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 Part One
Resolutions, decisions and President’s statement adopted by the Human Rights Council at its twenty-ninth session

 I. Resolutions

| *Resolution* | *Title* | *Date of adoption* |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| 29/1 | Fiftieth anniversary of the adoption and fortieth anniversary of the entry into force of the International Covenants on Human Rights | 2 July 2015 |
| 29/2 | Protection of the human rights of migrants: migrants in transit | 2 July 2015 |
| 29/3 | Human rights and international solidarity | 2 July 2015 |
| 29/4 | Elimination of discrimination against women | 2 July 2015 |
| 29/5 | Elimination of discrimination against persons affected by leprosy and their family members | 2 July 2015 |
| 29/6 | Independence and impartiality of the judiciary, jurors and assessors, and the independence of lawyers | 2 July 2015 |
| 29/7 | The right to education | 2 July 2015 |
| 29/8 | Strengthening efforts to prevent and eliminate child, early and forced marriage | 2 July 2015 |
| 29/9 | Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism | 2 July 2015 |
| 29/10 | Human rights and the regulation of civilian acquisition, possession and use of firearms | 2 July 2015 |
| 29/11 | The negative impact of corruption on the enjoyment of human rights | 2 July 2015 |
| 29/12 | Unaccompanied migrant children and adolescents and human rights | 2 July 2015 |
| 29/13 | Mission by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to improve human rights, accountability, reconciliation and capacity in South Sudan | 2 July 2015 |
| 29/14 | Accelerating efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women: eliminating domestic violence | 2 July 2015 |
| 29/15 | Human rights and climate change | 2 July 2015 |
| 29/16 | The grave and deteriorating human rights and humanitarian situation in the Syrian Arab Republic | 2 July 2015 |
| 29/17 | Situation of human rights in Belarus | 2 July 2015 |
| 29/18 | Situation of human rights in Eritrea | 2 July 2015 |
| 29/19 | The Social Forum | 2 July 2015 |
| 29/20 | The incompatibility between democracy and racism | 2 July 2015 |
| 29/21 | Situation of human rights of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar | 3 July 2015 |
| 29/22 | Protection of the family: contribution of the family to the realization of the right to an adequate standard of living for its members, particularly through its role in poverty eradication and achieving sustainable development | 3 July 2015 |
| 29/23 | Cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights | 3 July 2015 |
| 29/24 | Capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d’Ivoire in the field of human rights | 3 July 2015 |
| 29/25 | Ensuring accountability and justice for all violations of international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem | 3 July 2015 |

 II. Decisions

| *Decision* | *Title* | *Date of adoption* |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 29/101 | Outcome of the universal periodic review: Kyrgyzstan | 24 June 2015 |
| 29/102 | Outcome of the universal periodic review: Guinea | 24 June 2015 |
| 29/103 | Outcome of the universal periodic review: Lao People’s Democratic Republic | 25 June 2015 |
| 29/104 | Outcome of the universal periodic review: Spain | 25 June 2015 |
| 29/105 | Outcome of the universal periodic review: Lesotho | 25 June 2015 |
| 29/106 | Outcome of the universal periodic review: Kenya | 25 June 2015 |
| 29/107 | Outcome of the universal periodic review: Armenia | 25 June 2015 |
| 29/108 | Outcome of the universal periodic review: Guinea-Bissau | 25 June 2015 |
| 29/109 | Outcome of the universal periodic review: Sweden | 26 June 2015 |
| 29/110 | Outcome of the universal periodic review: Grenada | 26 June 2015 |
| 29/111 | Outcome of the universal periodic review: Turkey | 26 June 2015 |
| 29/112 | Outcome of the universal periodic review: Kuwait | 26 June 2015 |
| 29/113 | Outcome of the universal periodic review: Kiribati | 1 July 2015 |
| 29/114 | Outcome of the universal periodic review: Guyana | 2 July 2015 |

 III. President’s statement

| *President’s statement*  | *Title* | *Date of adoption* |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 29/1 | Enhancing the efficiency of the Human Rights Council | 3 July 2015 |

 Part Two
Summary of proceedings

 I. Organizational and procedural matters

 A. Opening and duration of the session

1. The Human Rights Council held its twenty-ninth session at the United Nations Office at Geneva from 15 June to 3 July 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 twenty-ninth session was held on 26 May 2015.

3. At its organizational meeting, the Council, pursuant to a request from the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, in his capacity as Chair of the Non-Aligned Movement, decided to postpone the panel discussion on the issue of unilateral coercive measures and human rights until its thirtieth session.

4. The twenty-ninth session consisted of 46 meetings over 15 days (see paragraph 20 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 15 June 2015, the President of the Human Rights Council referred to the letter of 29 May 2015 from the Permanent Representative of Latvia, on behalf of the European Union, containing a request to hold an enhanced interactive dialogue on the human rights of migrants during the first week of the twenty-ninth session of the Council with the participation of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and other stakeholders, including the International Organization for Migration, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the International Labour Organization, the World Health Organization, and the International Committee of the Red Cross / the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. Pursuant to the proposal of its Bureau, the Council decided to hold the enhanced interactive dialogue on 15 June 2015 (see paragraphs 29-34).

7. At the same meeting, pursuant to the proposal of its President and Bureau, the Council decided to invite the Co-Facilitator of the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda for a briefing on the current status of the negotiations and to hold a brief dialogue with him on 18 June 2015 (see paragraphs 35-38).

8. Also at the same meeting, the President informed that the Vice-President of the Council and Focal Point of the Bureau on accessibility issues would present an oral report to the Council at the end of its twenty-ninth session.

9. At the same meeting, the Council adopted the agenda and programme of work of the twenty-ninth session, as modified.

10. At the 25th meeting, on 24 June 2015, the President informed that the consideration of the universal periodic review outcome of Kiribati had been postponed to 1 July 2015 due to the fact that the document containing the position of Kiribati on the recommendations made during the universal periodic review of Kiribati at the 21 session of the Working Group on Universal Periodic Review was yet pending approval.

11. At the same meeting, the President informed that, following request from Guyana, the consideration of the universal periodic review outcome of Guyana had been postponed to 2 July 2015.

 D. Organization of work

12. At the 1st meeting, on 15 June 2015, the President outlined the modalities for the enhanced interactive dialogue on the human rights of migrants, including the speaking time limits which would be two minutes for statements by States Members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.

13. At the same meeting, the President outlined the modalities for the dialogue with the Co-Facilitator of the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda, including speaking time limits which would be two minutes for statements by States Members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.

14. Also at the same meeting, the President referred to the recommendation of the Bureau of 8 June 2015 concerning the advance inscription on the list of speakers for clustered interactive dialogues with special procedures mandate holders under agenda item 3 at the twenty-ninth session of the Human Rights Council. He also referred to the modalities and schedule of the advance inscription.

15. At the same meeting, the President, further to the decision taken at the organizational meeting of the twenty-ninth session of the Human Rights Council, held on 26 May 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 three minutes for observer States and other observers. However, if it would be estimated to be more than four hours, the speaking time limits would be reduced to three minutes for States Members and two minutes for observer States and other observers. Should this measure be deemed insufficient to ensure that the total duration not exceed four hours, the speaking time limit would be further reduced.

16. Also at the same meeting, the President outlined the modalities for the 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.

17. At the 7th meeting, on 16 June 2015, the President outlined the modalities for panel discussions, including the speaking time limits which would be two minutes for statements by States Members of the Human Rights Council, observer States and other observers.

18. At the 21st meeting, on 23 June 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 Human Rights Council and two minutes for observer States and other observers.

19. At the 26th meeting, on 24 June 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 Human Rights Council, observer States and United Nations agencies to express their views on the outcome of the review, with varying speaking times according to the number of speakers in accordance with the modalities set out in the Appendix to resolution 16/21; and up to 20 minutes for stakeholders to make general comments on the outcome of the review.

 E. Meetings and documentation

20. The Human Rights Council held 46 fully serviced meetings during its twenty-ninth session.

21. The list of the resolutions, decisions and the President’s statement adopted by the Human Rights Council is contained in part one of the present report.

 F. Visits

22. At the 2nd meeting, on 15 June 2015, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Igor Crnadak, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

23. At the same meeting, the Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Baroness Anelay, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

24. At the 9th meeting, on 17 June 2015, the Minister for Human Rights of Yemen, Ezzedin Al-Asbahi, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

25. At the 21st meeting, on 23 June 2015, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Georgia, Khatuna Totladze, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

26. At the 25th meeting, on 24 June 2015, the Minister of Justice of South Sudan, Paulino Wanawilla Unango, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

27. At the 40th meeting, on 1 July 2015, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Regional Integration and Member of Parliament of Ghana, Hanna Tetteh, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

28. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Dominican Republic, Andrés Navarro García, delivered a statement to the Human Rights Council.

 G. Enhanced interactive dialogue on the human rights of migrants

29. At its 3rd meeting, on 15 June 2015, pursuant to Human Rights Council decision taken on the same day (see paragraph 6 above), the Council held an enhanced interactive dialogue on the human rights of migrants.

30. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the enhanced interactive dialogue.

31. At the same meeting, the Deputy Director General for Field Operations and Partnerships of the International Labour Organization, the Deputy Director-General of the International Organization for Migration and the Director for the Division of International Protection of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees made statements.

32. Also at the same meeting, the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants, François Crépeau, made a statement.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, China, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, France, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Cyprus, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Georgia, Greece, Iraq, Italy, Libya, Malaysia, Malta, Monaco, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, the Niger, Norway, Panama, the Philippines, Senegal, Serbia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, the Holy See;

(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: Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development; Centre de Estudios Legales Y Sociales (CELS) (also on behalf of Conectas Direitos Humanos); Human Rights Watch; Rencontre Africaine pour la Défense des droits de l'homme (RADDHO); Save the Children International; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

34. At the same meeting, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights answered questions and made concluding remarks. The Deputy Director General for Field Operations and Partnerships of the International Labour Organization, the Deputy Director-General of the International Organization for Migration and the Director for the Division of International Protection of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees also answered questions and made concluding remarks.

 H. Dialogue with the Co-Facilitator of the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda

35. At its 14th meeting, on 18 June 2015, the Human Rights Council held a dialogue with the Permanent Representative of Ireland to the United Nations and Co-Facilitator of the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda, David Donoghue.

36. The Co-Facilitator made a statement on the current status of the intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda.

37. During the ensuing dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked the Co-Facilitator questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Bangladesh, Brazil, Brazil (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Croatia, Egypt, France, Germany, Maldives, Morocco, Slovenia, Spain, Uruguay), China, Mexico, Montenegro;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Chile, Switzerland;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights; CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation.

38. At the same meeting, the Co-Facilitator answered questions and made concluding remarks.

 I. Selection and appointment of mandate holders

39. At the 46th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the President of the Human Rights Council presented the list of candidates to be appointed for the six vacancies for special procedures mandate holders.

40. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Pakistan, Paraguay, Portugal and the United States of America made statements in relation to the appointment of the special procedures mandate holders.

41. Also at the same meeting, the Human Rights Council appointed six special procedures mandate holders in accordance with Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21 and its decision 6/102 (see annex IV).

 J. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Enhancing the efficiency of the Human Rights Council

42. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the President of the Human Rights Council introduced draft President’s statement A/HRC/29/L.34.

43. At the same meeting, the President of the Council orally revised the draft President’s statement.

44. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Estonia, Japan, Mexico, the Russian Federation, the United States of America and Viet Nam made general comments in relation to the draft President’s statement as orally revised.

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

46. At the same meeting, the draft President’s statement as orally revised was adopted by the Council (PRST 29/1).

47. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of China and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made comments on the President’s statement.

 K. Adoption of the report of the session

48. At the 46th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representatives of Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica (also on behalf of Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Uruguay), Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malta, South Sudan and Switzerland (also on behalf of Liechtenstein) made statements as observer States with regard to adopted resolutions.

49. At the same meeting, the Vice-President of the Human Rights Council and Focal Point of the Bureau on accessibility issues presented an oral report on the work of the Task Force on accessibility for persons with disabilities.

50. Also at the same meeting, the Vice-President and Rapporteur of the Human Rights Council made a statement in connection with the draft report of the Council on its twenty-ninth session.

