus in the sphere of human rights and the strengthening of its cooperation with international mechanisms and civil society. It also greeted the significant achievements of Belarus in education, social protection, gender equality, child protection and improvements to its legislation.

320. Turkmenistan thanked Belarus for the updated information provided and commended its engagement with the human rights mechanisms. It appreciated the acceptance of the vast majority of the recommendations and including those of Turkmenistan and valued the progress of Belarus in the advancement of human rights protection and promotion, particularly in combatting human trafficking and protecting the rights of children and women.

321. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland thanked Belarus for its commitment to the UPR. It stated that it would welcome more engagement by Belarus with all of the UN human rights instruments, including the special procedures. It welcomed the recent release of political prisoners and hoped that there would be further positive measures in the future. It encouraged Belarus to take forward its recommendation on the establishment of a national human rights institution and was disappointed that its recommendation on a moratorium on the death penalty was not accepted.

322. Uzbekistan thanked Belarus for the extensive information provided on its UPR and noted with satisfaction the serious approach of Belarus to the process. It was glad to see the acceptance of the majority of recommendations including its own. It considered that the

effective realization of the recommendations would further strengthen the protection of human rights in Belarus.

323. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the full and open cooperation of Belarus with the UPR, which demonstrated its strong commitment to the protection and promotion of human rights, and the detailed answers which Belarus had provided. It recognized the huge achievements of Belarus during the UPR cycle, especially in the fields of economic, social and cultural rights, and considered that this was in spite of the blockade and illegal sanctions imposed upon it by certain powers.

324. Zimbabwe commended Belarus for its acceptance of most of the recommendations arising from the second UPR. It noted the evident open and constructive engagement of Belarus with all stakeholders during and after the UPR which was proof of the country's commitment to the protection and promotion of human rights and the fulfilment of its international obligations.

325. Azerbaijan commended the constructive approach of Belarus to the UPR process and its continuing efforts in the promotion and protection of human rights. It was pleased that its recommendation on continuing active cooperation with the human rights mechanisms enjoyed the full support of Belarus and was convinced that the second UPR of Belarus would bring further positive changes.

326. Bahrain thanked Belarus for its report detailing the progress made and hailed its positive interaction with the Human Rights Council and noted the advancement of Belarus by 15 places in the Human Development Index. Bahrain appreciated the serious approach of Belarus to human rights which was reflected in the acceptance of the majority of the recommendations, including the 3 from Bahrain.

327. Belgium emphasized the need for the abolition of the death penalty and was pleased to see that Belarus had accepted the recommendation to undertake the necessary steps to hold a discussion on this topic within the relevant Parliamentary working group and apply certain minimum standards while awaiting a moratorium. It regretted that Belarus had not accepted its recommendation on better cooperation with the UN mechanisms, especially the special procedures and the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus in particular.

328. China commended Belarus for its active cooperation with the human rights mechanisms and constructive participation in the UPR. It appreciated the acceptance of numerous recommendations, especially its own on continuing to eradicate poverty, raising the living standards in rural areas, and improving social security for women, the elderly, children and persons with disabilities. Belarus' progress in promoting the right to development as a basic human right needed to be acknowledged.

329. Cuba thanked Belarus for the information provided and highlighted the large number of recommendations which had been accepted. This demonstrated the commitment of Belarus to the UPR, which Cuba considered to be a process which analysed the situation of human rights in all countries without politicization or confrontation. It thanked Belarus for the acceptance of its 3 recommendations.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

330. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Belarus, 7 other stakeholders made statements.

331. United Nations Watch was deeply concerned about the situation of human rights in Belarus. It welcomed the release of 6 political prisoners in August, including a presidential candidate, but noted the timing of the pardons at one day after the deadline for submission candidacy applications for the presidential elections. It regretted the rejection of the UPR

recommendations for the immediate release of all political prisoners. Noting the prosecution of journalists, it highlighted the rejected recommendation calling for the removal of all obstacles to the freedom of the press and an end the harassment of journalists. It deplored the continued use of torture in Belarus and noted the continued calls for the ratification of OP-CAT by Belarus. It urged Belarus to allow the Special Rapporteur on Belarus to visit the country.

332. International Federation for Human Rights Leagues called on Belarus to invite the Special Rapporteur on Belarus to visit the country and to institute a moratorium on the death penalty. It deplored Belarus' non-acceptance of recommendations which were based on its international obligations, including on the protection of human rights defenders and journalists and upholding the freedoms of peaceful assembly and association. While relieved by the recent release of certain prisoners, it noted the years of sanctions they had been subject to and that they continued to be deprived of numerous civil and political rights and called for the restoration of rights of all former political prisoners. It urged the international community to measure progress in implementing reforms according to precise criteria.

333. Human Rights House Foundation regretted that the UPR was the only mechanism recognized by Belarus and that it lacked cooperation with the other mechanisms and was the only European country that was not a member of the Council of Europe. It further regretted that Belarus had not cooperated with non-registered NGOs in the country in relation to the UPR. It outlined some of the recommendations which were not supported and noted that Belarus had affirmed that it had implemented 6 recommendations, including one on ensuring that the judiciary is independent of other branches of the government. It asked how this recommendation had been implemented stating that the lack of independence of the judiciary was patent. It welcomed the release of political prisoners in August but noted that none had been rehabilitated in relation to their civil and political rights. It noted increased cooperation with international election monitoring mechanisms ahead of the presidential elections, but that human rights violations continued.

334. While aware that there were many other pressing human rights concerns in Belarus, International Fellowship of Reconciliation was disappointed that Belarus had not received any recommendations relating to conscience objection to military service. It noted that a new law on the issue was to come into force in July 2016, but that it did not meet international standards as only those whose objections were based on religious convictions would be eligible for alternative service and the process for assessing these convictions was ambiguous and might limit the provision to members of certain religious communities. It called on Belarus to reconsider this legislation.

335. Action Canada for Population and Development noted the acceptance of recommendations relating to prosecuting acts of violence against women and ensuring women's access to reproductive health services. It called on Belarus to eliminate restrictions on access to oral contraception and voluntary sterilization, expand access to free abortion and contraception, including adolescents, and work to remove restrictions which limited adolescents' ability to make free and informed decisions on their sexual and reproductive health. It remained deeply concerned that Belarus did not accept recommendations to ensure that non-discrimination principles with respect to gender include LGBTI persons and to adopt specific anti-discrimination legislation for this group. It was also concerned that Belarus refused to abolish article 193-1 of the Criminal Code which criminalizes activities of non-registered NGOs.

336. Amnesty International regretted that Belarus rejected recommendations to establish a moratorium on the use of the death penalty and end the secrecy surrounding executions. It also regretted that Belarus resumed executions in 2014 and stated that death sentences were often imposed after unfair trials. It welcomed the release of 2 prisoners of conscience in

August 2015, but was concerned that people were routinely deprived of their rights to freedom of expression, association and assembly and that civil society organizations were forced to close due to bureaucratic hurdles. It regretted that Belarus had rejected recommendations to amend its legislation to guarantee the right to freedom of assembly. It was deeply disappointed that Belarus rejected recommendations to allow the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus to visit the country.

337. CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation welcomed the cooperation of Belarus with the UPR process. It stated that its partners on the ground observed that the human rights situation in Belarus had further deteriorated in comparison with 2011 as a result of repressive practices such as arbitrary detention, enforced disappearance, abductions and continued harassment of human rights defenders. It welcomed the release of 6 political prisoners in August 2015, but noted that this was one day after the deadline for registration for candidates' participation in the October presidential elections. It asked whether Belarus would implement all the recommendations which had been partially accepted concerning freedom of expression, assembly and association, the registration of NGOs and amending electoral laws. It asked Belarus to allow independent civil society monitors to monitor the October election.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

338. The President stated that based on the information provided, out of 259 recommendations received, 152 enjoy the support of Belarus, additional clarification was provided on another 6 recommendations, indicating which part was supported and which part was noted, and 101 are noted.

339. The delegation of Belarus thanked all the delegations and representatives of civil society who had participated in the dialogue, especially those which had given a positive assessment of the progress which Belarus had made during the first UPR cycle. It had also carefully listened to and taken note of all of the points of criticism. Belarus remained committed to the UPR mechanism and to cooperation with civil society, as had been demonstrated in the preparation of the national report. It would cooperate actively with all interested countries in the implementation of all its UPR recommendations.

United States of America

340. The review of the United States of America was held on 11 May 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 United States of America in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/USA/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/USA/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/USA/3).

341. At its 22nd meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the United States of America (see section C below).

342. The outcome of the review of the United States of America comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/12), the views of the United States of America 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/30/12/Add.1 and A/HRC/30/12/Add.1/Corr.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

343. Ambassador Harper reiterated the importance of the UPR mechanism, particularly its universality.

344. He noted that the UPR has been a process of self-reflection and improvement for the United States, and underscored the importance of the nation's vibrant civil society and federal structure.

345. He expressed appreciation for civil society's efforts to ensure their government lives up to its values, noting that their contributions to the UPR process are invaluable. He reiterated that a robust and open civil society space is one of the key ingredients for a successful democracy.

346. He also noted that the United States of America's federal system enhances protections for human rights, and that state, local, and tribal officials are often best positioned to solve problems.

347. Different levels of government in this federal system were described as laboratories of democracy, because they may develop and test different and creative solutions. Where their solutions work well, these best practices may be shared and emulated elsewhere.

348. As one example, in Brooklyn, New York, the district attorney revamped the Conviction Review Unit and tasked it to review wrongful conviction claims and questionable convictions.

349. As another example, the Race to the Top program asks state, local, and tribal school districts to submit their best and most innovative education reform ideas for federal funding, many of which are aimed to better support low-income and minority students, students with disabilities, and English learners. Race to the Top grantees now serve 22 million students and 1.5 million teachers in more than 40,000 schools.

350. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Scott Busby stated that the U.S. government carefully reviewed its 343 recommendations and supported in whole or in part 260 recommendations. He noted that responses to each and brief explanations for many are included in the U.S. written submission.

351. The United States of America supported many recommendations on civil rights, including those on continuing work toward elimination of racial discrimination and excessive use of force by law enforcement.

352. For example, in May 2015, the Justice Department announced a landmark agreement to address findings that the Cleveland Division of Police engaged in a pattern or practice of using excessive force.

353. That agreement requires the City of Cleveland to implement widespread reforms within its police department focused on building community trust, creating a culture of community and problem-oriented policing, officer safety and training, and officer accountability.

354. The United States supported recommendations to improve conditions in prisons and places of detention.

355. For example, in May 2015, the Justice Department announced a settlement to protect prisoners in an Alabama women's prison from harm caused by sexual victimization by correctional officers.

356. The Department anticipates working cooperatively with additional states, as it has with Alabama, to ensure that prisoners are not sexually abused.
357. The United States of America did not support the majority of recommendations on capital punishment, noting that continuing differences in this area are a matter of policy, and not what the rules of international human rights law currently require.
358. The United States of America supported a number of recommendations to continue promoting and protecting the rights of indigenous persons and peoples.
359. For example, in August 2015, the Government of the United States of America announced that it had restored the Athabascan name of Denali to the highest mountain in North America. This designation recognizes its sacred status to generations of Alaska Natives.
360. The United States of America supported or supported in part a number of recommendations on surveillance.
361. The Freedom Act of 2015 was enacted in June, which prohibits bulk collection by the Government under Titles IV and V of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA). Instead, it permits the Government to obtain telephone metadata records without the Government holding the metadata in bulk.
362. With respect to transparency, the Act requires the Government to publicly release unclassified versions of opinions by the FISA Court or Court of Review that involve significant or novel interpretations of law. When that is not possible, the Act requires the Government to release unclassified summaries.
363. The United States of America supported or supported in part several recommendations to close the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay.
364. President Obama has made clear his desire to close the Guantánamo Bay detention facility and to continue working with Congress, the courts, and the international community to do so in a responsible manner that is consistent with our international obligations.
365. Until it is closed, the United States of America will continue to ensure that operations there are conducted in this manner.
366. The United States of America supported recommendations to combat discrimination in the workplace, and continues to make progress in this area.
367. For example, in September 2015, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission secured a \$17 million jury verdict on behalf of women who were subjected to sexual harassment while working at an agricultural packing house. This reflects the United States of America's commitment to ensuring that members of all immigrant and vulnerable populations are protected by federal employment anti-discrimination laws.
368. Additionally, in June, the Departments of Justice, Homeland Security, and Labour announced the second phase of their Anti-Trafficking Coordination Team Initiative.
369. In districts where the first phase of this Initiative were implemented, there was a 119% increase in federal cases filed on forced labour, international sex trafficking and adult sex trafficking, a 114% increase in defendants charged, and an 86% increase in defendants convicted.
370. Finally, the United States of America supported recommendations to ratify CEDAW, CRPD, and ILO Convention #111.
371. It also supported recommendations to ratify the CRC, as the United States of America agrees with its goals and intends to review how it could move towards ratification.

372. Under the Constitution of the United States of America, treaty ratification requires approval not only by the Executive Branch, but also a two-thirds supermajority of the Senate. Despite this challenge, the Administration has pushed for positive Senate action on these treaties, and will continue to do so.

373. The United States of America is strengthening its interagency Working Group mechanism to work toward implementation of supported recommendations.

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

374. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the United States of America, 17 delegations made statements. The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.³¹

375. Greece noted that the United States of America national report submitted before the second review touched upon all recommendations of the first cycle and contained references to concrete examples on their implementation. Greece was pleased to hear that the United States of America accepted a large part of the recommendations made during the May 2015 review, and ultimately hoped that the repealing of capital punishment by three states since the last UPR will lead to a moratorium throughout the country.

376. Honduras welcomed the measures taken by the United States of America for the implementation of the recommendations, especially those on racial discrimination and violence. Honduras asked the United States of America for strengthening measures related to the protection of unaccompanied migrant children, especially girls, in compliance with the principle of the child best interest.

377. India was reassured by the United States of America response to its question on the disproportionate use of force that great care is taken to ensure that the use of force, including targeted strikes, conforms to all applicable domestic and international law. India appreciated the United States of America's acceptance of India's recommendations on CEDAW and CESCRC ratification. India recommended the adoption of the UPR WG report on the United States of America.

378. The Islamic Republic of Iran noted that 4 of its 5 recommendations were completely or partially accepted by the United States of America. The Islamic Republic of Iran urged the United States of America to increase efforts in addressing discrimination against minorities, migrants, racial discrimination including racial profiling, use of excessive force, ill-treatment and torture in detention centres.

379. Iraq commended the United States of America for the protection of civil rights and the fight against racial discrimination. Iraq also applauded the cooperation with human rights mechanisms and human rights awareness trainings for law enforcement officials and their relations with civil society.

380. Ireland welcomed the United States of America's commitment to eliminating racial discrimination and addressing the use of excessive force in policing. Ireland regretted that the United States of America had not accepted Ireland's recommendation to impose a moratorium on executions in advance of abolishing the death penalty. While noting the decline in its use, Ireland continued to be concerned about the manner in which the death penalty is implemented. Ireland also regretted that the Supreme Court had recently upheld the use of the lethal injection.

³¹<https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/30thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

381. Israel stated that the United States of America has contributed to the promotion of human rights across the globe. Israel supported the adoption of the UPR WG report on the United States of America.

382. Latvia noted that the majority of its recommendations relating to CEDAW ratification and cooperation with special procedures have been supported by the United States of America. Issuing a standing invitation to special procedures should remain the ultimate goal. Latvia supported the adoption of the UPR WG report on the United States of America.

383. Libya welcomed the United States of America's acceptance of the majority of the recommendations and their tireless efforts to fight against the use of excessive force by law enforcement officials. Libya recommended the adoption of the UPR WG report on the United States of America.

384. The Philippines encouraged the United States of America to continue introducing measures aimed at aligning its domestic legislation with international standards and further improving normative that offers better protection to women, children and migrants. The Philippines commended the United States of America for giving priority to the fight against sex trafficking of minors through, inter alia, the reinforcement of international cooperation, and appreciated initiatives to counter intolerance, violence and discrimination against members of all minority groups. The Philippines supported the adoption of the UPR WG report on the United States of America.

385. Romania expressed appreciation for the consideration given by the United States of America to the recommendations it made.

386. The Russian Federation hoped that the United States of America will take UPR recommendations seriously and that will work to implement them. The Russian Federation was particularly disappointed by violations of international humanitarian law, extrajudicial executions and intimidation of journalists and media which clearly amounts to a violation of the right to freedom of expression. The Russian Federation ultimately hoped that the United States of America will accept fair criticism and will work to improve the human rights situation in the country.

387. Rwanda welcomed the presentation, made by the United States of America, on the latest update on new development in human rights since the review process in May 2015. Rwanda also welcomed the progress and the achievements accomplished so far and recommended the adoption of the UPR WG report on the United States of America.

388. Senegal welcomed the United States of America's engagement in the implementation of UPR recommendations, particularly those on police violence against the black community, torture and discrimination. Senegal invited the United States of America to present a mid-term report on the status of the implementation of recommendations and recommended the adoption of the UPR WG report on the United States of America.

389. Sierra Leone was disappointed to note that many of recommendations made to the United States of America met with a lukewarm response. Its recommendation for a centralised human rights institution did not enjoy the support of the United States of America. Sierra Leone recommended the adoption of the UPR WG report on the United States of America.

390. The Sudan encouraged the United States of America to promote and protect human rights, particularly those of disable persons, to combat against racial discrimination and to ratify core international human rights instruments.

391. Togo noted with satisfaction the measures taken by the United States of America for the implementation of the recommendations of the first UPR cycle and welcomed

acceptance of the majority of the recommendations the United States of America received in the second cycle. Togo supported the adoption of the UPR WG report on the United States of America.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

392. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the United States of America, 10 other stakeholders made statements. The statements of the stakeholders that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.³²

393. International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA) welcomed the United States of America positive response to recommendations concerning the fight against discrimination based on sexual orientation of gender identity. LGTB persons still lack legal protection and ILGA urged the US Government to enact federal laws which would guarantee non-discrimination in many areas of the civil and social life. Violence against transgender women constitutes a national crisis: in the first nine months of 2015, at least 90 transgender persons have been killed.

394. American Civil Liberties Union stated that the UPR WG report provides concrete recommendations on how the US might rectify their human rights situation. However, the United States of America past record on implementing UPR recommendations has been disappointing and the Government engagement has not translated into any meaningful changes in domestic policies especially those that are out of step with international human rights standards.

395. Human Rights Watch regretted that the United States of America appear to use the UPR process more as a way to highlight their current policies than to commit to improving their human rights record. Human Rights Watch urged the United States of America to specify how they plan to implement recommendations they supported on looking into racial disparities in the application of the death penalty and on investigations on allegations of torture by an independent body.

396. Indian Council of South America (CISA) was disappointed to note that recommendation 176.325 concerning suggestions by special procedures on the cases of Alaska, Hawaii and Dakota was noted. Indian Council of South America stated that those cases should be addressed through the United Nations decolonization process as the right to self-determination of indigenous people continues to be denied.

397. Action Canada for Population and Development regretted the lack of support from the United States of America for recommendations calling for CESCRC ratification and assistance to provide safe abortion services in situation of conflict. It welcomed support for recommendations pertaining to ending gender based violence, discrimination based on sexual orientation, trafficking and sexual exploitation of children.

398. US Human Rights Network Inc. was deeply disappointed at the United States of America's response to the 343 recommendations they received at their second UPR. It was also disappointed at the fact that recommendations calling for the abolition of death penalty were noted. Moreover, the United States of America seemed to stick to the concept that economic, social and cultural rights will be realized progressively while poverty is steadily advancing throughout the country.

399. Amnesty International stated that the United States of America's response to scrutiny of its human rights record under the UPR would appear positive through the

³²<https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/30thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

support, or partial support, to approximately three quarters of the 343 recommendations received. However, the United States of America has a poor record in implementing international recommendations even when it appears to support them, whether in the UPR or from Treaty Bodies or Special Procedures. Amnesty International urged the United States of America to embark upon a programme of ratification and withdrawal of reservations.

400. International Human Rights Association of American Minorities (IHRAAM) stated that recommendation 176.325 – noted by the United States of America - suggests that the United Nations decolonization process ought to be available to Alaska, Hawaii and Dakota. International Human Rights Association of American Minorities called on the Human Rights Council to reinstate the topic of self-determination in its agenda.

401. World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace stated that the United States of America should meaningfully engaged with the civil society in a pattern of participation, aiming at the implementation of the recommendations received in the second UPR cycle. The United States of America should create a national human rights institution based on the Paris Principles. One of the first tasks of such an institution should be the shaping of a plan of action on racial justice and the organization of a conference on human rights education.

402. Indigenous World Association was concerned at the lack of effective protection for indigenous peoples' sacred places. The United States of America continue to insist that the United Nations Declaration on Indigenous Peoples is a not-binding instrument and existing laws on the protection of sacred places are simply not implemented. Mining activities are preferred to cultural practices despite numerous recommendations made by United Nations mechanisms on this matter.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

403. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 343 received recommendations, 150 are supported, and 83 are noted. The remaining 110 recommendations have elements which have been supported, with others noted, for which the State provided explanations, and on which they will provide further clarifications.

404. The United States of America noted that it could not respond to all issues raised by member states and civil society during the session, but reaffirmed that it must rededicate itself to ensuring that its civil rights laws live up to their promise, especially in the realm of police practices.

405. Mr. Busby noted that the vast majority of police officers and police departments work tirelessly to protect the civil and constitutional rights of those they serve. But, when federal, state, local, or tribal officials will fully use excessive force that violates the American Constitution or federal law, the United States of America has authority to prosecute them.

406. He noted that in the last six years, the Departments of Justice, Homeland Security, and Labour has brought criminal charges against more than 400 law enforcement officials.

Malawi

407. The review of Malawi was held on 5 May 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 Malawi in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/MWI/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/MWI/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/MWI/3).

408. At its 22nd meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Malawi (see section C below).

409. The outcome of the review of Malawi comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/5), the views of Malawi 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/30/5/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

410. The delegation recalled that Malawi received 199 recommendations during its universal periodic review in May 2015. At that stage, Malawi had expressed its support for 145 recommendations, 13 of which had been considered to be have been already implemented. Responses to a further 13 recommendations had been left pending.

411. The delegation reported that of the 13 pending recommendations, nine have since been accepted and the remaining four have been rejected. Malawi has thus accepted a total of 154 of the 199 recommendations that had been received.

412. The delegation stated that when deciding on which of the recommendations to support, the Government and the people of Malawi had been guided by the country's constitutional values and ideals, national priorities as reflected in the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy II and various sectorial policies. The supported recommendations therefore speak to the aspirations of the people of Malawi. Malawi was mindful that this review and the interactive dialogue will continue with the submission of its midterm report in 2017, as well as with its report in the third cycle in 2019.

413. The delegation stated that Malawi was keen to ensure that the supported recommendations are implemented. Since the review in May, Malawi has taken the following steps towards implementation of the recommendations: Firstly, the National Task Force on UPR was constituted in July to start the process of disseminating the recommendations; Secondly, the recommendations were being used as key benchmarks for the development of the National Human Rights Action Plan 2016-2020, a process led by the Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs and the Human Rights Commission; and Thirdly, a National Stakeholders' meeting is planned to take place in October 2015 to discuss the way forward and to determine how to prioritize the implementation process. The plan was to link implementation of the recommendations to the National Human Rights Action Plan.

414. The delegation thanked the members of the Troika and all Member and Observer States that had participated in the interactive dialogue during the review. It also expressed its appreciation for the role played by all key stakeholders in Malawi, including the Government Ministries, Departments, Constitutional Bodies and civil society.

415. On behalf of the Government of Malawi, the delegation affirmed its strongest commitment to the cause of human rights at home and abroad.

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

416. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Malawi, 17 delegations made statements. Where delegations were unable to deliver their statement due to time constraints, those written statements, if available, are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council.³³

417. Ethiopia commended Malawi for its constructive advances in the implementation of the recommendations from the first review. It thanked Malawi for accepting the recommendations it had made in the second review on promotion of human rights education for law enforcement organs and on efforts to achieve the remaining millennium development goals. It noted with satisfaction the efforts made in designing the medium term plan aimed at poverty reduction and reducing child mortality.

418. Gabon noted the commitment by Malawi to follow up on the recommendations received at the review in May 2015. It was pleased to note the significant efforts undertaken to promote and protect human rights and took particular note of the efforts undertaken in relation to vulnerable people, such as women, children, persons with disabilities and detainees. Gabon encouraged Malawi to continue its efforts in implementing the UPR recommendations.

419. Ghana noted that Malawi had expressed support for the recommendations on the submission of overdue reports to treaty bodies and on the issuing of standing invitations to all special procedures. Ghana hoped that Malawi would provide favourable responses to the recommendations it had made on the ratification of ICRMW and on the decriminalization of defamation.

420. Ireland noted the progress made in the tripartite elections in 2014 and the current work by the national task force on electoral reforms to improve the coherence, integrity and adequacy of the electoral and legal framework. Ireland stated that it trusts that the current review of legislation dealing with violence against women will address many of the concerns raised during the interactive dialogue. It was pleased to note that both of the recommendations submitted by Ireland enjoyed the support of Malawi. It looked forward to the Prisons' Bill, 2003, being submitted to Parliament at the earliest opportunity. It welcomed increased decentralization of the hearing of homicide cases and called for a time-bound action plan to deal with prison overcrowding. It expressed appreciation for the commitment to establish a legal framework on the right to food, building on the draft food and nutrition bill, and the proposal to integrate the food security bill and the nutrition security bill.

421. Lesotho noted with appreciation the steps taken by Malawi to clear its backlog of state party reports. It congratulated Malawi for taking measures to address the HIV and AIDS pandemic. Lesotho stated that the adoption of the 2011 National HIV and AIDS Strategic Plan was a step in the right direction, and it encouraged Malawi to scale up the relevant programmes. It applauded Malawi for taking steps to curb infant mortality. Lesotho congratulated Malawi for enacting the 2013 Gender Equality Act and encouraged its effective dissemination.

422. Libya applauded the Government of Malawi for its demonstration of openness that had been shown when preparing its report. Malawi had accepted a large number of recommendations, which reflects the Government's positive interaction with the UPR mechanism.

³³<https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/30thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

423. Norway commended Malawi for the increasing involvement of the Director of Prosecutions in cases of human rights violations, for the establishment of the inter-ministerial task force and the increased use of the Penal Code for prosecuting cases of trafficking. It also commended Malawi for initiating work on a national human rights action plan. Norway hoped for continued progress on the issue of medical abortions in cases of sexual violence, and looked forward to continued progress on follow-up to the recommendations and the UPR process.

424. Rwanda welcomed Malawi's acceptance of recommendations relating to the revision of the Constitution of the Republic of Malawi and the harmonization of laws in line with international obligations in relation to the definition of the child. Rwanda expressed appreciation to Malawi for accepting the recommendation it had made on human rights education and free and compulsory primary education. It looked forward to hearing about progress in the implementation of accepted recommendations.

425. Sierra Leone noted that Malawi was striving to fulfil its human rights obligations both at the international and regional levels. It acknowledged that many recommendations, including those made by Sierra Leone, had enjoyed the support of Malawi. Sierra Leone applauded Malawi for instituting a moratorium on the death penalty and encouraged efforts to abolish the death penalty. It encouraged Malawi to implement its recommendations on equal and free access to primary education and on the criminalization of all forms of trafficking.

426. South Africa welcomed the positive developments in Malawi since the first review. It conveyed its congratulations to Malawi for a successful second review and for the acceptance of a large number of recommendations. South Africa welcomed the progress made in the area of economic, social and cultural rights and the realization of the millennium development goals, and commended Malawi for its leadership in combating HIV and AIDS. It encouraged Malawi to continue its efforts in combating challenges particularly in relation to extreme poverty, inequality and hunger.

427. The Sudan expressed appreciation for the efforts undertaken by Malawi in promoting and protecting human rights, particularly the legislative and policy developments. The Sudan thanked Malawi for accepting the three recommendations it had made.

428. Togo welcomed the measures to improve the living conditions of detainees and to improve the capacity of the security forces in the fight against torture. It thanked Malawi for having accepted the majority of the recommendations, including those recommendations made by Togo. It requested the international community to assist Malawi with the implementation of the recommendations.

429. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela expressed full appreciation to Malawi for its commitment to the UPR mechanism. It expressed satisfaction with the responses provided by Malawi. It noted progress made in the field of human rights, and also took note of the efforts of the Government of Malawi in this regard. Malawi has made progress in ratifying international human rights instruments. It hoped that Malawi will continue to strengthen its commitment to its people with a particular emphasis on the most vulnerable groups.

430. Angola congratulated Malawi for having accepted a large number of recommendations, including those made by Angola. It commended Malawi's commitment to strengthening cooperation with international and regional mechanisms for the promotion and protection of human rights. Angola encouraged Malawi to continue its efforts in the areas of education, health and agriculture. It welcomed the adoption of the law on persons with disabilities which makes provision for equal opportunities and special educational facilities.

431. Benin congratulated Malawi on its commitment to the Human Rights Council. It was pleased to note the efforts made by Malawi in the promotion and protection of human rights, which included the submission of reports on the implementation of CAT, as well as ICESCR. It welcomed the measures to protect the rights of detainees. Benin encouraged Malawi to continue its efforts in the promotion and protection of human rights.

432. Botswana noted with appreciation that Malawi had supported the majority of the recommendations. It commended Malawi for the adoption and implementation of legislation on trafficking in persons and on gender, amongst others. Also commendable were the judicial reforms and the training of the police on human rights violations. Botswana encouraged Malawi to finalize the review of the Prison's Act and to ensure its implementation.

433. China welcomed the constructive participation of Malawi in the UPR process, as well as the acceptance of a large number of recommendations. It appreciated Malawi's commitment to implement the accepted recommendations. China particularly welcomed the acceptance of the recommendations it had made. In the beginning of the year Malawi suffered serious floods which seriously affected cereal production, and the country must therefore be facing greater challenges on the economic, social and cultural fronts. China called upon the international community to strengthen its aid to Malawi.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

434. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Malawi, seven other stakeholders made statements.

435. Malawi Human Rights Commission noted the considerable progress made by the Government of Malawi in the promotion and protection of human rights, especially in the areas of gender and women's rights, children's rights, as well as in the areas of economic social and cultural rights, and civil and political rights. It commended the Government for the inclusive approach that it had taken, which enabled the participation of stakeholders in the UPR process. Malawi supported the majority of the recommendations it had received. The recommendations addressed key challenges in realization of human rights. The Malawi Human Rights Commission will continue to engage with the Government on those recommendations relating to the ratification of ICRMW and decriminalization of defamation, which Malawi had not supported. It expressed concern with the delays in implementation of pieces of legislation, such as the legislation on trafficking in persons and provision in the Education Act on compulsory education. It stated that it will continue to play a crucial role in follow-up to the implementation of recommendations.