51. At the same meeting, the Human Rights Council adopted the draft report (A/HRC/29/2) ad referendum and decided to entrust the Rapporteur with its finalization.

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

(a) Representative of a State Member of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States);

(b) Observer for a non-governmental organization: International Service for Human Rights (ISHR) (also on behalf of Allied Rainbow Communities International; Article 19 – International Centre Against Censorship, The; Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development; CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Human Rights House Foundation; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association).

53. 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

54. At the 1st meeting, on 15 June 2015, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement providing an update of the activities of his Office.

55. During the ensuing general debate, at the 1st and 2nd 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, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, Egypt[[1]](#footnote-2) (also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Cuba, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)[[2]](#footnote-3) (also on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), Ireland, Japan, Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco (also on behalf of the States members and observers of the International Organization of la Francophonie), Namibia, Nigeria, Norway[[3]](#footnote-4) (also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, the State of Palestine), Pakistan (also on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, the Czech Republic, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Egypt, Greece, Honduras, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Mozambique, Nepal, the Niger, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova, Senegal, South Sudan, Spain, the Sudan, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Uruguay;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation; American Association of Jurists; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Human Rights Watch; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; International Service for Human Rights; International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations; Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; United Nations Watch; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; World Muslim Congress.

56. At the 4th meeting, on the same day, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Bahrain, Burundi, Egypt, Japan and the Republic of Korea.

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

57. At the 19th meeting, on 22 June 2015, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights presented thematic reports and oral updates prepared by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Secretary-General under agenda items 2 and 3, 5, 6, 8.

58. At the 20th meeting, on the same day, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on thematic reports and oral updates presented by the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights under agenda items 2 and 3 (see chapter III, section C).

 C. Interactive dialogue on the oral update of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the atrocities committed by the terrorist group Boko Haram and their effects on human rights in the States affected

59. At the 39th meeting, on 1 July 2015, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution S-23/1, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights provided the oral update of his Office on violations and abuses of human rights and atrocities committed by the terrorist group Boko Haram in the States affected by such acts.

60. At the same meeting, the representatives of Cameroon, Chad, the Niger and Nigeria made statements as the States concerned.

61. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 39th and 40th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the High Commissioner questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), China, the Congo, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ireland, Morocco, Sierra Leone, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Benin, Burundi, Canada, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Libya, Mali, Mauritania, New Zealand, Poland, Rwanda, Spain, the Sudan, Switzerland, Togo;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: African Union, European Union;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Center for Reproductive Rights, Inc., The; Human Rights Watch; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR) (also on behalf of Women’s Consortium of Nigeria); Rencontre Africaine pour la défense des droits de l’homme (also on behalf of North South XXI).

62. At the 40th meeting, on the same day, the High Commissioner answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

 D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

 Situation of human rights of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar

63. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.30, sponsored by Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation. Subsequently, Tunisia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

64. At the same meeting, the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, orally revised the draft resolution.

65. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of China, India, Japan, Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the United States of America and Viet Nam made general comments in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised. In their statements, the representatives of China, India and the Russian Federation disassociated the respective delegations from the consensus on the draft resolution as orally revised.

66. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, the consideration of and action on the draft resolution as orally revised was postponed to 3 July 2015.

67. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the consideration of and action on the draft resolution as orally revised was resumed.

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

69. 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.

70. At the same meeting, the representatives of Cuba and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

71. Also at the same meeting, the draft resolution as orally revised was adopted without a vote (resolution 29/21).

 Mission by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to improve human rights, accountability, reconciliation and capacity in South Sudan

72. At the 44th meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of the United States of America introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.8, sponsored by Albania, Paraguay, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America, and co-sponsored by Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, the Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Subsequently, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, the Congo, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Ghana, Iceland, Luxembourg, Poland, Portugal, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Sierra Leone and Slovenia joined the sponsors.

73. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America orally revised the draft resolution.

74. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Albania, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Paraguay and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made general comments in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

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

76. At the same meeting, the representative of Brazil made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

77. Also at the same meeting, the draft resolution as orally revised was adopted without a vote (resolution 29/13) (see also paragraph 938).

 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

 Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants

78. At the 4th meeting, on 15 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants, François Crépeau, presented his report (A/HRC/29/36 and Add.1–5).

79. At the same meeting, the representative of the European Union made a statement as the organization concerned.

80. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Italy, Malta and Sri Lanka made statements as the States concerned.

81. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 4th meeting, on 15 June 2015, and the 5th meeting, on 16 June 2015, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, the Congo, Ecuador[[4]](#footnote-5) (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, France, Gabon, Ghana, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, the Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Benin, Burkina Faso, Chile, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Greece, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Mali, Panama, the Philippines, Spain, the Sudan, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Conectas Direitos Humanos (also on behalf of Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociacion Civil); Edmund Rice International Limited; Franciscans International; Jubilee Campaign; Save the Children International; Terre Des Hommes Federation Internationale; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

82. At the 5th meeting, on 16 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

83. At the 21st meeting, on 23 June 2015, a statement in exercise of the right of reply was made by the representative of Eritrea.

 Special Rapporteur on minority issues

84. At the 4th meeting, on 15 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on minority issues, Rita Izsák, presented her study of the human rights situation of Roma worldwide, with a particular focus on the phenomenon of anti-Gypsyism (A/HRC/29/24).

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Argentina, Brazil, China, France, Ghana, India, Nigeria, Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), the Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Austria, Bulgaria, Chile, the Czech Republic, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Norway, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for national human rights institutions: Commissioner for Fundamental Rights of Hungary (by video message); Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain (also on behalf of the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission) (by video message);

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Lutheran World Federation; Minority Rights Group; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

86. At the 5th meeting, on 16 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

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

87. At the 5th meeting, on 16 June 2015, the Chairperson of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises, Michael Addo, presented the Working Group’s report (A/HRC/29/28 and Add.1–4).

88. At the same meeting, the representative of Azerbaijan made a statement as the State concerned.

89. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 5th and 6th meetings, on 16 June 2015, and the 8th meeting, on 17 June 2015, the following made statements and asked the Chairperson questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, France, Ghana, Ireland, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, the Netherlands, Norway[[5]](#footnote-6) (also on behalf of Argentina, Ghana, the Russian Federation), Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Australia, Belgium, Chile, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Madagascar, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights; Asian Legal Resource Centre; Centre Europe - Tiers Monde - Europe-Third World Centre; Conectas Direitos Humanos; Franciscans International; Human Rights Now; International Service for Human Rights; Korea Center for United Nations Human Rights Policy; Liberation.

90. At the 6th meeting, on 16 June 2015, the Chairperson answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

 Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children

91. At the 5th meeting, on 16 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children, Maria Grazia Giammarinaro, presented her report (A/HRC/29/38 and Add.1–2).

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

93. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Human Rights Commission of Malaysia (SUHAKAM) made a statement by video message.

94. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 5th and 6th meetings, on 16 June 2015, and the 8th meeting, on 17 June 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), Belarus[[6]](#footnote-7) (also on behalf of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, Egypt, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Libya, Nicaragua, Nigeria, the Philippines, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Singapore, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, the United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Botswana, China, Cuba, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Germany, Ghana, Indonesia, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the United Arab Emirates, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Chad, Chile, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Greece, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Italy, Madagascar, Myanmar, Panama, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova, Spain, the Sudan, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Uruguay;

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

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

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

(f) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Associazone Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of Dominicans for Justice and Peace (Order of Preachers); Marist International Solidarity Foundation; Pax Christi International; Pax Romana); Caritas Internationalis (International Confederation of Catholic Charities); International Humanist and Ethical Union; Korea Center for United Nations Human Rights Policy; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

95. At the 8th meeting, on 17 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

 Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences

96. At the 8th meeting, on 17 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences, Rashida Manjoo, presented her report (A/HRC/29/27 and Add.1–5).

97. At the 9th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Afghanistan, Honduras and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements as the States concerned.

98. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission and the Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain (also on behalf of the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission and the Scottish Human Rights Commission) made statements by video messages.

99. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 9th and 10th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, China, the Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador[[7]](#footnote-8) (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, Estonia, France, Ghana, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Tunisia[[8]](#footnote-9) (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Iraq, Italy, Luxembourg, Mali, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, the Philippines, Poland, Rwanda, Slovenia, Spain, the Sudan, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development; Association for Progressive Communications (APC); Center for Reproductive Rights, Inc., The; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; Human Rights Now; Indian Law Resource Centre; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; International Humanist and Ethical Union; International Lesbian and Gay Association; Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Lutheran World Federation; Organisation pour la Communication en Afrique et de Promotion de la Cooperation Economique Internationale - OCAPROCE Internationale; Social Service Agency of the Protestant Church in Germany ; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; World Barua Organization (WBO).

100. At the 10th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

 Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons

101. At the 8th meeting, on 17 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons, Chaloka Beyani, presented his report (A/HRC/29/34 and Add.1–3).

102. At the 9th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Azerbaijan, Haiti and Ukraine made statements as the States concerned.

103. At the same meeting, the representative of the Ukrainian Parliament Commissioner for Human Rights made a statement.

104. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 9th and 10th meetings, on the same day, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, China, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Estonia, France, Ghana, Ireland, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, the United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Armenia, Austria, Chile, Colombia, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Georgia, Greece, Honduras, Iraq, Italy, Mozambique, the Philippines, Rwanda, Spain, the Sudan, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, the State of Palestine;

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

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

105. At the 10th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

106. At the 11th meeting, on the same day, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Armenia and Azerbaijan.

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

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

108. At the 10th meeting, on 17 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, David Kaye, presented his report (A/HRC/29/32 and Add.1).

109. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 11th meeting, on 17 June 2015, and the 12th meeting, on 18 June 2015, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, Estonia, France, Germany, Ghana, Indonesia, Ireland, Latvia, Montenegro, Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, the Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement; Article 19 - International Centre Against Censorship, The (also on behalf of Amnesty International; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (FIDH)); Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development; Asian Legal Resource Centre; Association for Progressive Communications (APC); East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project; Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights; International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission (also on behalf of International Lesbian and Gay Association); International Service for Human Rights; Social Service Agency of the Protestant Church in Germany; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

110. At the 12th meeting, on 18 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

111. At the 14th meeting, on the same day, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Angola, China and Malaysia.

112. At the 21st meeting, on 23 June 2015, a statement in exercise of the right of reply was made by the representative of Ukraine.

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

113. At the 10th meeting, on 17 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, Maina Kiai, presented his report (A/HRC/29/25 and Add.1–5).

114. At the same meeting, the representatives of Oman and Kazakhstan made statements as the States concerned.

115. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 11th meeting, on 17 June 2015, and the 12th meeting, on 18 June 2015, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, Estonia, France, Ghana, India, Ireland, Latvia, Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Canada, Chile, the Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Norway, Poland, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Togo, Tunisia;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence Internationale pour le Developpement; Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement; Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development; Asian Legal Resource Centre; Association for Progressive Communications (APC); Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociación Civil; CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project; Human Rights House Foundation; International Service for Human Rights; Social Service Agency of the Protestant Church in Germany; World Organisation Against Torture (also on behalf of International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (FIDH)).

116. At the 12th meeting, on 18 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

117. At the 14th meeting, on the same day, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Angola, China and Malaysia.

118. At the 21st meeting, on 23 June 2015, a statement in exercise of the right of reply was made by the representative of the United States of America.

 Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers

119. At the 12th meeting, on 18 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers, Gabriela Knaul, presented her report (A/HRC/29/26, Corr.1 and Add.1–6).

120. At the same meeting, the representatives of Portugal, Qatar, Tunisia and the United Arab Emirates made statements as the States concerned.

121. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Provedoria de Justiça (Ombudsman) of Portugal made a statement.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, Estonia, France, Ghana, India, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), the Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Tunisia[[9]](#footnote-10) (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Burkina Faso, Chile, the Czech Republic, Egypt, Fiji, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, the Sudan, Switzerland;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence Internationale pour le Developpement; Alsalam Foundation; Amnesty International; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Asociación Civil; Development Innovations and Networks; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

123. At the 13th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

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

124. At the 12th meeting, on 18 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, Dainius Pūras, presented his report (A/HRC/29/33 and Add.1-2).

125. At the same meeting, the representative of Malaysia made a statement as the State concerned.

126. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Human Rights Commission of Malaysia (SUHAKAM) made a statement by video message.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador[[10]](#footnote-11) (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), France, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Burkina Faso, Chile, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lithuania, Panama, the Republic of Moldova, Slovenia, the Sudan, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, the State of Palestine;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development; Alliance Defending Freedom; Allied Rainbow Communities International (also on behalf of International Lesbian and Gay Association); Arab Commission for Human Rights; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; Human Rights Now; Liberation; VIVAT International (also on behalf of Franciscans International); World Barua Organization (WBO).

128. At the 13th meeting, on the same day, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

 Special Rapporteur on the right to education

129. At the 13th meeting, on 18 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the right to education, Kishore Singh, presented his report (A/HRC/29/30 and Add.1–2).

130. At the 14th meeting, on the same day, the representatives of Algeria and Bhutan made statements as the States concerned.

131. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 14th meeting, on 18 June 2015, and the 16th meeting, on 19 June 2015, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador[[11]](#footnote-12) (also on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, Estonia, France, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Tunisia[[12]](#footnote-13) (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Benin, Chile, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Georgia, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Mali, Sri Lanka;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alliance Defending Freedom; Alsalam Foundation; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; International Muslim Women’s Union; International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (OIDEL) (also on behalf of Association Points-Coeur; Associazione Communita Papa Giovanni XXIII; Catholic International Education Office; Congregation of our Lady of Charity of the Good Sherpherd; Dominicans for Justice and Peace (Order of Preachers); Fondazione Marista per la Solidarieta Internazionale (ONLUS); Foundation for GAIA; Institute for Planetary Synthesis; International Catholic Child Bureau; International Catholic Child Bureau; International Organization for the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination; New Humanity; Planetary Association for Clean Energy Inc, The; Servas International; Women’s Board Educational Cooperative Society); Jubilee Campaign; Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Plan International, Inc. (also on behalf of Arigatou International); Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; World Barua Organization (WBO).

132. At the 16th meeting, on 19 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

 Independent Expert on human rights and international solidarity

133. At the 13th meeting, on 18 June 2015, the Independent Expert on human rights and international solidarity, Virginia Dandan, presented her report (A/HRC/29/35).

134. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 14th meeting, on 18 June 2015, and the 16th meeting, on 19 June 2015, 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), Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador[[13]](#footnote-14) (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), El Salvador, Ghana, India, Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), the Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

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

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al-khoei Foundation; Associazione Communita Papa Giovanni XXIII (also on behalf of Congregation of our Lady of Charity of the Good Sherpherd; Edmund Rice International Limited; Foundation for GAIA; International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (OIDEL); Pax Christi International, International Catholic Peace Movement; Pax Romana (ICMICA and IMCS); Planetary Association for Clean Energy Inc, The); Indian Council of South America (CISA); Jubilee Campaign; World Association for the School as an Instrument of Peace.

135. At the 14th meeting, on 18 June 2015, the Independent Expert answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

 Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions

136. At the 16th meeting, on 19 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, Christof Heyns, presented his report (A/HRC/29/37 and Add.1–7).

137. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 16th meeting, on 19 June 2015, and the 18th meeting, on 22 June 2015, the following made statements and asked the Special Rapporteur questions:

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

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Belgium, Denmark, Egypt, Italy, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, the State of Palestine;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence Internationale pour le Développement; Alsalam Foundation; Article 19 - International Centre Against Censorship, The; Asian Legal Resource Centre; Centro Regional de Derechos Humanos y Justicia de Genero (also on behalf of Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociación Civil); Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, Asociación Civil; Franciscans International; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; World Muslim Congress.

138. At the 16th meeting, on 19 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

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

139. At the 16th meeting, on 19 June 2015, the Chairperson of the Working Group on the issue of discrimination against women in law and in practice, Emna Aouij, presented the Working Group’s report (A/HRC/29/40 and Add.1–5).

140. At the same meeting, the representatives of Chile, Peru and Spain made statements as the States concerned.

141. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 16th meeting, on 19 June 2015, and the 18th meeting, on 22 June 2015, the following made statements and asked the Chairperson questions:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador[[14]](#footnote-15) (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Estonia, France, Gabon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Colombia, Denmark, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Slovenia, the Sudan, Switzerland, Tunisia, Uruguay;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International; Center for Reproductive Rights, Inc., The; CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Defence for Children International; Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit - COC Nederland (also on behalf of International Lesbian and Gay Association; The Swedish Federation of lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights- RFSL); International Humanist and Ethical Union; Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

142. At the 16th meeting, on 19 June 2015, the Chairperson answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

 Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights

143. At the 18th meeting, on 22 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights, Philip Alston, presented his report and that of his predecessor (A/HRC/29/31 and Add.1).

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, Ecuador[[15]](#footnote-16) (also on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), France, Ghana, Indonesia, Ireland, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Paraguay, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Tunisia[[16]](#footnote-17) (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Burkina Faso, Chile, Djibouti, Egypt, Greece, Haiti, Luxembourg, Mauritania, the Niger, Norway, the Sudan, Togo;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: African Development Association; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Federation; Franciscans International; Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; Human Rights Commission of Pakistan; Indian Law Resource Centre (also on behalf of Amnesty International); International Buddhist Relief Organisation; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

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

146. At the 21st meeting, on 23 June 2015, a statement in exercise of the right of reply was made by the representative of Ukraine.

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

147. At the 18th meeting, on 22 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, Ben Emmerson, presented his report (A/HRC/29/51).

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

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

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Chile, Egypt, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, New Zealand, the Niger, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey;

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

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights; Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies; Indian Council of South America (CISA); International Buddhist Relief Organisation; Liberation; Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; World Barua Organization (WBO).

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

150. At the 20th meeting, on the same day, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Qatar, the Syrian Arab Republic and Turkey.

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

 B. Panels

 Panel discussion on realizing the equal enjoyment of the right to education by every girl

152. At the 7th meeting, on 16 June 2015, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 27/6, the Council held a panel discussion on realizing the equal enjoyment of the right to education by every girl.

153. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The Associate Director for Programme Partnerships of the Division of Programmes at United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), Marilena Viviani, moderated the discussion for the panel.

154. At the same meeting, the panellists Reem Al Hashemi, Barbara Bailey, Kishore Singh, Hannah Godefa and Adama Coulibaly made statements. The Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Ecuador[[17]](#footnote-18) (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Egypt[[18]](#footnote-19) (also on behalf of Algeria, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)), Nigeria (also on behalf of Argentina, Austria, Ecuador, Finland, Norway), Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar (on behalf of the Gulf Cooperation Council), Tunisia[[19]](#footnote-20) (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Canada, Egypt, Slovenia (also on behalf of Austria and Croatia), Togo;

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

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: Conseil des Droits de l’homme de la Mauritanie;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Lesbian and Gay Association; Plan International, Inc. (also on behalf of Arigatou International; Defence for Children International; Save The Children; Save the Children International).

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

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Brazil, China, Estonia, India, Mexico, Namibia, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, the United Arab Emirates;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Colombia, Fiji, Greece, Liechtenstein, Nepal, Rwanda, Turkey;

(c) Observer for a national human rights institution: National Human Rights Council of Morocco;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International; European Disability Forum; International Humanist and Ethical Union.

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

 Annual full-day discussion on the human rights of women

159. An annual full-day discussion on the human rights of women was held on 19 June 2015, in accordance with Human Rights Council resolutions 6/30, 23/25 and 26/15. The meeting was divided into two panel discussions.

160. The first panel discussion was held at the 15th meeting, on the same day. The panel was focused on the theme “Eliminating and preventing domestic violence against women and girls”. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The General Secretary of the World Young Women's Christian Association and African Union Goodwill Ambassador for the Campaign to End Child Marriage, Nyaradzayi Gumbonzvanda, moderated the discussion for the panel.

161. At the same meeting, for the first panel, the panellists Marie Yves Rose Morquette Myrtil, Blanca Hernández Oliver, Nur Hasyim, Begoña Lasagabaster, Julia Estela Monárrez Fragoso and Sven Pfeiffer made statements. The Council divided the first panel discussion into two slots, both held at the same meeting.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania; Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States); China (also on behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Sudan, Thailand, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam); Ecuador[[20]](#footnote-21) (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States); Mexico; Morocco (on behalf of the States members and observers of the International Organization of la Francophonie); Paraguay; the Philippines[[21]](#footnote-22) (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations); the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Egypt, Norway (also on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Sweden);

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

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: National Human Rights Council of Morocco;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Allied Rainbow Communities International; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

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

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Argentina, Brazil, Germany, Indonesia, Namibia, the Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, the United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Chile, Ecuador, Iraq, Mali, Monaco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Slovenia, Thailand, the Holy See;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development; Africa Culture Internationale; Friends World Committee for Consultation; Indian Law Resource Centre.

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

166. The second panel discussion was held at the 17th meeting, on the same day. The panel was focused on the theme “Women’s human rights and participation in power and decision-making”. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The Chairperson of the Working Group on the issue of discrimination against women in law and in practice, Emna Aouij, moderated the discussion for the panel.

167. At the same meeting, the panellists Arancha González, Shirin Akhter, Lucrèce Falolou, Michèle Ollier and Lilian Soto made statements. The Council divided the second panel discussion into two slots, both held at the same meeting.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Ecuador[[22]](#footnote-23) (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), France, Montenegro, Pakistan, the United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Austria (also on behalf of Liechtenstein, Norway, Switzerland), Croatia, Finland (also on behalf of Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden), Spain, the Syrian Arab Republic, Togo;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights; International Service for Human Rights; World Blind Union.

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

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, El Salvador, Estonia, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, Sierra Leone, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Canada, the Czech Republic, Greece, Kuwait, Lithuania, the Niger, Rwanda;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: All China Women’s Federation; Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD).

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

 Panel discussion on the effects of terrorism on the enjoyment by all persons of human rights and fundamental freedoms

172. At the 37th meeting, on 30 June 2015, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 28/17, the Council held a panel discussion on the effects of terrorism on the enjoyment by all persons of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

173. The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights made an opening statement for the panel. The Vice-President of the Human Rights Council, Mothusi Bruce Rabasha Palai, moderated the discussion for the panel.

174. At the same meeting, the panellists Ben Emmerson, Steven Siqueira and Mauro Miedico made statements. The Council divided the panel discussion into two slots.

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania (also on behalf of Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, ‎Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mali, Monaco, Morocco, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland‎, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, the United States of America), Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Cuba, Ecuador[[23]](#footnote-24) (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Egypt[[24]](#footnote-25) (also on behalf of Algeria, Jordan, Morocco, Saudi Arabia), Hungary[[25]](#footnote-26) (also on behalf of Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay), Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland[[26]](#footnote-27) (also on behalf of Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America), the United States of America;

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

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

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: National Human Rights Council of Morocco;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation; Human Rights Watch (also on behalf of International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (FIDH); International Service for Human Rights (ISHR)).

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

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: China, Estonia, India, Ireland, Morocco, Namibia, the Netherlands, Sierra Leone, Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Egypt, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kuwait, the Niger, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Holy See;

(c) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, International Organization of la Francophonie;

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amuta for NGO Responsibility; Arab Commission for Human Rights; CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Friends World Committee for Consultation (also on behalf of Amnesty International); Organization for Defending Victims of Violence.