436. International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission, also on behalf of International Lesbian and Gay Association, commended Malawi for the achievements in the areas of gender, women and children rights and welcomed the acceptance of two recommendations on sexual orientation and gender identity. However, 17 recommendations on sexual orientation had not enjoyed the support of Malawi. The sodomy laws which the Government had referred to the Law Commission for review on 7 December 2011 were yet to be reviewed. They called for the repealing of sections 137A, 153 AND 156 of the Penal Code and an amendment of the discriminatory sections in the marriage law. Between 2014-2015, serious cases of human rights abuses of the LGBTI community have been documented.

437. UPR Info stated that Malawi had received 199 recommendations that had been made with the intention of improving the human rights situation on the ground. However, the review will remain an empty shell unless all stakeholders effectively and genuinely follow up with concrete actions at national level. In June 2015, 50 non-governmental organisations had begun drafting an implementation plan to see how they could support the Government

in the challenging implementation process. The implementation of UPR recommendations is dependent on political will and in Malawi that political will does exist. In October, a dialogue between the Government and civil society organisations is scheduled to take place. This will have to be followed up with many other meeting to take the UPR to its full potential.

438. Action Canada for Population and Development noted that Malawi had accepted recommendations pertaining to gender-based violence, early and forced marriages, gender equality, the protection of LGBTI persons from violence, maternal mortality, reproductive health services for adolescence and HIV. They called on the Government to consult with organisations working on those issues, when implementing the recommendations. They also recommended putting in place an effective mechanism to ensure the delivery of public health services in a confidential, respectful and non-judgemental manner, revisiting the delivery mode of the Prevention of Mother to Child Transmission of HIV programme to remove any access barriers; and ensure the availability of referral health facilities close to police stations. They encouraged the speedy implementation of the three recommendations pertaining to reviewing the legislation on abortion. They expressed disappointment that Malawi had not accepted recommendations pertaining to the criminalization of spousal rape and FGM, decriminalizing adult consensual sexual activity, and eliminating legal and social discrimination based on sexual and gender identity, and urged Malawi to reconsider its decision.

439. Amnesty International welcomed Malawi's acceptance of the recommendation to take measures to protect LGBTI persons from violence and to prosecute perpetrators. Malawi has also agreed to guarantee effective access to health services for LGBTI persons. It noted the Malawi's rejection of recommendations to repeal provisions in the Penal Code criminalizing consensual same-sex sexual activities between adults and LGBTI persons engaging in such conduct continue to face prosecution. It noted that Malawi rejected recommendations on the abolition of the death penalty and strongly encouraged the Government to keep these recommendations under consideration. It stated that Malawi must act immediately to reduce pre-trial detention, to guarantee fair trials and to ensure access to adequate food for prisoners. It expressed concern about the practice of imprisoning failed asylum seekers and suspected illegal immigrants.

440. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme commended Malawi on its success in its democratic transition through free and transparent elections. It appreciated the efforts made in economic and social spheres, as well as the adoption of the second growth and development strategy. However, in spite of the adoption of the 2015 law on marriage, divorce and family relations, gender inequality continued within society. It stated that the courts continued to sentence persons to death. It encouraged Malawi to draw up a code of conduct aimed at the security and police forces to ensure appropriate use of firearms. It urged Malawi to take appropriate measure to effectively apply the law on trafficking in persons and to better protect albinos in society.

441. Centre pour les droits civils et politiques commended Malawi for demonstrating its commitment to human rights by appearing before the Human Rights Council and for its acceptance of 154 recommendations. It also commended Malawi for being progressive and enacting good laws. The national human rights plan which is in the process of being drafted will go a long way in guiding Malawi in the implementation of the recommendations. It was unfortunate that Malawi rejected recommendations on the death penalty and sexual minorities. Malawi should also address other outstanding issues such as poor conditions in prisons, corruption, and access to information.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

442. The President stated that based on the information provided of the 199 recommendations that had been received, 154 recommendations enjoyed the support of Malawi and 45 recommendations were noted.

443. The delegation thanked the Member and observer States and other stakeholders for their active engagement. It expressed its gratitude to those States that have commended Malawi for its efforts and have taken note of the significant steps taken by Malawi in the promotion and protection of human rights. The delegation has also taken note of the criticisms, where it has been perceived that Malawi had not done well. The challenge that Malawi faced was that where it has been alleged that violation have taken place, that information has not been brought to the relevant authorities, such as the National Human Right Commission. In this context, the delegation urged those who have relevant documentation or reports to bring them to the attention of the authorities.

444. The delegation reiterated Malawi's commitment and willingness to continue its engagement and collaboration with the Human Rights Council and other United Nations bodies, in ensuring that Malawi fulfils its obligations.

Mongolia

445. The review of Mongolia was held on 5 May 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 Mongolia in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/MNG/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/MNG/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/MNG/3).

446. At the 24th meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Mongolia (see section C below).

447. The outcome of the review of Mongolia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/6), the views of Mongolia 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/30/6/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

448. Mongolia stated that as follow-up to the second review, the Government had carefully considered all 164 recommendations jointly with national NGOs and other relevant stakeholders. As a result, Mongolia supports 150 recommendations and notes 14 recommendations.

449. Mongolia informed the Human Rights Council that in July 2015, Mongolia had ratified the Convention on Safety and Health in Mine of the International Labor Organization and the Marrakesh Treaty to Facilitate Access to Published Works for Persons Who are Blind, Visually Impaired or Otherwise Print Disabled.

450. Mongolia also noted that the Parliament would hold a debate on the issue of decriminalization of defamation acts when the Parliament conducts its secondary review of the draft of the revised Criminal Code at the upcoming fall session. Once the revised Criminal Code is enacted, the death penalty will be abolished legally.

451. Mongolia further noted that the National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia successfully hosted the 20th Annual General Meeting of the Asia Pacific Forum of the National Human Rights Institutions and the 3rd Biennial Conference focusing on prevention of torture and protection of the rights and dignity of people held in places of detention.

452. With respect to the recommendation to “*Lift the declaration of recognizing Article 14 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination,*” Mongolia provided the following detailed explanation: Mongolia fully supports the work of the Human rights treaty bodies. The Government will consider the issue of recognizing the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination under Article 14 of the Convention as well as the competence of the Committee against Torture under Articles 21 and 22 of the Convention against Torture.

453. With regard to the recommendations to “*Consider recognizing the competence of the Committee against Torture and make declarations under articles 21 and 22 of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment,*” Mongolia noted that it had ratified the OP-CAT in 2014, and would assign the National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia with the function of the national preventive mechanism by revising the Law on National Human Rights Commission. Mongolia would prioritize the successful implementation of the OP-CAT. Mongolia would also commence the cooperation with the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture while continuing to take effective measures to address the issues related to torture raised in other recommendations made during the second review.

454. Regarding the recommendations to “*Consider ratifying the International Convention for the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families,*” Mongolia stated that it was a state party to all core international human rights treaties except for the ICRMW. Mongolia further noted that research and surveys to study the possibility of acceding to the Convention were being undertaken by relevant authorities and agencies. Before considering the possibility of becoming a state party, the Government wishes to see more countries, especially the recipients of foreign workers, including Mongolian citizens, to accede to the Convention.

455. Mongolia also stated that although a domestic work is non-traditional form of employment in Mongolia, the Government would study the possibility of ratifying the ILO 189 Domestic Workers Convention.

456. With respect to the recommendations to “*consider acceding to the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol and enact legislation to protect asylum-seekers and refugees regardless of country of origin,*” Mongolia clarified that the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol had always been given careful consideration by the relevant authorities and agencies. Due to the strong relevance to the national security policy of the State, a decision to accede to these instruments would be ultimately a matter for the Parliament of Mongolia.

457. At the same time, the Government would further study the possibility of introducing a specific regulation to provide working guidelines for relevant authorities on the issue of promoting and protecting the rights of asylum-seekers, and continue to work together with UNHCR to ensure the rights of asylum-seekers, particularly in compliance with the principle of *non-refoulement*.

458. With respect to the recommendations to “*consider ratifying the Convention on Status of Stateless Persons and the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness*,” Mongolia stated that a stateless person enjoyed the same rights as foreign nationals. Nationality and citizenship of a child born from a stateless person was regulated by the Law on Citizenship and Nationality. The national security policy also required maintaining appropriate balance of foreign nationals, stateless persons and migrants in the country. These laws and policy documents ensure the rights of stateless persons in line with the main principles enshrined in the Convention on the Status of Stateless Person and the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.

459. Regarding the recommendation to “*establish judicial and other mechanisms to investigate allegations of torture, police brutality, and arbitrary detention*,” Mongolia is committed to strengthening its efforts to investigate all allegations of torture and police brutality. National legislation in force prohibits arbitrary detention of persons by law enforcement officials as any act of detention has to be approved by the judge.

460. Moreover, Mongolia informed the Human Rights Council that, in accordance with the previous practice, the Government would develop and adopt a plan on implementation of the accepted recommendations after holding an extensive consultation with relevant human rights NGOs, civil society organizations and other relevant stakeholders. In this regard, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in cooperation with the “UPR Info” and national human rights NGOs would organize a two-day consultative meeting for all relevant stakeholders in mid-October, 2015 in Ulaanbaatar.

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

461. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Mongolia, 14 delegations made statements.

462. India noted that 150 recommendations enjoyed the support of Mongolia. Further, India believed that Mongolia had gained much from participating in the UPR expressing the hope that Mongolia would continue its efforts to implement the supported recommendations in the coming years.

463. Kyrgyzstan appreciated Mongolia’s positive efforts and commitment to promote and protect human rights. It also noted Mongolia’s substantive efforts to promote the right to education, to implement judicial reform, and to strengthen institutional and legislative mechanisms. Kyrgyzstan also noted the progress made in accession to international instruments, strengthening of human rights institutions, and environmental protection.

464. The Lao People’s Democratic Republic appreciated that a large number of recommendations were supported by Mongolia, including the two recommendations proposed by the Lao People’s Democratic Republic to strengthen educational system, including ensuring equal access of children with disabilities to education, and to promote gender equality and involvement of women in public services. It also welcomed the achievements made in promoting gender equality, improving educational system, and addressing unemployment rate and domestic violence.

465. The Philippines was pleased with Mongolia’s support for the recommendation to step up efforts to curb domestic violence and to provide adequate human and financial resources to programmes to combat human trafficking. The Philippines however regretted that Mongolia noted the recommendations to consider ratifying the ICMRW reiterating the recommendation to Mongolia and to all other States to consider ratifying it.

466. Rwanda stated that the fact that Mongolia supported the recommendation regarding efforts to increase women’s representation in decision-making positions was a clear

indication of the commitment by the Government of Mongolia to further consolidating the enjoyment of human rights in the country.

467. Sierra Leone noted with appreciation that Mongolia supported a large number of recommendations, including most of those made by Sierra Leone, notably the ratification of several key international human rights instruments and the Government's commitment to implementing into national law the OP-CAT. It also commended Mongolia for the fact that prior to the 2010 moratorium, the President granted pardon to all those sentenced to death. It further encouraged Mongolia to make further efforts aimed at the full abolition of the death penalty in the country.

468. Tajikistan noted Mongolia's efforts to take targeted steps to improve state mechanisms and to build the capacity to promote and protect human rights, including by expanding its treaty obligations through accession to a number of treaties. Tajikistan welcomed measures to improve legislative basis in the fields of healthcare, gender equality, and increased efforts to combat human trafficking and the steps taken to address its consequences. Tajikistan also welcomed Mongolia's cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and civil society.

469. Turkmenistan welcomed the efforts made by the Government of Mongolia to strengthen its legislative, institutional and policy mechanisms for the promotion and protection of human rights. Turkmenistan also commended the establishment of the National Committee on Gender Equality led by the Prime Minister, whose functions include the implementation of the Law on Gender Equality in ministries, agencies and local government organizations.

470. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela noted that Mongolia had made notable progress in acceding to international human rights instruments and submitting outstanding reports to the treaty bodies. It was also pleased to note that Mongolia reduced poverty, including reduction in the number of people lacking food. It encouraged Mongolia to continue to take targeted social programme for its people, in particular for the most needed sector of society.

471. Algeria encouraged Mongolia to take continuing efforts to improve the rights of migrant workers, including the ratification of the ICMRW.

472. China welcomed Mongolia's commitment to implement the supported recommendations. China also appreciated Mongolia's support for the recommendation made by China, as well as its commitment to continue investing more in education, development of children, and combat against discrimination, violence, and hatred.

473. Djibouti encouraged Mongolia to continue its efforts to promote and protecting human rights, including by promoting gender equality and participation of women in public services. Djibouti welcomed the adoption of the Criminal Code which abolished the death penalty.

474. Estonia noted that Mongolia maintained a moratorium on the death penalty since 2010 and the revised draft Criminal Code excluded capital punishment. Estonia also noted that the death penalty had not yet been abolished *de jure* encouraging Mongolia to swiftly move from a moratorium to abolition. Estonia welcomed Mongolia's decision to join the Freedom Online Coalition while noting that there are still measures that need to be taken to ensure that journalists, media workers and civil society activists are able to practice their activities freely in accordance with international standards without any fear for punishment.

475. While noting that Mongolia supported the recommendation made by Ghana to rectify the shortcomings related to the definition of torture under the criminal procedure code in order to ensure that evidence obtained from torture is not admissible in any legal proceedings, Ghana asked for an update on the steps taken if any to enact the necessary

legislative amendment to bring the definition of torture in line with the CAT. Ghana welcomed Mongolia's joining the Group of Friends of the CAT initiative.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

476. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Mongolia, 6 other stakeholders made statements.

477. The National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia (NHRCM) (by video message) noted that the Government had made certain initiatives and efforts to implement the recommendations from the first cycle review however these actions had not been undertaken at the expected degree and had not achieved substantive outcomes. It appreciated the recommendations during the second cycle review on important human rights issues, including torture, human trafficking domestic violence, the right to a health and safe environment, promotion of gender equality, and prevention of discrimination against vulnerable groups. The NHRCM will cooperate with the Government, civil society and other stakeholders to implement the recommendations received during the second review and to improve the situation of human rights in the country.

478. UPR Info noted that in the wake of the UPR in May 2015, over 40 stakeholder organizations began drafting an implementation action plan in order to support the Government in the challenging implementation process. UPR Info highlighted that without the involvement of civil society, there would be no sustainable implementation. UPR Info welcomed the good example of the Government to consult civil society before the adoption of its UPR outcome. It also noted the political will by the Government to consult civil society. While noting the planned consultation meeting with the Government, civil society and the UNCT, UPR Info stated that this would benefit the UNCT's UNDAF drafting process.

479. Federatie van Nederlandse Vereniginge tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit - COC Nederland stated that as follow-up to the first cycle UPR recommendations, the Government has initiated and drafted amendments to the Criminal Code to criminalise hate crimes and hate speech. It also noted that the Mongolia still did not have a legal framework that protects everyone from any type of discrimination, especially on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity. It underscored that the above mentioned draft bill had not been passed by Parliament, which signifies that LGBTI people continue to suffer from various types of discrimination. It urged the Government to scale up its efforts to uphold the UDHR, the Constitution and to ensure equality before the law and non-discrimination for everyone. It noted the need for the Government to train public servants on the human rights of LGBTI persons, to reassess its human rights programmes and projects, and to include the LGBTI community in the processes of assessment, planning, implementation and evaluation.

480. Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development appreciated efforts by the Government to consult with civil society organisations on the translation of recommendations and on its decision to accept and implement the recommendations. It urged the Government to develop a concrete plan of action for implementation and provide adequate resources in the national budget for this purpose. While recognising the efforts made by the Government towards the promotion and protection of human rights, it expressed concern about recent back-tracking in protecting freedoms of expression, association and assembly and the weak adherence to non-discrimination. It also expressed concern about the absence of effective legislative protection for human rights defenders who face attacks, abuse, libel and slander, which is evidenced by the increasing cancellation of media operating permits when high-ranking public officials are criticised; the severe sentencing of individuals struggling for environmental preservation; and the restriction of the right to freedom of peaceful assembly of LGBTI people. It further

expressed concern on environmental degradation stressing the need to pay attention to irresponsible mining and the consequent displacement of herder communities who are forced to forego their nomadic culture, tradition and livelihood and join the urban poor.

481. Amnesty International noted that no executions had been carried out since 2009, and that in January 2010, the President announced a moratorium on executions and commuted the death sentences of those who had appealed for clemency. It expressed concern that the death penalty still remains in the Criminal Code even after Mongolia's accession in 2012 to the OP2-ICCPR. In this regard, it urged the Government to pass without delay the draft Criminal Code, currently pending before Parliament, which includes provisos for the abolition of the death penalty.

482. International Service for Human Rights urged Mongolia to fully implement the supported recommendations aimed at: preventing and responding to discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity; and establishing effective protection for and accountability for attacks against LGBTI individuals, including human rights defenders. It encouraged Mongolia to continue to improve the independence and effectiveness of the NHRCM, including provision of sufficient funds. It also called on the Government to implement the supported recommendation in the area of corporate accountability initiating a national action plan on business and human rights that will include significant input from civil society and human rights defenders. It also stated that actively participating in the voluntary principles and initiatives constituted an important step toward respect for human rights in the extractive sector and beyond. It also urged the Government to ensure that no regulatory measures are used to silence human rights defenders or independent civil society.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

483. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 164 recommendations received, 150 enjoy the support of Mongolia and 14 are noted.

484. Mongolia expressed thanks to Member and observer States of the Human Rights Council for their participation and constructive dialogue in reviewing its second national report. Mongolia also stated that recommendations, comments, questions would be valuable contribution to its endeavours in promoting and protecting human rights in the country.

485. Mongolia underscored the uniqueness and advantage of the universal periodic review that gives to all United Nations Member States an equal opportunity to introduce their human rights situation at the Human Rights Council, to share good practices, discuss ones' challenges in the implementation of human rights obligations.

486. Mongolia has been making continuous efforts to ensure effective protection and promotion of human rights at the national level. Mongolia acknowledged that there was still room for improvement: These included making domestic legislation compatible with international treaties, ensuring effective enforcement of the laws, building capacity and strengthening necessary human resources. In this connection, Mongolia expressed its keen interest to continue cooperating with OHCHR and other relevant UN bodies and receive necessary technical assistance.

487. In addition, Mongolia highlighted that it was running for the first time for the election of the Human Rights Council membership for the term of 2016-20 expressing genuine hope that Mongolia will enjoy full support of UN Member States for its candidacy to the Human Rights Council.

Panama

488. The review of Panama was held on 6 May 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 Panama in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/PAN/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/PAN/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/PAN/3).

489. At the 24th meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Panama (see section C below).

490. The outcome of the review of Panama comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/7), the views of Panama 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

491. The delegation reiterated the commitment of Panama with the protection of human rights. It added that the Government would continue to take actions to enhance their enjoyment at the national level and to promote them universally.

492. Panama welcomed the comments and recommendations of the delegations that participated in the interactive dialogue of its second UPR and recognized the contribution of civil society organizations in preparing the national report. Panama also acknowledged the work done by its troika composed by Germany, Ghana and the Russian Federation.

493. Since its first review in 2010, Panama had made significant progress in the implementation of accepted recommendations, in particular those relating to the administration of justice, the strengthening of the legal and institutional framework, the improvement of the cooperation with United Nations agencies and the ratification of international instruments.

494. The delegation noted that out of the 125 recommendations received during its second review, Panama accepted 90 percent of them, which had already been incorporated as national policies and were in the process of implementation.

495. In this context, Panama had amended the Family Code, to establish that the minimum age for marriage is 18 years, in compliance with the Convention of the Rights of the Child; ratified ILO Convention 189, on Domestic Workers; established a high-level inter-institutional commission to draft a comprehensive law for the protection of children, with the advice of United Nations agencies; developed legislation creating a national preventive mechanism against torture, which had been reviewed by the SPT; and established a working group to follow up compliance with Human Rights Conventions.

496. Likewise, Panama had accepted the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) and signed, in 2014, the Inter-American Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. As a result, the Government was drafting a law that consolidates the existing legal and administrative

regulations and establishes mechanisms to prevent racism and eliminate all discriminatory practices.

497. Regarding the rights of persons with disabilities, the Government and civil society were working together to review Act 42/1999 and adapt it to international standards. Also, a statistical service of persons with disabilities had been established, in order to generate plans, programs and projects that respond coherently to the needs of this segment of society, including persons with disabilities without birth registration.

498. The process of certification of disability begun in May 2015, and in August the Government signed an agreement of inter-institutional cooperation in the area of persons with disabilities with the Ecuadorian Government. In addition, by Cabinet Resolution 89/2015 the Government decided to submit to the National Assembly a bill adopting the Marrakech Treaty to Facilitate Access to Published Works for Persons Who Are Blind, Visually Impaired or Otherwise Print Disabled.

499. The Government was committed to address overcrowding in the prison system and promoted repatriations, commutations of sentence and probation. The Government was focusing, as well, on the social and legal needs of women prisoners. A bill to establish a penitentiary force was in the process of drafting and a new building to house the Academy for the Penitentiary Force would be inaugurated in 2016.

500. The elimination of child labour, trafficking, violence against women and femicide were considered priorities for Panama. In this context, the Government provided care for victims of such crimes, promoted the integration of the actions of the Judiciary and the National Institute for Women, considered the establishment of a specialized body of the Police dedicated to the protection of women and strengthened the Department providing free Legal assistance within the Judiciary.

501. Regarding the situation of the youth, the Government conducted awareness raising and information activities for young persons in especially difficult circumstances, in order to mitigate their exposure to the problems facing them. In this context, more than 4000 young persons in conflict with the law were involved in a program called Safe Neighbourhoods. Through it, youngsters belonging to gangs were given the opportunity to better organize their lives and receive training for jobs created through public investment.

502. The Ministries of Education and Social Development as well as the Ombudsman were involved in school programs for children and adolescents, designed to prevent any form of violence and bullying. These programs were complemented with professional assistance for children and, particularly, pregnant teenagers in order to prevent discrimination or rejection and avoid school dropout.

503. The Government was strengthening intercultural bilingual education in indigenous regions and was taking the necessary administrative steps to pay the compensation established by the ruling of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of October 2014.

504. Despite serious budget constraints that would continue in 2016, the Government had pursued an ambitious program of access to drinking water in twelve regions, benefiting mostly the indigenous populations of the districts of Guna Yala, Ngobe Bugle and Embera.

505. Before concluding, the delegation stated that the Government was studying amendments to the procedure for determining the refugee status, with the participation of UNHCR and civil society organizations.

506. The delegation recalled the commitment of Panama to the protection of human rights at the national level and its promotion universally. In this spirit, Panama had presented its candidacy to the Human Rights Council for the period 2016-2018. Panama has

shared with member States its credentials and commitments through the General Assembly document A/70/71 of March 20, 2015.

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

507. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Panama, 11 delegations made statements.

508. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela recognized the importance granted by Panama to the implementation of the accepted UPR recommendations. It recalled that Panama had ratified important instruments such as the Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela noted the significant decline in women's unemployment in Panama, more than 10 per cent in less than a decade, and commended the Government for meeting the MDG on poverty reduction ahead of time. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela encouraged the Government to continue strengthening its social policies in favour of the neediest sectors of the population.

509. Algeria welcomed Panama's cooperation with the UPR and its acceptance of most of the recommendations made by States, including the two it made on legislative and policy measures to fight racial discrimination against people of African descent and universal access to education, particularly for people living in remote areas. Algeria encouraged Panama to continue its efforts in the promotion and protection of human rights.

510. Benin welcomed the efforts and achievements of Panama in connection with the implementation of the recommendations of its second review. Benin praised, in particular, the procedure used for determining the refugee status, the enactment of accountability measures, the establishment of mechanisms to promote and protect human rights and the adoption of the Act which sets the minimum age for marriage at 18 years.

511. China welcomed the constructive and active participation of Panama during the UPR. It thanked the delegation for presenting the Government's feedback on the recommendations it received during the review and acknowledged that Panama had accepted the recommendations China put forward concerning the protection of the rights of detainees and the protection of the right of education for all, including vulnerable groups. China congratulated Panama for implementing the Millennium Development Goals, in particular the one related to poverty alleviation. China supported the Panamanian efforts to promote sustainable economic and social development.

512. Cuba stressed that Panama accepted almost 90 percent of the recommendations received during its second UPR. Also, Cuba recognized that Panama accepted the two recommendations it put forward regarding the continuance of the prison reform and implementation of measures and strategies to alleviate the immediate needs of households in extreme poverty.

513. Ecuador welcomed the efforts of the Government to comply with the second cycle of the UPR, a human rights mechanism guided by the principles of equality, impartiality, universality, objectivity, non-selectivity, dialogue and cooperation between States. Ecuador praised that Panama presented its achievements and challenges to promote the participation of women and continue its efforts to combat illiteracy, particularly among indigenous women. Ecuador also noted the will of Panama to ratify ILO Convention 169 and the efforts to promote the rights of persons with disabilities.

514. El Salvador welcomed the collaboration of Panama with the UPR, which, it considered, was a valuable mechanism that ensured the promotion and protection of human

rights in a spirit of cooperation among States. El Salvador congratulated Panama for accepting most of the recommendations of its second UPR.

515. Ghana considered that the number of accepted recommendations attested the commitment of Panama with human rights. Ghana was honoured to be part of the troika of the second review of Panama. Ghana looked forward to the implementation of the recommendations it delivered to Panama related to the presentation of overdue reports to the treaty bodies and the enactment of legislation prohibiting discrimination, particularly on grounds of race and ethnicity. Ghana renewed its appeal to Panama to consider ratifying the Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. Ghana also encouraged the Government to take into account the issues raised by the Ombudsman's Office in addressing the remaining challenges facing Panama towards the fulfilment of its human rights obligations including improving the resources allocated to the human rights institutions.

516. Honduras welcomed the positive steps taken by the Government to implement the UPR recommendations, in particular those aimed at providing education in rural areas without discrimination, particularly to indigenous peoples and persons of African descent. Honduras encouraged Panama to continue to incorporate the rights of persons with disabilities and to ratify the Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

517. Rwanda welcomed Panama's commitment to ratify various human rights agreements and promote equal opportunities for women and their organizations. It commended Panama for the acceptance of the recommendation to establish a national policy which comprehensively protects and promotes the rights of children, especially with regard to the minimum age of marriage of boys and girls.

518. Sierra Leone noted the cooperative spirit of Panama demonstrated by its standing invitation to the special procedures, its renewed commitment to institution building and the implementation of public policies aimed at harmonising international norms into national legislation. Sierra Leone was pleased to note that three of the recommendations it put forward to Panama were accepted. Sierra Leone would look forward to learning more about the efforts which to be undertaken by the Government to incorporate them into national laws and policies. Sierra Leone encouraged Panama to consider ratifying in the near future the Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

519. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Panama, four other stakeholders made statements.

520. Defensoría del Pueblo de la República de Panamá regretted the budget cuts it suffered in 2015 and 2016 which endangered the continuity of the projects and programs it was implementing. In this regard, it recalled that recommendation 21 of the first UPR of Panama required the strengthening of the Ombudsman's Office through, among other, a budget increase. The Ombudsman's Office considered that the reduction in the budget was a direct attack against the institution and a violation of the law. Among the activities that were endangered it mentioned the project "Educate and Re-Educate on Human Rights"; the "Women Know Your Rights" project and the extension of the free legal aid office of the Faculty of Law of the University of Panama. Regarding the situation of prisons, the Ombudsman's Office noted the problems of overcrowding, lack of medical care, the classifications of inmates and poor quality of food remained unresolved. Thus, it considered that, to address these issues, the rehabilitation and re-socialization of inmates should become a priority. Finally, it recalled that the Ombudsman had reiterated to the authorities

that the ratification of ILO Convention 169 and the implementation of the preventive mechanism against torture were still pending.

521. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen to Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit-COC Nederland considered that the sex and gender diverse population continued at risk in Panama due to the absence of a legal framework that recognized the principle of equality and non-discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity. COC had received reports of illegal and arbitrary detentions of trans, gays and lesbians. The discrimination also extended to the provision of health care which had led to a growing population of men who have sex with men infected by HIV/AIDS. COC regretted that the National Assembly had dismissed twice a bill against discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity and considered, in this context, that the support of the United Nations was essential for the implementation of the recommendations requesting Panama to harmonize its policies in accordance with the Yogyakarta principles, defend the fundamental rights of LGBTI populations and respect international standards already agreed on this subject.

522. Franciscans International recalled that Panama had accepted recommendations on water, health, poverty and childhood and considered that State practice to permit and promote mining without protecting the environment and human rights constituted a serious obstacle to improvements in these areas. It mentioned, as an example, that a foreign company had ceased its operations in 2014 without closing the mine and without fulfilling its obligations to workers. Also, the operations of Panama mining company affected a large area in the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor, declared a natural reserve, with serious consequences for the forest and the persons living in that area. Franciscans International urged the Government to supervise the activities of mining companies, safeguard the environment and take the necessary measures to defend the rights to life and health. Franciscans International also mentioned the four recommendations received on trafficking and noted that labour exploitation, prostitution and mistreatment of undocumented persons had increased with the influx of migrants. Thus, it requested the Government to implement programs to prevent trafficking. Finally, Franciscans International urged the Government to ensure the rights of migrants and refugees and monitor the implementation of the two accepted recommendations in relation to migrant children.

523. Action Canada for Population and Development recalled that Panama had accepted five recommendations specifically calling for the adoption of anti-discrimination legislation based on sexual orientation and gender identity and the promotion of measures in favour of the rights of LGBTI people. However, it regretted that Panama had not supported a recommendation calling for the abolition of Articles 11 and 12 of Article 133 of an Executive Order establishing as serious offenses the conduct of police officers who practiced lesbianism and homosexuality, as expressed literally in the norm. It also regretted that issues raised during the interactive dialogue such as the implementation of programs to eliminate discrimination in the media, the adoption of a plan against discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity, the repeal of section 40 of the Act 7/2014 banning same-sex marriage, the enactment of legislation guaranteeing legal equality of same-sex couples and the legal recognition of the gender identity of transgender people had not been incorporated into the recommendations of the second review. Action Canada requested Panama to take into account these issues and recalled that the Government had an obligation to ensure the right of non-discrimination of all persons, including discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

524. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 125 recommendations received, 111 enjoy the support of Panama and 14 are noted.

525. Panama acknowledged the delegations that intervened during the adoption of its report. It took note of all comments and concerns raised in order to officially send them to the Government, in Panama City. The delegation recognized, in this regard, that some mining activities could constitute a remaining challenge vis-à-vis the protection of the environment and human rights. The delegation indicated that the Government was committed to address this issue.

Maldives

526. The review of Maldives was held on 6 May 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 Maldives in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/MDV/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/MDV/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/MDV/3).

527. At the 24th meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Maldives (see section C below).

528. The outcome of the review of Maldives comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/8), the views of Maldives 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/30/8/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

529. The delegation stated that the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review's consideration of Maldives in May 2015 had gained nationwide interest, renewing and strengthening the commitment of the Government to the process.