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

 C. General debate on agenda item 3

179. At its 20th meeting, on 22 June 2015, and its 21st meeting, on 23 June 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 (on behalf of the Group of African States), Botswana, Brazil (also on behalf of Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay), Chile[[27]](#footnote-28) (also on behalf of Brazil, Colombia, Uruguay), Germany, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)[[28]](#footnote-29) (also on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), Ireland, Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine), Mongolia[[29]](#footnote-30) (also on behalf of Australia, Austria, Canada, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Lithuania, Maldives, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Sweden, Tunisia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America), Montenegro, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan (also on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar (on behalf of the Gulf Cooperation Council), the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Burkina Faso, Mauritania, Norway, Slovenia, Spain;

(c) Observer for a United Nations entity, specialized agency and related organization: Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS;

(d) Observers for intergovernmental organizations: Council of Europe, International Development Law Organization;

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development; Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs; Agence Internationale pour le Developpement; Al-khoei Foundation; All Russian Public Organization “Russian Public Institute of Electoral Law”; Alliance Defending Freedom; Allied Rainbow Communities International (also on behalf of International Lesbian and Gay Association); Alsalam Foundation; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Amnesty International (also on behalf of Human Rights Watch); Arab Commission for Human Rights; Article 19 - International Centre Against Censorship, The; Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development; Association Dunenyo; BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights; British Humanist Association; Center for Reproductive Rights, Inc., The; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; Colombian Commission of Jurists; Conectas Direitos Humanos; Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos; Franciscans International; Friends World Committee for Consultation; Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant (also on behalf of Consortium for Street Children, The; Foundation ECPAT International (End Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and Trafficking in Children for Sexual Purposes); International Movement ATD Fourth World; Plan International, Inc; Save the Children International); Helios Life Association; Il Cenacolo; International Buddhist Relief Organisation; International Humanist and Ethical Union; International Lesbian and Gay Association; International Muslim Women's Union; International Service for Human Rights; Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Liberation; Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association; Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés (OIPMA); Organisation pour la Communication en Afrique et de Promotion de la Cooperation Economique Internationale - OCAPROCE Internationale; Organization for Defending Victims of Violence; Peivande Gole Narges Organization; Rencontre Africaine pour la defense des droits de l'homme; Save the Children International; Society for Threatened Peoples; United Nations Watch; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; World Barua Organization (WBO); World Jewish Congress; World Muslim Congress.

180. At the 20th meeting, on 22 June 2015, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of India and Pakistan.

181. At the 21st meeting, on 23 June 2015, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of China and Saudi Arabia.

 D. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

 Fiftieth anniversary of the adoption and fortieth anniversary of the entry into force of the International Covenants on Human Rights

182. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of the Russian Federation introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.2, sponsored by the Russian Federation. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cabo Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Mexico, Peru, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uruguay, and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

183. At the same meeting, the representative of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made general comments in relation to the draft resolution.

184. 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.

185. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

186. Also at the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 29/1).

187. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representatives of Japan and South Africa made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

 Protection of the human rights of migrants: migrants in transit

188. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Mexico introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.3, sponsored by Mexico and co-sponsored by Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cyprus, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Ireland, Kenya, Montenegro, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Portugal, and Uruguay. Subsequently, Angola, Armenia, Belgium, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Greece, Haiti, Morocco, the Niger, Nigeria, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Tunisia, Ukraine, and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

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

190. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made general comments in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

191. 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.

192. At the same meeting, the draft resolution as orally revised was adopted without a vote (resolution 29/2).

193. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representative of Japan made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

 Human rights and international solidarity

194. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.6, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), and Zimbabwe. Subsequently, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Tunisia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) joined the sponsors.

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

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

*In favour*:

Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of ), Botswana, Brazil, China, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, 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

197. Draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.6 was adopted by 33 votes to 14, with 0 abstentions (resolution 29/3).

 Elimination of discrimination against women

198. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representatives of Colombia and Mexico introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.7/Rev.1, sponsored by Colombia and Mexico, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United States of America, Uruguay, and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Austria, Burkina Faso, Costa Rica, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Lithuania, Norway, Panama, the Republic of Korea, Togo, Tunisia, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

199. At the same meeting, the representatives of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and South Africa made general comments in relation to the draft resolution.

200. Also at the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 29/4).

201. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

 Elimination of discrimination against persons affected by leprosy and their family members

202. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Japan, also on behalf of Brazil, Estonia, Ethiopia, Morocco, Portugal and Romania, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.10, sponsored by Brazil, Estonia, Ethiopia, Japan, Morocco, Portugal and Romania, and co-sponsored by Andorra, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, the Congo, Cyprus, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kenya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Montenegro, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Belgium, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cuba, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ghana, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Myanmar, the Netherlands, Nigeria, the Philippines, Serbia, Singapore, Timor-Leste, Tunisia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

203. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 29/5).

 Independence and impartiality of the judiciary, jurors and assessors, and the independence of lawyers

204. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representatives of Hungary[[30]](#footnote-31) and Mexico, also on behalf of Australia, Botswana, Maldives and Thailand, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.11, sponsored by Australia, Botswana, Hungary, Maldives, Mexico, and Thailand, and co-sponsored by Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kenya, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Algeria, Armenia, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Fiji, Haiti, Indonesia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, Tunisia, Uruguay, and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

205. At the same meeting, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote.

206. Also at the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 29/6).

207. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

 The right to education

208. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Portugal introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.14/Rev.1, sponsored by Portugal and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Qatar, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Armenia, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Germany, Iceland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Maldives, Mozambique, Namibia, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Panama, Romania, Sierra Leone, Togo, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, and the State of Palestine joined the sponsors.

209. At the same meeting, the representative of Pakistan introduced amendment A/HRC/29/L.31 to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.14/Rev.1. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.31 was sponsored by China and Pakistan.

210. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Portugal made general comments in relation to the draft resolution and the amendments.

211.At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Portugal, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/29/L.31. The voting was as follows:

*In favour*:

Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United States of America

*Against*:

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

*Abstaining*:

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Congo, Cuba, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Republic of Korea, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

212. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.31 was rejected by 9 votes to 22, with 16 abstentions.

213. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Pakistan, a separate vote was taken on preambular paragraph 8 of the draft resolution.

214. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to preambular paragraph 8 of the draft resolution.

215. The voting in relation to preambular paragraph 8 of the draft resolution was as follows:

*In favour*:

Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

*Abstaining*:

Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

216. Preambular paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.14/Rev.1 was adopted by 30 votes to 0, with 17 abstentions.

217. At the same meeting, draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.14/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote (resolution 29/7).

218. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

 Strengthening efforts to prevent and eliminate child, early and forced marriage

219. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representatives of Sierra Leone and Italy[[31]](#footnote-32) (also on behalf of Argentina, Canada, Ethiopia, Honduras, Maldives, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Poland, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, and Zambia) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.15, sponsored by Argentina, Canada, Ethiopia, Honduras, Italy, Maldives, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Poland, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, and Zambia, and co-sponsored by Andorra, Angola, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chad, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, the United States of America, and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Albania, Armenia, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, the Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, France, Haiti, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Monaco, the Niger, the Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

220. At the same meeting, the representatives of Sierra Leone and Italy[[32]](#footnote-33) (also on behalf of Argentina, Canada, Ethiopia, Honduras, Maldives, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Poland, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, and Zambia) orally revised the draft resolution.

221. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Qatar (on behalf of the Gulf Cooperation Council) made general comments in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

222. 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.

223. At the same meeting, the draft resolution as orally revised was adopted without a vote (resolution 29/8).

224. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representative of the United States of America made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

 Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism

225. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Mexico introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.17/Rev.1, sponsored by Mexico and co-sponsored by Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Colombia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Guatemala, Ireland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, the Netherlands, Norway, Peru, San Marino, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Subsequently, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, France, Greece, Iceland, Japan, Luxembourg, Monaco, New Zealand, Poland, Serbia, Slovenia, Sweden, Tunisia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

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

227. Also at the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 29/9).

228. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representative of Sierra Leone made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

 Human rights and the regulation of civilian acquisition, possession and use of firearms

229. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representatives of Peru and Ecuador introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.18, sponsored by Ecuador and Peru, and co-sponsored by Cuba, Nigeria, Nicaragua, Switzerland, and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Australia, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, the Congo, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Greece, Haiti, Ireland, the Niger, Panama, the Philippines, Portugal, Singapore, Spain, Thailand and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

230. At the same meeting, the representative of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made general comments in relation to the draft resolution.

231. 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.

232. At the same meeting, the representatives of Mexico, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

*In favour:*

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

*Abstaining:*

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

234. Draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.18 was adopted by 41 votes to 0, with 6 abstentions (resolution 29/10).

235. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representatives of Japan and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

 The negative impact of corruption on the enjoyment of human rights

236. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Morocco (also on behalf of Austria, Brazil, Ethiopia, Indonesia and Poland) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.19, sponsored by Austria, Brazil, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Morocco, and Poland, and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Chad, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Mexico, Montenegro, New Zealand, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Slovakia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Ukraine. Subsequently, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Andorra, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, the Czech Republic, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, France, Haiti, Iceland, Israel, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Peru, the Philippines, Qatar (on behalf of the Gulf Cooperation Council), the Republic of Korea, Romania, Serbia, Singapore, Slovenia, Sweden, Tunisia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), the United States of America, and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

237. 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.

238. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 29/11).

239. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representatives of Japan and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

 Unaccompanied migrant children and adolescents and human rights

240. At the 43rd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of El Salvador (also on behalf of Nicaragua) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.24, sponsored by El Salvador and Nicaragua, and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Haiti, Honduras, Morocco, Namibia, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Thailand, Tunisia, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), and the State of Palestine. Subsequently, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Greece, Guatemala, Japan, the Philippines, Portugal, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and Turkey joined the sponsors.

241. At the same meeting, the representatives of Bolivia (Plurinational State of) and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments in relation to the draft resolution.

242. Also at the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 29/12).

 Accelerating efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women: eliminating domestic violence

243. At the 44th meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Canada introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.16/Rev.1, sponsored by Canada and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Benin, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Fiji, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Mali, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Chad, Costa Rica, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, El Salvador, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Madagascar, Mexico, Mongolia, Romania, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, and Turkey joined the sponsors.

244. At the same meeting, the representative of Saudi Arabia (also on behalf of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, the Russian Federation and the United Arab Emirates) introduced amendments A/HRC/29/L.27 and A/HRC/29/L.29 to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.16/Rev.1. Amendments A/HRC/29/L.27 and A/HRC/29/L.29 were sponsored by Bahrain, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. Subsequently, Bangladesh and the Sudan joined the sponsors of both amendments.

245. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the United Arab Emirates introduced amendments A/HRC/29/L.26 and A/HRC/29/L.28 to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.16/Rev.1. Amendments A/HRC/29/L.26 and A/HRC/29/L.28 were sponsored by Bahrain, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. Subsequently, Bangladesh and the Sudan joined the sponsors of both amendments.

246. At the same meeting, the representatives of Argentina, Brazil, France, Japan, Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Pakistan (also on behalf of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Libya, Oman, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates) and Viet Nam made general comments in relation to the draft resolution and the amendments. In his statement, the representative of Pakistan (also on behalf of Bahrain, Bangladesh, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Libya, Oman, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates) disassociated the respective delegations from the consensus on preambular paragraph 9 and operative paragraphs 2, 4, 8 (a) and (h), and 9 (a) of the draft resolution.

247. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Albania made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/29/L.26.

248. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Sierra Leone, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/29/L.26. The voting was as follows:

*In favour*:

Bangladesh, China, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

*Against*:

Albania, Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, 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*:

Algeria, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, Viet Nam

249. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.26 was rejected by 13 votes to 24, with 7 abstentions[[33]](#footnote-34).

250. At the same meeting, the representative of Ireland made a statement in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/29/L.27.

251. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Sierra Leone, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/29/L.27. The voting was as follows:

*In favour*:

Bangladesh, Botswana, China, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

*Against*:

Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Congo, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, 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*:

Algeria, Côte d’Ivoire, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, Maldives, Viet Nam

252. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.27 was rejected by 13 votes to 23, with 7 abstentions[[34]](#footnote-35).

253. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Sierra Leone, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/29/L.28. The voting was as follows:

*In favour*:

Bangladesh, Botswana, China, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Maldives, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

*Against*:

Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Estonia, France, Germany, India, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining*:

Algeria, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, Namibia, South Africa, Viet Nam

254. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.28 was rejected by 14 votes to 21, with 9 abstentions[[35]](#footnote-36).

255. At the same meeting, the representatives of Montenegro and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/29/L.29.

256. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Sierra Leone, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/29/L.29. The voting was as follows:

*In favour*:

Bangladesh, Botswana, China, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Morocco, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

*Against*:

Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Congo, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, 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*:

Algeria, Côte d’Ivoire, El Salvador, Gabon, Ghana, Maldives, Nigeria, Viet Nam

257. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.29 was rejected by 12 votes to 24, with 8 abstentions[[36]](#footnote-37).

258. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Saudi Arabia, a separate vote was taken on operative paragraph 8 (a) of the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

*In favour*:

Albania, Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam

*Against*:

Botswana, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, South Africa

*Abstaining*:

Algeria, Bangladesh, China, Ethiopia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Maldives, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates

259. Operative paragraph 8 (a) of draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.16/Rev.1 was adopted by 29 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions[[37]](#footnote-38) [[38]](#footnote-39).

260. At the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Saudi Arabia, a separate vote was taken on operative paragraph 9 (a) of the draft resolution. The voting was as follows:

*In favour*:

Albania, Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, 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, Viet Nam

*Against*:

Botswana, Morocco, Pakistan

*Abstaining*:

Algeria, Bangladesh, China, Ethiopia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Maldives, Nigeria, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

261. Operative paragraph 9 (a) of draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.16/Rev.1 was adopted by 30 votes to 3, with 14 abstentions.

262. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 29/14).

263. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representative of the United States of America made general comments and the representative of South Africa made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote.

 Human rights and climate change

264. At the 44th meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representatives of Bangladesh and the Philippines introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.21, sponsored by Bangladesh and the Philippines and co-sponsored by Bosnia and Herzegovina, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Mauritania, Peru, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), and Viet Nam. Subsequently, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, the Dominican Republic, Fiji, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Kiribati, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Portugal, Saint Lucia, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Timor-Leste, Tunisia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), Tuvalu and Vanuatu joined the sponsors.

265. At the same meeting, the representatives of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), South Africa and the United States of America made general comments in relation to the draft resolution.

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

267. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 29/15).

268. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representatives of Japan and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

 Protection of the family: contribution of the family to the realization of the right to an adequate standard of living for its members, particularly through its role in poverty eradication and achieving sustainable development

269. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representatives of Saudi Arabia and Egypt[[39]](#footnote-40), also on behalf of Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Côte d’Ivoire, El Salvador, Mauritania, Morocco, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Tunisia and Uganda, introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25, sponsored by Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Côte d’Ivoire, Egypt, El Salvador, Mauritania, Morocco, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia and Tunisia, and co-sponsored by Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States except South Africa), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Malaysia, Maldives, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation except Albania), Sri Lanka, and Tunisia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States). Subsequently, Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation except Albania) withdrew co-sponsorship of the draft resolution. Subsequently, the Dominican Republic, Egypt (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation except Albania and Pakistan (see also paragraph 280)), Haiti, the Philippines and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) joined the sponsors.

270. At the same meeting, the President announced that amendment A/HRC/29/L.36 to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25 had been withdrawn. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.36 was sponsored by South Africa.

271. Also at the same meeting, the representative of South Africa (also on behalf of Brazil, Chile and Uruguay) introduced amendment A/HRC/29/L.37 to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.37 was sponsored by Brazil, South Africa and Uruguay. Subsequently, Chile and Colombia joined the sponsors.

272. At the same meeting, in accordance with rule 116 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the representative of the Russian Federation (also on behalf of Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Côte d’Ivoire, Egypt, El Salvador, Mauritania, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia and Uganda) moved the adjournment of the consideration of amendment A/HRC/29/L.37.

273. Subsequently, the representatives of China and Indonesia made statements in favour of the motion. The representatives of Brazil and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made statements against the motion.

274. Under the same rule, a recorded vote was taken on the motion to adjourn the consideration of amendment A/HRC/29/L.37.The voting was as follows:

*In favour*:

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

*Against*:

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

*Abstaining*:

Gabon, Sierra Leone, Viet Nam

275. The motion to adjourn the consideration of amendment A/HRC/29/L.37 was adopted by 22 votes to 21, with 3 abstentions[[40]](#footnote-41). Consequently, the consideration of amendment A/HRC/29/L.37 was adjourned.

276. At the same meeting, the representative of Norway[[41]](#footnote-42) (also on behalf of Albania, Chile and Ireland) introduced amendment A/HRC/29/L.38 to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.38 was sponsored by Albania, Ireland and Norway. Subsequently, Chile, Finland and Sweden joined the sponsors.

277. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Uruguay introduced amendment A/HRC/29/L.39 to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.39 was sponsored by Belgium, Luxembourg and Uruguay. Subsequently, Chile, Finland and Sweden joined the sponsors.

278. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.39 was accepted by the sponsors of draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25 which was orally revised accordingly.

279. At the same meeting, the representative of Norway[[42]](#footnote-43) (also on behalf of Albania and Denmark) introduced amendment A/HRC/29/L.40 to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25 as orally revised. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.40 was sponsored by Albania, Denmark and Norway. Subsequently, the Czech Republic, Finland and Sweden joined the sponsors.

280. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Pakistan announced that amendment A/HRC/29/L.41 to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25 as orally revised had been withdrawn. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.41 had been sponsored by Pakistan. As a consequence, Pakistan subsequently joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25 as orally revised (see also paragraph 269).

281. At the same meeting, the representatives of Algeria, Bangladesh, Estonia (also on behalf of Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay), Indonesia, Ireland, Morocco, Pakistan, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, the United Arab Emirates and the United States of America (also on behalf of Australia and Canada) made general comments in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised and amendments A/HRC/29/L.38 and A/HRC/29/L.40.

282. 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.

283. At the same meeting, the representatives of the Netherlands and Qatar made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/29/L.38.

284. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Qatar, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/29/L.38. The voting was as follows:

*In favour*:

Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Against*:

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

*Abstaining*:

Gabon, Ghana, Kazakhstan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Viet Nam

285. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.38 was rejected by 18 votes to 23, with 5 abstentions[[43]](#footnote-44).

286. At the same meeting, the representatives of Morocco and the Netherlands made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to amendment A/HRC/29/L.40.

287. Also at the same meeting, at the request of the representative of Morocco, a recorded vote was taken on amendment A/HRC/29/L.40. The voting was as follows:

*In favour*:

Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Estonia, France, Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Against*:

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

*Abstaining*:

Gabon, Kazakhstan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Viet Nam

288. Amendment A/HRC/29/L.40 was rejected by 19 votes to 23, with 4 abstentions[[44]](#footnote-45).

289. At the same meeting, the representatives of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Mexico, Paraguay and South Africa made statements in explanation of vote before the vote in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

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

*In favour*:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, 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, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against*:

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

*Abstaining*:

Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

291. Draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25 as orally revised was adopted by 29 votes to 14, with 4 abstentions (resolution 29/22).

292. At the same meeting, the representative of Sierra Leone made general comments and the representatives of Cuba and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

 The right to freedom of expression, including in the form of art

293. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the President of the Council announced that draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.20 had been withdrawn by the sponsors. Draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.20 had been sponsored by Benin, Latvia, the United States of America, and Uruguay, and co-sponsored by Albania, Australia, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Lithuania, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Peru, the Republic of Moldova, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Subsequently, the Dominican Republic, Liechtenstein, Malta, San Marino and Tunisia had joined the sponsors.

294. By consequence, amendments A/HRC/29/L.32 and A/HRC/29/L.33 to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.20 were not considered by the Council. Amendments A/HRC/29/L.32 and A/HRC/29/L.33 had been sponsored by Pakistan on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation with the exception of Albania and Benin.

 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

295. At the 21st meeting, on 23 June 2015, the Chairperson of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic, Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro, provided an oral update, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 28/20.

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

297. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 21st and 22nd meetings, 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, Belgium[[45]](#footnote-46) (also on behalf of Luxembourg and the Netherlands), Botswana, Brazil, China, Cuba, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Maldives, Morocco, the Netherlands, Paraguay, Portugal, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

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

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Association of World Citizens; Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies; Presse Embleme Campagne; Union of Arab Jurists; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom; World Jewish Congress.

298. At the 22nd meeting, on the same day, the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic made final remarks as the State concerned.

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

300. At the 23rd meeting, on the same day, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Turkey.

 B. Interactive dialogue with the Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in Eritrea

301. At the 23rd meeting, on 23 June 2015, the Chairperson of the Commission of Inquiry to investigate all alleged violations of human rights in Eritrea, Mike Smith, presented the report of the Commission (A/HRC/29/42), pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 26/24.

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

303. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 23rd meeting, on 23 June 2015, and the 24th meeting, on 24 June 2015, the following made statements and asked the Chairperson questions:

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

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Djibouti, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Luxembourg, Norway, Somalia, Spain, the Sudan, Switzerland;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International; Article 19 - International Centre Against Censorship, The; CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Conscience and Peace Tax International (CPTI); East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project; Human Rights Watch; International Fellowship of Reconciliation; Jubilee Campaign.

304. At the 24th meeting, on 24 June 2015, the representative of Eritrea made final remarks as the State concerned.

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

 C. Interactive dialogue with special procedures mandate holders

 Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus

306. At the 23rd meeting, on 23 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus, Miklós Haraszti, presented his report (A/HRC/29/43).

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

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Albania, China, Cuba, Estonia, France, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Latvia, the Russian Federation, the Russian Federation (also on behalf of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe), the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kyrgyzstan, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Zimbabwe;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Human Rights House Foundation; Human Rights Watch; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; International Fellowship of Reconciliation; United Nations Watch.

309. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Belarus made final remarks as the State concerned.

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

 Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea

311. At the 24th meeting, on 24 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea, Sheila B. Keetharuth, presented her report (A/HRC/29/41).

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

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

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Ireland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) Representative of an observer State: New Zealand;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Amnesty International; Association of World Citizens; Conscience and Peace Tax International (CPTI); East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project; International Fellowship of Reconciliation; United Nations Watch.

314. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Eritrea made final remarks as the State concerned.

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

 D. General debate on agenda item 4

316. At its 24th and 25th meetings, on 24 June 2015, and its 28th meeting, on 25 June 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, Iran (Islamic Republic of)[[46]](#footnote-47) (also on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), Ireland, Ireland (also on behalf of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America), Japan, Latvia (also on behalf of Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America), Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Ukraine), Montenegro, the Netherlands, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Eritrea, Georgia, Iceland, Israel, Malaysia, Norway, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs; Africa Culture Internationale; African Development Association; Agence Internationale pour le Developpement; Al-Khoei Foundation; Alsalam Foundation; Alulbayt Foundation; American Association of Jurists (also on behalf of International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL)); Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Amnesty International; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Article 19 - International Centre Against Censorship, The (also on behalf of CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation); Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development; Asian Legal Resource Centre (also on behalf of Franciscans International); Association Dunenyo; Association of World Citizens; Baha'i International Community; British Humanist Association; Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies; Center for Inquiry; Center for Reproductive Rights, Inc., The; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; Centrist Democratic International; Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociación Civil (also on behalf of American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU); Conectas Direitos Humanos; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (FIDH); Minority Rights Group (MRG); Washington Office on Latin America); CIVICUS - World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Conectas Direitos Humanos; East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project; European Region of the International Lesbian and Gay Federation; European Union of Jewish Students; Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos; France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterand; Franciscans International (also on behalf of Brahma Kumaris World Spiritual University (BKWSU); Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL); Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches; Edmund Rice International; Foodfirst Information and Action Network (FIAN); Foundation for GAIA; Institute for Planetary Synthesis; International Movement ATD Fourth World; Planetary Association for Clean Energy (PACE); Sovereign Military Order of the Temple of Jerusalem (OSMTH)); Gazeteciler ve Yazarlar Vakfi; Human Rights House Foundation (also on behalf of Article 19- International Center Against Censorship, The; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (FIDH)); Human Rights Law Center; Human Rights Watch; Il Cenacolo; Indian Council of South America (CISA); International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; International Humanist and Ethical Union; International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR); International Muslim Women's Union; Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Liberation; Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association; Minority Rights Group; Nonviolent Radical Party, Transnational and Transparty; Organisation pour la Communication en Afrique et de Promotion de la Cooperation Economique Internationale - OCAPROCE Internationale; Organization for Defending Victims of Violence; Peivande Gole Narges Organization; Presse Embleme Campagne; Rencontre Africaine pour la defense des droits de l'homme; Reporters Sans Frontiers International - Reporters Without Borders International; United Nations Watch; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; Victorious Youths Movement; Vivat International; World Barua Organization (WBO); World Environment and Resources Council (WERC); World Muslim Congress; World Organisation Against Torture (also on behalf of International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (FIDH)).

317. At the 26th meeting, on 24 June 2015, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Bahrain, Burundi, China, Cuba, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Egypt, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Maldives, Myanmar, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan and Uzbekistan.