530. Maldives reported that after careful consideration it had accepted 198 recommendations out of 258 received and had rejected 60 recommendations.

531. Referring to some recent developments, Maldives indicated that the Bills on Health Services, Sports, National Integrity Commission and Disaster Management had been ratified. Maldives stated that the new Penal Code had come into effect on 16 July 2015, after a comprehensive roll-out and sensitization programme conducted to familiarize relevant stakeholders with the changes. Many amendments to legislation had also been ratified to comply with the 2008 Constitution and the new Penal Code.

532. Maldives highlighted other developments such as: the Government's commitment to provide 24-hours electricity to all inhabited islands before 2018; introduction of the concept of "Smart city"; efforts begun to develop a youth city, to cater for the nearly fifty percent of the population that were below the age of 25 years; and the introduction of the Islamic Financing loan programme to benefit small and medium enterprises.

533. Maldives referred to the President's appointment, with the approval of Parliament, of 3 new members of the Human Rights Commission, to replace members whose terms had been completed. Members had also been appointed to the Public Service Media Governing Board.

534. The delegation observed that of the 60 recommendations rejected by the Government, and thus taken note of, most of those had contradicted the Islamic faith and the Maldives Constitution. Maldives had rejected recommendations on matters relating to freedom of religion, lesbian, gay, bi-sexual and transgender and non-traditional forms of the family. Maldives indicated that non-Maldivians were allowed to practice their own faith in private. Explanations of the recommendations were contained in the addendum to the report.

535. Maldives reported that the Government had developed a comprehensive strategy for implementing the 198 accepted recommendations. Under the guidance of the President of the Maldives, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs would continue to be the principal agency coordinating the implementation of the recommendations and had already started consultations. Following informal meetings, the reconstituted Standing Committee of the UPR had held its first formal meeting on 20 August 2015. The new Standing Committee had 8 Governmental members and 4 members from civil society. Maldives had taken a results-based approach in implementing the recommendations by identifying measurable and verifiable benchmarks. Maldives reiterated that to promote human rights values the Government would continue its efforts to provide human rights education.

536. Maldives indicated that new legislation such as the Gender Equality Bill would be presented to the next session of Parliament. The adverse impacts of climate change were also viewed as posing new challenges and the country had not been immune to waves of drug abuse and radical extremism spreading across the globe.

537. Maldives stated that it had been very forthcoming about its limitations and had exercised maximum transparency in highlighting the challenges it encountered. Despite those challenges Maldives stated that it had achieved immeasurable progress in the last decade and that it was unfortunate that several forces both outside and inside were trying to reap the benefits of its political vulnerability. Maldives stated that change was sustainable only if it were locally owned, driven and shaped. According to the delegation, institutions needed to have the space and time to grow organically according to the specific needs of the people of the country.

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

538. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Maldives, 17 delegations made statements. The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.³⁴

539. Algeria congratulated Maldives on the progress it had made especially in accepting recommendations, including one of the two made by Algeria concerning ratification of the Convention against discrimination in education.

540. Azerbaijan valued Maldives constructive approach to the UPR process. Azerbaijan welcomed the acceptance by Maldives of a majority of recommendations made to it, including the one from Azerbaijan.

541. Bahrain thanked Maldives for its views and comments on the recommendations received which demonstrated Maldives deep commitment to working with human rights mechanisms. In that regard, Bahrain made specific reference to the acceptance of the recommendations it made to Maldives to guarantee education, including for children with disabilities. Bahrain referred to Maldives' willingness to pursue international cooperation

³⁴<https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/30thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

and a positive dialogue on human rights and of Maldives' commitments to implementing legislative and institutional reforms.

542. Belgium welcomed Maldives' acceptance of two of the recommendations it made on protecting the rights of the child and on gender equality. Belgium regretted Maldives' rejection of the recommendation to continue the moratorium on the death penalty with a view to abolishing it and to prohibit the application of the death penalty to persons under the age of 18 at the time of the offence, in compliance with Maldives' international obligations and commitments made during the first universal periodic review.

543. Benin commended the efforts and achievements of Maldives, including its ratification of the main ILO Conventions, visits of United Nations mandate holders, initiatives for migrant workers, progress in the areas of education, health, housing and the promotion and protection of the rights of women. Benin encouraged Maldives to continue to work for the Parliament's adoption of the draft law on gender equality.

544. Botswana welcomed the ratification of the Rome Statute and Palermo Protocol by the Maldives and its finalization of the National Action Plan to combat trafficking in persons. Botswana appreciated the continued cooperation of the Maldives with special procedures and other human rights mechanisms.

545. China welcomed the commitment of Maldives to implement the accepted UPR recommendations and thanked Maldives for accepting those made by China to accord attention to the human rights impact of climate change and drug crime. China understood the difficulties faced in such fields as human and financial resources and wished Maldives sustained political stability, social harmony and economic prosperity, and that the international community would provide technical assistance and support to capacity building urgently needed by the Maldives.

546. Côte d'Ivoire welcomed the attention paid by Maldives to the recommendations made during the review. Côte d'Ivoire called on Maldives to continue measures aiming at respecting and protecting civil and political rights, guaranteeing freedom of expression and promoting gender equality. Côte d'Ivoire also encouraged Maldives to build upon measures to combat religious discrimination and violence against vulnerable groups. It asked Maldives to continue cooperating with the international community.

547. Cuba appreciated the presentation of the position of Maldives on its postponed recommendations and for having accepted the two recommendations made by Cuba in relation to women's empowerment and the rights of persons with disabilities. Cuba reiterated its call to the international community, including United Nations mechanisms, to cooperate with the Government of Maldives to attain the objectives set.

548. Djibouti welcomed the remarkable progress made for the promotion and protection of human rights, particularly in the modernization of national legislation. Djibouti commended Maldives' efforts to promote the well-being of its citizens, especially the rights to health, education and housing.

549. Egypt remained supportive of the efforts of the Government of Maldives to overcome challenges and consolidate a sustainable home grown democracy. Egypt acknowledged the progress achieved by Maldives as it underwent significant political transition as well as chronic suffering from the adverse effects of climate change. Egypt encouraged the Government to maintain its resolve and to continue its constructive engagement with international human rights mechanisms. Egypt welcomed Maldives acceptance of more than 75 percent of recommendations received, especially the four from Egypt.

550. Ethiopia noted with satisfaction that Maldives implemented a significant number of recommendations and understood the challenges faced by the country since the first UPR

cycle. Ethiopia thanked Maldives for accepting its recommendation and appreciated the successful results registered in such areas as education, housing and sustainable development. Ethiopia recommended that Maldives continue facilitating favourable conditions for minority religious groups.

551. Ghana supported Maldives' call on the international community to support the implementation of accepted recommendations and to strengthen peace and political stability. Ghana welcomed the acceptance of recommendations to strengthen the independence of the judiciary and requested updates on steps taken to promote religious dialogue and the effective implementation of laws aimed at addressing violence against women. Ghana would be grateful to know of the progress made by Maldives to enact a juvenile justice law in compliance with the Convention on the Rights of the Child and to pass legislation to enhance freedom of religion for citizens and foreigners.

552. Honduras welcomed measures adopted by Maldives to implement the universal periodic review recommendations relating to the protection of the rights of migrant workers against trafficking and exploitation, guaranteeing non-discrimination and accessing the labour market, and to consider ratifying ICRMW. Honduras particularly valued the establishment of infrastructure for the promotion of mutual understanding and tolerance and interreligious dialogue to address religious extremism and strengthen cultural diversity.

553. India appreciated the constructive participation of the Government of Maldives in the universal periodic review process, which witnessed the participation of 102 delegations resulting in 258 recommendations. India noted that Maldives accepted as many as 198 recommendations, including the recommendation made by its delegation on better protection of foreign workers and effective implementation of the Anti-Human Trafficking Act.

554. Iraq commended the acceptance of the majority of recommendations, including the recommendations it made. Iraq welcomed the measures taken by Maldives in relation to media freedom, freedom of expression, right to education, especially for children with special needs, health, housing, combating domestic violence and trafficking in persons. Iraq commended efforts to enhance the rights of women and consolidate democracy.

555. Kuwait commended efforts being made to enhance human rights. Kuwait appreciated Maldives' acceptance of a majority of recommendations, including those made by Kuwait on a strengthened comprehensive health service and improving the quality of education, as an indication of the attention paid by Maldives to the promotion and protection of human rights.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

556. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Maldives, eight other stakeholders made statements.

557. United Nations Watch condemned the unlawful incarceration of former President Mohamed Nasheed who, it stated, was arrested in 2012 on unsubstantiated terrorism charges following the arrest of a corrupt judge. It stated that Nasheed was denied the opportunity to submit evidence in his case, and the presiding judge served simultaneously as the key witness and that the sentencing of Nasheed to 13 years imprisonment was condemned by the international community. It observed that many members of the opposition were currently awaiting trial or in prison following the Government's crackdown on political dissent. It was also concerned that survivors of sexual violence, the majority of who were women, were prosecuted for fornication and subjected to flogging as legal punishment. It called on the Maldives to release former President Nasheed from prison immediately and to hold free and fair elections.

558. Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development expressed concern that violent attacks against journalists, media and political activists had increased significantly over the past three years; and that police attempted to thwart demands for accountability, including with the violent crackdown on a rally that marked one year of the disappearance of journalist Ahmed Rilwan. It urged the Government to review the Terrorism Prevention Bill and Freedom of Expression Bill in line with commitments made during the universal periodic review. It noted that, while the Government had accepted all recommendations to ensure the independence of the judiciary and strengthen the rule of law, the lack of judicial independence was a major challenge to realizing human rights. It urged the Government to reinstate the six-decade long moratorium and called on the Maldives to publicly set out a comprehensive, measurable and time-bound action plan for the implementation of UPR recommendations in cooperation and consultation with civil society.

559. Action Canada for Population and Development welcomed the acceptance by Maldives of recommendations calling for the adoption of a gender equality bill, legislating against domestic violence, providing more shelters and addressing the practices of female genital mutilation and early and forced marriage. Regarding the implementation of those recommendations, it urged the Government to consult and collaborate with local non-governmental organizations particularly those that work with women and on gender issues. It was deeply concerned that the Maldives rejected adopting a law against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation; and to decriminalize consensual extra-marital sexual relations. It also noted that issues addressed by stakeholders during the review such as formulating policy to address unsafe abortion and providing sexual and reproductive health education were absent as recommendations.

560. Amnesty International stated that in September 2014, the Supreme Court brought contempt of court charges against the Human Rights Commission of Maldives for highlighting flaws in the judicial system in its universal periodic review submission. Amnesty International was concerned that hundreds of people were charged and tried in grossly unfair trials, especially in violation of their right to freedom of assembly, including former President Nasheed, former Defence Minister Nazim; and former Deputy Speaker of Parliament Nazim. According to Amnesty International, prisoners who filed an appeal were unlikely to receive a fair and impartial appeal hearing until the government enforced judicial compliance with fair trial guarantees. It urged the Government to strengthen the independence and impartiality of the judiciary and to guarantee the rule of law, as recommended during the review. Amnesty International deeply regretted Maldives' rejection of 28 recommendations on the death penalty and flogging and urged the Government to immediately announce a moratorium on those practices with a view to abolishing them.

561. International Commission of Jurists stated that the Maldivian judiciary continued to disregard international and domestic principles of judicial independence, impartiality and accountability; and that the Supreme Court's "treason" case against the Commission for its universal periodic review submission to the Council, for instance, violated numerous international standards, including on reprisals and the independence of national human rights institutions. According to the International Commission of Jurists, politically motivated criminal trials against former President Nasheed and former Defence Minister Nazim, among others, had involved arbitrary detentions and gross violations of the rights to fair trial and appeal; and that the human rights crisis had also created an environment conducive to attacks against journalists and civil society. It urged Maldives to accept and implement the universal periodic review recommendations on strengthening judicial independence, the Human Rights Commission of Maldives and other constitutional bodies, and protecting human rights and the rule of law; and referred to its recent written submission to the Human Rights Council and to its joint fact-finding mission report for more detailed analysis.

562. International Service for Human Rights reported that the Supreme Court had initiated a case against the Human Rights Commission of Maldives' following its contribution to the second universal periodic review, which touched on the politicisation and lack of independence of the judiciary. It further reported that in 2015 the Court handed down a verdict in that case declaring the Commission's submission unlawful and that it must abide by a set of 11 very broad and ill-defined guidelines in carrying out its activities, including that any communication with international bodies must take place through relevant Government institutions. It stated that the decision of the Court was a clear breach of international law and incompatible with Maldives' membership of the Council; and that preventing relevant stakeholders from participating undermined the UPR process as a whole and constituted an act of reprisal.

563. Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative reported that it shared the concerns of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights in relation to reservations about former President Nasheed's trial and supported the call for his immediate release. It expressed deep concern about the future of democracy in the Maldives given the developments over the past year, such as the lack of positive action in the case of the disappearance of a journalist, the actions against the Human Rights Commission of Maldives for engaging with the universal periodic review, continued restrictions on the right to counsel and to remain silent under certain circumstances, and the arbitrary removal of Supreme Court justices. It welcomed the Government's indicated willingness to work with certain inter-governmental organizations, including the Commonwealth Secretariat and looked forward to necessary reforms being implemented promptly. It called on the Government to fulfil swiftly its reporting obligations to various UN mechanisms and to constructively engage in partnership with civil society at home and internationally over the UPR recommendations it had accepted and those it rejected.

564. Freedom Now stated that former President Mohamed Nasheed of the Maldives was imprisoned by the Government on fabricated charges of "terrorism" and that there were shocking violations of due process throughout his case in a corrupt court system. Freedom Now stated that the Government continued to support this gross infringement of justice along with the cases of about two dozen other political prisoners and some 1700 people facing legal charges for their peaceful political activism. Freedom Now referred to several world leaders who had called for former President Nasheed's release, including the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and the European Parliament. Freedom Now expressed expectations that that the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention would soon present an independent and impartial judgement on the case of former President Nasheed, and that the Government would fully abide by the Working Group's recommendations as it had fully engaged in that process.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

565. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 258 recommendations received, 198 enjoy the support of Maldives and 60 are noted.

566. Maldives reiterated its support for the UPR process and its principles and expressed appreciation to all that participated in the discussion but expressed its disappointment that some delegations had used this opportunity in a manner that was inconsistent with those principles.

567. The delegation referred to the attention that the international community and media had shown towards the democracy consolidation process of the Maldives and reminded participants of how far Maldives had progressed in only a decade, especially in protecting the rights of the vulnerable in society, the women, children and elderly, and towards economic and social development.

568. Maldives responded to some comments made on independence of the judiciary, the Human Rights Commission of Maldives and the trial of former President Nasheed.

569. Maldives stated that the Government believed that the Judiciary, should be free from interference and undue influence by the Executive; and that the Judiciary, with other institutions, must be given the time and space to grow organically into a robust democratic institution. Maldives stated that it continued to engage with the international human rights mechanisms aimed at strengthening the judiciary and that the Government was working with international partners towards strengthening the judiciary and restoring public confidence.

570. Maldives stated that the decision of the Supreme Court and 11-point guidelines contained therein did not stipulate, in any specific terms, any restriction or limitation on the HRCM's ability to submit reports to the UN. Maldives reported that the substance of the *suo moto* case was not concerned with the substance of the report prepared for the UPR, but issues concerning the compilation of that report.

571. On the issue of the sentencing of former President Nasheed, the Maldives reiterated that he was sentenced to 13 years in jail on 13 March 2015 by the Criminal Court for ordering the illegal abduction of a judge in January 2012. Maldives stated that former President Nasheed's lawyers had some questions about the process, but refused appeal. Under the provisions of Article 223 of the Constitution, the Prosecutor General filed an appeal at the High Court, and now at the Supreme Court on former President Nasheed's case. The Supreme Court was expected to hold a preliminary hearing on the appeal application in the near future.

572. Maldives stated that the Government's efforts at the democracy consolidation process and strengthening the rule of law would not falter neither would its commitment to the economic and social advancement of the Maldives people and the protection of the environment, which were the top priorities of President Abdulla Yameen Abdul Gayoom's Government.

573. The delegation reaffirmed the Government's commitment to provide a mid-term report on our progress of implementation of recommendations in 2017. Maldives hoped that the third cycle of UPR would adopt the lessons learnt from its past two cycles and achieve more fruitful results.

Andorra

574. The review of Andorra was held on 7 May 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 Andorra in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/AND/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/AND/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/AND/3).

575. At the 26th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Andorra (see section C below).

576. The outcome of the review of Andorra comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/9), the views of Andorra 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/30/9/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

577. The delegation of the Principality of Andorra thanked the Troika for its excellent work and expressed its appreciation to the Member States who took the floor and made recommendations during the presentation of the national report in May of 2015.

578. The delegation stated that Andorra was fully committed to the UPR process, which is a unique space that provides an opportunity for States to exchange experiences and good practices and improve the situation of human rights in their respective countries.

579. After the presentation of the national report to the UPR Working Group, Andorra took note of the findings and the comments and recommendations received. Concretely, a total of 85 recommendations were made by the Member States. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs had been responsible for compiling the recommendations and initiating a broad consultation process with the Government Departments involved in their implementation. This exercise led to a thorough analysis of the human rights situation in the country, in order to define the position of Andorra regarding each of the recommendations received.

580. The delegation indicated that each recommendation had been carefully analysed in order to assess their applicability and their potential to improve the situation of human rights in the country over the next four and a half years. It also noted that many of the recommendations received had already been implemented, and that their acceptance should therefore be understood as a commitment by Andorra to maintain already implemented policies. On the other hand, many of the recommendations which had, a priori, the support of the Government of Andorra were in the end noted as these contained some element which prevented their acceptance in full.

581. The delegation reported that once the consultations between the departments concerned were concluded, the Government of Andorra, at the meeting of the Council of Ministers of August 26, 2015, took position on the recommendations received. The delegation announced that of the 85 recommendations received during the second UPR cycle, Andorra had accepted 41 recommendations and noted the remaining 44 recommendations.

582. The delegation explained Andorra's position with regard to the main recommendations received. It noted that many of the recommendations received in the second cycle of the UPR were related to the ratification and accession to the main international human rights conventions. It recalled that during the presentation of the national report in Geneva by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Andorra undertook to examine its legislation with regard to each of the major international human rights instruments, in order to assess if it was in line with the provisions thereof.

583. Andorra reiterated this commitment and indicated that it had accepted the recommendations that encouraged it to either consider or study accession to the main international conventions on human rights, without prejudice to finally proceeding to do so. However, Andorra has not accepted recommendations that required its accession before the next cycle of the UPR.

584. The delegation clarified that it is an exercise in responsibility, to understand that becoming a party to international conventions requires a thorough analysis of national legislation in relation to the provisions of international conventions and the State's ability to bear with the commitments made.

585. The delegation specified that Andorra cannot accept recommendations to ratify various ILO Conventions, since becoming a party to these instruments requires membership in the organization. It was recalled that Andorra is now a member of 23 international organizations and that it has limited resources, which do not allow it to be present in new organizations like the ILO. However, Andorra considered that its national labour legislation complies with the main ILO Conventions.

586. The delegation also indicated that Andorra had noted recommendations to provide a legal framework to guarantee the right of asylum and refugee status. It noted that currently, the Government of Andorra is in contact with the European Union and UNHCR to coordinate its participation in the current humanitarian crisis affecting Syrian refugees.

587. As regards the creation of a National Human Rights Institution, Andorra recalled that it had pledged, during the presentation of its national report, to study the issue without prejudice to finally undertaking to taking the necessary steps for its creation. The courts and the Raonador del Ciutadà (Ombudsman) are the main bodies guaranteeing human rights in the country. The creation of a new institution responsible for ensuring respect for human rights could lead to a duplication of powers. For this reason, Andorra indicated that it would undertake to study the issue without committing itself to creating such an institution in the coming years.

588. The delegation observed that Andorra had accepted all recommendations received aimed at strengthening the rights of persons with disabilities. Andorra was firmly committed to the principle of inclusive education in schools in the country and was committed to continue doing such action the coming years.

589. It was highlighted that Andorra will present its initial report to the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in March 2016. This action also aims at complying with several recommendations received to cooperate fully with the treaty bodies and to present the corresponding periodic reports within established deadlines.

590. The delegation stated that during the first UPR cycle Andorra had not accepted recommendations to ensure the right to strike. However, in the second cycle, Andorra accepted such recommendations and would make the necessary legislative amendments to guarantee the right to strike and collective bargaining. An important step taken in relation with this right was the initiation in parliament of a procedure on a legislative initiative on the right to strike, in compliance with the commitment by Andorra to the Secretary General of the United Nations during his visit to the Principality. The text, which could not be approved before the parliamentary elections earlier this year, will be proposed to the new Parliament.

591. Finally, the delegation stated, with regard to recommendations regarding the rights of women, that Andorra had agreed to adopt a comprehensive law on gender equality, in accordance with the provisions of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and to continue to implement policies to promote gender equality. However, Andorra had noted the recommendation to provide quotas for women's representation on the boards of companies, since business in Andorra was mainly characterized by the presence of small and medium enterprises.

592. The delegation thanked the Human Rights Council for its attention.

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

593. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Andorra seven delegations made statements.

594. China welcomed Andorra's participation in the UPR and their decision to accept most of the recommendations especially the ones from China to strengthen the legislation against racism and intolerance, take measures to prohibit public incitement to racial hatred, violence and discrimination and improve health policies as to provide affordable health services to migrant women and female children.

595. The Council of Europe congratulated the Andorran delegation for its UPR successful examinations. Council of Europe highlighted the challenges faced by Andorra, namely the lack of comprehensive legislation against racism and racial discrimination including the non-implemented recommendations of the ECRI, the conditions of detention, the need to separate juvenile detainees from others and to improve access of prisoners to medical assistance and finally the absence of a specific law addressing gender based violence. It invited the Government to ensure the effective implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence brought into force in 2014 and to ratify the Council of Europe's Convention on Cybercrime and its Additional Protocol.

596. Ghana commended Andorra's commitments to the UPR mechanism. It highlighted the large number of accepted recommendations in particular those relating to the strengthening of laws and policies to check all forms of discrimination and those aimed at strengthening the criminal justice system. Ghana praised the acceptance to ratify the ICESCR, CED and the OP-CAT. It also appealed to the Government to take concrete steps to implement the accepted recommendations including legislation concerning the Rome Statute crimes and the submission of overdue periodic reports to the various human rights treaty bodies.

597. Sierra Leone noted that since its first UPR cycle Andorra had submitted two reports of Treaty Bodies as recommended. Sierra Leone noted Andorra's commitment to human right especially its advancement on children's rights through its prohibition of corporal punishment. However it remained concerned about discrimination against women and incidents of racial intolerance. It encouraged Andorra to ratify the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons especially Women and Children, establish a national human rights institution and enact laws on the status of refugees and asylum-seekers.

598. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela praised the open cooperation of Andorra with the UPR. It highlighted the political will to implement the accepted recommendations of the first and second cycle of the UPR. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela noted the progress made in the protection of women rights, with the significant adoption of legal provisions to eradicate gender based and domestic violence. It also praised Andorra's strengthening of its plans and social programmes in the area of employment, health and food.

599. Angola welcomed the delegation of Andorra and the presentation of their National Report for the second cycle of the UPR. It noted with appreciation the various initiatives taken by Andorra in its legislation, on the protection of the child, the elimination of gender based and domestic violence, as well as the adoption of the Foreign Investment Act 21. Angola encouraged Andorra to continue its cooperation with the human rights mechanisms.

600. Rwanda praised Angola's strong commitments to the protection and promotion of human rights and its constructive and participatory role since the first UPR cycle. It commended the extension of the standing invitation to all the Special Procedures of the human rights council.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

601. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Andorra, no other stakeholder made statements.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

602. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 85 recommendations received, 41 enjoyed the support of Andorra, while 44 are noted.

603. The delegation of Andorra concluded by thanking the Member States that had taken the floor, the representatives of Civil Society, the Troika and the Secretariat. Andorra reiterated its commitment to the UPR process, stressing that the second cycle had given a new and useful opportunity to look at the situation of human rights in their country in order to improve it.

Bulgaria

604. The review of Bulgaria was held on 7 May 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 Bulgaria in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/BGR/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/BGR/2*);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/BGR/3).

605. At the 26th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Bulgaria (see section C below).

606. The outcome of the review of Bulgaria comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/10), the views of Bulgaria 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/30/10/Add.1 and A/HRC/30/10/Add.1/Corr.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

607. The delegation of Bulgaria stated that the Government attributed high importance to the process of the Universal Periodic Review as a valuable tool to assess objectively the human rights situation in every Member State and to set the path for its further improvement. The second cycle was proven to be a beneficial exercise for Bulgaria by assisting the Government in evaluating progress since the first cycle and in setting its goals in the area of human rights.

608. Bulgaria would pursue its efforts within the National Coordination Mechanism for Human Rights, which was tasked to improve the coordination among public authorities and other stakeholders involved in the implementation of its international human rights obligations. In this regard, a seminar was held to consider and discuss thoroughly all 182 recommendations that were put forward during the review, as well as the follow-up of those recommendations. Subsequently, the Government made its position on all recommendations based on the wide consultations and submitted it in a written form to the

Human Rights Council. Bulgaria accepted or accepted in principle 174 recommendations out of total 182 recommendations.

609. The delegation provided additional information on some areas that had been covered in the national report and in the recommendations received. It highlighted several achievements made in the area of deinstitutionalisation, aimed at protecting and promoting the rights of the child, which remained a top priority of the Government. Among those achievements was the placement of a large number of the children, living in the institutions, into a family or similar to a family type of environment, the introduction of new approaches to combat abandonment, and strengthening the partnership between the health care, social assistance, and education sectors.

610. In respect to gender equality, the delegation reiterated the commitment of Bulgaria to continue promoting the active participation of women in all spheres of social and political life. A Gender Equality Act had been in the process of preparation with an aim to ensure an integrated policy on gender equality through the involvement of all institutions at every level. The Act would reinforce the efforts of the Government in reducing and in eliminating gender pay gap. The Government had recently taken a commitment to develop and adopt a National Strategy for Gender Equality, covering the period 2015 – 2020.

611. In pursuance of its commitments towards the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, an action plan on the implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities for the period 2015-2020 was adopted in May 2015. The plan outlined the specific steps, the role and responsibilities of the respective governmental bodies and stakeholders, with the assistance of the organisations of persons with disabilities.

612. In respect of tolerance and non-discrimination, the delegation, while recalling a long-standing historic tradition of ethnic and religious tolerance in Bulgaria, stated that the Government had been pursuing a consistent policy aimed at preventing and eliminating any form of discrimination and enhancing understanding and tolerance among persons belonging to different ethnic, religious or linguistic groups.

613. The full integration of Roma in the society remained an important goal of the Government. Thus, particular efforts were directed at the provision of necessary conditions for the integration of Roma in the society. Bulgaria had been preparing to present its periodic report for the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination by the end of 2015.

614. Regarding asylum-seekers and refugees, the delegation confirmed the commitment of Bulgaria to ensure the respect of human rights of all persons seeking protection in its territory, in cooperation with its various partners, including NGOs. The domestic legislation provided for the full protection of the rights of the persons seeking international protection. A National Strategy on Migration, Asylum and Integration for the period 2015-2020 was adopted in 2015. The delegation noted that Bulgaria was mainly a transit country for mixed migration flows and was committed to supporting those who express their will to stay, while taking the necessary precautions regarding its national security.

615. Several recommendations encompassed and addressed the reform of the judicial system. Following the approval of an Updated Strategy to Continue the Reform of the Judicial System and in line with the six strategic goals, a Draft Act to Amend and Supplement the Judicial System Act was presented for a wide discussion. The draft envisaged a change in the structure and organisation of the Supreme Judicial Council and aimed at reinforcing the independence of courts and at elaborating the appraisal of the performance of judges, prosecutors and investigating magistrates as a basis for their professional development. In September 2015, the National Assembly adopted during its first reading the amendments to the Constitution that provided for the separation of the

colleges of judges and prosecutors. The amendments would also reinforce the principle of democratic accountability in the work of the prosecutors and investigative magistrates.

616. The delegation provided some explanations in respect of some of the recommendations that the Government could not support. Regarding the recommendation no 123.80, Bulgaria shared a view that states should cease funding of organisations and political parties that advocate racism. However, it found factually incorrect the allegation made in the recommendations that such practices might exist in Bulgaria. Consequently, the Government could not support the recommendation.

617. In respect of recommendation no 123.163, the delegation reported that there was a legal procedure in place for about 20 years, providing for the recovery and change of the names of Bulgarian citizens who had been forced to change their original names. Regarding recommendation no 123.164, the delegation recalled that the Religious Denominations Act provided for the restitution of nationalized, expropriated, confiscated or otherwise illegally taken properties of religious communities, subject to the condition that the relevant legal requirements were met. Restitution of confiscated properties was provided based on court decisions on a non-discriminatory basis.

618. As to recommendation no 123.165, the Constitution guaranteed the right to those citizens whose mother tongue was not the Bulgarian language, to study and use their own language, alongside the compulsory study of the Bulgarian language. The Constitution also guaranteed the free use of mother tongue in many spheres of life. However, Bulgarian, as a state language, must be used in election campaigns. This legal requirement could not affect in any way the free exercise of any political rights of any citizen of Bulgaria, noted the delegation.

619. The delegation reiterated the commitment of Bulgaria to follow through with the implementation of the accepted recommendations with a view of strengthening the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The Government would prepare a voluntary mid-term report on the implementation of recommendations, as it did during the first review.

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

620. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Bulgaria, 17 delegations made statements.

621. Albania noted with satisfaction that Bulgaria supported the most of the recommendations put forward during the review. It noted the commitment of Bulgaria to implement those recommendations. Albania commented Bulgaria for its efforts to promote gender equality.

622. Algeria noted with satisfaction that Bulgaria supported the most of the recommendations put forward during the review, including two recommendations made by Algeria regarding gender equality and the rights of migrant workers. It encouraged Bulgaria to continue its efforts to ensure more guarantees for migrant workers and women.

623. Benin noted with satisfaction the efforts of Bulgaria in promoting and protecting human rights, including strengthening legislation on gender equality, fighting against domestic violence and protecting the rights of persons with disabilities. It recommended that Bulgaria continue its efforts in the area of juvenile justice and protection of children placed in specialised institutions.

624. China welcomed the acceptance of majority of recommendations, including those recommendations made by China. It noted with satisfaction measures taken by Bulgaria to

ensure gender equality, protect the rights of women belonging to ethnic minorities, and address racial discrimination and hatred.

625. Côte d'Ivoire welcomed the commitment of Bulgaria towards the recommendations put forward during the review. It encouraged Bulgaria to continue reforms to bring its legislation into conformity with international norms and to enhance its efforts in protecting the vulnerable groups of the population and in combating all forms of discrimination.