318. At the same meeting, statements in exercise of a second right of reply were made by the representatives of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Japan and the Republic of Korea.

319. At the 28th meeting, on 25 June 2015, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

 E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

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

320. At the 44th meeting, on 2 July 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/29/L.4, sponsored by France, Germany, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Arab Emirates. Subsequently, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Ireland, Lithuania, Monaco, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino, Sierra Leone, and Ukraine joined the sponsors.

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

322. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of China, Cuba, Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Qatar, the Russian Federation, the United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made general comments in relation to the draft resolution as orally revised.

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

324. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil and Pakistan made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

325. 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

326. Draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.4 as orally revised was adopted by 29 votes to 6, with 12 abstentions (resolution 29/16).

 Situation of human rights in Belarus

327. At the 44th meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Latvia (on behalf of the European Union) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.12, sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and co-sponsored by Albania, Andorra, Canada, Iceland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and the United States of America. Subsequently, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway, Saint Kitts and Nevis, San Marino and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

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

329. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Belarus made a statement as the State concerned.

330. 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.

331. At the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil and Mexico made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

*In favour*:

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

*Against*:

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

*Abstaining*:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates

333. Draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.12 was adopted by 21 votes to 8, with 18 abstentions (resolution 29/17).

 Situation of human rights in Eritrea

334. At the 44th meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Djibouti introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.23, sponsored by Djibouti and Somalia, and co-sponsored by Croatia, Cyprus, France, Montenegro, and New Zealand. Subsequently, Austria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

335. At the same meeting, the representatives of China, Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), the Russian Federation and the United States of America made general comments in relation to the draft resolution. In their statements, the representatives of China and the Russian Federation disassociated the respective delegations from the consensus on the draft resolution.

336. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Eritrea made a statement as the State concerned.

337. 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.

338. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 29/18).

339. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela made a statement in explanation of vote after the vote. In his statement, the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela disassociated the delegation from the consensus on the resolution.

 V. Human rights bodies and mechanisms

 A. Social Forum

340. At the 28th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the 2015 Social Forum, Faisal bin Abdulla al-Henzab, presented the report of the 2015 Social Forum, held from 18 to 20 February 2015 (A/HRC/29/44).

 B. Forum on Business and Human Rights

341. At the 28th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Chief ad interim of the Special Procedures Branch of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights presented, on behalf of the Chairperson-Rapporteur, the report containing a summary of discussions at the third annual Forum on Business and Human Rights, held from 1 to 3 December 2014 (A/HRC/29/29).

 C. Open-ended intergovernmental working group on a draft United Nations declaration on the right to peace

342. At the 28th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on a draft United Nations declaration on the right to peace, Christian Guillermet-Fernández, presented the report of the working group on its third session held from 20 to 24 April 2015 (A/HRC/29/45).

 D. General debate on agenda item 5

343. At the 28th meeting, on 25 June 2015, and the 32nd meeting, on 26 June 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, Ghana, India, Ireland, Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Ukraine), the Russian Federation (also on behalf of Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Cuba, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Nicaragua, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam (on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Austria, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Norway, Tunisia;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs; Africa Culture Internationale; Agence Internationale pour le Developpement; 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 Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of The Good Shepherd; Institute for Planetary Synthesis; Institute of Global education; IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association; Organisation pour la Communication en Afrique et de Promotion de la Coopération Economique Internationale – OCAPROCE Internationale; Pax Romana (International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs and International Movement of Catholic Students)); BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights; Center for Global Nonkilling; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; Colombian Commission of Jurists; Comision Juridica para el Autodesarrollo de los Pueblos Originarios Andinos-CAPAJ; Conectas Direitos Humanos; Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos; Human Rights Law Center; Il Cenacolo; Indian Council of South America (CISA); International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL); International Institute for Peace, Justice and Human Rights (also on behalf of Global Network for rights and development (GNRD)); International Muslim Women's Union; International Service for Human Rights; Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Liberation; Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association; Organization for Defending Victims of Violence; Pasumai Thaayagam Foundation; Rencontre Africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme; Servas International; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; World Barua Organization (WBO); World Muslim Congress.

 E. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

 The Social Forum

344. At the 44th meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Cuba introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.5/Rev.1, sponsored by Cuba and co-sponsored by Argentina, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Colombia, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Ecuador, El Salvador, Malaysia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Qatar, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), and Zimbabwe. Subsequently, Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Indonesia, Mexico, Qatar (on behalf of the Gulf Cooperation Council), Tunisia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Uruguay joined the sponsors.

345. At the same meeting, the representatives of Japan, Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) and the United States of America made general comments in relation to the draft resolution. In her statement, the representative of the United States of America disassociated the delegation from the consensus on the draft resolution.

346. 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.

347. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 29/19).

 VI. Universal periodic review

348. 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-first session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review held from 19 to 30 January 2015.

349. 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

350. 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.

 Kyrgyzstan

351. The review of Kyrgyzstan was held on 19 January 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 Kyrgyzstan in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KGZ/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KGZ/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KGZ/3).

352. At its 26th meeting, on 24 June 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Kyrgyzstan (see section C below).

353. The outcome of the review of Kyrgyzstan comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/4), the views of Kyrgyzstan 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/29/4/Add.1)*.

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

354. The delegation stated that Kyrgyzstan had accepted 139 recommendations out of 196 recommendations during the working group of the universal periodic review. The Government did not support 28 recommendations and postponed the decision of its position on the remaining 29 recommendations until June session of the Human Rights Council. The delegation informed that Kyrgyzstan accepted 11 recommendations out of those 29 remaining recommendations and noted 18 recommendations. All recommendations put forward during the universal periodic review would remain under consideration of the Government and the fact that some recommendations were not supported did not imply that those recommendations would not be implemented.

355. The delegation provided additional clarifications regarding several recommendations that were not supported by Kyrgyzstan and thus, were noted. In respect to the recommendations on cooperation with special procedures mandate holders of the Human Rights Council and issuance of a standing invitation for them, the delegation reminded that Kyrgyzstan regularly received the visits of the special rapporteurs. Since 2001, seven special rapporteurs paid a visit to the country. The Government agreed to, in principle, the visits of the special rapporteurs on freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, human rights defenders and the right to safe drinking water and sanitation, and the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances. The issue of a standing invitation to special procedures mandate holders remained under consideration of the Government.

356. The delegation provided clarifications regarding the Government’s position on the recommendations to revoke laws that did not comply with international standards on prohibition of discrimination based on sexual orientation. The Constitution guaranteed all rights and freedoms to everyone living in the country and subject to the jurisdiction of Kyrgyzstan and prohibited discrimination on the grounds of sex, race, language, disability, ethnicity, religion, age, political affiliation, education, origin, property or other status, and other circumstances. Therefore, the Constitution guaranteed that the principle of non-discrimination would be embodied in the new laws. In addition, the Criminal Code did not contain any restrictions on the exercise of the rights of members of sexual minorities. The draft law on "creating a positive attitude toward non-traditional sexual relations" was initiated by a group of Parliamentarians, not by the Government and it did not aim at infringing the rights of sexual minorities.

357. The delegation reminded that according to the Constitution, international treaties to which Kyrgyzstan is a party, as well as generally recognized principles and norms of international law were an integral part of the legal system of Kyrgyzstan and that the provisions of the international human rights treaties were directly applicable.

358. Regarding the draft law on "foreign agents", the delegation explained that the parliamentary hearing on the draft law, which was initiated by the members of Parliament, was held in December 2014 with the participation of representatives of Government and non-governmental organizations. The draft law received negative comments during the hearing. It remained under the consideration of two committees and its discussion at the parliamentary session has not been scheduled.

359. The Constitution guaranteed the right to freedom of opinion and expression, including freedom to seek, receive and impart information freely. The delegation stated that the Law on Mass Media was consistent with the relevant resolutions of the UN General Assembly, highlighting that the main principle of the freedom of information remained a responsibility to strive for revealing facts and disseminating information without malicious intent. This, in turn, implied that journalists should take full responsibility for their words written or broadcast and that thorough verification of disseminated information was the foundation of socially responsible journalism.

360. The Coordination Council on Human Rights, which was established in 2013, was entrusted with a mandate to ensure the implementation of international human rights obligations of the country. Kyrgyzstan was a party to eight out of the nine core international human rights treaties as well as 40 additional human rights conventions of the United Nations and of other organisations. The Government submitted its periodic reports to six treaty bodies since 2010. Kyrgyzstan recognized the competency of the Human Rights Committee and CEDAW to consider and examine individual complaints.

361. The delegation stated that Kyrgyzstan intensified its efforts to ensure the protection of human rights and the respect of the rule of law in the past years. Serious efforts had been made to bring the legislation into line with the provisions of the Constitution and with its international human rights obligations. A new policy concept had been developed to set guidelines for further improvement of legislation and its implementation in practice with a view to strengthening the human rights mechanisms, improving governance and reforming law enforcement bodies and the judicial system.

362. The Government would continue implementing its international human rights obligations in the framework of a specifically defined state policy by taking into account national and regional development peculiarities, as well as historical, cultural and religious characteristics. The Government had been considering ways and mechanisms to implement the recommendations put forward during the review and the issue of a holistic approach in the implementation of the recommendations made by various human rights mechanisms of the United Nations had been under consideration of the Coordination Council on Human Rights.

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

363. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Kyrgyzstan, 13 delegations made statements.

364. Belarus noted the responsible approach adopted by Kyrgyzstan during the second cycle of the universal periodic review and that the Government supported the majority of the recommendations put forward during the review, demonstrating its commitment to strengthening its national capacity to promote and protect human rights.

365. China commended Kyrgyzstan for its constructive participation in the universal periodic review and for accepting the majority of the recommendations. Kyrgyzstan accepted the recommendation made by China to implement its poverty reduction strategy.

366. Cuba welcomed the effective implementation of the recommendations of the first cycle of the review, which demonstrated the commitment of Kyrgyzstan to promoting and protecting human rights. It noted with appreciation the acceptance by Kyrgyzstan recommendations, made by Cuba, to implement the National Sustainable Development Strategy as a means to combat poverty and to ensure the rights and the quality of life of persons with disabilities.

367. Ghana stated that the establishment of the National Centre for the Prevention of Torture and the adoption of the Children’s Code and of the Peaceful Assembly Act demonstrated the Government’s commitment to improving the human rights situation. It encouraged Kyrgyzstan to enhance the respect for human rights anchored on the rule of law and good governance.

368. India welcomed acceptance by Kyrgyzstan of a large number of recommendations that were put forward during review. Kyrgyzstan had gained from its participation in the universal periodic review and would continue with its efforts to implement the accepted recommendations in the coming years.

369. Kuwait noted the commitment of Kyrgyzstan to implementing the recommendations of the previous review, including the establishment of the Coordination Council on Human Rights. It noted with appreciation that Kyrgyzstan accepted the recommendations made by Kuwait calling for the provision of the necessary assistance and services to the victims of trafficking.

370. The Russian Federation noted that the Government supported the majority of the recommendations put forward during the universal periodic review. It noted with appreciation the efforts of Kyrgyzstan to strengthen human rights institutions and mechanisms and to bring its legislation and legislative practice into line with its international human rights obligations.

371. Sierra Leone commended Kyrgyzstan for supporting a large number of the recommendations that were put forward during the universal periodic review. It noted with interest that the efforts would be made to ensure better protection against child or early marriage and that Government continued to work to strengthen the role of the judiciary and to ensure the rule of law, demonstrating its commitment to promote human rights.

372. Tajikistan noted the commitment of Kyrgyzstan to cooperating with international human rights mechanisms, adopting a number of laws on anti-terrorism and anti-extremism and to stepping up its efforts to improve the human rights situation and the respect of the rule of law.

373. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela noted the commitment of Kyrgyzstan in promoting and protecting human rights. It noted the efforts of the Government to and progress made in implementing the recommendations put forward during the first cycle of universal periodic review.

374. Viet Nam commended progress achieved on the protection and promotion of human rights since the previous cycle of the review. It took note of the efforts that Kazakhstan had taken to protect the rights of vulnerable groups, especially women and children. Vietnam noted with appreciation acceptance by Kyrgyzstan of a large number of recommendations including two made by Vietnam.