626. The Council of Europe referred to some challenges that Bulgaria faced, including the discrimination of Roma, malfunctioning of the judicial system, the lack of coherent policies regarding corruption prevention and discrimination against minorities. It welcomed the measures taken by Bulgaria in order to address those issues.

627. Ghana encouraged the National Human Rights Mechanism of Bulgaria to continue to give priority attention to the promotion and protection of the rights of child, persons with disabilities and of migrants and refugees as well as the promotion of ethnic and religious tolerance and the protection of minorities. It commended Bulgaria for the ratification of CAT and OP-CAT.

628. Greece noted with appreciation the progress achieved in enhancing the existing solid institutional framework regarding the human rights protection and in promoting equal opportunities between men and women. It welcomed the efforts to strengthen the National Council on Gender Equality and to raise the awareness of domestic violence. It expressed confidence that Bulgaria would establish working groups for the follow up process of the recommendations, as it was done during the first review.

629. Iraq welcomed the acceptance of the most recommendations put forward during the review, including those made by Iraq. It commended the efforts of Bulgaria to achieve gender equality, poverty reduction, the protection of the rights of children, and religious tolerance as well as combat hate speech and violence.

630. Kyrgyzstan appreciated the efforts of Bulgaria to implement its human rights obligations, including through institutional and legislative framework for the promotion and protection of human rights. It noted the continued commitment of Bulgaria to promote fundamental freedoms and rights by creating the National Coordination Mechanism on Human Rights.

631. Romania noted the commitment of Bulgaria to uphold the human rights standards by adopting legislation and by updating the institutional framework. It noted with appreciation the holistic approach adopted by Bulgaria for the fulfilment of its human rights obligations.

632. Rwanda commended Bulgaria on its efforts to protect and promote human rights, improve democratic elections and respect freedom of assembly. It welcomed the accession of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the establishment of the National Coordination Mechanism on Human Rights.

633. Sierra Leone commended Bulgaria on its consistent engagement in the universal periodic review process. It noted that Bulgaria submitted a voluntary mid-term report in 2013, which highlighted the progress achieved in strengthening the institutional and legislative framework for human rights. It commended Bulgaria on the reform of the judiciary and its anti-trafficking measures. Sierra Leone encouraged Bulgaria to implement effectively policies on violence against minorities, intensify efforts to combat gender stereotypes and to promote gender equality.

634. The Sudan commended Bulgaria on its positive engagement in the universal periodic review. It noted with appreciation that Bulgaria supported the recommendations made by the Sudan.

635. Tajikistan noted with satisfaction the efforts of Bulgaria to improve the judicial system and introduce new human rights mechanisms as well as strengthen the existing ones. It noted the commitment of Bulgaria to expand its human rights obligations by accessing to a number of international treaties.

636. Turkmenistan noted with satisfaction that its recommendations were supported by Bulgaria. It expressed its appreciation for active cooperation of Bulgaria with various human rights bodies of the United Nations, including the Human Rights Council.

637. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela noted progress made by Bulgaria in improving its legislative framework regarding domestic and gender violence in order to protect victims of violence. It appreciated the efforts of Bulgaria to protect and promote human rights despite the challenges of the economic crisis.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

638. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Bulgaria, three other stakeholders made statements.

639. Action Canada for Population and Development commended Bulgaria on the acceptance of all recommendations to adopt legislation on gender equality and urged Bulgaria to enact and implement relevant legislation. It called upon Bulgaria to classify all forms of violence within the family as criminal offences and to ratify the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence. The Action Canada for Population and Development noted with regret the absence of recommendations on the high pregnancy rates among adolescents and youth, the overreliance on abortions as a family planning method and the need to include comprehensive sexuality education in school curricula. It called on Bulgaria to address those issues and to consult and collaborate with local NGOs in this process.

640. Amnesty International expressed concern that legislation and practice concerning hate crimes fell short of international human rights standards. It referred to information, indicating the failure of the criminal justice system in investigating and prosecuting hate crimes. The Criminal Code did not protect against hate crimes based on disability, sexual orientation or gender identity and the process of revising the Criminal Code had stalled since the fall of July 2014. Amnesty International stated that despite some progress, serious gaps remained in the asylum system. It noted inadequate conditions in reception centres, several measures taken to control the flow of refugees and migrants, and instances of illegal push-backs. It urged Bulgaria to halt unlawful push-backs of migrants and refugees and to investigate all allegations. It called on Bulgaria to implement the National Integration Strategy for Refugees and to ensure that people in need of international protection are guaranteed an adequate standard of living and access to health-care, education and other public services.

641. Allied Rainbow Communities International commended Bulgaria for important steps taken to implement recommendations of the first review regarding rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) people. It highlighted few problematic issues that need to be taken into consideration in improving further laws and policies. It noted inadequate measures to overcome continuing discriminatory patterns against LGBTI persons. The efforts to overcome stereotypical attitudes regarding the roles of men and women and existing gender inequality remained unsatisfactory. It was problematic that there was no gender recognition legislation. The Allied Rainbow Communities International stated that hate crimes based on sexual orientation and gender identity have to be included in the Penalty Code and that sexual orientation and gender identity or expression needed to be included as a qualifying circumstance.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

642. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 182 recommendations received, 174 enjoyed the support of Bulgaria, and 8 were noted.

643. In conclusion, the delegation of Bulgaria thanked all participants of the review and assured that the Government would pay due consideration to all issues raised during the adoption by the participants. The Government would work to enhance its administrative capacity in order to implement effectively the accepted recommendations. The delegation conveyed assurances of the Government to increase the participation of stakeholders, including NGOs in the follow-up process. Bulgaria would maintain its commitment towards fulfilment of its international human rights obligations. The universal periodic review process remained an essential part of this endeavour, noted the delegation.

Honduras

644. The review of Honduras was held on 25 May 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 Honduras in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/HND/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/HND/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/HND/3).

645. At the 26th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Honduras (see section C below).

646. The outcome of the review of Honduras comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/11), the views of Honduras 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

647. The Head of the delegation, Under-Secretary for Human Rights and Justice, indicated that Honduras was participating in the session of the Council on the occasion of the adoption of the outcome of their review under the UPR, committed to report on progress and challenges in the field of human rights.

648. The delegation recalled that during the second review, Honduras had received 152 recommendations of which none had been rejected. Honduras accepted 92 percent of these recommendations. The remaining 8 percent were still being considered, and were thus noted.

649. Most of the noted recommendations 126.1, 126.2, 126.3, 126.4, 126.5, 126.6, 126.7, 126.8, 126.9, 126.10, 126.11 and 126. 12, referred to the ratification of international instruments, the reform of the Constitution or domestic legislation, which required broader consultations and national debate.

650. The delegation reiterated Honduras' commitment to incorporate all supported recommendations in the Public Policy and the National Human Rights Action Plan, to

promote their implementation through appropriate mechanisms. The delegation provided an update on progress achieved so far.

651. Honduras continued open to cooperating with special procedures. It referred to the visit of the Rapporteur on Indigenous peoples in November and the visit by the Special Rapporteur on internally displaced persons that will take place before the end of the year.

652. In line with recommendation 124.15, Honduras submitted in 2015 four reports to treaty bodies, fully fulfilling all pending reporting obligations.

653. In relation to recommendations 124.1 and 125.1, relating to the harmonization of internal legislation and adherence to international human rights instruments, Honduras has incorporated the crimes against humanity, genocide and war crimes in the new draft criminal code, in line with the Rome Statute.

654. With regard to recommendations 124.5 and 124.14, on the establishment of a Country Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, an exploratory mission has recently taken place, with the expectation to start operations in late 2015 or early 2016. Honduras thanked countries that had made contributions to allow the establishment of the Office, hoping that it would assist the country in enhancing the capacities of existing institutions.

655. In relation to recommendation 125.45, the Police Investigations Direction within the Secretariat (Ministry) of Security is functioning since 4 September and the necessary human, financial and logistic resources had been allocated.

656. Regarding recommendation 125.44, and since the second review, human rights training has been provided to 6,037 persons, among them members of the armed forces, public servants and persons deprived of their liberty.

657. With regard to the issue of trafficking and sexual exploitation, and consistent with recommendations 125.22 and 125.23, 23 victims have been rescued and more than 10 traffickers punished in accordance with the law, this year. A cooperation agreement between the Ministry of Development and Social Inclusion and the Commission against Trafficking has also been signed with a view to incorporating victims to the social protection system.

658. With regard to recommendations 125.47, 125.48, 125.50, 125.51, 125.52, 125.53, 125.54, 125.56, 125.57, 125.58, 125.59 and 125.60, the law for the protection of human rights defenders, journalists, social communicators and justice operators came into force in May 2015. Through this law, the State recognizes the right of everyone, individually or collectively, to defend, promote, protect and fulfil human rights, as well as the obligation of the State to respect human rights of defenders and to reasonably prevent threats, harassment and attacks that could be generated against them, regardless if these threats come from State or private institutions.

659. As part of this law, the National Protection System has been established. Two cases of human rights defenders have already being dealt by the mechanism.

660. The process for the elaboration of the regulations of the law has also been initiated, and it was extended following requests from various national and international human rights organizations, to promote and encourage greater participation from organizations and sectors protected by it.

661. Human rights organizations have recently elected their representatives to the National Protection Council. An allocation of 10 million Lempiras from the national budget has already been made, so as to guarantee its sustainability.

662. In addition, on 22 September, during the current Human Rights Council session, Honduras joined a group of countries supporting a declaration to condemn acts of intimidation or reprisals against human rights defenders.

663. Regarding the human rights of persons deprived of their liberty, in relation to recommendations 124.22 and 124.23, 2016 funding to the National Penitentiary Institute has been increased and the concept for a National Penitentiary Academy has been defined.

664. With regard to recommendations 125.8 and 125.9, a Human Rights Observatory has been established. A comprehensive system to monitor and evaluate the Public Policy and National Human Rights Plan with indicators will also be established and assistance from OHCHR has already been requested.

665. The President of the National Women Institute highlighted progress made with regard to recommendations 124.9, 124.27, 124.29, 124.30, 124.31, 124.33, 124.35, 124.46, 125.12, 125.13 and 125.14 on gender-based violence.

666. Reference was made to a project supported by the Inter-American Development Bank that will be implemented in 2016, called *City Woman*, and which aims at improving the women's lives through access to the justice system and their inclusion in the social protection system.

667. Honduras is also working towards the drafting of a Comprehensive law to combat violence against women, with the participation of organized women and the movement of women and feminists.

668. The Committee for the Implementation of the National Plan Against Violence Towards Women has also been reactivated. Honduras is implementing the 2010-2022 Second Plan on Equality and Gender Equity and incorporating a gender perspective in the design, implementation and evaluation of public policies, programmes and public budget. As of October 2015, a national campaign to combat violence against women, with a priority on the prevention of domestic violence, trafficking and femicide will also be initiated. Efforts are also underway to create the Unit of Crimes against the Life of Women in the Public Prosecutor's Office.

669. Honduras has continued efforts to guarantee economic, social and cultural rights and to combat poverty, in accordance with recommendations received during the second review. The Under Secretary of Development and Social Inclusion provided information about actions aimed at the social inclusion and development to reduce the levels of inequality and poverty.

670. With regard to recommendations 125.70; 125.71 and 125.72, a Multidimensional Poverty Index has been designed in three key areas: health; education and quality of life, with human rights as guiding principles.

671. In relation to recommendations 125.61 and 125.65, the 2016-2017 National Plan for Literacy is being implemented, with the goal of reaching 600,000 young people and adults who cannot read or write.

672. In line with recommendations 124.20, 124.57, 124.59 and 125.76, the Public Policy Against Racism and Racial Discrimination for the Integral Development of Indigenous Peoples and Afro-Honduran was adopted, following a broad consultation process and with the support of UNDP.

673. Referring to recommendations 125.19, 125.77, 125.78, 125.79, 125.80 and 125.81, an Observatory of the Consular and Migration of Honduras CONMIGHO and a call center called "Alho Voice", to facilitate the monitoring of the consular activity in the United States of America, were established.

674. Honduras continues promoting communication campaigns to fully address the immigration status both of children, young people and adults and creating work opportunities. A Center for the Attention of Returning Migrants was recently opened in Omoa.

675. In the area of employment, linked to recommendation 125.68, programs to incorporate people to the labour market are being carried out.

676. With regard to recommendation 125.26, the Economic and Social Council elaborated the draft law on labour inspection.

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

677. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Honduras, nine delegations made statements.

678. China welcomed the constructive participation of Honduras in the UPR and their decision to support most of the recommendations received. It appreciated that Honduras had supported recommendations from China relating to economic development, increase of labour opportunities, poverty alleviation and raising the living standards of the people. It encouraged Honduras to gradually implement the supported recommendations and called to the international community to provide necessary support to Honduras, on the basis of consultations with the country.

679. Cuba commended Honduras for the information provided and appreciated that it had supported the majority of recommendations already during the review. Cuba noted that Honduras had supported two recommendations it had made and invited it to implement concrete actions, in particular with regard to the implementation of the fundamental law on education and to continue taking measures to address the situation of migrant children.

680. Sierra Leone noted that Honduras had implemented 106 recommendations out of a total of 129 recommendations received since 2010, exhibiting its willingness to improve their national human rights framework. It noted the favourable response of Honduras to recommendations previously made by Sierra Leone, most specifically the recommendation concerning the normative standards aimed at eliminating domestic violence against women. Sierra Leone recognised constraints faced by the State in implementing all the recommendations and the sheer determination to note all of them.

681. The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) congratulated Honduras for the adoption of laws and policies aimed to guarantee the human rights of children, including the national policy for the prevention of violence against children and youth. It encouraged the State to pursue long-term national financial strategies to retain and expand the coverage of social protection programmes. UNICEF called upon Honduras to reduce the causes of child migration and ensure the conditions of their dignified reception and reintegration, and offered UNICEF support. It reaffirmed its commitment to continue supporting Honduras in its efforts to realize the rights of children, including the implementation of the recommendations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child and of the UPR.

682. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela highlighted the constructive dialogue during the review of Honduras. Honduras provided concrete responses to questions raised in a spirit of open cooperation. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela underscored the commitment of Honduras by accepting 92 per cent of the recommendations received. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela encouraged Honduras to continue strengthening its social programmes benefitting the most vulnerable sectors of the population.

683. Algeria thanked Honduras for the additional information provided regarding the progress made in the implementation of recommendations. Algeria took note of Honduras'

acceptance of almost all recommendations, in particular the acceptance of the two recommendations made by Algeria, on the policy to combat violence against children and youth and the implementation of the national human rights plan of action. Algeria wished Honduras all success in implementing the recommendations.

684. Belgium noted that it had expressed concern about the independence of the judiciary and combating impunity, the protection of women from violence and freedom of expression and the protection of journalists and human rights defenders. Belgium commended Honduras for having accepted all its recommendations. Belgium hoped that the implementation of the recommendations will assist Honduras in improving human rights in the country.

685. Benin welcomed progress made by Honduras during the last five years, in particular with regard to the establishment of a political and institutional framework, and their cooperation with human rights mechanisms. Benin recommended Honduras to continue its efforts for the protection of vulnerable groups of the population, notably women, children and young adults.

686. Rwanda congratulated Honduras on the adoption of the Public Policy and National Action Plan for Human Rights for the period 2013-2022. It welcomed the strengthening of the Judiciary's Gender Unit and the incorporation of the offence of femicide in the Criminal Code. It acknowledged efforts to bring national legislation into conformity with international human rights instruments. It noted that progress made in combating impunity for serious crimes and reducing the homicide rate was a good step by Honduras to protect human rights.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

687. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Honduras, ten other stakeholders made statements. The statements of the stakeholders that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.³⁵

688. Article 19 - International Centre against Censorship, referred to journalists and media workers killed this year in Honduras. Only in 2015, the Association for Free Speech has issued 160 alerts for different attacks of freedom of expression. It noted that the protection mechanism of the Law for Human Rights Defenders and Journalists has not entered into force and regulations have not been issued. The law on the Free Expression of 1958 criminalizes and censors the work of journalists.

689. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit - COC Nederland, also on behalf of International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA), commended Honduras for having accepted some recommendations regarding sexual orientation and gender identity, in particular those relating to the implementation of policies and programs that promote tolerance and non-discrimination, and the adoption of measures to investigate, prosecute and punish crimes of hate against LGBT persons. Notwithstanding the will of the government, the LGBT community continues to be one of the most vulnerable and discriminated groups in Honduras.

690. Franciscans International referred to the situation of communities in Honduras affected by exploitative industries. The situation is a matter of life or death. With the general law on mining, the State has declared the usefulness of the exploitation of lands. The impact has been devastating for the communities, and a number of persons defending

³⁵<https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/30thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

their land have lost their life. The situation is also marked by impunity. Communities have called for the creation of an International Commission against impunity in Honduras. Communities, families, including children, have been suffering from intimidation and threats. Communities live in a situation marked by abandonment by the State. FI further recalled Honduras obligations before the Inter-American Human Rights Court.

691. Amnesty International (AI) noted that in recent years human rights defenders in Honduras, including peasant and Garifuna leaders and LGBTI activists, justice officials and journalists, have been victims of physical violence, kidnapping and threats, in reprisal for their work. AI welcomed that Honduras had accepted recommendations to protect individuals at risk, including by implementing the new Protection Law for Human Rights Defenders, Journalists, Social Communicators and Justice Officials. AI was also concerned about reports that proposed changes to the Criminal Code could end eliminating language that prohibits discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. AI urged Honduras to ensure that there is no backslide on progress made since the country's UPR in 2010.

692. World Organization against Torture expressed concern about the recent adoption by the Congress of a law regarding work for persons deprived of their liberty, which has a special regimen for high risk and aggressive prisoners that has restrictions which are contrary to the dignified treatment of persons deprived of their liberty and the principle of non-discrimination. It also referred to reports of sexual violence, and the fact that abortion continues to be a crime, without exception. It further called on Honduras to adopt necessary measures to end impunity in cases of torture and ill-treatment, including the ratification and acceptance of mechanisms that allow for the review of individual communications.

693. Peace Brigades International Switzerland recognized the importance of Honduras acceptance of UPR recommendations. It noted however that in their daily life, the LGBT community suffered from violence, discrimination, sexual, physical and psychological mistreatment and exclusion. It reported on hate crimes against LGBT persons due to their sexual orientation and gender identity. Reference was made to the draft law on the criminal code that will disappear article 321, in which the punishment of discrimination for sexual and gender identity is codified.

694. International Service for Human Rights (ISHR) referred indicated that there is no recognition by the State of the work carried out by human rights defenders in different areas. There is a clear legal persecution by companies that, with the participation or the omission of the State, undermine the work of the human rights defenders. ISHR also made reference to various cases, including of communities accused of usurping land. This year, the network of human rights defenders recorded 70 cases. ISHR called for the protection of human rights defenders that are before the United Nations today. It called for the respect of the right to defend human rights free from fear and free from reprisals. This call was made on behalf of numerous networks of human rights groups.

695. Center for Reproductive Rights (CRR) regretted that Honduras did not support recommendations on reproductive health and rights. CRR continued to be deeply concerned about the access to health services, including sexual and reproductive rights without discrimination. It urged Honduras to amend the current law to legalize abortion in the cases of rape and to amend its extreme prohibitions on accessing, using, and selling emergency contraception. CRR believed that Honduras should pass and implement legislation guaranteeing women's access to essential reproductive health services and provide information that will enable women to exercise reproductive autonomy, particularly protecting their right to health, life and dignity.

696. Foodfirst Information and Action Network (FIAN) regretted the lack of recommendations made to Honduras with regard to economic, social and cultural rights, in

particular the right to food, access to water, land, seeds and other natural resources. It noted that the development model of Honduras is based on the extraction of natural resources, including mining industry, the expansion of mono crops agriculture for the production of biofuels and the creation of ‘model cities’, which is contrary to the cosmovision of indigenous, *campesinos*, Garifuna and other rural communities.

697. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom expressed concern over the increase of violence against women. It referred to cases of domestic violence and impunity. Despite the fact that femicide has been criminalized, there is no institution to implement it. There are investigative bodies, but without specialized units to address femicide. Institutions are weak and resources are limited. Organizations called on Honduras to ratify the OP-CEDAW, meeting its promise to the feminist movement as well as ILO Convention 189.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

698. The President stated that based on the information provided, out of 152 recommendations received, 140 enjoyed the support of Honduras, and 12 others were noted.

699. To conclude, the delegation thanked delegations, as well as civil society organizations, for their participation in the UPR of Honduras. Honduras will, in due time, submit a mid-term report on progress made in the implementation of recommendations.

700. Honduras indicated that the country needed Hondurans to get united in an unconditional, open and transparent dialogue, to build the Honduras that everyone aspires to.

Liberia

701. The review of Liberia was held on 4 May 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 Liberia in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/LBR/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/LBR/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/LBR/3).

702. At the 27th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Liberia (see section C below).

703. The outcome of the review of Liberia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/LBR), the views of Liberia 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/30/LBR/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

704. The delegation of Liberia indicated that its 1847 Constitution guarantees equality before the law, right to work and freedom of expression and assembly, among other rights.

Liberia had been in the vanguard of the promotion and protection of human rights for over 168 years.

705. Liberia stated that the UPR process is an opportunity to demonstrate to the council and the international community that notwithstanding difficulties faced, it remained unwavering in the commitment assumed under international human rights treaties.

706. Liberia accepted a number of recommendations received during the first cycle. Over the past five years, it had fully implemented many of those recommendations while on some, it had made significant progress.

707. Liberia had just come through its greatest crisis since the end of its fourteen-year civil conflict in 2003. In fact, in early 2014, it was engulfed in a fight against Ebola virus, to which over four thousand Liberians and foreign residents succumbed. The crisis consumed a great deal of the nation's resources and devastated the economy, thus posing a challenge to the speedy implementation of its human rights agenda.

708. Through the strong leadership of the President, the resilience of the people of Liberia, and the support of the UN and our international partners, Liberia was declared Ebola free. However, Liberia still remained at risk as long as Ebola remains in the neighbouring countries due to the porosity of our borders and the free movement of people.

709. Despite challenges, Liberia had remained steadfast in its determination to participate in the UPR process. In July 2015, a two-day consultative workshop was organized in Liberia, which brought together more than 50 representatives from government ministries and agencies, the Independent National Commission on Human Rights, and civil society organizations. Based on the views expressed during the workshop, and taking into consideration the feasibility of implementation given Liberia's political, economic, social and cultural climate, out of 186 recommendations received during the second cycle of the UPR, 147 enjoyed the support of Liberia. The remaining 39 recommendations were noted. However, even where Liberia noted a recommendation, this did not mean that such recommendation did not enjoy any support. It meant, rather, that the Government of Liberia was not able, at that point in time, to commit to the practical implementation of such a recommendation. Nonetheless, all recommendations received during the UPR process had been incorporated in Liberia's National Human Rights Action Plan with noted recommendations included as aspirational provisions of the Action Plan.

710. Liberia accepted recommendations related to the scope of its international treaty obligations, including domestication, harmonization, and treaty reporting. Liberia favourably considered the ratification of additional human rights instruments. However, because ratification represented not only significant financial undertaking, but also political, social and cultural implications, Liberia gave notice that it will move cautiously in this regard with priority given to ratifying only those outstanding human rights treaties that will facilitate the consolidation of peace and stability in the country and not to frustrate or unravel it.

711. Liberia stated that it will continue efforts toward harmonizing its laws at both the constitutional and statutory levels with the treaties it had ratified; and where law reform is time consuming, it will proceed to do so by way of executive orders, regulations, and policies as appropriate, in order to facilitate the speedy implementation of its human rights obligations.

712. Subsequent to the submission of the National Report, and while the recommendations were under consideration, the Constitution Review Committee, established by the President to review the 1986 Constitution with the view to recommending amendments that could help improve the governance of the country and

protect human rights. 25 proposals for amendment of the Constitution, including with regard to the right to a nationality, were submitted.

713. Regarding equality, the Constitution Review Committee proposed that respect and recognition for persons with disabilities be enshrined in the Constitution and that education and job opportunities be accorded to them.

714. Regarding women rights, the Committee advanced three proposals: (i) that the Constitution ensure women's participation in governance and national affairs; (ii) that Women have access to equal economic and social opportunities and (iii) that the Constitution guarantee inheritance rights for women. These recommendations will be submitted to referendum along with the 2017 general elections.

715. Liberia had also finalized a National Strategy on Treaty Obligations as well as a draft Common Core Document, which will allow Liberia to make significant progress in addressing its treaty reporting obligations consistent with the recommendation advanced.

716. Liberia recognized the critical role that Special Procedures can play in enhancing the engagement between member states and the Council in furtherance of human rights. Accordingly, Liberia extended a Standing Invitation to the Special Procedures mandate holders, in fulfilment of recommendations received during the first and second UPR cycles. Liberia looked forward to constructive engagement with all them to enhance the promotion and protection of human rights.

717. Liberia also accepted most of the recommendations related to the rights of women and children; including to eliminate sexual and gender-based violence. Liberia remained committed to eradicate discrimination, and implement the right to equal protection of the laws as enshrined in the Constitution. In addition to the proposals for constitutional amendment, Liberia indicated that it will strengthen prosecutorial services for SGBV in the three regional Hubs and give favourable consideration to establishing SGBV courts in all 15 judicial circuits, as provided for under the statute creating Criminal Court E for SGBV.

718. Regarding recommendations to adopt a law explicitly prohibiting Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) and harmful traditional practices, Liberia reiterated its position that it is opposed to these practices, and also to early marriages, and trial by ordeal. Hence it accepted all the recommendations on this subject. Liberia was taking steps to address the challenges. Thus, in August, 2015, while the UPR recommendations were under consideration, a draft Domestic Violence Act, which partially criminalizes FGM and other harmful practices, was submitted to the Legislature. If adopted, this Act would prohibit FGM performed on children under the age of 18, and on women 18 and older who do not consent to the practice. Liberia will continue to strengthen efforts on combating sexual and gender violence through further comprehensive legislation bill to prohibit and criminalize FGM and all harmful traditional practices, and strengthening of institutional capacities. Liberia will also strengthen alternative measures of diminishing FGM and traditional harmful practices such as sensitization on the harmful effects of such practices, especially on the future of girls, and provision of alternative livelihoods for traditional practitioners.

719. Liberia also accepted the recommendations made in the area of administration of justice and the rule of law, considering that no foundation for peace and stability could be laid without respect for the rule of law. In December 2014, the UN Security Council resolved that the Government of Liberia should assume fully by 30 June 2016, responsibility over the security architecture of Liberia from the UN Mission (UNMIL) since 2003. In this regard, Liberia had developed a plan for UNMIL Transition, with a human rights based approach integrated therein, which was being implemented in close collaboration with the UN and our international partners. Liberia, through the Transition Plan, will strengthen capacity in the justice and security sector, expand the scope and breadth of existing services, especially in the area of pre-trial detentions and gender based

violence, and address outstanding challenges that pose threat to the effective administration of justice.

720. Liberia had chosen to note, however, some few recommendations that present significant political, economic, social and cultural challenges and thus considered as not feasible to implement in the short term. For instance, Liberia was not opposed to the abolition of the death penalty in principle, as evident by the fact that it has not carried out a single execution since the reintroduction of the death penalty in 2005. However, Liberia remained inclined to maintain its position of “abolitionist by practice” so as to serve as a deterrent for conduct which pose threat to the consolidation of peace and security in Liberia. Liberia, therefore, accepted the recommendations to maintain the *de facto* moratorium with the view to a consideration of *de jure* abolition.

721. The Government also noted the recommendations received on the subject of the rights of LGBT persons. While the Constitution of Liberia prohibited discrimination, and protected the fundamental rights and freedoms of all persons within its borders without distinction on the basis of sexual orientation, Liberia would like to tread cautiously in this area until there has been adequate public discourse, sensitization and awareness on the need to protect these rights.

722. Liberia accepted the recommendations regarding the revision of the immigration and nationality law. However, article 28 of the 1986 Constitution already provided for the right of Liberian women to transmit their nationality to their children on an equal basis with Liberian men. The Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization had embarked on the drafting a New Alien and Nationality law consistent with the 1986 Constitution and obligations undertaken to reform the nationality laws to prevent statelessness in Liberia.

723. In closing, Liberia thanked the HRC, OHCHR, member States who advanced recommendations, and the NGOs that made comments. Liberia remained committed to integrate a human rights-based approach as a foundational measure for sustaining peace, democracy, and the rule of law.

724. Liberia also acknowledged the support and technical advice offered by the Human Rights Section of the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL), and by UN Agencies and other international partners.

725. Recommendations made during the 2nd UPR have a significant influence, as they inform Liberia’s strategies and priorities. Liberia looked forward to implementing those recommendations accepted, and to working closely with the HRC, the Special Procedures mandate holders, and other partners to enhance compliance with its international human rights obligations.

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

726. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Liberia, 16 delegations made statements.

727. Libya congratulated Liberia for its active participation on the UPR and its commitment with human rights. It welcomed positive developments including the launching of a holistic long term strategy starting in 2012, aimed at promoting a range of sectors and improving national development. Libya appreciated that Liberia accepted most of the recommendations received, which demonstrates its engagement with UPR and its willingness to pursue its human rights agenda.

728. Sierra Leone commended the efforts undertaken by Liberia to comprehensively integrate human rights standards into the national legal framework and policies. In particular, it noted with appreciation the work being carried out by the Constitutional

Review Committee. Sierra Leone also noted challenges still faced by Liberia related to the Ebola epidemic. It encouraged the international community to support on-going efforts to rebuild Liberia's health care system and to provide further assistance for the rehabilitation and reintegration of survivors and orphans. Regarding gender violence, Sierra Leone hoped that more could be done to implement comprehensive strategies aimed at preventing an eliminating child rape.

729. Togo welcomed cooperation of Liberia with the UPR as well as progress made since its first UPR. Togo noted with satisfaction that Liberia accepted most of the recommendations emerged from its 2nd UPR and invited the international community to offer support to implement the recommendations received by Liberia.

730. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela noted that Liberia frankly recognized challenges faced in implementing human rights in the country. The conflict and Ebola epidemic had had negative effects on Liberia's capacity to progress in development. However, Liberia made efforts to fulfil its human rights commitments and had therefore ratified several international instruments and submitted reports under treaty bodies. In the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela's view, genuine dialogue and cooperation should contribute to enabling Liberia to surmount the crisis. It urged the international community to provide Liberia with all the assistance required.

731. Angola congratulated Liberia for having accepted most of the recommendations received. Angola supported Liberia's commitment with regard to human rights, in particular ratification of regional and international instruments and submission of human rights reports. Angola acknowledged challenges faced by Liberia to guarantee access to justice, and encouraged its efforts to progressively create regional centres of justice and security. Angola also encouraged Liberia to pursue its peace and reconciliation strategy, and continue making progress regarding justice, health and education for vulnerable groups.

732. Rwanda acknowledged the intensive efforts by Liberia to fight against Ebola virus and noted with appreciation that it supported many recommendations. Rwanda encouraged Liberia to continue its efforts aimed at abolishing the death penalty and total eradicate Female Genital Mutilation.

733. Benin welcomed efforts made by Liberia in the area of human rights, as well as those deployed to eradicate Ebola virus. Benin invited the international community to provide all assistance needed by Liberia to implement all the human rights, fight against poverty, and for economic and social development. Benin urged Liberia to pursue implementation of UPR recommendations.

734. Botswana commended Liberia for the implementation of a number of policies, including among others, the Strategic Roadmap for National Healing Peace-building and Reconciliation, and the Economic Stabilization and Recovery Plan aimed at improving health-care infrastructure, education and social welfare. Botswana noted with appreciation measures taken to address gender based violence and harmful practices against women. It encouraged Liberia to ensure full implementation of these laws.

735. China congratulated Liberia for putting an end to Ebola virus. It appreciated its participation to the UPR and support to China's recommendation, namely to take effective measures to protect vulnerable groups, and specially, to combat violence against women and children; to strengthen judicial and law enforcement institutions and eliminate corruption. Ebola outbreak had a negative impact on the economic and social development and caused further challenges in the promotion and protection of human rights. China called on the international community to provide technical assistance and capacity building to Liberia.

736. The Congo commended the high quality cooperation of Liberia with the UPR and its efforts deployed to address a number of challenges further to a long period of conflict, including the Ebola epidemic. It encouraged Liberia to implement the UPR recommendations.

737. Cuba noted that Ebola epidemic had had a negative impact on Liberia during its last development period; despite international assistance received, including from Cuba, in the health sector. Cuba reiterated the necessity for the international community, in particular developed countries, to increase cooperation and financial assistance to Liberia, especially to strengthen health infrastructure. Cuba thanked Liberia for supporting its recommendations related to health and economic and social rights.

738. Djibouti welcomed Liberia's efforts to promote and protect human rights, in particular to improve life conditions that were negatively affected during the Ebola crisis. Djibouti encouraged Liberia to continue its effort to consolidate the rule of law, as well as peace and reconciliation, in accordance with the National Truth and Justice Commission.

739. Ethiopia acknowledged Liberia continuing engagement with the HRC mechanisms and appreciated the acceptance of many recommendations. It commended Liberia for launching a long-term comprehensive strategy for development and actions related to peace-building and reconciliation. Ethiopia also noted with satisfaction Liberia's commitment with promotion and protection of human rights by providing wide coverage of social services, specially health and education.

740. Gabon congratulated Liberia for its commitment to implement recommendations emerged from the 2nd UPR. It noted many difficulties provoked by the Ebola epidemic, as well as notable actions taken by Liberia to improve the human rights situation, including regarding the legal and institutional framework. It encouraged Liberia to implement the UPR recommendations.

741. Ghana indicated that it will support Liberia's efforts to implement UPR recommendations. The presence of the Liberian delegation reminded the dark days of the civil war, but also reassured of how far the resilient people of Liberia have come. It urged Liberia to join the Group of Friends of the Responsibility to Protect in order to promote a better understanding of the never again moment, captured in the UP Charter, and say enough to war in the region and in the world.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

742. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Liberia, three other stakeholders made statements.

743. International Lesbian and Gay Association regretted the lack of support by Liberia to recommendations on issues of sexual orientation and gender identity. According to the association, LGBTI persons in Liberia continued to be subject to human rights abuses such as harassment, physical attacks, verbal abuse, hate crimes, religious intolerance, negative media expression and family rejection. The Penal Code criminalized "voluntary sodomy" by same-sex couples and Liberia lacked legal provisions to combat hate crimes and incidents against LBGT persons. LGBT persons also faced obstacles to access basic services, particularly health services, and remained stigmatized and discriminated.

744. Amnesty International appreciated efforts by Liberia to uphold human rights in spite of challenges arising from the Ebola outbreak. However, despite policy reform and other positive initiatives, it was concerned by shortcoming in the justice sector. AI urged Liberia to improve detention conditions, in line with international standards, and to use pre-trial detention as a measure of last resort. AI was also concerned at deficiencies in the judicial system that had led to impunity for sexual and gender-based violence. It reiterated its call

on Liberia to increase resources and improve coordination and cooperation with the justice system on cases of gender-based violence. AI also called on Liberia to accelerate the ratification of the OPs to CRC and to immediately abolish the death penalty.

745. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme (RADDHO) congratulated Liberia for the positive results of fight against Ebola, as well as for progress made on the human rights area from its 1st UPR. It noted the establishment of the National Human Rights Commission, and supported actions taken to implement the Palava Hut strategy of Peace Consolidation and reconciliation in the Country. RADDHO was concerned at increasing of unemployment rates among young people, as well as violence against women and children. It hoped that current constitutional reforms will contribute to abolish death penalty, and eliminate discrimination against women, and child recruitment to army activities. RADDHO invited Liberia to pay further attention to inequalities in health services and related to the protection of Ebola's survivals. It requested the international community to support Liberia efforts regarding its plan of stabilisation and economic recovery for the rehabilitation of its health infrastructure and its economy affected by Ebola.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

746. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 186 recommendations received, 147 enjoy the support of Liberia, and 39 are noted.

747. The Delegation of Liberia expressed its appreciation and thanked member states, the HRC, NGOs and all those who contribute to the UPR process, for their comments and support. It took note of comments received and will continue to enhance efforts to implement recommendations despite challenges and difficulties. Recommendations noted will also inspire the national human rights plan.

Marshall Islands

748. The review of the Marshall Islands was held on 11 May 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 Marshall Islands in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/MHL/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/MHL/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/MHL/3).

749. At the 27th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the Marshall Islands (see section C below).

750. The outcome of the review of the Marshall Islands comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/13), the views of the Marshall Islands 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/30/13/Add.1 and A/HRC/30/13/Corr.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

751. The Marshall Islands reiterated its gratitude to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Human Rights Council, the Working Group, the Regional Rights Resource Team of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat and its bilateral partners for allowing and preparing it to partake in the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process.

752. The Marshall Islands was pleased to submit its responses to recommendations made through the UPR process as follows. Given its limited resources to carry out and ensure proper implementation of the recommendations, the Government of the Marshall Islands once again called upon the international community in providing assistance in this regard.

753. With regard to the ratification of human rights treaties, the Marshall Islands accepted the recommendations to ratifying or acceding to the core human rights instruments and respective Optional Protocols and to analyse and develop strategies to do so as endorsed by its Cabinet in May 2015.

754. The Marshall Islands accepted the recommendations to strengthen the promotion of human rights activities and the Government will continue to work with various non-governmental organizations in the promotion of human rights. The Marshall Islands also accepted the recommendations to developing socio-economic strategies and plans.

755. In addition, the Marshall Islands accepted the recommendations to further review its laws to be in conformity with the international human rights standards and its Constitution. While some gaps might exist, they would naturally be addressed over an extended period of time as part of the implementation process.

756. The Marshall Islands accepted the recommendations to addressing women's rights and domestic violence and dealing with other issues affecting women. It recognized that adequate progress towards basic national development – as well as wider regional and global goals – would not happen without addressing the social and economic contribution of women.

757. The Marshall Islands accepted the recommendations to implementing children's rights to improve the situation of children in the country and the recommendations to continue to take steps to addressing other needs of persons with disability.

758. The Marshall Islands accepted the recommendations and recognized the need to strengthen progress in education and health. Although it had progressed gender parity in education, this had not resulted in economic outcomes for women and girls; and while it was able to strengthen prenatal and postnatal program, and increase its emphasis on preventative care to ensure that woman could continue to have safe pregnancies and births, it continued to have the highest teenage pregnancy rate and second-youngest population in the Pacific.

759. As a nation being affected by climate change, the Marshall Islands accepted the recommendations to addressing climate change and will continue to advocate to strengthening impacts relating to human rights issue and recognized the need to implement measures to build resilience, reduce disaster risk, support renewable energy and energy efficiency, and other adaptation measures. On September 24, 2015, the President signed a Proclamation on a State of Disaster whereas the communities in the affected atolls of the Marshall Islands by Typhoon Nangka had been overwhelmed with the challenges and effects resulting from those persisting strong winds, storm surges and inundation and were facing infrastructure, both private and public, coastal damage and economic hardship. As the saying goes in the Pacific, "We are not drowning, we are fighting".

760. The Marshall Islands accepted the recommendations and emphasized the report of the Special Rapporteur on the implications for human rights of environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous wastes when he visited the country in March 2012, and the United States in April 2012, “to assess the impact of human rights of the Nuclear Testing Program conducted in the Marshall Islands by the United States from 1946 to 1958”.

761. Last but not the least, the Marshall Islands noted the importance of establishing a national human rights institution. However, at this time it was not considering such establishment due to limited resources. Overall, as with the promotion of human rights, the Government continued to work with various non-governmental organizations in the promotion of human rights, particularly Women United Together Marshall Islands.

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

762. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Marshall Islands, seven delegations made statements.

763. China thanked the Marshall Islands for its constructive participation in the UPR and welcomed its positive reaction to the recommendations made during the UPR. China also thanked the Marshall Islands for having accepted its recommendations to improve public infrastructure, water sanitation and ensure adequate living standards for its people despite the effect of climate change, as well as provide rapid response with the international assistance.

764. Cuba was grateful to the small island developing State that had suffered the negative effect of nuclear testing and of the climate change, for having accepted the two recommendations made by Cuba. The progress made by the country in human rights should be underlined, in particular, of note, was the Government interest in implementing the recommendations accepted during the first cycle of the UPR. Cuba reiterated its call to the international community to support the Marshall Islands on those areas that the country had mentioned in its national report. It wished every success in the implementation of the recommendations accepted in the second cycle of the UPR.

765. Fiji thanked and commended the Marshall Islands for its constructive engagement with the UPR process. Fiji came from the same region and understood the challenges of a small island developing State with resource constraints and many extraneous challenges to development. Accordingly, the efforts of the Marshall Islands in ensuring that human rights were addressed in an institutional structure most appropriate for the size and situation of the country were appreciated. Fiji thanked the Marshall Islands for positively considering the recommendations made by Fiji. The implementation of the National Gender Policy, and gender-responsive budgeting and planning were a useful tool to ensure mainstreaming of gendered perspectives of human rights. Fiji would also continue to work in partnership with the Marshall Islands on climate change advocacy, as well as in learning from best practice on training on human rights impacts of climate change.

766. The Philippines welcomed the presentation of updates and responses of the Marshall Islands to the recommendations it received during its second periodic review. Cognizant of the resource constraints of the Marshall Islands, its acceptance of a large number of recommendations in that review process left no doubt to its strong commitment towards the promotion, protection and fulfilment of human rights of its people. As fellow climate vulnerable country, Philippines appreciated the continuing adherence of the Marshall Islands to the human rights based approach in addressing the adverse impact of climate change to the full and effective enjoyment of human rights. Philippines looked forward to its continuing partnership with the Marshall Islands in this concern. It also looked forward

for the reinforced cooperation and active engagement of the Marshall Islands with its bilateral, regional and international partners to as it implement its accepted recommendations in this cycle of UPR.

767. Sierra Leone commended the efforts of the Marshall Islands to harmonize human rights into national legislation as well as its willingness to seek international assistance and technical support to meet its commitments. In spite of its limited resources, the Marshall Islands had in recent years sought to adopt a series of normative standards which demonstrated its commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Sierra Leone noted, with particular interest, the National Strategic Plan of 2015-2017, the National Policy on Disability Inclusive Development, the human rights commission bill and the child protection bill. It hoped the two bills would be adopted into national law and policies in the foreseeable future. Sierra Leone believed that serious consideration should again be paid to the impact climate change had on this region and therefore the capacity of the Marshall Islands to implement human rights norms, especially as it was a small islands developing State which was subject to specific geographical sensitivities. Nonetheless, Sierra Leone hoped the recommendations it put to the Marshall Islands, including those relating to abolishing child marriage, had enjoyed support, with the possibility that they would be incorporated into future national human rights strategies.

768. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela noted that despite major challenges such as the economic crisis and climate change, the Marshall Islands had made noteworthy efforts to fulfil the recommendations accepted under the UPR. The country had undertaken major legislative reforms to bring its laws into line with international standards with significant progress in terms of policy for protecting women rights. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela recognized the political will of the Marshall Islands to honour its human rights commitments. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela encouraged the Marshall Islands to continue strengthening social policy for most needy groups with the support of the international community.

769. Rwanda welcomed the delegation of the Marshall Islands and thanked the Marshall Islands for its participation in the UPR. It acknowledged the continued commitment of the Marshall Islands to human rights and to strengthening laws protecting human rights. Rwanda congratulated the Marshall Islands on ratifying the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disability. It also welcomed the measures taken to combat gender-based violence and protect the rights of children. It wished the Marshall Islands every success in implementing the accepted recommendations.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

770. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Marshall Islands, two other stakeholders made statements.

771. United Nations Watch stressed that according to the annual human rights survey by Freedom House, the Marshall Islands received the highest possible rankings on the measure of freedom, on civil liberties, and also on political rights. This was worthy of sincere congratulations. At the same time, United Nations Watch encouraged the Marshall Islands to take further actions, to strengthen human rights protection, in particular in the fields of women and children's rights, non-discrimination related to sexual orientation and gender identity, and persons with disabilities. In addition, it would like to encourage the Marshall Islands to take measures to increase the participation and representation of women in political life. Respect for human rights and the founding principles of the United Nations Charter were manifest not only by a Government's domestic policy and practice, but also by the degree to which it supported the promotion and protection of human rights in the international arena. In this regard, the Marshall Islands had an exemplary record in its voting at the General Assembly. Where others might go along to get along, the Marshall

Islands had taken firm and principled positions in support of peace, human rights, and the equality principles of the United Nations Charter, and in noble opposition to selectivity, polarization, demonization, politicization and double-standards. Due to its small size and budget, the Marshall Islands had only a delegation in New York but none in Geneva. United Nations Watch was concerned that a United Nations member State was 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.

772. World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace stated it was aware of the unique challenges related to the history of the resilient nation of Marshall Islands in relations to human rights. The right of self-determination was the most significant pursuit of the people of the Marshall Islands. The process of demilitarization and decolonization was significant and its legacy continued to impact the realization of the Marshall Islands to guarantee civil liberties, human rights and fundamental freedoms. There were 67 atmospheric detonations of nuclear bombs on the nation of atolls for over a decade after the conclusion of the Second World War. While the bombs had stopped, the symptoms of sickness continued to haunt economic, social and cultural rights, specifically the right to health. The Marshall Islands was a member State of the United Nations but also entered into Compact of Free Association with the United States of America. World Association believed that the human rights mechanisms of the United Nations Human Rights Council specifically the special procedures could contribute to the promotion and protection of human rights. World Association applauded the visit of the Special Rapporteur on the implications for human rights of the environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes in 2012 to investigate the Nuclear Testing Program. The Marshall Islands should issue a standing invitation for all special procedures. There should be a prioritization relating to climate change and human rights. The Marshall Islands should ratify the core human rights treaties. There should also be creation of a national human rights institution to coordinate national plans of action to address the intersectionality of human rights in the islands. Human rights education should be absolutely essential, especially with a focus on climate justice. The scale and intensity of climate change was a crisis in Oceania. Climate change already violated the right to self-determination. It even impacted more the right to water, food and health. All States that posed questions and made recommendations had to protect human rights in the Marshall Islands by committing to 1.5 degrees in Paris. States had also to assist in addressing the impact of climate change harnessing the political will and resources of the international community. World Association will volunteer to assist in human rights education. World Association also pledged assistance in creating a national human rights institution. It echoed the voice of Ambassador DeBroom and advocate Kathy Jetnil-Kijiner during the opening of the United Nations Climate Change Summit in 2014. It stood in solidarity even as the water rose.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

773. The President stated that based on the information provided, out of 111 received recommendations, 102 enjoy the support of the Marshall Islands while 9 are noted.

774. The Marshall Islands thanked all the delegations and non-governmental organizations which provided comments and made remarks on its UPR. The Marshall Islands would continue to find opportunities and avenues to improve human rights situation in the country, but wished to say that strengthened capacity required implementing plans and commitments to promote and protect human rights. Moreover, support from the international community was necessary. Again, the Marshall Islands thanked the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Human Rights Council, the Working Group, the Regional Rights Resource Team of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat and its bilateral partners for their support which ensured the meaningful participation of the Marshall Islands to its second UPR.

Croatia

775. The review of Croatia was held on 12 May 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 Croatia in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/HRV/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/HRV/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/HRV/3).

776. At the 27th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Croatia (see section C below).

777. The outcome of the review of Croatia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/14), the views of Croatia 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/30/14/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

778. The head of delegation, Ms. Vesna Batistić Kos, Permanent Representative of Croatia to the United Nations in Geneva, was pleased to present Croatia position regarding the recommendations they received during the second cycle. It considered this as an opportunity for Croatia to present the continuity of their policies in the field of the protection and promotion of human rights and pledged that if elected to the Human Rights Council for the period 2017 – 2019, Croatia will work with all Member States in the genuine spirit of cooperation and solidarity. They appreciated all countries constructive remarks and recommendations during the interactive UPR dialogue.

779. The Croatian Government has reviewed carefully and in good will 167 recommendations in close cooperation and through intensive and fruitful consultations with all relevant actors in Croatia. We are pleased to inform you, that Croatia was able to accept 162 recommendations; among those six that were partially accepted are now confirmed to be fully accepted. Only five recommendations have been noted.

780. The head of delegation addressed the HRC on the recommendations they received in a thematic clustering:

781. The head of delegation drew attention to the fact that Croatia is a party to almost all international human rights treaties, without reservations to any of their provisions. On the recommendation to ratify ICRMW, Croatia, as a member state of the European Union, adheres to the common policy on migration and will continue to actively participate in the consideration of the EU asylum framework within the EU. They underline the particular sensitivity that Croatia attaches to the current plight of migrants arriving to Europe. From the beginning of the crisis, around 55 000 people have entered Croatia on their way to final European destinations and that number is still growing. All arrivals have been taken care of in a humane and dignified manner. They underlined that the current situation requires a swift, but a comprehensive response, as well as they will continue to advocate the importance of addressing the root causes of these overwhelming migrations. Regarding the ratification of the ILO Convention 189, Croatia considered that its existing legal framework

is sufficient and is therefore currently not planning to ratify this Convention. In addition, their legislation does not recognize the term of domestic workers.

782. The head of delegation stated that a review of the alignment of the national legislation and practices is ongoing with a view to take the decision on ratifying the OP-ICESCR; preparatory activities related to the ratification of the OP-CRC-IC are also envisaged and the ratification of the ICPED is under consideration.

783. The head of delegation explained regarding the recommendation to establish an inter-ministerial committee responsible for international HR obligations, that Croatia uses a system where the ministries are the competent state bodies that, in accordance with their jurisdiction, deal with the implementation of the provisions of the HR conventions.

784. Regarding the Legislative and Institutional Framework, Croatia was proud that, in accordance with the analyses of different human rights mechanisms, it demonstrated a solid legal framework. Thus, all recommendations were accepted.

785. Regarding the issue of Discrimination and Hate crime and speech, they have accepted all recommendations. The Criminal Code adopted in 2013 is fully harmonized with modern European criminal laws that distinguish defamation and insult. Furthermore, the amendments passed in 2015 amended the criminal offense of severe defamation and stipulated more clearly the preconditions for exclusion of unlawfulness.

786. Related to the Prisons/Torture, there have been several recommendations and all of them were accepted.

787. In light of the recommendations to the issue on Domestic Violence, Croatia was surprised by their number of recommendations (20); however they accepted all of them. Through permanent adjustment of the legislative framework (Gender Equality Act and the National Policy on Gender Equality), specific and targeted measures have already been put in place to effectively combat gender discrimination and gender based violence. Croatia will continue to implement measures to further increase the proportion of women in decision-making processes. Further action for gender equality and women empowerment will also include measures to combat widespread gender stereotypes and raise the level of public knowledge.

788. All recommendations concerning the rights of the child and the rights of persons with disabilities are already implemented or are in the process of the implementation. Croatia traditionally supported all resolutions that focus on child's protection, including in armed conflict. A new National Strategy for the Rights of the Child 2014/20 has been adopted with a great number of measures to further improve the situation in this area.

789. Croatia stated that it fully recognises the need to strengthen the promotion, protection and monitoring the rights of persons with disabilities. It established a modern institutional framework that can answer their need and exercise their rights. Croatia is among a small number of countries that have a special Office of the Ombudsperson for Persons with Disabilities.

790. The Ambassador emphasized that Croatia attaches great importance to the protection of the LGBTI persons from discrimination as well as to enabling them to enjoy their rights. The Life Partnership Act adopted in 2014 has introduced a civil partnership for same-sex couples with all rights that married heterosexual couples enjoy, except for the adoption of children. However, the recommendation related to the strengthening the accountability and prosecution of law enforcement officers who commit abuses against LGBTI persons and ethnic persons has been noted. Since 2007 Croatia implements a system of track record for all hate crimes. During that period no law enforcement officers were recorded as perpetrators of hate motivated criminal offences or misdemeanors. In addition, since 2006

Croatian Police introduced education on hate crimes for police officers at the Police Academy.

791. On Trafficking in Persons, Croatia was pleased that it received only four recommendations. This has been a significant decrease from the first UPR cycle, however what is more important – it is a sign that our efforts to combat this phenomenon are effective.

792. The Ambassador shared that for Croatia accepted all recommendations on minorities and they are now in the course of implementation. Members of national minorities in Croatia enjoy the rights prescribed in Croatian Constitution, in adopted international instruments as well as in laws established for the purpose of their protection. They are guaranteed the right to representation in the Croatian Parliament as well as in local self-government units. When it comes to Roma minority, it is important to stress that the national policy on Roma is in place since 2003 and that Croatia was also one of the founding members of the Decade of Roma Inclusion. Although challenges across numerous areas still exist, the progress made in Roma inclusion cannot be disputed. It has in particular been documented in the area of education and employment.

793. On Refuges/returnees, the head of delegation noted that this refers to one of those important issues that still exist in their society as a consequence of the Homeland war and they reiterate that Croatia is fully dedicated to solving all problems regarding the right to adequate housing and the other rights of these people and is cooperating actively within the framework of the Regional Housing Program. In addition they accepted all four recommendations.

794. Croatia also accepted all recommendations regarding War crimes and missing persons. As it was clearly shown in interactive dialogue with the Working group on involuntary and enforced disappearance last week in the Council same hall, regional cooperation remains the inevitable requirement in resolving the remaining issues related to missing persons. It is progressing and should speed up as well as they started the initiative for the preparation of a regional list of missing persons.

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

795. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Croatia, 14 delegations made statements.

796. Benin noted with interested the important measures taken to strengthen legal framework to protect minorities and vulnerable groups and commended Croatia on reforms to its judiciary and its public prosecutor's office and simplification in the procedures concerning youth justice. Benin encouraged Croatia to ratify international instruments with regards to human rights, and promote equal opportunity and foster implementation of the relevant national policies.

797. China welcomed the constructive engagement of Croatia with the UPR mechanism and its decision to accept most of the recommendations. China appreciates the fact that Croatia has accepted the recommendations made by China. Croatia has continued its efforts effectively to implement the action plan of employment of all minority groups towards the pre-set targets, Croatia also accepted the recommendation to implement the national immigration policy and measures according to the relevant situation and make the necessary adjustment concerning the protection of rights of migrants.

798. Côte d'Ivoire thanked Croatia for its replies and the additional information they provided at this meeting. They commended Croatia for its interest with the recommendations stemming from this review and wished them success in the

implementation of the accepted recommendations as this will have an effective contribution to the full enjoyment of human rights. It invited Croatia to further efforts with regards to migration management and promotion of gender equality as well as work to overcome racial and other prejudice. To conclude, Cote d'Ivoire invited Croatia to pursue its fruitful cooperation with human rights mechanisms.

799. The Council of Europe evoked recommendations made to Croatia by various monitoring bodies of the COE. It noted three main challenges facing Croatia. First, the need to resolve human rights issues from the 91-92 conflict and provide victims access to justice, effective domestic remedies, and reparation. Second, it urged Croatia to facilitate the naturalization of all stateless Roma and provide them access to free legal aid, and end segregation and discrimination of Roma children in schools. Third, it called on Croatia to improve material conditions in prisons reduce overcrowding, and end physical ill-treatment. They invited Croatia to ratify the Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence, and the Third Additional Protocol to the European Convention on Extradition.

800. Cuba thanked Croatia for the explanation provided with regard to the countries position on the recommendations received within the Working Group. In addition, they thanked Croatia for having accepted the two recommendations made by Cuba concerning the rights of women and of persons with disabilities. They urged Croatia to implement the accepted recommendations as a signal of Croatia's commitment to the UPR mechanism.

801. Estonia welcomed the measure taken to address several crucial challenges as raised in the national review, both what concerns the institutional set-up, the legislation and the implementation of measures at various levels. They appreciated the continuous commitment to further improve human rights situation in Croatia. They evoked the recommendation to Croatia to ensure investigation of all unresolved cases of missing persons and bring perpetrators to justice.

802. Romania was pleased to see their recommendations in the course of implementation as the recommendations received during the Working Group sessions and those formulated by their delegation have been accepted. They note with satisfaction the voluntary commitment by Croatia to update the second UPR, through its Mid-term report.

803. Rwanda commended Croatia for their commitment to promoting human rights and welcomed the positive steps in promoting inclusive education. It encouraged Croatia to consider ratifying the International Convention for the Protection of Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their Families.

804. Serbia welcomed Croatia for accepting its recommendations. However, it noted with concern the deterioration in Croatia with regards to human rights of the Siberian minority, citing the example in which the Vukovar City Council decided to ban the of the Cyrillic script in an area where Serbs comprise 40% of the population. They called on Croatia to comply with their international commitments and respect religious freedom of minorities. They also called on Croatia to ensure full accountability for all manifestation of ethnic based hate speech, racism, and extremist rhetoric. They reiterated their recommendation concerning the prosecution of past human rights violations, war crimes and crimes against humanity.

805. Sierra Leone appreciated the commitment demonstrated by Croatia in establishing normative standards in the promotion and protection of fundamental freedoms. Recognizing the challenges in addressing the issue of human trafficking, Sierra Leone encouraged Croatia to increase efforts aimed at human rights training of all its law enforcement officials. Sierra Leone also recommended the ratification of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and encouraged Croatia to do more with regards to granting asylum and protecting unaccompanied migrant children.

They urged Croatia to do more to effectively address incidents of hate crimes with a view to standardizing the criminalization of such practices.

806. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela noted Croatia's full open cooperation with the Working Group on the UPR, testifying to its commitment to promoting and protecting human rights. They were pleased to note that over the period under review, Croatia showed considerable progress in raising awareness for the population with regards to minorities and vulnerable groups as well as efforts to promote political participation by women and to guarantee gender equality. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the progress achieved in the human rights arena and encouraged it to continue to strengthen its social programs particularly in the areas of employment, health and food in order to guarantee the best possible levels of well-being of the population.

807. Albania was pleased that Croatia accepted the majority of recommendations including both of its recommendations and commended its commitment to fully implement them. They expressed satisfaction with regards to progress made on the Roma community rights and its participation to the regional process on the refugee issue. It encouraged Croatia for further progress in all areas of protection and promoting of human rights.

808. Bulgaria thanked Croatia for its engagement with the UPR as well as for their bilateral cooperation and dialogue on this issue. They commended Croatia on the implementation of the National program for the protection and promotion of human rights 2013-2016 and the created institutions and mechanisms. It encouraged Croatia to strengthen efforts to combat discrimination, social exclusion of minorities and cases of hate speech, while taking note of the creation of a working group for monitoring hate crimes. It also encouraged the judicial reform, the process of deinstitutionalization and the fight against domestic violence.

809. Egypt encouraged Croatia's continued efforts and commitment in promoting and protecting human rights through the positive institutional, legislative and policy developments particularly in strengthening international human rights institutions, elimination of sexual violence, combatting hate speech, prevention of torture and better representation of women in public and political life. It invited Croatia to continue its efforts using the opportunity of the UPR through effective national follow-up process to address institutional and policy challenges. Egypt welcomed Croatia's acceptance of its recommendations in the realization of the right to work, ensuring balance in geographical coverage of health care and attainment of the right to safe drinking water and sanitation for all, and wished it success in their implementation.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

810. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Croatia, three other stakeholders made statements.

811. Allied Rainbow Communities International recognized Croatia's progress in the protection of LGBT rights, but pointed out the gender identity issues that remain neglected. They raised concern over the lack of adequate legislation providing access to legal gender recognition. They also stressed that the Regulation on obtaining medical documentation and requirement preconditions are ineffective and violates human rights of trans persons. They called on Croatia to urgently ensure respect of right to gender identity and right to bodily autonomy and to accept and implement a recommendation to strengthen its human rights protection of LGBT's in line with its international obligations and commitments as well as with domestic legislation. They stressed the importance of close cooperation with LGBTIQ and human rights organizations when working on advancement of their rights.

812. Human Rights House Foundation urged Croatia to take the necessary financial measures to guarantee everyone's access to the legal aid system. They noted serious threats

to freedom of media by the new provisions of the Penal Code, which re-introduce defamation and prosecution of journalists. They noted that discrimination towards women, minority and vulnerable groups, remains a widespread. They called upon Croatia to amend the Anti-Discrimination Act by re-defining the grounds of discrimination and exceptions and to draft a National Anti-Discrimination Plan. They urged Croatia to implementation of the Constitutional Act on Rights of National Minorities. They reiterated their call on Croatia to engage in a more systematic manner with human rights groups.

813. Action Canada for Population and Development noted the positive development made by Croatia in accepting recommendations in relation to sexual violence and ratifying the COE Convention on Prevention and Combatting Violence against Women and Domestic Violence, particularly with the importance given to article 9 as it calls for effective cooperation with organizations combatting violence against women. It highlighted the lack of specialist rape crises centers and the need for legislative and other measures to provide specialist support services to victims in an adequate geographical distribution. They noted regret that no recommendations addressed challenges facing accessibility and affordability of abortion and the need to monitor implementation of Curriculum of Health Education in schools.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

814. The President stated that based on the information provided, out of 167 received recommendations, 162 enjoyed Croatia's support while 5 are noted.

815. The Ambassador expressed her gratitude to all speakers, including the civil society. With a view to ratifying the Istanbul Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence, Croatia will conduct activities required to ensure administrative and financial resources as the ratification must go hand in hand with creating preconditions for its effective implementation.