375. Afghanistan noted with appreciation constructive engagement of Kyrgyzstan in the universal periodic review and the acceptance of a significant number of the recommendations that were put forward during the review. It noted the strong commitment of Kyrgyzstan to strengthening the rule of law and democratic institutions and to bringing legislation in conformity with the Constitutional and international standards.

376. Albania noted with appreciation the acceptance by Kyrgyzstan a large number of recommendations and encouraged Kyrgyzstan to implement those recommendations. It also encouraged pursuing its efforts to improve detention conditions, combat violence against women and children, and improving the procedures of birth registration. It noted with appreciation the establishment of the Coordination Council on Human Rights and encouraged strengthening its institutional capacity to implement human rights standards.

 3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

377. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Kyrgyzstan, 6 other stakeholders made statements.

378. The World Organization against Torture noted with concern attempts to restrict the freedom of association by requirement of registration for non-governmental organisations as a foreign agent and by restrictions on their foreign funding. It welcomed the acceptance by Kyrgyzstan of 8 recommendations on the rights of peaceful assembly and of association and encouraged Kyrgyzstan to translate those commitments into effective reforms. It expressed concern regarding the rejection of several recommendations calling for the adoption of legislation prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation.

379. Human Rights Watch stated that despite accepted recommendations by Kyrgyzstan, calling for accountability for the abuses related to June 2010 events, the Government failed to address those abuses adequately in the south of the country. Two problematic bills pending before the parliament – an anti-gay ‘propaganda’ bill and a ‘foreign agents’ bill – would seriously curb freedom of association and expression. The problem of gender-based violence, and violence and discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons persisted despite some steps taken by the Government.

380. Article 19, International Centre Against Censorship stated that the new draft amendments, allowing the blocking of websites without a court order, offered vague definitions of ‘extremism’ and ‘terrorism’, which could lead to broad interpretation, threatening freedom of expression. The law on ‘foreign agents’ would establish wider government control over the activities of non-governmental organisations, allowing their suspension. Additionally, Article 19 called on Kyrgyzstan to withdraw the draft amendments, seeking to ban the creation of positive attitudes towards lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons.

381. Federatie van Nederlandse Verenigingen tot Integratie Van Homoseksualiteit – COC Nederland stated that violations of basic human rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons were on the increase despite accepted recommendations regarding the protection of their rights. The discriminatory anti-propaganda bill, prohibiting formation of positive attitudes towards non-traditional sexual relations was still under the discussion in the Parliament. If approved, it would close all doors for human rights defenders to protect the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons. The public discussion of the bill itself caused the growth of hate crimes and violence against those individuals.

382. Amnesty International welcomed the acceptance by Kyrgyzstan of the majority of recommendations made during the review. It was concerned, however, at increasing restrictions on freedom of expression and association, discrimination and violence against minority groups and at the failure to investigate human rights violations during the June 2010 events. The Parliament had been considering draft legislation on ‘foreign agents’, which if adopted, could criminalise the work of human rights defenders and restrict the activities of non-governmental organisation. Amnesty International noted the lack of commitment of Kyrgyzstan to protect the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons.

383. Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik noted with regret that Kyrgyzstan did not ratify the Rome Statute of ICC, [Optional Protocol to the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/OPCESCR.aspx), and [Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/OPICCRC.aspx) during the reporting period, and did not accept recommendations to ratify the [International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CED/Pages/ConventionCED.aspx) and the ILO Convention no. 189, and to enact specific anti-discrimination legislation. It stated that bride kidnapping must be stopped. It noted that Kyrgyzstan accepted 150 recommendations.

 4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

384. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 196 recommendations received, 150 enjoy the support of Kyrgyzstan and 46 are noted.

385. The delegation expressed sincere appreciation to the Human Rights Council and the states for the constructive dialogue and their valuable observations and recommendations during the universal periodic review. The dialogue and the adoption of the national report would contribute to the further implementation of national policies to meet the international human rights obligations of Kyrgyzstan.

386. In conclusion, the delegation emphasized the firm intention of Kyrgyzstan to further improve human rights situation and ensure the compliance of national legislation to the letter and spirit of international law. This process remained a complex and required systematic efforts as well as cooperation and input of all political actors, civil society representatives and government institutions. The Government would continue to maintain a close and constructive dialogue with the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Human Rights Council.

 Kiribati

387. The review of Kiribati was held on 19 January 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 Kiribati in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KIR/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KIR/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KIR/3).

388. At its 41st meeting, on 1 July 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Kiribati (see section C below).

389. The outcome of the review of Kiribati comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/5), the views of Kiribati 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 A/HRC/29/5/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

390. On 30 June, Kiribati sent a document indicating its position on pending recommendations as well as a letter informing the Council that it was unfortunately not in a position to send a representative to this Council session. The Council therefore proceeded with the consideration of the outcome of Kiribatibased on the Report of the Universal Periodic Review Working Group of Kiribati, as contained in documents A/HRC/29/5 and A/HRC/29/5/Add.1. This report and its addendum, together with the additional information provided by Kiribati, constituted the outcome of the review.

391. The Vice-President went on reading a letter from the Representative of Kiribati to the United Nations New York Office in which Kiribati thanked the Council for rescheduling the consideration of the outcome of the UPR for Kiribati to 1 July 2015, originally scheduled for 24 June 2015. Kiribati stated that the process of consultation on the UPR outcome was an important process if Kiribati was to foster national ownership of these outcomes. For a small nation like Kiribati dispersed over 3.5 million square kilometres of ocean, the extensive consultation has been challenging and has taken longer than expected. Kiribati therefore welcomed the Council’s understanding and decision to reschedule consideration of our UPR. With regard to the recommendations received at the UPR 21st session, Kiribati accepted seventy recommendations, while other 32 have been considered and 13 ultimately noted. On the 32 recommendations identified like “considered” Kiribati stated that it will continue to work with key stakeholders including other Government ministries and departments, build capacity and provide necessary resources with a view to consider accepting such recommendations in the future.

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

392. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Kiribati, six delegations made statements.

393. China appreciated the constructive participation of Kiribati in UPR and its acceptance of most of the recommendations. It commended Kiribati for accepting China’s recommendations to increase education investment, improve enrolment and education quality, emphasize the impact of climate change, and cooperate actively with the international community to address climate change. China appreciated Kiribati’s efforts in increasing employment, empowering women and protecting the disabled children, refugees and migrants. China supported the adoption of the UPR WG report on Kiribati.

394. Cuba noted with satisfaction the adoption of laws protecting childhood, youth, the family and education, together with the establishment of the Ministry for Women, Youth and Social Affairs. Free access to health services and international cooperation agreements in favour of the population of Kiribati were other major achievements. Cuba was pleased to note that its recommendation on the follow up of the national plan for development with a view to achieve increased social protection and gender equality was accepted by Kiribati and recommended the adoption of the UPR WG report on Kiribati.

395. Ghana noted with satisfaction the progress Kiribati made in implementing a number of recommendations made in the first cycle of UPR. It lauded Kiribati for passing the Family Peace Act, the Education Act, the Children, Young People and Family Welfare Act and amendment of the Constitution to establish the Ministry of Women, Youth and Social Affairs. It encouraged Kiribati to further strengthen its commitment in promoting human rights. Ghana recommended the adoption of the Working Group on the UPR of Kiribati.

396. Sierra Leone appreciated efforts Kiribati made in implementing recommendations of the last review cycle, and hoped that Kiribati could have provided more detailed information on it. It noted Kiribati’s expressed intention to continue to work with human rights mechanisms and its vulnerability to climate change. It commended Kiribati for creating a coalition of nations most affected by climate change and calling for international assistance to address climate change. Sierra Leone supported the adoption of the Working Group on the UPR of Kiribati.

397. UNICEF welcomed the passing of the Child, Young Persons and Family Welfare Act and Policy and the Family Peace Act, and urged Kiribati to implement these laws through appropriate resource allocation. It mentioned measures to reduce violence against women and children, and highlighted the need to reduce new born mortality through a series of measures. It also urged Kiribati to ratify OP-CRC and submit its overdue periodic report to CRC, to which end it offers technical support.

398. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela underlined that Kiribati has achieved remarkable progress in the human rights field, such as the 2013 law on the Welfare of children, youth and the Family, the 2013 law on education and the creation of the Ministry for Women, Youth and Social Affairs. Venezuela noted that, despite economic difficulties, Kiribati has shown openness to constructive dialogue and commitment to achieve the objectives proposed in the second UPR Cycle. Therefore, Venezuela recommended the adoption of the UPR WG report.

 3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

399. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Kiribati, one stakeholder made a statement.

400. Franciscans International appreciated Kiribati’s commitment in combating climate change. It noted the need for urgent global action to address climate change. It welcomed recommendations Kiribati received, especially those related to climate change. It called UN member states to put countries most affected by climate change at the center of consideration in upcoming negotiation in Paris, and insist on a human rights based approach. It recommended taking urgent action to tackle climate change, such as by establishing a UN special procedure.

 4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

401. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 115 recommendations received, 70 enjoy the support of Kiribati, and 45 are noted.

 Guinea

402. The review of Guinea was held on 20 January 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 Guinea in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GIN/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GIN/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GIN/3).

403. At its 26th meeting, on 24 June 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Guinea (see section C below).

404. The outcome of the review of Guinea comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/6), the views of Guinea 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/29/6/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

405. The delegation of Guinea began by noting that the Members of the Human Rights Council had contributed to support Guinea by making positive contributions and formulating useful recommendations.

406. The delegation recalled that 194 recommendations had been addressed to Guinea in order not only to consolidate its gains but also enable it to continue the reforms needed to build a state of law respectful of human rights.

407. The delegation noted that in January, it had decided to delay its position on all the recommendations to be able to consult with institutional, political and social partners before taking position. It added that a large information and awareness campaign on the UPR recommendations had been launched to make everyone more familiar with them.

408. The delegation highlighted that after the Government had debated the recommendations, the position had been communicated to the organisations of the civil society during a workshop. On this occasion, these organisations promised to assist the authorities in the implementation of the accepted recommendations.

409. The delegation mentioned that a Committee of follow-up and implementation of the recommendations had been established. This Committee is composed of representatives of the civil society and members of the Inter-ministerial Committee in charge of the drafting of the reports to the human rights mechanisms.

410. Regarding the recommendations relating to the 28 September trial, the delegation stated that the Government was committed to ensure justice to the victims through a fair and equitable trial.

411. With regard to the reforms of the security and justice sectors, the delegation noted that they would be pursued in order to make the justice credible and the defence forces respectful of human rights.

412. On the recommendations relating to the gender equality and the fight against violence against women, the delegation stated that the Government was committed to continue its social and institutional reforms so that women were protected against all forms of violence.

413. The delegation reiterated Government’s commitment to respect civil and political rights and to enable every Guinean citizen to enjoy them fully, in particular in view of the forthcoming elections. It added that it was important to consolidate and expand those rights.

414. The delegation noted that with respect to the process of reconciliation, the Government had launched national consultations in order to define a coherent and appropriate approach for an inclusive and consensual reconciliation.

415. Regarding the national human rights institution, the delegation said that the authorities continued their efforts to make it operational and in conformity with the Paris Principles.

416. Given the international crisis and the Ebola virus disease (EVD), the delegation outlined that Guinea needed the support of the international community in order to guarantee a dignified life to its citizens.

417. The delegation explained that due to the difficult political, social and cultural context, characterised by strong resistances, the Government had noted the recommendations on LGBT’s rights and on the abolition of the death penalty. It added that this position was not definitive since the role of a Government was to ensure the enjoyment of their rights to all citizens. Awareness campaigns on the death penalty will be pursued and a national debate will be launched. The delegation highlighted that the revision of the Penal Code, which already proposed the abolition of the death penalty, had been drafted and would be submitted to the National Assembly.

418. The delegation stated that even though the challenges in terms of human rights were obvious given the weakness of the Guinean public institutions and the sociocultural resistances, the fight for the human rights was imperative. It also outlined the importance of public education, training and awareness policy in this context.

419. In conclusion, the delegation reiterated its call to the international community to support Guinea and its people.

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

420. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Guinea, 19 delegations made statements.

421. Niger commended Guinea for the creation of a Ministry of Human Rights and Civil Liberties; the establishment of a national human rights commission; the adoption of several measures for gender promotion and the fight against discrimination and violence.