816. Regarding the issues of investigations and prosecutions of war crimes, the head of delegation assured that the Government is committed to the prosecution and punishment of individuals responsible for the crimes during the Homeland War. The head of delegation emphasized that there is no ethnic bias in prosecuting war crimes as Croatia investigates and prosecutes war crimes in a non-discriminatory manner. Croatia was especially proud of the new Bill on compensating the victims of sexual violence committed during the Homeland War.

817. The Ambassador stressed that Croatia continues to protect and promote the participation of all of its twenty two national minorities in all aspects of society with the objective of implementing the Constitutional Act on the Rights of National Minorities. It was explained that the right to equal official use of a minority language and scripts other than Croatian is being respected throughout the country, with the use of the Serbian Cyrillic script in the Town of Vukovar remaining a sensitive one. The head of delegation stated that regardless of the sensitiveness of this issue the Government is determined to ensure the full implementation of the provisions of the Constitutional law, while being bound by the Constitutional court judgements' order not to enforce this law in the area of the Town of Vukovar by using coercive measures.

818. The Ambassador noted that Croatian Government is committed to change Roma social and economic dynamics, by providing them with specific programs and resources. It was stated that Croatian National Roma Inclusion Strategy 2013-2020 and accompanying Action Plan go beyond four areas suggested in the most advanced international documents.

819. The Ambassador mentioned that Croatia is handling the migratory influx with great sensitivity but its capacity is not unlimited. Croatia recognised its duty to ensure the security and safety of people passing the Croatian territory as well as the assistance they

require. Shelters in Croatia are fully functional but refugees/migrants are refusing to stay and are opting to continue their journey.

820. The Ambassador concluded by saying that they are confident that this final outcome of the review will further contribute to Croatia's efforts in enhancing the human rights of its citizens, while expressing the full support to the UPR mechanism.

Jamaica

821. The review of Jamaica was held on 13 May 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 Jamaica in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/JAM/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/JAM/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/JAM/3).

822. At the 28th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Jamaica (see section C below).

823. The outcome of the review of Jamaica comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/15), the views of Jamaica 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/30/15/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 Jamaica stated that during the interactive dialogue 168 recommendations were made, the majority of which were accepted by Jamaica, including some which the Government regarded as having been already implemented or in the process of being implemented.

825. Jamaica had submitted its final response to the recommendations received in May 2015, including those that the Government had declared would have required further consideration. In all, Jamaica had accepted 92 recommendations in whole and 2 recommendations in part, including 68 that the Government considered as having already been implemented or as being in the process of implementation.

826. The delegation of Jamaica stated it had a longstanding policy that reflected its very serious commitment to the country's obligations to implement international treaties to which it was party, in good faith. As such, Jamaica did not bind itself and its citizens to any treaty, unless or until it was satisfied that the domestic framework to give effect to that international treaty would stand up to national scrutiny, and to the standards set by that treaty. This fundamental approach had informed Jamaica's responses to those recommendations relating to the accession to various treaties.

827. The delegation then addressed the responses to recommendations across various thematic clusters:

828. On institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures, Jamaica confirmed its acceptance of those recommendations related to, inter alia, the establishment

of a National Human Rights Institution and human rights training and sensitization for the Jamaica Constabulary Force and the Judiciary.

829. With respect to recommendations about human rights defenders the delegation reiterated that there was no basis for stating that human rights defenders were at risk in Jamaica. Full protection was afforded to these persons as citizens under the law. Jamaican human rights advocates were extremely active, openly and boldly engaged in fearless advocacy, and had contributed and continued to contribute positively to the development of the Jamaican human rights architecture.

830. Jamaica confirmed its acceptance of the recommendation regarding the creation of an online system to track international recommendations, including those accepted by the State under the UPR mechanism. As a Small Island Developing State (SIDS), with resources that were often stretched quite thinly; such a system would, if effectively implemented, go a far way in assisting Jamaica with both domestic implementation and reporting responsibilities.

831. The delegation stated that Jamaica was not opposed to accommodating visits of Special Rapporteurs but that however these were and would continue to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Jamaica was therefore, not in a position to issue standing invitations to Special Rapporteurs, irrespective of how much it valued their work and the issues for which they advocated. In the case of agreed visits, it was critically important that the Government be given adequate notice, through established diplomatic channels, to ensure that necessary arrangements were in place for successful visits, in accordance with mutually-agreed timelines.

832. The delegation also placed on record its recommendation that a mechanism be put in place by the Human Rights Council that allowed for the sharing of information among the various Human Rights bodies and procedures, as often there were overlapping requests which were inefficient and unduly stretched the limited resources of many members.

833. On recommendations to combat non-discrimination and actions to protect vulnerable persons including women, children and the disabled, as well as the LGBTI community, Jamaica had accepted the majority of recommendations. It had an agglomeration of legislation, policies, strategies and measures in place at various levels, which formed an effective machinery that provided all Jamaicans redress from discrimination of any kind. Jamaica was therefore, not in agreement with those recommendations that suggested that the only way to effectively fight discrimination was through a single anti-discrimination law.

834. Jamaicans could and sought redress in various sectors, primarily employment, education and health. The delegation mentioned several mechanisms for this purpose, such as the Industrial Disputes Tribunal (IDT) and the mechanism established in the Ministry of Education and Health and Health.

835. The Government of Jamaica condemned all forms of discrimination and negative stereotypes affecting women and children. It was pursuing appropriate policies to eliminate these acts and a gender equality framework was currently in place for this purpose. Legal and constitutional reforms were undertaken against sex discrimination and sexual harassment.

836. The delegation expressed that Jamaica was a Party to CRPD (2007); CEDAW (1984); CRC (1991) and other conventions and platforms. It also supported the agreed Outcome Documents of international and regional meetings on gender equality.

837. The delegation also shared some of the relevant domestic legislation that promoted gender equality and the protection of women, girls, boys and men, and persons with disabilities, including: The Charter of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms 2011; The Sexual

Offences Act, 2011; The Child Care and Protection Act, 2004 and The Domestic Violence Act, 1995 (Amendment) 2004.

838. Jamaica had accepted the recommendation to ensure that women and girls had effective access to justice, including through the provision of legal aid. This was reflected in Jamaica's Legal Aid Act, through which legal aid was available to both men and women.

839. Jamaica continued to take steps to end prejudice and stigmatisation affecting all Jamaicans, including LGBTI persons, emphasising mutual respect among all Jamaicans, adherence to the rule of law and continuing in a strong historical tradition of freedom of expression and opinion. Jamaica did not accept any recommendation which sought to typify the attitudes of Jamaican society generally as "homophobic".

840. The Government of Jamaica had consistently condemned all acts of violence, against all persons and had been a leading voice in the Caribbean region regarding this issue.

841. The delegation reported that legislative and administrative reforms had significantly improved the operations of state actors in issues regarding the police, the judiciary and conditions in prisons. Therefore, there was no difficulty for Jamaica in accepting many of the recommendations in these areas.

842. Jamaica also accepted most of the recommendations that addressed implementation or enhancement of social and economic rights and conditions for Jamaican citizens.

843. On recommendations made regarding trafficking in persons, most of them accepted by Jamaica, the delegation asserted that owing to the clandestine nature of this crime, it had been difficult to secure convictions, although it reported one successful conviction and there were seven cases before the Courts.

844. The delegation said it had noted the partial recommendation urging the decriminalisation of abortion and could confirm that in Jamaica, abortion was permissible on certain medical grounds.

845. Although Jamaica had accepted several of the recommendations regarding the Independent Commission of Investigations (INDECOM), which investigated cases of alleged excessive use of force, it regarded as redundant, the recommendation to amend the Coroner's Act to strengthen INDECOM's powers. As currently written, the Coroner's Act gave the Coroner, the authority to deem anyone an interested party in a Coroner's Inquest. Should INDECOM have an interest in a matter before the Coroner's Court, it simply had to indicate this interest to the Coroner.

846. With respect to the recommendations regarding corporal punishment, this had been abolished in early childhood institutions, children's homes and other arranged alternate living spaces, and appropriate measures were being taken to ensure that it was discontinued in schools. The Child Care and Protection Act afforded protection for all children from abuse.

847. The delegation stated that the Jamaican Government remained committed to the implementation of the recommendations of the UPR, and would endeavour to uphold its demonstrated tradition of respect for the rule of law. It reiterated the Government's gratitude to its many bilateral and multilateral partners, who had offered sage advice, technical and other assistance to increase its capacity to honour its obligations to the people of Jamaica.

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

848. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Jamaica, nine delegations made statements.

849. Sierra Leone applauded steps taken by Jamaica, in addition to its constitutional provisions which further guaranteed the fundamental freedoms as evidenced in the Charter of fundamental Rights and Freedoms. It stated that despite a challenging financial situation, Jamaica had managed to reform its justice sector and had entertained the idea of establishing a national human rights commission based on the Paris Principles. Sierra Leone recognized that implementation of recommendations was often determined by the scarcity of resources which may undermine the general political will. It stated that however, it was clear that Jamaica attached dedication to the UPR process and the Council as a whole. It encouraged Jamaica to continue to seek assistance to more comprehensively address adaptation measures to address the effects of climate change. It also encouraged Jamaica to establish a moratorium on death penalty and to ratify CAT and the ICPED.

850. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela appreciated Government efforts in the compliance of accepted UPR recommendations. It was pleased about Jamaica's willingness that had enabled a positive interaction during this review. It highlighted major advances in the country on gender equality and the adoption of the Law on Persons with Disability which brought this vulnerable group more protection. It recognized efforts in the field of human rights and encouraged Jamaica to continue strengthening its social policies in favour of the most needed sector of the population.

851. The Bahamas noted that Jamaica had embarked on a path of national transformation through its national development plan for 2009-2030. The Bahamas was pleased to note that despite the constraints that the country faced as a Small Island Developing State, Jamaica had accepted 23 of the recommendations submitted during its review and had already implemented or was in the process of implementing a further 62 recommendations. It noted Jamaica's continuing efforts to promote and protect the rights of the most vulnerable groups in society and applauded its strides in advancing the rights of women by the incorporation of a gender perspective in its laws and public policies, and pursuing measures to combat violence against women.

852. Benin welcomed the efforts and accomplishments of Jamaica through the implementation of recommendations issued during its UPR. The Delegation of Benin congratulated Jamaica for ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention on Children's Rights on the sale of children, child prostitution and pornography as well as for actions taken as part of its economic reform program, reducing unemployment, lower inflation, reducing the current account deficit and rising foreign domestic investment. It noted with satisfaction the progress made on gender equality with the appointment of a woman as Prime Minister and the presence of women in Parliament, in a proportion of 21% of total parliamentarians. Benin recommended that Jamaica continue its efforts undertaken to reduce poverty, improve access to drinking water and take strong measures to broaden access to education in rural areas.

853. Botswana commended Jamaica for accepting a majority of the recommendations issued during their review. It applauded Jamaica for taking measures to promote and protect the rights of the most vulnerable persons and stated that the approval of the social protection strategy among others, was to cater to the vulnerable. Botswana welcomed 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, and the amendment of the trafficking in Persons Act. It underscored that their implementation was crucial in the protection of the rights of children.

854. China welcomed the constructive approach of Jamaica to the UPR, its comprehensive and positive feedback to the recommendations of the UPR and its acceptance of most of the recommendations. China appreciated Jamaica's acceptance of China's recommendations, to seek the opportunity of its National Poverty Policy and Programme, redouble efforts to reduce poverty, and improve the lives of vulnerable groups, increase investment in education, improve the coverage and quality of education and in particular to ensure the right to education for children from poor families, girls, and children with disabilities. China wished the Jamaican Government greater success in the comprehensive development of human rights.

855. Cuba congratulated Jamaica on the acceptance of the majority of recommendations. It stated that during Jamaica's UPR, Cuba had highlighted important advances reached by the country on human rights, including the implementation of policies to improve the rights of the child and of the persons with disabilities, as well as the health system. It thanked Jamaica for having accepted the two recommendations made by Cuba on disabilities and the fight against HIV/AIDS. It expressed its wish for a successful implementation of accepted recommendations in its second UPR.

856. The Philippines expressed appreciation for the large number of recommendations that Jamaica had accepted, and expressed it was particularly pleased with Jamaica's acceptance of its recommendation to continue its advocacy for keeping global warming at or below 1.5 degrees Celsius above the pre-industrial age. The Philippines was also pleased that Jamaica was stepping up efforts to establish its national human rights institution that was compliant to the Paris Principles. It acknowledged Jamaica's continuing efforts to provide adequate resources for its anti-trafficking in persons programs. The Philippines stated it looked forward for Jamaica's reinforced cooperation and active engagement with its bilateral, regional and international partners to combat trafficking in persons. It regretted that Jamaica was not ready to accept the Philippines' recommendation that it consider ratifying ILO Convention 189, and expressed hope, however that with Jamaica's strong advocacy for protection and promotion of the rights of vulnerable sectors, the country would find ample reason to consider ratifying this Convention.

857. Rwanda expressed appreciation for Jamaica's acceptance of Rwanda's recommendation to intensify its efforts to establish a National Human Rights Institution. It recognized measures undertaken by the Jamaican Government to combat human trafficking such as the National Plan of Action to combat trafficking in persons, and commended the adoption of legislative measures aimed at eliminating discrimination against women.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

858. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Jamaica, three other stakeholders made statements.

859. International Lesbian and Gay Association commended the government on its efforts and acceptance of recommendations, including those on LGBT people. It was deeply concerned that several recommendations did not enjoy full support or at all by Jamaica. It understood that some recommendations such as amending the buggery law or legalizing abortion were particularly sensitive. It urged the government to conduct a legal audit on the impact several pieces of legislation had on vulnerable groups such as people living with HIV, LGBT people, women and girls and people with disabilities. It was encouraged by the prioritization of the needs of vulnerable groups and urged the government to review its social protection strategy with human rights organizations to ensure LGBT people, people living with HIV, street children and other vulnerable groups could better access available services. It commended human rights education in school curricula. It stated that the government's response to homelessness of LGBT persons was generally woefully insufficient. It welcomed the efforts to establish the National Human

Rights Institution and urged that it be structured to address the multi-layered way in which vulnerable groups, including LGBT persons, experienced discrimination and violence and that it be empowered to make complaints to both the government and international human rights bodies.

860. Amnesty International welcomed Jamaica's acceptance of recommendations to establish and operationalize a National Human Rights Institution, in accordance with the Paris Principles. It welcomed the establishment and work of the Independent Commission of Investigations and noted the decline in killings by state agents in 2014 compared with 2013. It stated however that local organizations continued to express concern over obstacles faced by INDECOM in carrying out its functions, including lack of cooperation from members of the police force, and under-resourcing. It called on Jamaica to provide INDECOM with the necessary resources to effectively carry out its mandate, including for timely ballistics and forensic analysis. It remained concerned by the serious delays at the Coroner's court and the Supreme Court, and called on Jamaica to ensure the Special Coroner in charge of fatal police shootings had the necessary resources to carry out its functions. It welcomed the government's appointment of a Commission of Enquiry to investigate alleged human rights violations during the 2010 state of emergency and reminded Jamaica that this Commission should complement, not substitute an independent, impartial and properly resourced criminal justice process. Amnesty International remained concerned by detention conditions in police lock-ups and correctional facilities and called on Jamaica to improve these conditions. It echoed concerns expressed during the review that Jamaica lacked a general legal framework against discrimination, including with regard to discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity or expression. It expressed concern that impunity continued for violent and hateful attacks on people based on their real or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity or expression and expressed regret at the reluctance by Jamaica to accept recommendations to abolish the death penalty, to establish a formal moratorium on executions and to decriminalize consensual same-sex sexual activities.

861. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme underscored Jamaica's efforts on the ratification of the Optional Protocol of the convention on the Rights of the Child, regarding the sale of children, prostitution and pornography, as well as the updating of reports to the conventional organs, and cooperation with the mandate holders. It congratulated Jamaica for its contribution to the adoption of the decade for people of African descent and hoped that the national development plan entitled Vision 2030 Jamaica would enable the country to achieve its socio-economic development objectives. It deplored the persistence of excessive use of force by law enforcement officers, poor conditions of detention, and discrimination against women, minorities, persons with disabilities, and lesbians, gays, bisexual and transgender. It was also concerned by the extent of physical and sexual violence against women and girls and by the fact that no formal moratorium on the death penalty had been adopted to date. It urged Jamaica to take additional measures against these harmful practices which undermined the enjoyment of human rights. It encouraged Jamaica to accede to the international instruments to which the country was not yet a party, ensure that the human rights and fundamental freedoms enshrined in the Constitution were protected and improve the implementation of laws protecting the most vulnerable groups.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

862. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 168 recommendations received, 92 enjoyed the support of Jamaica, while 74 were noted. Additional clarification was provided on 2 recommendations.

863. In its concluding remarks, the delegation of Jamaica thanked all the States and representatives of Civil Society for their contributions, ideas, questions and recommendations. It expressed assurance that all recommendations were given the most careful consideration and were the subject of intense inter-agency consultation.

864. The delegation expressed it was pleased to have been able to accept most of the recommendations made, and understood the overall spirit behind all recommendations including those that were not accepted.

865. It referred to the UPR as a valuable contributor to the strengthening and improvement of the Human Rights architecture and policies and practice at all levels especially the National level.

866. The delegation had taken note of a number of observations made and remained confident that submissions by Jamaica in the UPR exercise provided adequate responses or explanations. It stated that however, it had to respond to the assertion that there was impunity for attacks against vulnerable persons and groups by emphasising that this was not so.

867. Jamaica would follow through on its promised reflection on some of the recommendations that had been made and stressed that it would not be complacent in the areas where progress had been made.

868. The delegation expressed that the Government committed itself to intensifying its efforts to communicate, to the Jamaican public, the variety of options available to them to seek redress for alleged violations of their rights.

869. In conclusion, the delegation expressed appreciation to all the Ministries, Agencies and Departments of Government and members of civil society, for their tremendous support and constructive engagement in this process.

Libya

870. The review of Libya was held on 13 May 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 Libya in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/LBY/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/LBY/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/22/LBY/3).

871. At the 28th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Libya (see section C below).

872. The outcome of the review of Libya comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/30/16), the views of Libya 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/30/16/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

873. The delegation of Libya expressed its appreciation to the Secretariat of the Human Rights Council and the UPR Working Group, as well as the Troika, which consisted of South Africa, the Maldives, and El Salvador for their cooperation, professionalism, and constructive contribution to the UPR process and the preparation of the second UPR Working Group report of Libya.

874. The delegation also thanked all countries that had participated in the 2nd cycle UPR of Libya in May 2015, where they had presented 202 recommendations, most of which Libya accepted. There was no doubt that Libya had accepted these recommendations with its firm commitment to the UPR mechanism and determination to improve the human rights situation within the scope of the interim constitutional declaration, Islamic law, and Libyan identity, taking into account the fact that it was going through a very difficult transitional period and facing daunting challenges at political, security, social and economic levels. Libya was working on the realization of people's aspiration in building State institutions. There was no doubt that the promotion of human rights, ending the abuses, ensuring accountability and preventing impunity in Libya required continued international and regional political support.

875. The delegation paid tribute to the pivotal political role of the United Nations aiming at the success of the political process, ending the conflict, and consolidating security and stability in Libya. That would contribute to supporting State institutions, represented in the army and the police, in maintaining security and enforcing law in order to counter the problem of random proliferation of arms through the programme of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration.

876. The delegation underscored enhancing the national capacities to deal effectively with various security challenges related to cross-border crimes, such as the increase in acts of terrorism, committed by Daesh and other terrorist groups, as well as smuggling in all its forms, including smuggling of drugs and trafficking in persons, associated with the phenomenon of illegal migration. These challenges exceeded the capacity of any single country and required a spirit of shared responsibility on the part of the international community, neighbouring countries, and the European Union.

877. The delegation expressed hope that the international community and the United Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL) would continue to provide technical assistance that would assist Libya in fulfilling its obligations in the field of human rights and rule of law, including the continuation of measures to achieve transitional justice and bolstering of support for national reconciliation and social justice efforts, and to continue to work on the legislative and practical levels to enhance the rights of all components of the society, including Amazigh, Tabu, Tuarek, and other social segments, and offer protection to women and persons with disabilities.

878. The delegation once again expressed its appreciation to the Human Rights Council and all States that had made observations. The delegation emphasized the commitment of the Libyan Government to work on the implementation of all accepted recommendations and called for the establishment of a genuine partnership with all international organizations and civil society organizations that were interested in the realization and promotion of human rights and rule of law in Libya.

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

879. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Libya, 17 delegations made statements. The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.³⁶

880. Estonia expressed concern about the continuing violence between several armed groups. The protracted conflict, lack of border controls and fragile rule of law had allowed a continued trafficking of human beings, drugs and weapons. Estonia called on all parties of the conflict to respond to the demands of the Libyan people and agree to the UN mediated political solution, cease armed hostilities and take immediate steps to protect civilians, especially vulnerable groups: women, children and internally displaced persons. Estonia also encouraged the authorities to take concrete steps in order to fulfil the accepted recommendations and show its real commitment to improve the human rights situation on its territory.

881. Ethiopia thanked Libya for accepting the recommendation that it had provided to intensify the effort to fight terrorism and seek assistance from the international community and to continue implementing the remaining accepted recommendations from the 1st UPR cycle. Ethiopia noted the challenges that Libya encountered to ensure peace and security and the impediments that Libya confronted in implementing the accepted recommendations from the 1st UPR cycle. Ethiopia recommended that Libya redouble its efforts in the restoration of peace and order.

882. Iraq appreciated that Libya had accepted most of the recommendations, including those presented by Iraq, and also congratulated Libya on the adoption of the policy on human rights and fundamental freedoms in a way that would lead to rule of law and achievement of social justice for all citizens, despite the difficulties that Libya was facing with regard to the stability of the country. It called upon the international community to support Libya in its efforts to enhance human rights.

883. Ireland noted with satisfaction that both of its recommendations had been accepted by Libya. It stated, however, that the human rights situation in Libya remained of serious concern and urged swift action to hold accountable those responsible for violations of international human rights law and humanitarian law. It also urged full cooperation with the International Criminal Court. It expressed concern about protection of civilians, humanitarian workers, human rights defenders and media workers. It underscored that continue reports of torture and ill-treatment in detention centres must also be investigated and addressed.

884. Italy welcomed the acceptance by Libya of 161 recommendations, including the one presented by Italy, which aimed at strengthening efforts to investigate all allegations of torture, summary executions, enforced disappearance and other abuses, and to bring those responsible to justice. Italy stated that it had remained committed to supporting the efforts of the Libyan people to take forward the democratic transition and restart the reconstruction of the country.

885. Kuwait commended the achievements made in the field of human rights, despite the crisis that Libya witnessed, which had repercussions on a number of spheres. The big number of accepted recommendations reflected genuine efforts of Libya to protect all people. It hoped that Libya would emerge from this crisis through a comprehensive dialogue under the aegis of the United Nations.

³⁶<https://extranet.ohchr.org/sites/hrc/HRCSessions/RegularSessions/30thSession/Pages/Calendar.aspx>.

886. Latvia was pleased to note that all of its recommendations enjoyed the support of Libya. It was, however, alarmed by reports of continued serious human rights violations, including summary executions, arbitrary detention, torture and other ill-treatment. It shared the concerns of the High Commissioner for Human Rights about the existing near-absolute impunity for such violations. It urged Libya to swiftly act on its UPR commitments and investigate all allegations of torture in prompt and impartial manner and to ensure that victims obtain redress. It also encouraged Libya to make full use of the expertise of the Special Procedures by allowing those mandate holders who had requested Libya to visit the country.

887. Morocco commended the fact that Libya had responded positively to the UPR, which was exemplified by the acceptance of the huge number of recommendations. Morocco also highly evaluated Libya's renewed commitment to protect human rights and reaffirmation to honour its obligations despite difficulties and challenges imposed by the transitional phase. Libya was in dire need of assistance in order to address such challenges in all its institutional, security and development dimensions. Morocco expressed solidarity with Libya.

888. Sierra Leone applauded Libya's standing invitation to the Special Procedures and the invitation extended to the High Commissioner for Human Rights. It noted with concern, however, the challenges that Libya continued to face, in particular, the humanitarian situation which had led to the displacement of thousands, as well as the alarming expansion of the activities of terrorist groups in the region. It appreciated Libya's willingness to establish normative standard and their expressed urgent need to rebuild state institutions. It encouraged the international community to continue to assist Libya in establishing durable peace, security and stability in the country.

889. Rwanda appreciated the continued engagement of Libya with the mechanism of the Human Rights Council. It encouraged Libya to ensure adequate human rights protection for the migrant populations residing or transiting through its borders. It also encouraged Libya to establish policies aimed at the increase of women's representation in decision-making positions.

890. The State of Palestine stated that Libya's acceptance of the recommendations reflected the way Libya dealt with human rights mechanisms. It valued the efforts made by Libya in the protection and promotion of human rights through the support for and development of a national institutional structure and relevant legislation, despite the challenges and difficulties facing the country. It appreciated cooperation of Libya with the UPR mechanism through studying the recommendations, which had been done through consultations with all the concerned parties.

891. The Sudan commended Libya's commitment to the UPR and efforts for the promotion of human rights of its citizens. The Sudan appreciated that Libya had accepted most of its recommendations, including those made by the Sudan to include human rights in the educational curricula.

892. Togo was pleased with the progress made, despite the crisis that Libya had gone through, in implementing recommendations accepted in the 1st UPR. In addition, many measures had been taken, for the enjoyment of human rights. Togo welcomed the fact that Libya had accepted most of the recommendations made during the 2nd UPR cycle and invited the international community to assist Libya in their implementation.

893. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland noted with concern that Libya had a limited capacity to investigate all human rights violations, including assassinations of journalists and human rights defenders. It underscored that all such violations must be investigated and that perpetrators must be brought to justice. It was encouraged that a committee had been created to draft the constitution with elected

members and that the rights of minorities had been enshrined in the draft. It stressed that the committee and the Constitution Drafting Assembly must act on feedback from civil society. It also emphasized that all parties and their associated forces commit to UN Special Representative Bernardino Leon's final text from the Libya political dialogue.

894. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela recalled that, through 2011, Libya had the highest per capita GDP and life expectancy in the region, having the most developed infrastructure in Africa. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela denounced grave consequences of the military aggressions of the powers that had seized resources, which claimed the lives of hundreds and thousands of people. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela urged restoration of conditions that would pave the way to peace in Libya. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela was certain that solutions by international law could prevent the escalation of violence.

895. Algeria noted that Libya had accepted most of the recommendations, including those made by Algeria, namely, recommendations to reach a peaceful solution to the crisis and to include human rights in education curricula. Libya spared no efforts to implement all the accepted recommendations. Algeria expressed its full solidarity with Libya and wished more progress.

896. Angola acknowledged the difficulties facing Libya, however, noted with appreciation efforts made for the promotion and protection of human rights and assistance to vulnerable groups, as well as for the establishment of the National Council for Civil Liberties and Human Rights.

3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

897. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Libya, eight other stakeholders made statements.

898. United Nations Watch was deeply concerned by the human rights situation in Libya and called attention to three areas of particular concern. First, it was alarmed by the sexual violence taking place with complete impunity. Despite decisions no. 39 and 119, no concrete actions had yet been taken to effectively address the gross human rights violations related to sexual violence. Second, it noted that women's rights were denied to the Libyan women on a daily basis. If laws had been promulgated to allegedly strengthen their rights, the situation on the ground had barely changed since the fall of the Qaddafi regime. On the contrary, religious legal opinions, issued by the Grand Mufti, had been a major blow to the full enjoyment of human rights by women in the country. Third, it indicated that the use of torture was increasing, while law no. 10 had completely failed to prevent those major human rights violations.

899. Article 19: International Centre against Censorship welcomed Libya's acceptance of all 14 recommendations related to freedom of expression, association or assembly. They welcomed the acceptance Latvia's recommendation, whose implementation would require substantial legal reform, including repealing Law 15 of 2012 and Law 5 of 2014. The two organizations also welcomed the acceptance of the UK's recommendation to "ensure all human rights violations, including assassination of journalists and human rights defenders, were investigated and the perpetrators brought to justice." Prominent women's rights activist, Salwa Bugahighis, youth activists, Tawfiq Bensaud and Sami Elkawafi were all assassinated by gunmen. Libya must ensure independent, speedy and effective investigations and prosecutions, as well as supportive mechanisms, such as safety, risk awareness and self-protection trainings, to protect freedom of expression of stakeholders from future attacks. They also called on Libya to put in place a national plan for implementation of the accepted recommendations in cooperation with civil society.

900. Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, also on behalf of World Organization against Torture, called on Libya to adopt a four-year national action plan to ensure the implementation of its UPR recommendations and to ensure cooperation with all stakeholders, including civil society. They noted that militias and paramilitary groups on all sides of the conflict continued to commit grave violations that could amount to war crimes and crimes against humanity. These violations were fueled in large part by an almost total lack of effective accountability mechanisms within the country. The two organizations called for concrete and effective steps to be taken to remedy the obstacles that would hinder the implementation of UPR recommendations. Namely, the widespread lack of accountability for serious crimes and the failure to form a coherent vetting process for security institutions. The Libyan authorities had failed to establish a mechanism for transitional justice and, in doing so, had denied truth and reconciliation to Libyan citizens.

901. Arab Commission for Human Rights expressed concern about reservations placed by Libya about signing the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. It was also deeply concerned about the situation on the ground in Libya and the failure of reaching a peace agreement. It urged all parties to the conflict to reach a political solution that would prevent further bloodshed. It urged Libya to adopt a national plan or national strategies to collect weapons. It was not acceptable in democratic countries that arms were sold on the streets. It underlined that only the State should be the holder of weapons and that these weapons would be used by the State to protect its citizens. All militias and armed groups should be disarmed regardless of their affiliations. It urged Libya to implement Security Council resolution 2178 in relation to holding fighters of Daesh responsible for their actions.

902. Amnesty International regretted that Libya had rejected a specific recommendation to take measures to ensure that forces loyal to the Government were made accountable for their indiscriminate targeting of civilians, civilian property and infrastructure. Over the past year, it had documented a pattern of abuses by Operation Dignity forces aligned with the Government. It called on Libya to act on accepted recommendations to ensure the safe return of internally displaced persons to their homes. It welcomed Libya's acceptance of recommendations to ensure that the rights of migrants, asylum-seekers and refugees in Libya are protected. Foreign nationals were subjected to abductions, human trafficking, extortion and sexual violence, indefinite detention in immigration detention centres. It welcomed recommendations to end arbitrary detention and to close illegal detention centres. Where cases had been processed, trials were marred by serious flaws and had resulted in the death penalty. It therefore regretted Libya's rejection of recommendation to establish a moratorium on executions. It also regretted Libya's refusal to take special measures in favour of gender equality.

903. World Organization against Torture noted that human rights defenders had become prime targets for many armed groups involved in the ongoing civil war in Libya. Violence, harassment and intimidation were daily occurrences for these defenders, in a climate of impunity resulting from the breakdown of the State. It was essential to go beyond their needs for protection and to reclaim the essential role human rights defenders should play in the conflict-settlement and peace building process. It called on the Libyan authorities to promote the participation of human rights defenders in the implementation of the political agreement recently concluded. It welcomed the seven recommendations focusing on the need for protection of human rights defenders and on the need for measures to foster accountability for the perpetrators of assassinations, attacks, intimidation and harassment against human rights defenders. It called on Libya to implement these at the shortest delay.

904. Rencontre africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme stated that Libya was facing the following challenges: deterioration of state infrastructure, weakness of the judiciary and the administration, and increased tensions among armed groups, and the

extremists in the south, the development of mafias, proliferation of small arms, smuggling of migrants, and the massive internal displacement of civilian populations. It attached great importance to the signing of Libya's draft peace agreement adopted in Skhirat in Morocco. It hoped that all parties would take this opportunity to rebuild trust between them, by signing it before the deadline of 20 October 2015. It remained alarmed by the situation of African migrant workers, who continued to suffer from mistreatment and persecution. Measures should be taken to put an end to these practices. It urged Libya to strengthen cooperation with the International Criminal Court and Special Procedures mandate holders. It called for perpetrators of violations of international humanitarian law and human rights, or infringements of these rights, including sexual violence, to be held accountable for their act.

905. Centre indépendant de recherches et d'initiatives pour le dialogue stated that political divisions in Libya had important impact on the review of Libya. Libya presented the report four months after the deadline, and the report was biased. When it came to highlighting the points of divisions, there were lots of falsifications, and no facts stated. The report did not refer to war crimes committed in Benghazi and the fact that the House of Representatives turned a blind eye to the acts of the rebellion, amounting to grave violations of human rights and leading to charges of ethnic cleansing. The situation was dire. Only three clinics and hospitals were operational. There were shortages of medicines, medical equipment, medical staff, food, water, electricity. Airports/ports were not functioning. By resolution 28/30, the Human Rights Council had decided to send a mission to Libya for investigation. It emphasized the importance of this resolution and called upon the Human Rights Council to provide this team with all the necessary requirements to conduct a clear and independent investigation on the ground to ensure that there is no impunity and that perpetrators are brought to justice.

4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

906. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 202 recommendations received, 161 enjoy the support of Libya, additional clarification was provided on another 10 recommendations, and 31 are noted.

907. The delegation of Libya expressed gratitude to all the delegations that had made the statements and indicated that these statements reflected full understanding of challenges facing Libya, especially security challenges posed by the Islamic State and other terrorist groups. This negatively affected Libya's ability to control the situation, especially the human rights and humanitarian situation. Libya looked forward to full support of the international community at technical and political levels. The delegation emphasized that UNSMIL had an important role to play and that their contribution would enable competent authorities to carry out their duties to ensure rule of law and protection of human rights and help civil society organizations and activists to operate freely and without constraints. Libya was confident that the UPR recommendations would lead the Government to redouble its efforts to ensure that basic rights are enshrined in legislation and protected in practice.

B. General debate on agenda item 6

908. At the 28th meeting, on 25 September 2015, and the 29th meeting, on 28 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 6, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Brazil (on behalf of the Community of Portuguese Speaking Countries), China, Ghana, India, Luxembourg³⁷ (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Montenegro, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Sierra Leone, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Grenada, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Luxembourg, Solomon Islands;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa Speaks; Alsalam Foundation; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Amnesty International; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace; Canners International Permanent Committee; Center for Environmental and Management Studies; Colombian Commission of Jurists; Commission to Study the Organization of Peace; European Union of Public Relations; Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD); Human Rights Law Centre; Indian Council of Education; International Association for Democracy in Africa; International Association of Schools of Social Work; International Educational Development, Inc.; International Institute for Non-aligned Studies; Iraqi Development Organization; Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Maarif Foundation for Peace and Development; Organization for Defending Victims of Violence; Pan African Union for Science and Technology; Rencontre Africaine pour la defense des droits de l'homme; Romani CRISS - Roma Centre for Social Intervention and Studies; United Schools International; UPR Info; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; World Environment and Resources Council (WERC).

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Belarus

909. At the 22nd meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/101 on the outcome of the review of Belarus.

United States of America

910. At the 22nd meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/102 on the outcome of the review of the United States of America.

Malawi

911. At the 22nd meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/103 on the outcome of the review of Malawi.

Mongolia

912. At the 24th meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/104 on the outcome of the review of Mongolia.

Panama

913. At the 24th meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/105 on the outcome of the review of Panama.

³⁷ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Maldives

914. At the 24th meeting, on 24 September 2015, the Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/106 on the outcome of the review of Maldives.

Andorra

915. At the 26th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/107 on the outcome of the review of Andorra.

Bulgaria

916. At the 26th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/108 on the outcome of the review of Bulgaria.

Honduras

917. At the 26th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/109 on the outcome of the review of Honduras.

Liberia

918. At the 27th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/110 on the outcome of the review of Liberia.

Marshall Islands

919. At the 27th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/111 on the outcome of the review of the Marshall Islands.

Croatia

920. At the 27th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/112 on the outcome of the review of Croatia.

Jamaica

921. At the 28th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/113 on the outcome of the review of Jamaica.

Libya

922. At the 28th meeting, on 25 September 2015, the Council adopted, without a vote, decision 30/114 on the outcome of the review of Libya.

VII. Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories

A. General debate on agenda item 7

923. At the 29th and 30th meetings, on 28 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 7, during which the following made statements:

(a) The representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and the State of Palestine, as the States concerned;

(b) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Cuba, Ghana, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)³⁸ (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), Maldives, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(c) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Bahrain, Chile, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Oman, Senegal, Sudan, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Uruguay, Yemen;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa Speaks; Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man; American Association of Jurists; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Asociacion Cubana de las Naciones Unidas (Cuban United Nations Association); BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights; Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies; Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace; Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches; Defence for Children International; Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos (also on behalf of Union of Arab Jurists); Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD); Human Rights Now; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations; International-Lawyers.Org; Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development; Organization for Defending Victims of Violence; Peivande Gole Narges Organization; The Palestinian Return Centre Ltd; Union of Arab Jurists.

³⁸ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

VIII. Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

A. Panels

Annual discussion on the integration of a gender perspective

924. At the 6th meeting, on 15 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held the annual discussion on the integration of a gender perspective, in accordance with Council resolution 6/30. The opening statement for the panel was delivered by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Her Majesty the Queen of the Belgians gave a keynote address. Member and Rapporteur of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, Patricia Schulz, made introductory remarks and moderated the discussion for the panel.

925. At the same meeting, the panellists Michael Møller, Virginia Dandan, Tracy Robinson, and Subhas Gujadhur made statements.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Brazil, Ecuador³⁹ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Montenegro, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Sierra Leone;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Canada, Kuwait, Sweden (also on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway), Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development; Gazeteciler ve Yazarlar Vakfi; Pan African Union for Science and Technology.

927. The following made statements during the second speaking slot:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, El Salvador, India, Ireland, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Nicaragua, Poland, Spain, Switzerland;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence pour les droits de l'homme; Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace; Indian Law Resource Centre.

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

³⁹ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

Panel discussion on the impact of the world drug problem on the enjoyment of human rights

929. At the 31st meeting, on 28 September 2015, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 28/28, the Council held a panel discussion on the impact of the world drug problem on the enjoyment of human rights, to have a constructive and inclusive dialogue on this issue with relevant stakeholders, including specialized United Nations agencies and civil society, and with the participation of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

930. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human made an opening statement for the panel. Former President of the Swiss Confederation, and member of the Global Commission on Drug Policy, Ruth Dreifuss, moderated the discussion for the panel.

931. At the same meeting, the panellists Javier Andres Florez, Ann Fordham, Mohammad-Mahmoud Ould Mohamedou, Shekhar Saxena and Aldo Lale-Demoz made statements. Ambassador of Thailand to the United Nations Office in Vienna and Chairperson of the 58th session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, Arthayudh Srisamoot, participated in the panel and made a statement.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Colombia⁴⁰ (also on behalf of Albania, Brazil, Greece, Guatemala, Mexico, Norway, Paraguay, Switzerland and Uruguay), Ecuador⁴¹ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Mexico, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Portugal, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Sierra Leone, Switzerland⁴² (also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Colombia, Greece, Guatemala, Israel, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, San Marino, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay), Uruguay⁴³ (on behalf of the Union of South American Nations);

(b) Representative of an observer State: Singapore;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Centro Regional de Derechos Humanos y Justicia de Genero (also on behalf of Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS); Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Asociación Civil; Harm Reduction International; Intercambios Asociación Civil; International Service for Human Rights; Washington Office on Latin America); International Harm Reduction Association (IHRA); International Lesbian and Gay Association (also on behalf of International Service for Human Rights).

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

934. The following made statements during the second speaking slot:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, El Salvador, France, India, Paraguay;

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.

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

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

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Egypt, Greece, Kyrgyzstan, Nicaragua, Sweden, Tunisia;

(c) Observer for a United Nations entity, specialized agency and related organization: Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Asociación Civil; International Educational Development, Inc.; Penal Reform International.

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

B. General debate on agenda item 8

936. At the 30th and 32nd meetings, on 28 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 8, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina (also on behalf of Brazil, Chile, Colombia and Uruguay), China, Cuba, Ireland, Luxembourg⁴⁴ (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, South Africa, Ukraine⁴⁵ (also on behalf of Australia, Hungary, Maldives, Morocco, Poland and Uruguay), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America (also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Ukraine), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Denmark (also on behalf of Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), Iran (Islamic Republic of), Slovenia, Spain, Sudan, Uruguay;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development (also on behalf of Federation for Women and Family Planning); Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs; Advocates for Human Rights; Africa Culture Internationale; Africa Speaks; Agence Internationale pour le Développement; Agence pour les droits de l'homme; Alliance Defending Freedom; Alsalam Foundation; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Amnesty International; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme; Federacion de

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.

Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos; Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD); Helios Life Association; Human Rights Law Centre (also on behalf of Allied Rainbow Communities International; International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA); International Service for Human Rights); Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'Homme- IIPJDH; International Humanist and Ethical Union; International Service for Human Rights; International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES (also on behalf of Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco (IIMA)); Iranian Elite Research Center; Iraqi Development Organization; Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Liberation; Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development; Marangopoulos Foundation for Human Rights; Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association; Organization for Defending Victims of Violence; Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation; Prahar; Presse Embleme Campagne; Rencontre Africaine pour la defense des droits de l'homme; Solidarité Suisse-Guinée (also on behalf of Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul); Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace; World Barua Organization (WBO); World Environment and Resources Council (WERC); World Muslim Congress.

IX. Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance, follow-up to and implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action

A. Interactive dialogue with special procedures mandate holders

Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent

937. At the 32nd meeting, on 28 September 2015, the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent, Mireille Fanon-Mendes France, presented the report of the Working Group (A/HRC/30/56 and Add.1-3).

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

939. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands Institute for Human Rights made a statement by video message.

940. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the representative of the Working Group questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Brazil, Cuba, Ecuador⁴⁶ (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Ghana, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahamas, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Tunisia;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Africa Speaks; Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace; Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD); 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; African Canadian Legal Clinic; African Development Association; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Association Dunenyó; Comité International pour le Respect et l'Application de la Charte Africaine des Droits de l'Homme et des Peuples (CIRAC); Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme; December Twelfth Movement International Secretariat; Drammeh Institute, Inc; International Association Against Torture; International-Lawyers.org; Tiye International); Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development.

941. At the same meeting, the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the Working Group answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

B. General debate on agenda item 9

942. At the 32nd meeting, on 28 September 2015, and at the 33rd meeting, on 29 September 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 9, during which the following made statements:

⁴⁶ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, Cuba, Luxembourg⁴⁷ (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine), Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Colombia, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Uruguay;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Advocates for Human Rights; Africa Culture Internationale; Africa Speaks; Agence Internationale pour le Developpement; Agence pour les droits de l'homme; Asociacion Cubana de las Naciones Unidas (Cuban United Nations Association); Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD); International Humanist and Ethical Union; International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; 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; African Canadian Legal Clinic; African Development Association; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Association Dunenyo; Comité International pour le Respect et l'Application de la Charte Africaine des Droits de l'Homme et des Peuples (CIRAC); Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme; December Twelfth Movement International Secretariat; International Association Against Torture; International-Lawyers.org; Nord-Sud XXI - North-South XXI; and Tiye International); International-Lawyers.Org; Iranian Elite Research Center; Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Liberation; Maarif Foundation for Peace and Development; Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association; National Union of Jurists of Cuba, The; Organization for Defending Victims of Violence; Prahar; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; World Muslim Congress.

943. At the 33rd meeting, on 29 September 2015, a statement in exercise of the right of reply was made by the representative of Estonia.

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

From rhetoric to reality: a global call for concrete action against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

944. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.20, sponsored by Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States) and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, the Russian Federation and Turkey. Subsequently, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Nicaragua and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

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

946. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Ghana made a general comment in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

⁴⁷ Observer of the Human Rights Council speaking on behalf of Member and observer States.

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

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

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

In favour:

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

Against:

Albania, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Latvia, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Japan, Portugal, Republic of Korea

950. Draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.20 as orally revised was adopted by 32 votes to 12, with 3 abstentions (resolution 30/16).⁴⁸

Forum on people of African descent in the diaspora

951. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.21, sponsored by Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States) and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Panama and Peru. Subsequently, Bangladesh, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Nicaragua and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

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

953. 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.

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

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

In favour:

⁴⁸ The representative of Namibia subsequently stated that there had been an error in the delegation's vote and that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft text.

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Japan, Maldives, Republic of Korea

956. Draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.21 as orally revised was adopted by 32 votes to 12, with 3 abstentions (resolution 30/17).

957. At the same meeting, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made a statement in general comment and explanation of vote after the vote on all resolutions adopted under agenda item 9.

X. Technical assistance and capacity-building

A. Interactive dialogue on cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights

958. At the 33rd meeting, on 29 September 2015, 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.

959. At the same meeting, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine, Sergiy Kyslytsya, made a statement as the State concerned.

960. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, also 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, China, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Latvia, Netherlands, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Georgia, Hungary, Lithuania, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey;

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

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

(e) Observer for a national human rights institution: Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights (by video message);

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Advocates for Human Rights; Human Rights House Foundation; Human Rights Watch; International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL); International Catholic Child Bureau.

961. At the 33rd meeting, on 29 September 2015, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

962. At the 35th meeting, on the same day, a statement in exercise of the right of reply was made by the representative of the Russian Federation.

B. Interactive dialogue on technical assistance and capacity-building for human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

963. At the 34th meeting, on 29 September 2015, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 27/27, the Deputy United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights presented the report of the High Commissioner on the efforts of OHCHR to increase and strengthen its technical assistance programmes and activities aimed at improving the human rights situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (A/HRC/30/32) and the study of the High Commissioner on the impact of technical assistance and capacity-building on the human rights situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (A/HRC/30/33). In accordance with Council resolution 27/27, the presentation was followed by an interactive dialogue on the study of the High Commissioner.

964. At the same meeting, the Minister of Justice and Human Rights of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Alexis Thambwe Mwamba, made a statement as the State concerned.

965. During the ensuing discussion, also at the same meeting, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, China, France, Gabon, Ireland, Morocco, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Belgium, Egypt, Mozambique, New Zealand, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Togo;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International; Franciscans International; International Catholic Child Bureau (also on behalf of Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul and Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd); International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; World Organization against Torture.

966. At the same meeting, the Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

C. Interactive dialogue on technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in Libya

967. At the 34th meeting, on 29 September 2015, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 28/30, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights provided an oral update on the mission to investigate violations and abuses of international human rights law committed in Libya since the beginning of 2014. In accordance with Council resolution 28/30, the oral update was followed by a stand-alone interactive dialogue, with the participation of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Libya.

968. The Director of the Division of Human Rights, Transitional Justice and Rule of Law of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya, on behalf of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Libya, participated in the dialogue and made a statement.

969. At the same meeting, the representative of Libya made a statement as the State concerned.

970. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 34th and 35th meetings, 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: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), China, Estonia, France, Germany, Ghana, Netherlands, Portugal, Russian Federation, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Czech Republic, Egypt, Italy, Kuwait, Malta, Norway, Senegal, Spain, Turkey, Yemen;

(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: Amnesty International; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies; Human Rights Watch; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

971. At the 35th meeting, on 29 September 2015, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights and the Director of the Division of Human Rights, Transitional Justice and Rule of Law of the United Nations Support Mission in Libya answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

D. Interactive dialogue with special procedures mandate holders

Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Cambodia

972. At the 35th meeting, on 29 September 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Cambodia, Rhona Smith, presented her report (A/HRC/30/58).

973. At the same meeting, the representative of Cambodia made a statement as the State concerned.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, France, Ireland, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Switzerland, Thailand;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development; CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Human Rights Now; Human Rights Watch; International Catholic Child Bureau; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (FIDH); Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada; World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace.

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

Independent expert on the situation of human rights in the Sudan

976. At the 35th meeting, on 29 September 2015, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Sudan, Aristide Nononsi, presented his report (A/HRC/30/60).

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

978. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 36th meeting, on 30 September 2015, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), China, Cuba, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ireland, Morocco, Netherlands, Qatar, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Kuwait, Mali, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Switzerland;

(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: Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace; CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project; Eastern Sudan Women Development Organization; Human Rights Watch; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; Jubilee Campaign; Society Studies Centre (MADA ssc).

979. At the 36th meeting, on 30 September 2015, the representative of the Sudan made final remarks as the State concerned.

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

981. At the 38th meeting, on the same day, a statement in exercise of the right of reply was made by the representative of the Sudan.

Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic

982. At the 36th meeting, on 30 September 2015, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic, Marie-Therese Keita Bocoum, presented her report (A/HRC/30/59).

983. At the same meeting, the representative of the Central African Republic made a statement as the State concerned.

984. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 36th and 37th meetings, on 30 September 2015, the following made statements and asked the Independent Expert questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Estonia, France, Gabon, Ireland, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Belgium, Benin, Croatia, Egypt, Luxembourg, Mali, Mozambique, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sudan, Togo;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities) (also on behalf of World Evangelical Alliance); Human Rights Watch; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; Jubilee Campaign; Rencontre Africaine pour la defense des droits de l'homme; Save the Children International.

985. At the 37th meeting, on the same day, the representative of the Central African Republic made final remarks as the State concerned.

986. Also at the same meeting, the Independent Expert answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Somalia

987. At the 37th meeting, on 30 September 2015, the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Somalia, Bahame Nyanduga, presented his report (A/HRC/30/57).

988. At the same meeting, the representative of Somalia made a statement as the State concerned.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), China, Ethiopia, France, Ireland, Morocco, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Djibouti, Egypt, Italy, Norway, Sudan, Turkey, Yemen;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Advocates for Human Rights; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace (also on behalf of International Federation of Journalists); CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project; Human Rights Watch; International Educational Development, Inc.; Minority Rights Group.

990. At the same meeting, the representative of Somalia made final remarks as the State concerned.

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

E. General debate on agenda item 10

992. At the 38th meeting, on 30 September 2015, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights provided an oral update, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 29/21, and presented country reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General submitted under agenda items 2 and 10 (A/HRC/30/30 and A/HRC/30/31).

993. At the same meeting, on the same day, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights provided an oral report, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 29/13, and presented a report of the High-Commissioner submitted under agenda items 2 and 10 (A/HRC/30/66). The Assistant Secretary-General also presented a report of the OHCHR submitted under agenda item 2 (A/HRC/30/67).

994. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Iraq, Myanmar, Nigeria, South Sudan and Yemen made statements as the States concerned.

995. At the 38th meeting, on 30 September 2015, and at the 39th meeting, on 1 October 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 10, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), China, El Salvador, France, Germany, Ghana, India (also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Myanmar, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam), Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Iceland, Montenegro, Republic of Moldova, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine), Maldives, Morocco (on behalf of the States members and observers of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Belarus, Canada, Egypt, Georgia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Philippines, Senegal, Thailand, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: African Union, Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf, Council of Europe, Organization of Islamic Cooperation;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Advocates for Human Rights; Africa Culture Internationale; Africa Speaks; Agence pour les droits de l'homme; Al Zubair Charitable Foundation; Alliance Creative Community Project; Alsalam Foundation; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Amnesty International; Association Burkinabé pour la Survie de l'Enfance; Association des Jeunes pour l'Agriculture du Mali; Association Mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit; Association of World Citizens; Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies; Cameroon Youths and Students Forum for Peace; Center for Reproductive Rights, Inc., The; CIRID (Centre Independent de Recherches et d'Initiatives pour le Dialogue); Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD); Human Rights Information and Training Center; Human Rights Watch; Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'Homme-IIPJDH; International Career Support Association; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; International Humanist and Ethical Union; International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR); Iranian Elite Research Center; Iraqi Development Organization; Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada; Liberation; Maarif Foundation for Peace and Development; Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association; Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés (OIPMA); Prahar; Rencontre Africaine pour la defense des droits de l'homme; Save the Children International; Sikh Human Rights Group; Solidarité Suisse-Guinée; United Nations Watch; World Barua Organization (WBO).

996. At the 39th meeting, on 1 October 2015, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Cameroon, Myanmar, Nigeria and Thailand.

F. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Technical assistance and capacity-building for Yemen in the field of human rights

997. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.1/Rev.2, sponsored by Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Yemen, and co-

sponsored by Thailand. Subsequently, Bangladesh, Maldives, Pakistan and Turkey joined the sponsors.

998. At the same meeting, the representative of Saudi Arabia, on behalf of the Group of Arab States, orally revised the draft resolution.

999. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Yemen made a statement as the State concerned.

1000. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

1001. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

1002. Also at the same meeting, the draft resolution as orally revised was adopted without a vote (resolution 30/18).

1003. At the same meeting, the representatives of Germany, also on behalf of the Czech Republic, and the Netherlands made general comments.

Technical assistance and capacity-building in the field of human rights in the Central African Republic

1004. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.6, sponsored by Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States) and co-sponsored by Belgium, Croatia, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Spain. Subsequently, Australia, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Georgia, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

1005. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union) and the United States of America made general comments in relation to the draft resolution.

1006. 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.

1007. Also at the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 30/19).

Assistance to Somalia in the field of human rights

1008. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representatives of Somalia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, also on behalf of Australia, Italy, Somalia, Turkey and the United States of America, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.7, sponsored by Australia, Italy, Somalia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, and co-sponsored by Algeria, Angola, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, the Central African Republic, the Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Morocco, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, the Sudan,

Sweden, Tunisia and Uganda. Subsequently, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Canada, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, Djibouti, Georgia, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Japan, Madagascar, Maldives, Malta, New Zealand, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Yugoslavia, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen joined the sponsors.

1009. At the same meeting, the representative of Sierra Leone made a general comment in relation to the draft resolution.

1010. 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.

1011. Also at the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 30/20).

Enhancement of technical cooperation and capacity-building in the field of human rights

1012. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Thailand, also on behalf of Brazil, Honduras, Indonesia, Morocco, Norway, Singapore and Turkey, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.10/Rev.1, sponsored by Brazil, Honduras, Indonesia, Morocco, Norway, Singapore, Thailand and Turkey, and co-sponsored by Chile, Eritrea, Malaysia, Mexico, Montenegro, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Tajikistan, the United States of America, Uruguay and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Albania, Algeria, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Chad, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Luxembourg, Maldives, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland and Tunisia joined the sponsors.

1013. At the same meeting, the representative of Thailand, also on behalf of Brazil, Honduras, Indonesia, Morocco, Norway, Singapore and Turkey, orally revised the draft resolution.

1014. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union) made a general comment in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

1015. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

1016. Also at the same meeting, the draft resolution as orally revised was adopted without a vote (resolution 30/21).

Technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in the Sudan

1017. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.18, sponsored by Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States). Subsequently, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Costa Rica, Thailand and Turkey joined the sponsors.

1018. At the same meeting, the representative of Algeria, on behalf of the Group of African States, orally revised the draft resolution.

1019. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union) made a general comment in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

1020. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Sudan made a statement as the State concerned.

1021. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

1022. Also at the same meeting, the draft resolution as orally revised was adopted without a vote (resolution 30/22).

Advisory services and technical assistance for Cambodia

1023. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Japan introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.22/Rev.1, sponsored by Japan and co-sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovakia, Spain and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Finland, Italy, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovenia and Sweden joined the sponsors.

1024. At the same meeting, the representative of Japan orally revised the draft resolution.

1025. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union) made a general comment in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

1026. At the same meeting, the representative of Cambodia made a statement as the State concerned.

1027. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

1028. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

1029. At the same meeting, the draft resolution as orally revised was adopted without a vote (resolution 30/23).

National policies and human rights

1030. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representatives of Ecuador and Peru, also on behalf of Algeria, Italy, Romania and Thailand, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.24, sponsored by Algeria, Ecuador, Italy, Peru, Romania and Thailand, and co-sponsored by Argentina, Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Djibouti, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Panama, Paraguay, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Spain and Turkey. Subsequently, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Georgia, Honduras, Indonesia, Japan, Maldives, Nicaragua, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

1031. At the same meeting, the representatives of Ecuador and Peru orally revised the draft resolution.

1032. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the attention of the Human Rights Council was drawn to the estimated administrative and programme budget implications of the draft resolution as orally revised.

1033. At the same meeting, the draft resolution as orally revised was adopted without a vote (resolution 30/24).

Promoting international cooperation to support national human rights follow-up systems and processes

1034. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representatives of Brazil and Paraguay introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.26, sponsored by Brazil and Paraguay, and co-sponsored by Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Ecuador, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Mexico, the Netherlands, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sierra Leone, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay. Subsequently, Algeria, Armenia, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Italy, Kazakhstan, Luxembourg, Maldives, Montenegro, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Thailand and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

1035. At the same meeting, the representative of Sierra Leone made a general comment in relation to the draft resolution.

1036. 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.

1037. At the same meeting, the representative of South Africa made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

1038. Also at the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 30/25).

1038. At the same meeting, the representative of Japan made a general comment.

Technical assistance and capacity-building for human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

1039. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.30, sponsored by Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States) and co-sponsored by Belgium and Denmark. Subsequently, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Thailand, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

1040. At the same meeting, the representative of the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union) made a general comment in relation to the draft resolution.

1041. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo made a statement as the State concerned.

1042. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 30/26).

Technical cooperation and capacity-building for Burundi in the field of human rights

1043. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 October 2015, the representative of Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.31, sponsored by Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States) and co-sponsored by Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany,

Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom of the Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, Albania, Australia, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Costa Rica, Lithuania, New Zealand, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey joined the sponsors.

1044. At the same meeting, the representative of Algeria orally revised the draft resolution.

1045. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of the Netherlands (on behalf of the European Union) and the United States of America made general comments in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

1046. At the same meeting, the representative of Burundi made a statement as the State concerned.

1047. Also at the same meeting, the draft resolution as orally revised was adopted without a vote (resolution 30/27).

Annex I

Attendance

Members

Albania	Germany	Paraguay
Algeria	Ghana	Portugal
Argentina	India	Qatar
Bangladesh	Indonesia	Republic of Korea
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Ireland	Russian Federation
Botswana	Japan	Saudi Arabia
Brazil	Kazakhstan	Sierra Leone
China	Kenya	South Africa
Congo	Latvia	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Côte d'Ivoire	Maldives	United Arab Emirates
Cuba	Mexico	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
El Salvador	Montenegro	United States of America
Estonia	Morocco	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
Ethiopia	Namibia	Viet Nam
France	Netherlands	
Gabon	Nigeria	
	Pakistan	

States Members of the United Nations represented by observers

Andorra	Democratic People's Republic of Korea	Jordan
Angola	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Kiribati
Armenia	Denmark	Kuwait
Australia	Djibouti	Kyrgyzstan
Austria	Dominican Republic	Lao People's Democratic Republic
Azerbaijan	Ecuador	Lebanon
Bahamas	Egypt	Lesotho
Bahrain	Equatorial Guinea	Liberia
Belarus	Eritrea	Libya
Belgium	Fiji	Liechtenstein
Benin	Finland	Lithuania
Bulgaria	Georgia	Luxembourg
Burkina Faso	Greece	Madagascar
Burundi	Grenada	Malawi
Cambodia	Guatemala	Malaysia
Cameroon	Haiti	Mali
Canada	Honduras	Malta
Central African Republic	Hungary	Marshall Islands
Chad	Iceland	Mauritania
Chile	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Mongolia
Colombia	Iraq	Mozambique
Costa Rica	Israel	Myanmar
Croatia	Italy	Nepal
Cyprus	Jamaica	New Zealand
Czech Republic		Nicaragua
		Niger
		Norway

Oman	Singapore	Tajikistan
Panama	Slovakia	Thailand
Peru	Slovenia	Togo
Philippines	Solomon Islands	Tunisia
Poland	Somalia	Turkey
Republic of Moldova	South Sudan	Turkmenistan
Romania	Spain	Ukraine
Rwanda	Sri Lanka	United Republic of Tanzania
Saint Lucia	Sudan	Uruguay
San Marino	Sweden	Uzbekistan
Senegal	Switzerland	Yemen
Serbia	Syrian Arab Republic	

Non-Member States represented by observers

Holy See
State of Palestine

United Nations

Joint United Nations Programme on
HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS)
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)
United Nations Economic Commission for
Europe (UNECE)
United Nations Interim Administration Mission in
Kosovo (UNMIK)

Specialized agencies and related organizations

Food and Agriculture Organization of the
United Nations (FAO)
International Labour Organization (ILO)

Intergovernmental organizations

African Union	European Union
Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf	International Organization of la Francophonie
Council of Europe	Organization of Islamic Cooperation

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

Canadian Human Rights Commission	Defensoría del Pueblo de la República de Panamá
----------------------------------	--

Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain
 European Network of National Human Rights Institutions
 International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights (ICC)
 Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (by video message)

Malawi Human Rights Commission
 National Human Rights Commission of the Republic of Korea (by video message)
 National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia (by video message)
 Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission (by video message)
 Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights (by video message)

Non-governmental organizations

Action Canada for Population and Development
 Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs
 Advocates for Human Rights
 Africa Culture Internationale
 Africa Speaks
 African-American Society for Humanitarian Aid and Development
 African Commission of Health and Human Right Promoters
 African Development Association
 Agence internationale pour le développement
 Agence pour les droits de l'homme
 Al-Hakim Foundation
 Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man
 Al-khoei Foundation
 All China Women's Federation
 Alliance Creative Community Project
 Alliance Defending Freedom
 Allied Rainbow Communities International
 All-Russian Public Organization "Russian Public Institute of Electoral Law"
 Alsalam Foundation
 Al-Zubair Charity Foundation
 American Anthropological Association
 American Association of Jurists
 American Civil Liberties Union
 Americans for Democracy and Human Rights in Bahrain
 Amnesty International
 Arab Commission for Human Rights
 Arab NGO Network for Development
 Archbishop E. Kataliko Actions for Africa "KAF"
 Article 19: International Centre against Censorship
 Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact
 Asian-Eurasian Human Rights Forum

Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development
 Asian Legal Resource Centre
 Association burkinabé pour la survie de l'enfance
 Association des jeunes pour l'agriculture du Mali
 Association Dunenyo
 Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism
 Association for Progressive Communications
 Association mauritanienne pour la promotion du droit
 Association "Paix" pour la lutte contre la contrainte et l'injustice
 Association of World Citizens
 Association pour les victimes du monde
 Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII
 Badil Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Resource Rights
 Baha'i International Community
 Bakhtar Development Network Switzerland
 Beijing Children's Legal Aid and Research Center
 Bischöfliches Hilfswerk Misereor
 Brahma Kumaris World Spiritual University
 British Humanist Association
 Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies
 Canners International Permanent Committee
 Caritas Internationalis
 Center for Inquiry
 Center for Legal and Social Studies
 Center for Reproductive Rights
 Center for Development of Civil Society
 Centre de documentation, de recherche et d'information des peuples autochtones
 Centre Europe-tiers monde
 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	Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen
Centro Regional de Derechos Humanos y	tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit
Justicia de Género	COC Nederland
Charitable Institute for Protecting Social	Federation of Cuban Women
Victims	Foodfirst Information and Action Network
Child Development Foundation	France Libertés: Fondation Danielle
China Association for Preservation and	Mitterrand
Development of Tibetan Culture	Franciscans International
China NGO Network for International	Freedom House
Exchanges	Freedom Now
China Society for Human Rights Studies	Friedrich Ebert Foundation
Chinese People's Association for Peace	Friends World Committee for Consultation
and Disarmament	General Research Institute on the
CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen	Convention on the Rights of the Child
Participation	Geneva for Human Rights – Global Training
Colombian Commission of Jurists	Global Initiative for Economic, Social and
Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y	Cultural Rights
Promoción de los Derechos Humanos,	Global Network for Rights and
Asociación Civil	Development
Comité international pour le respect et	Groupe des ONG pour la Convention
l'application de la charte africaine des	relative aux droits de l'enfant
droits de l'homme et des peuples	Grupo Intercultural Almaciga
Commission of the Churches on	Hawa Society for Women
International Affairs of the World	Helios Life Association
Council of Churches	HelpAge International
Commission to Study the Organization	Himalayan Research and Cultural Foundation
of Peace	Human Rights Advocates, Inc.
Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative	Human Rights House Foundation
Conscience and Peace Tax International	Human Rights Information and Training Center
Corporación para la Defensa y Promoción	Human Rights Law Centre
de los Derechos Humanos Reiniciar	Human Rights Network (HURINET)
Cuban United Nations Association	Human Rights Now
Cultural Survival	Human Rights Watch
Defence for Children International	Humanist Institute for Co-operation with
Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order	Developing Countries
of Preachers	Indian Council of Education
Earthjustice	Indian Council of South America
East and Horn of Africa Human Rights	Indigenous Information Network
Defenders Project	Indian Law Resource Centre
Eastern Sudan Women Development	Indigenous World Association
Organization	Institut international pour la paix, la justice
Ecumenical Alliance for Human Rights	et les droits de l'homme
and Development	Institute for Policy Studies
Edmund Rice International Limited	Institute for Planetary Synthesis
Espace Afrique international	International Association for Democracy
European Center for Constitutional and	in Africa
Human Rights	International Association of Democratic
European Humanist Federation	Lawyers
European Law Students' Association	International Association of Schools of
European Union of Public Relations	Social Work
European Youth Forum	International Career Support Association
Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y	International Catholic Child Bureau
Promoción de los Derechos Humanos	International Commission of Jurists

International Committee for the Indians of the Americas (Switzerland)
 International Educational Development, Inc.
 International Federation for Human Rights Leagues
 International Federation of Journalists
 International Federation of Rural Adult Catholic Movements
 International Federation for the Protection of the Rights of Ethnic, Religious, Linguistic and Other Minorities
 International Federation of University Women
 International Fellowship of Reconciliation
 International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission
 International Harm Reduction Association
 International Human Rights Association of American Minorities
 International Humanist and Ethical Union
 International Indian Treaty Council
 International Institute for Non-Aligned Studies
 International-Lawyers.Org
 International Lesbian and Gay Association
 International Longevity Center Global Alliance
 International Movement against all Forms of Discrimination and Racism
 International Movement ATD Fourth World
 International Movement for Fraternal Union among Races and Peoples
 International Organization for the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination
 International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education
 International Service for Human Rights
 International Studies Association
 International Trade Union Confederation
 International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development
 International Women Bond
 International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs
 International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations
 Iranian Elite Research Center
 Iraqi Development Organization
 Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco
 IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association Iuventum
 Jossour forum des femmes marocaines
 Jubilee Campaign
 Khiam Rehabilitation Centre for Victims of Torture
 La Brique
 Latter-Day Saint Charities
 Lawyers for Lawyers
 Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada
 Le Collectif des Femmes Africaines du Hainaut
 Liberal International
 Liberation
 Lutheran World Federation
 Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development
 Marangopoulos Foundation for Human Rights
 Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association
 Minority Rights Group
 Mothers Legacy Project
 National Coalition Against Racial Discrimination
 National Union of Jurists of Cuba, The Native American Rights Fund
 Nonviolence International
 Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational and Transparty
 Nord-Sud XXI
 Norwegian Refugee Council
 Organization for Defending Victims of Violence
 Organisation marocaine des droits humains
 Organisation pour la communication en Afrique et de promotion de la coopération économique internationale
 Pan African Union for Science and Technology
 Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation
 Pax Romana
 Peace Brigades International Switzerland
 Peivande Gole Narges Organization
 Penal Reform International
 Plan International
 Prahar
 Presse emblème campagne
 Rencontre africain pour la défense des droits de l'homme
 Reporters sans frontières international
 Réseau international des droits humains
 Roma Centre for Social Intervention and Studies
 Russian Peace Foundation
 Saami Council

Save the Children International	United Cities and Local Governments
Schweizerische Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Jugendverbände	Union of Arab Jurists
Sikh Human Rights Group	Unesco Centre Basque Country
Shia Rights Watch Inc	United Nations for Education, Universal Science and Human Rights
Shimin Gaikou Centre	Universal Networking Digital Language Foundation
Shirkat Gah, Women's Resource Centre	US Human Rights Network
Shivi Development Society	Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitic
Society for Threatened Peoples	Victorious Youths Movement
Society Studies Centre	Villages inis (United Villages)
Solar Cookers International	VIVAT International
Solidarité pour un monde meilleur	Women Organization for Development and Capacity Building
Solidarité Suisse-Guinée	Women's Human Rights International Association
SOS Kinderdorf International	Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
Stichting Justitia et Pax Nederland	World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace
Stiftung Brot fuer Alle	World Barua Organization
Sudanese Women Parliamentarians Caucus	World Environment and Resources Council
Syriac Universal Alliance	World Evangelical Alliance
The Equal Rights Trust	World Federation of United Nations Associations
The International Organisation for LDCs	World Jewish Congress
The Journalists and Writers Foundation	World Muslim Congress
The Palestinian Return Centre Ltd	World Organization against Torture
United Nations Watch	World Russian People's Council
United Schools International	
UPR Info	

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 thirtieth session*Documents issued in the general series*

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/1	1	Annotations to the agenda for the thirtieth session of the Human Rights Council: note by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/30/2	1	Report of the Human Rights Council on its thirtieth session
A/HRC/30/3	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Belarus
A/HRC/30/3/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/30/4	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Liberia
A/HRC/30/4/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/30/5	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Malawi
A/HRC/30/5/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/30/6	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Mongolia
A/HRC/30/6/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/30/7	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Panama
A/HRC/30/8	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Maldives
A/HRC/30/8/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/30/9	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Andorra
A/HRC/30/9/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/30/10	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Bulgaria
A/HRC/30/10/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/30/10/Add.1/Corr.1	6	Corrigendum
A/HRC/30/11	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Honduras

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/12	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on the United States of America
A/HRC/30/12/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/30/12/Add.1/Corr.1	6	Corrigendum
A/HRC/30/13	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on the Marshall Islands
A/HRC/30/13/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/30/13/Corr.1	6	Corrigendum
A/HRC/30/14	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Croatia
A/HRC/30/14/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/30/15	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Jamaica
A/HRC/30/15/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/30/16	6	Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Libya
A/HRC/30/16/Add.1	6	Addendum
A/HRC/30/17	1	Election of members of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee: note by the Secretary-General
A/HRC/30/18	2, 3	Capital punishment and the implementation of the safeguards guaranteeing protection of the rights of those facing the death penalty: yearly supplement of the Secretary-General to his quinquennial report
A/HRC/30/19	2,3	Human rights implications of overincarceration and overcrowding: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/20	2,3	Study on the prevention of human rights violations and its practical implementation: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/21	2,3	Summary report on the high-level panel discussion on the question of the death penalty: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/22	2,3	The right to development: consolidated report of the Secretary-General and the

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/23	2,3	Summary report on the panel discussion on realizing the equal enjoyment of the right to education by every girl: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/24	2,3	Evaluation of the implementation of the second phase of the World Programme for Human Rights Education: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/24/Corr.1	2,3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/30/25	2,3	The rights of indigenous peoples: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/26	2,3	Best practices, experiences and challenges and ways to overcome them with regard to the promotion, protection and implementation of the right to participate in public affairs in the context of the existing human rights law: study of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/27	3, 4,7,9,10	Communications report of special procedures
A/HRC/30/28	2, 10	Summary report on the panel discussion on the issue of national policies and human rights: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/29	2, 5	Cooperation with the United Nations, its representatives and mechanisms in the field of human rights: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/30/30	2, 10	Role and achievements of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights in assisting the Government and people of Cambodia in the promotion and protection of human rights: report of the Secretary-General
A/HRC/30/31	2,10	Situation of human rights in Yemen: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/32	2,10	Situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		Rights
A/HRC/30/32/Corr.1	2,10	Corrigendum
A/HRC/30/32/Corr.2	2,10	Corrigendum
A/HRC/30/33	2,10	Study on the impact of technical assistance and capacity-building on the situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/34	3	Report of the Working Group on the use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination
A/HRC/30/34/Add.1	3	Mission to Côte d'Ivoire
A/HRC/30/34/Add.2	3	Comments by Côte d'Ivoire
A/HRC/30/35	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery, including its causes and consequences, Urmila Bhoola
A/HRC/30/35/Add.1	3	Mission to the Niger
A/HRC/30/35/Add.2	3	Mission to Belgium
A/HRC/30/36	3	Report of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention
A/HRC/30/36/Add.1	3	Follow-up mission to Germany
A/HRC/30/36/Add.2	3	Mission to New Zealand
A/HRC/30/36/Add.3	3	Follow-up mission to Italy
A/HRC/30/36/Add.4	3	Comments by Germany
A/HRC/30/37	3	United Nations Basic Principles and Guidelines on remedies and procedures on the right of anyone deprived of their liberty to bring proceedings before a court: report of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention
A/HRC/30/38	3	Report of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances
A/HRC/30/38/Add.1	3	Mission to Serbia, including Kosovo
A/HRC/30/38/Add.2	3	Mission to Montenegro
A/HRC/30/38/Add.3	3	Mission to Croatia
A/HRC/30/38/Add.4	3	Follow-up to the recommendations of the missions of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances to East

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		Timor and Mexico
A/HRC/30/38/Add.5	3	Study on enforced or involuntary disappearances and economic, social and cultural rights
A/HRC/30/39	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation, Léo Heller
A/HRC/30/39/Add.1	3	Priority areas of work for the new mandate-holder
A/HRC/30/39/Add.2	3	Mission to Kenya
A/HRC/30/40	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the implications for human rights of the environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes, Baskut Tuncak
A/HRC/30/40/Add.1	3	Mission to Kazakhstan
A/HRC/30/40/Add.1/Corr.1	3	Corrigendum
A/HRC/30/40/Add.2	3	Comments by Kazakhstan
A/HRC/30/41	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples, Victoria Lucia Tauli-Corpuz
A/HRC/30/41/Add.1	3	Mission to Paraguay
A/HRC/30/42	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence, Pablo De Greiff
A/HRC/30/42/Add.1	3	Mission to Burundi
A/HRC/30/43	3	Report of the Independent Expert on the enjoyment of all human rights by older persons, Rosa Kornfeld-Matte
A/HRC/30/43/Add.1	3	Mission to Slovenia
A/HRC/30/43/Add.2	3	Mission to Austria
A/HRC/30/43/Add.3	3	Mission to Mauritius
A/HRC/30/43/Add.4	3	Comments by Mauritius
A/HRC/30/44	3	Report of the Independent Expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order, Alfred-Maurice de Zayas
A/HRC/30/44/Corr.1	3	Corrigendum

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/45	3	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on the enjoyment of human rights, Idriss Jazairy
A/HRC/30/46	3	Report of the Working Group on the Right to Development on its sixteenth session: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/30/47	3	Report of the open-ended intergovernmental working group to consider the possibility of elaborating an international regulatory framework on the regulation, monitoring and oversight of the activities of private military and security companies on its fourth session
A/HRC/30/48	4	Report of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/30/48/Corr.1	4	Corrigendum
A/HRC/30/49	3,5	Role of local government in the promotion and protection of human rights: final report of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee
A/HRC/30/50	3,5	Using sport and the Olympic ideal to promote human rights for all and to strengthen universal respect for them: finalized study of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee
A/HRC/30/51	5	Reports of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee on its fourteenth and fifteenth sessions: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/30/52	5	Report of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples on its eighth session
A/HRC/30/53	5	Promotion and protection of the rights of indigenous peoples with respect to their cultural heritage: study of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous People
A/HRC/30/54	5	Final summary of responses to the questionnaire survey on best practices regarding possible appropriate measures and implementation strategies in order to attain the goals of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: study of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/55	5	Report of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on the draft United Nations declaration on the rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas
A/HRC/30/56	9	Report of the Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent on its fifteenth and sixteenth sessions
A/HRC/30/56/Add.1	9	Mission to the Netherlands
A/HRC/30/56/Add.2	9	Mission to Sweden
A/HRC/30/56/Add.3	9	Comments by the Netherlands
A/HRC/30/57	10	Report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in Somalia, Bahame Nyanduga
A/HRC/30/58	10	Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Cambodia, Rhona Smith
A/HRC/30/59	10	Report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic, Marie-Therese Keita Bocoum
A/HRC/30/60	10	Report of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Sudan, Aristide Nononsi
A/HRC/30/61	2	Promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/62	2,3	Summary report on the full-day meeting on the rights of the child on the theme "Towards better investment in the rights of the child": report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/63	3	Ways and means, as well as obstacles and challenges and proposals to overcome them, for the enhancement of international cooperation in the United Nations human rights machinery, including the Human Rights Council: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights - Note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/30/64	2,3	Summary report on the panel discussion on the effects of terrorism on the enjoyment by all persons of human rights and fundamental freedoms: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

Documents issued in the general series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/65	2,8	Study 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/30/66	10	Promotion and protection of human rights in Iraq: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/67	2	Violations and abuses of human rights and atrocities committed by the terrorist group Boko Haram in the countries affected by such acts: report of the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/68	2,3	Report of the Secretary-General on the safety of journalists and the issue of impunity: note by the secretariat
A/HRC/30/69	3	Methods of work of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention
A/HRC/30/70	2,3	Summary report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the annual-full day of discussion on the human rights of women: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/71	3	Report of the Working Group on the Right to Development on its sixteenth session

Documents issued in the conference room papers series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/CRP.1	3	Update by the Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence on his visit to Burundi
A/HRC/30/CRP.2	2	Report of the OHCHR Investigation on Sri Lanka (OISL)
A/HRC/30/CRP.3	2,10	Oral update of the High Commissioner for Human Rights on the human rights violations and abuses against Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar

Documents issued in the limited series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/L.1 and Rev.1, Rev.2	10	Technical assistance and capacity-building for Yemen in the field of human rights
A/HRC/30/L.2	3	Human rights and unilateral coercive measures
A/HRC/30/L.3	3	Regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights
A/HRC/30/L.4 and Rev.1	2	Situation of human rights in Yemen
A/HRC/30/L.5 and Rev.1	4	The grave and deteriorating human rights and humanitarian situation in the Syrian Arab Republic
A/HRC/30/L.6	10	Technical assistance and capacity building in the field of human rights in the Central African Republic
A/HRC/30/L.7	10	Assistance to Somalia in the field of human rights
A/HRC/30/L.8	3	Human rights and indigenous peoples
A/HRC/30/L.9	5	Review of the mandate of the expert mechanism on the rights of indigenous peoples
A/HRC/30/L.10 and Rev.1	10	Enhancement of technical cooperation and capacity-building in the field of human rights
A/HRC/30/L.11 and Rev.1	3	The question of the death penalty
A/HRC/30/L.12	3	Right to development
A/HRC/30/L.13	5	Promotion of the right to peace
A/HRC/30/L.14	3	Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order
A/HRC/30/L.15	3	The use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination
A/HRC/30/L.16	3	Human rights in the administration of justice, including juvenile justice
A/HRC/30/L.17	3	Contribution of the Human Rights Council to the high level meeting on HIV/AIDS in 2016
A/HRC/30/L.18	10	Technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in the Sudan
A/HRC/30/L.19	5	Promotion and protection of the human rights of peasants and other people

Documents issued in the limited series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		working in rural areas
A/HRC/30/L.20	9	From rhetoric to reality: a global call for concrete action against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance
A/HRC/30/L.21	9	Forum on people of African descent in the diaspora
A/HRC/30/L.22 and Rev.1	10	Advisory services and technical assistance for Cambodia
A/HRC/30/L.23	5	Contribution of parliaments to the work of the Human Rights Council and its universal periodic review
A/HRC/30/L.24	10	National policies and human rights
A/HRC/30/L.25 and Rev.1	3	Human rights and preventing and countering violent extremism
A/HRC/30/L.26	10	Promoting international cooperation to support national human rights follow-up systems and processes
A/HRC/30/L.27 and Rev.1	3	Equal participation in political and public affairs
A/HRC/30/L.28	1	Follow-up to PRST/29/1
A/HRC/30/L.29	2	Promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka
A/HRC/30/L.30	10	Assistance technique et renforcement des capacités en matière des droits de l'homme en République Démocratique du Congo
A/HRC/30/L.31	10	Technical cooperation and capacity building for Burundi in the field of human rights
A/HRC/30/L.32	1	Reports of the Advisory Committee
A/HRC/30/L.33	4	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.5/Rev.1
A/HRC/30/L.34	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.11/Rev.1
A/HRC/30/L.35	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/L.36	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/L.37	3	Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/30/L.25
A/HRC/30/L.38	3	Idem

Documents issued in the limited series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/L.39	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/L.40	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/L.41	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/L.42	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/L.43	1	Promoting the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health through enhancing capacity-building in public health against pandemics

Documents issued in the Government series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/G/1	10	Note verbale dated 12 August 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Cambodia to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/G/2	4	Letter dated 10 August 2015 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of Georgia to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/30/G/3	4	Letter dated 10 September 2015 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/30/G/4	2	Note verbale dated 16 September 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Sri Lanka 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/30/G/5	10	Note verbale dated 15 September 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Ukraine to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/30/G/6	7	Note verbale dated 18 September 2015

Documents issued in the Government series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		from the Permanent Mission of Saudi Arabia to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/30/G/7	3	Note verbale dated 11 September 2015 from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Albania to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/G/8	4	Letter dated 25 September 2015 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/30/G/9	10	Note verbale dated 30 September 2015 from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of the Sudan to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/30/G/10	2, 3	Note verbale dated 1 October 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Singapore to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council
A/HRC/30/G/11	3	Note verbale dated 2 October 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
A/HRC/30/G/12	7	Note verbale dated 6 October 2015 from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Albania to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva addressed to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/NGO/1	3	Written statement submitted by the World Muslim Congress, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/2	3	Written statement submitted by the Prahar, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/3	6	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/4	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/5	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/6	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/7	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/8	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/9	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/10	4, 5	Written statement submitted by the International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/11	8	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/12	4	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/13	3	Written statement submitted by the Himalayan Research and Cultural Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/14	4	Written statement submitted by the International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/15	3	Written statement submitted by the Center for Global Nonkilling, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/16	9	Written statement submitted by the Prahar, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/17	3	Written statement submitted by the Auspice Stella, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/18	4	Written statement submitted by the Europe Third World Centre, a non-governmental

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/19	4	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/20	7	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/21	3	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/22	6	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/23	3	Written statement submitted by the Society Studies Centre (MADA ssc), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/24	3	Written statement submitted by the Modern Advocacy, Humanitarian, Social and Rehabilitation Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/25	3	Written statement submitted by the Reporters Sans Frontiers International - Reporters Without Borders International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/26	4	Written statement submitted by the Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/27	4	Written statement submitted by the Alsalam Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/28	4	Written statement submitted by the Nord-Sud XXI - North-South XXI, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/29	4	Written statement submitted by the International Educational Development, Inc., a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/30/NGO/30	4	Written statement submitted by the International Career Support Association, a

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/31	3	Written statement submitted by the Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/32	6	Written statement submitted by the International Commission of Jurists, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/33	4	Written statement submitted by the International Federation for the Protection of the Rights of Ethnic, Religious, Linguistic & Other Minorities, a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/30/NGO/34	3	Written statement submitted by the Nord-Sud XXI - North-South XXI, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/35	8	Joint written statement submitted by the Ewiiapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians, National Congress of American Indians, Native American Rights Fund, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Indian Law Resource Centre, non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/30/NGO/36	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/37	7	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/38	5	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/39	4	Written statement submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/40	4	Joint written statement submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, European Humanist Federation, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/41	2	Written statement submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights (JKCHR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/NGO/42	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/43	4	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/44	10	Written statement submitted by the World Federation of Ukrainian Women's Organizations, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/45	3	Written statement submitted by the Child Foundation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/46	4	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/47	4	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/48	2, 10	Written statement submitted by the International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/49	5	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/50	9	Written statement submitted by the Prahar, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/51	4	Written statement submitted by the Pax Romana (International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs and International Movement of Catholic Students), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/52	3	Written statement submitted by the Hawa Society for Women, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/53	3	Written statement submitted by the Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/54	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/55	4	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/56	10	Written statement submitted by the International Educational Development, Inc., a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/30/NGO/57	10	Written statement submitted by the Eastern Sudan Women Development Organization,

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/58	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/59	9	Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/60	4	Written statement submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/61	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/62	4	Written statement submitted by the Nazra for Feminist Studies, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/63	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/64	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/65	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/66	9	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/67	4	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/68	10	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/69	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/70	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/71	5	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/72	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/73	3	Written statement submitted by the Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/74	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/30/NGO/75	4	Exposición conjunta escrita presentada por Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, American Association of Jurists,

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		organizaciones no gubernamentales reconocidas como entidades consultivas especiales
A/HRC/30/NGO/76	4	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/30/NGO/77	3	Exposición conjunta escrita presentada por Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, American Association of Jurists, organizaciones no gubernamentales reconocidas como entidades consultivas especiales
A/HRC/30/NGO/78	5	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/79	4, 5	Written statement submitted by the International Career Support Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/80	5	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/81	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/82	3	Written statement submitted by the HelpAge International, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/83	3	Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/84	4	Written statement submitted by the Jubilee Campaign, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/85	3	Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/86	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/87	3	Written statement submitted by the World Organisation Against Torture, a non-governmental organization in special

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/88	3	Joint written statement submitted by the International Catholic Child Bureau, Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, Defence for Children International, Edmund Rice International Limited, International Juvenile Justice Observatory, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development - VIDES, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, Terre Des Hommes Federation Internationale, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/89	2	Written statement submitted by the World Evangelical Alliance, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/90	3	Exposé écrit présenté conjointement par le International Catholic Child Bureau, Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, Edmund Rice International Limited, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development - VIDES, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, organisations non gouvernementales dotées du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/30/NGO/91	3	Written statement submitted by the International Federation of University Women, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/92	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), nongovernmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/93	3	Written statement submitted by the Federal Union of European Nationalities, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/94	3	Idem

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/NGO/95	3	Written statement submitted by the Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europe, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/96	3	Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/97	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/98	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/99	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/100	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/101	2	Written statement submitted by the International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/102	3	Written statement submitted by the Gazeteciler ve Yazarlar Vakfi, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/103	7	Written statement submitted by the Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/104	7	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/105	4	Written statement submitted by the Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/106	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/107	10	Joint written statement submitted by the International Catholic Child Bureau, Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, Edmund Rice International Limited, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development - VIDES, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/108	3	Written statement submitted by the Badil

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
		Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, a nongovernmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/109	7	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/110	3	Exposé écrit présenté conjointement par le France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, organisations non gouvernementales dotées du statut consultatif spécial
A/HRC/30/NGO/111	3	Written statement submitted by the Family and Life, a nongovernmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/112	2	Written statement submitted by the Association Points-Coeur, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/113	10	Exposé écrit présenté par le Franciscans International, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif général
A/HRC/30/NGO/114	3	Written statement submitted by the Women's Human Rights International Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/115	3	Written statement submitted by the Liberal International (World Liberal Union), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/116	4	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/117	4	Written statement submitted by the Nord-Sud XXI - NorthSouth XXI, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/118	3	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/119	7	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/120	4	Written statement submitted by the Women's Human Rights International Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/121	7	Joint written statement submitted by Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, BADIL

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		Resource Centre for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/122	10	Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/123	4	Written statement submitted by the International Educational Development, Inc., a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/30/NGO/124	5	Written statement submitted by the World Youth Alliance, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/125	2	Written statement submitted by the Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/126	3	Written statement submitted by Le Collectif des Femmes Africaines du Hainaut, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/127	3	Written statement submitted by the Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/128	10	Written statement submitted by the Association for Progressive Communications (APC), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/129	4	Written statement submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/130	5	Written statement submitted by the Association for Defending Victims of Terrorism, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/131	3	Joint written statement submitted by International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, nongovernmental organizations in general consultative status, Asociación Española para el Derecho Internacional de los Derechos Humanos AEDIDH, American Association of Jurists, Amman Center for Human Rights Studies, Apne Aap Women World Wide (India)

*Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series**Symbol**Agenda item*

Trust, Armenian Constitutional Right-Protective Centre, Association Dunenyo, Association of War-Affected Women, Association pour l'Intégration et le Développement Durable au Burundi, Atheist Alliance International, Aube Nouvelle pour la Femme et le Développement, Autre Vie, BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, Bangladesh Nari Progati Sangha, Center for Development of Civil Society, Centre d'accompagnement des alternatives locales de développement, Centre for Democracy and Development, Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme, Foundation for Human Horizon, Foundation for the development of knowledge Suma Veritas, Humanitaire Plus, Institute of Global Education, Institute of Noahide Code, International Career Support Association, International Federation of Women in Legal Careers, International Federation of Women Lawyers, International Institute for Child Protection, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Kham Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, Labour, Health and Human Rights Development Centre, Lama Gangchen World Peace Foundation (LGWPF), Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada, Marangopoulos Foundation for Human Rights, Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés (OIPMA), Public Services International, Réseau des Organisations Féminines d'Afrique Francophone, Réseau International des Droits Humains (RIDH), Save the Climat, Shirley Ann Sullivan Educational Foundation, Solidarité Agissante pour le Développement Familial (SADF), Sun Charity USA, Tandem Project, The, The Children's Project, Inc., United Nations Association of San Diego, United Religions Initiative, Women's World Summit Foundation, World Association for Psychosocial Rehabilitation, World for World Organization, Yayasan Pendidikan Indonesia, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Arab NGO Network for Development, Dzeno Association, Indian Council of South America (CISA), Institute for Planetary Synthesis, International Society for Human

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Agenda item</i>
		Rights, Share The World's Resources (STWR), non-governmental organizations on the roster
A/HRC/30/NGO/132	3	Written statement submitted by the Make Mothers Matter - MMM, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/133	4	Written statement submitted by the Women's Human Rights International Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/134	5	Written statement submitted by the Indian Council of South America (CISA), a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/30/NGO/135	3	Exposición escrita presentada por Indian Council of South America (CISA), organización no gubernamental reconocida en la Lista
A/HRC/30/NGO/136	9	Written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a nongovernmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/137	6	Written statement submitted by the Indian Council of South America (CISA), a non-governmental organization on the roster
A/HRC/30/NGO/138	9	Exposición escrita presentada por Indian Council of South America (CISA), organización no gubernamental reconocida en la Lista
A/HRC/30/NGO/139	2	Written statement submitted by the Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/140	3	Written statement submitted by the InternationalLawyers.Org, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/141	5	Exposición escrita presentada por Indian Council of South America (CISA), organización no gubernamental reconocida en la Lista
A/HRC/30/NGO/142	3	Written statement submitted by the InternationalLawyers.Org, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/NGO/143	5	Written statement submitted by the International Indian Treaty Council (IITC), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/144	3	Written statement submitted the Association for Progressive Communications (APC), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/145	3	Written statement submitted the Asian-Eurasian Human Rights Forum, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/146	4	Written statement submitted by the Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/147	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/148	4	Written statement submitted by the Liberation, a nongovernmental organization on the Roster
A/HRC/30/NGO/149	8	Written statement submitted by the Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/150	2	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/151	4	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/152	2	Idem
A/HRC/30/NGO/153	3	Exposición escrita presentada por Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociación Civil, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial
A/HRC/30/NGO/154	6	Written statement submitted by the Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociación Civil, a nongovernmental organization in consultative status
A/HRC/30/NGO/155	5	Written statement submitted by the Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational and Transparty, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, Women's Human Rights International Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status, Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, a nongovernmental organization on the roster

Documents issued in the national institutions series

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Agenda item</i>	
A/HRC/30/NI/1	6	Written submission by the Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/30/NI/2	3	Information presented by the Canadian Human Rights Commission: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/30/NI/3	3	Information provided by the European Network of National Human Rights Institutions: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/30/NI/4	3	Information presented by the Provedor for Human Rights and Justice of Timor-Leste: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/30/NI/5	2	Information provided by the Ombudsman's Office of Colombia: note by the Secretariat
A/HRC/30/NI/6	3	Idem
A/HRC/30/NI/7	2	Idem
A/HRC/30/NI/8	2	Idem
A/HRC/30/NI/9	2	Idem

Annex IV

Advisory Committee members elected by the Human Rights Council at its thirtieth session and duration of terms of membership

<i>Member</i>	<i>Term expires in</i>
Ibrahim Abdul Aziz Al Sheddi (Saudi Arabia)	30 September 2018
Mario Luis Coriolano (Argentina)	30 September 2018
Katharina Pabel (Austria)	30 September 2018
Imeru Tamrat Yigezu (Ethiopia)	30 September 2018

Annex V

Special procedures mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its thirtieth session

Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights

Karima Bennoune (United States of America)

Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent (member from Latin American and Caribbean States)

Ahmed Reid (Jamaica)

Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances (member from Eastern European States)

Henrikas Mickevicius (Lithuania)