422. Rwanda noted with appreciation that Guinea accepted a considerable number of recommendations, in particular Rwanda’s one on accelerating the process of ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Violence against Women.

423. Senegal commended Guinea for inviting the special procedures mandate holders, establishing an independent national human rights commission and ratifying several optional protocols. It added that Guinea was committed to continue its reforms including the creation of the steering committee on the reform of the justice. Senegal also noted that the Guinean authorities were committed to ensure the full enjoyment of their rights to women and vulnerable people.

424. Sierra Leone noted the establishment of a new and unprecedented Ministry of Human Rights and Civil Liberties. It added that as an Ebola-affected country, it was understandable that the Government had focused on the health crisis, addressing issues of stigmatisation and dealing with the aftermath of the impact of the EVD. It concluded by calling for further technical, political and institutional assistance to help Guinea to meet its human rights commitments and obligations.

425. South Africa welcomed the acceptance by Guinea of a large number of recommendations. It welcomed the strides undertaken, including recent efforts aimed at giving a new impetus to economic and social development in the country as well as efforts in the fight against EVD. South Africa encouraged Guinea to continue tackling the constraints and challenges it faced, including in the context of the democratisation’s process and the establishment of reforms.

426. Sudan appreciated the steps taken by the Government to promote and protect the human rights of its citizens, especially after the outbreak of the EVD in 2014. It wished success to Guinea in the implementation of the accepted recommendations.

427. Togo commended Guinea for the remarkable progress made in the implementation of the recommendations of the first UPR cycle. It noted with appreciation that the Government accepted most of the second cycle recommendations, including those addressed by Togo. Finally, it invited the international community to assist Guinea in the implementation of the recommendations.

428. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela highlighted that Guinea had drawn up a ministerial task force aimed at ensuring national policies in favor of the family, and against gender violence. It acknowledged the efforts made by Government to comply with its human rights commitments and the will as reflected in its second review. It encouraged Guinea to continue strengthening its social policies in order to further improve the living conditions of its people.

429. Albania commended Guinea for the implementation of the recommendations, in particular the creation of a Ministry of Human Rights and Civil Liberties. It also welcomed the significant success in the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women and vulnerable people and the reforms undertaken to ensure the full enjoyment of their rights.

430. Botswana commended Guinea of its continued efforts to building a democratic State with efficient public institutions. It also applauded Guinea for taking steps to address violations of human rights and end impunity. Botswana welcomed Guinea’s accession to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict.

431. Burkina Faso stated that despite a difficult political, economic and social context exacerbated by the EVD, Guinea made considerable efforts to build a society respectful of human rights. It also wished the Guinea Government every success in the implementation of the accepted recommendations and called on the international community to assist the country.

432. China commended Guinea for its decision to accept the majority of recommendations, including China’s one. It urged Guinea to continue its efforts to improve human rights and public health, correct prejudices against women, make efforts to eradicate old unhealthy practices and enhance its capacity to deal with EVD and other major public health events.

433. Côte d’Ivoire commended Guinea for accepting a large number of recommendations. While encouraging the Government to consolidate its gains and pursue its efforts to face remaining challenges, Côte d’Ivoire called on the international community to continue providing Guinea with technical and financial assistance.

434. Cuba recognized the country's efforts to reduce hunger and poverty and reiterated the importance for the international community to support the Government's actions to improve access to public health. It considered that it was important to increase the cooperation and assistance to support Guinea’s efforts in order to strengthen its health infrastructures, including combatting the threat of Ebola. Cuba welcomed the acceptance by Guinea of the recommendations that it had made.

435. Djibouti encouraged Guinea to continue its human rights reforms in order to consolidate the institutions on a democratic basis. It also recommended to the international community and to the High Commissioner for Human Rights to support Guinea in the implementation of the recommendations.

436. Ethiopia thanked Guinea for accepting a significant number of recommendations, including Ethiopian ones on continuing providing effective training that builds the capacity of armed forces, police and other security forces on the human rights, especially vulnerable groups as well as to strengthen its efforts to combat traditional practices that are harmful to women and children, particularly female genital mutilation.

437. Ghana commended Guinea for the appointment of a Minister of Human Rights and Civil Liberties and the on-going reforms in the areas of justice and elections. It urged the Government to seriously consider the effective implementation of the recommendations, particularly those regarding the ratification of core UN human rights treaties as well as the establishment of an independent national human rights commission in conformity with the Paris Principles. Ghana noted that the establishment of the UN Mission for Ebola Emergency Response (UNMEER) in Accra in support of the fight against EVD in Guinea and other West African countries reflected the commitment of the international community to assist Guinea people to enjoy their right to health.

438. Kuwait welcomed the country’s commitment to human rights conventions and the UPR, shown through the implementation of national policies aiming at improving the standard of living of its population. It commended legislative amendments that cater for human rights on all fronts, in order to protect all vulnerable groups and ensure their enjoyment of human rights.

439. Mali welcomed the efforts undertaken by Guinea in implementing the recommendations accepted in the first cycle, in particular in the areas of education, justice and security. It encouraged the authorities to deepen ongoing actions for the wellbeing of all Guinean citizens. Mali also called on the international community to provide Guinea with a technical assistance to conduct successfully the reforms already carried out.

 3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

440. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of 4 other stakeholders made statements.

441. Human Rights Watch (HRW) noted progress made by the Government since 2010 in addressing serious human rights problems. It commended the authorities for a reduction of abuses by security forces and some gain in addressing long-standing impunity. Advances in addressing impunity include the opening by the judiciary of investigations into the 2007 and 2013 killings of a large number of political demonstrators; the 2009 massacre and rapes of opposition supporters and the 2012 killings in the village of Zoghota. However, HRW stated that progress in most of these cases had been hampered by inadequate resources and the failure of members of security forces to respond to judicial summons. HRW urged Guinea to intensify its efforts to ensure justice in these and other similar cases. Furthermore, it raised concern regarding the failure to provide equal protection to citizens of all ethnic groups, notably those supporting the political opposition, in advance of the 2015 elections. HRW encouraged Guinea to swiftly implement UPR recommendations to ensure investigations of violations by security forces. It added that it was encouraged by the apparent reduction in cases of torture, the establishment of the Superior Council of Judges and the revision of key legal texts. However, striking deficiencies in the judiciary continue to undermine the rule of law. HRW noted that prison detention centres operated below international standards and the Cour d’Assises failed to meet regularly. Finally, HRW supported the UPR recommendations on the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

442. International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (FIDH) and l’Organisation guinéenne de Défense des Droits de l’Homme et du Citoyen (OGDH) commended Guinea for accepting a large number of recommendations and for the commitment of the Minister of Human Rights and Civil Liberties in this regard. They welcomed measures taken to bring national legislation in line with the international conventions to which Guinea was a State party and commended Guinea for the criminalization of female genital mutilation. FIDH and OGDH called on Guinea to prohibit polygamy; criminalize conjugal rape and decriminalize abortion. Regarding the military justice, they called on the Government to review the draft Code and bring it in line with international standards. Concerning the fight against impunity, FIDH and OGDH welcomed significant progress in regard to the 28 September massacre and hoped that a trial would take place in 2016. Concerned by the fact that the previous head of the junta, Moussa Dadis Camara, was running for presidential election, they recalled that nobody presumed responsible was exempt from the obligation to answer for his actions in court.

443. Amnesty International (AI) appreciated efforts undertaken by Guinea to protect and promote human rights despite the challenging conditions brought on by EVD. It welcomed Guinea’s acceptance of key recommendations, including protecting the right to freedom of expression and assembly and ensuring that perpetrators of human rights violations were brought to justice. However, AI remained extremely concerned at on-going violations committed by the security forces ahead of the 2015 presidential elections. According to AI, over the past decade, at least 357 people have died and thousands have been wounded during demonstrations and the security forces are responsible for the vast majority of these violations. AI urged the authorities to act immediately and implement the recommendations they had accepted to end excessive use of force and impunity. This will include amending laws, which restrict the right to freedom of expression and assembly. AI further reiterated its call for an independent complaints mechanism to investigate human rights violations by police officers. Finally, it regretted the reluctance by Guinea to accept recommendations to abolish the death penalty and decriminalise same sex sexual activities.

444. Rencontre Africaine pour la Défense des Droits de l’Homme (RADDHO) congratulated Guinea for its acceptance of the majority of UPR recommendations. It commended Guinea for its efforts on reforming the justice and security sectors, the penal and mining codes, as well as efforts to combat drug trafficking and corruption. The opening of an Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and the establishment of a Ministry of Human Rights and Civil Liberties were also commended. However, RADDHO noted with concern that political violence was becoming increasingly prevalent, which had given rise to social tensions, ethnic hate and increased racism. It was concerned by hate speech made by extremist groups and some politicians in the media and on the web and stated that these actions constituted a threat to peace, security and national cohesion. Moreover, RADDHO noted that despite the prosecution of some of those who had ordered the massacre of 28 September 2009, the main perpetrators of these crimes enjoyed impunity. Further on, it urged Guinea to respect the right to peaceful demonstration, guarantee the security and freedom of the press, step up its cooperation with the International Criminal Court, combat impunity and improve prison conditions.

 4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

445. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 194 recommendations received, 179 enjoy the support of Guinea and 15 are noted.

446. The delegation of Guinea thanked once again the members of the Human Rights Council for their positive contributions.

447. The delegation noted that the issue of human rights should not be understood without taking into account the reality of the Guinean institutions. Guinea is before a huge challenge in upholding democratic principles and at the same time, building institutions that are able to deal with constitutional and international obligations.

448. The delegation stated that Guinea should work on structural challenges as well as on the conjuncture that promoted violence, in particular against the most vulnerable people, women and children.

449. The delegation mentioned that in the struggle between modernity and tradition, Guinea had to fight against peripheral powers that had a lot of social power in front of fragile public institutions.

450. The delegation noted that Guinea had to take stock of its history through a process of reconciliation and transitional justice. It added that it would be necessary to invest heavily in the areas of education and training to build a society respectful of human rights. It is also of importance to reverse the curb of violence and fight against impunity.

451. To conclude, the delegation called once again the international community to assist Guinea to ensure that all its citizens enjoy their rights and it reiterated the Government’s commitment to implement the UPR recommendations.

 Lao People’s Democratic Republic

452. The review of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic was held on 20 January 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 Lao People’s Democratic Republic in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/LAO/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/LAO/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/LAO/3).

453. At its 27th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic (see section C below).

454. The outcome of the review of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/7), the views of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic 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/29/7/Add.1)*.

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

455. The Lao People’s Democratic Republic emphasized that the Government attached importance to the UPR process as a useful mechanism in providing States with a good opportunity to highlight their efforts in improving human rights in their respective countries.

456. The Lao People’s Democratic Republic expressed its sincere thanks to the delegations for their positive comments on achievements in the national socio-economic development of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic and on its efforts in advancing human rights for the Lao multi-ethnic people.

457. The Lao People’s Democratic Republic reported that after the January UPR review, the National Steering Committee on Human Rights, comprising the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and key agencies, conducted debriefings, reviews and consultations among government agencies, mass organizations, representatives of the diplomatic community, civil society organizations, international non-governmental organizations on the UPR outcome and recommendations.

458. Furthermore, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic noted that all inputs, views and comments from Government agencies and stakeholders were taken into account in the consideration by the Government of the recommendations. The on-going process of the amendment of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic’s Constitution and Penal Code, and the formulation of the 8th Five-Year National Socio-Economic Development Plan 2016-2020 as well as other national action plans also included economic, social, cultural, civil and political rights dimensions, including the UPR recommendations.

459. The Lao People’s Democratic Republic informed the Council that among the 196 recommendations, it fully supported 116 and noted the remaining recommendations. The noted recommendations did not enjoy the full support of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic because some recommendations could be only partially supported or they were not in line with the Lao People’s Democratic Republic Constitution and laws or they did not reflect the real situation in the country or it was not prepared to implement them due to certain factors, including the lack of human and financial resources. The Lao People’s Democratic Republic also noted that most of the noted recommendations were repetitive or overlap which could be clustered into less than 20 recommendations.

460. The Lao People’s Democratic Republic highlighted that it would take into account those noted recommendations in its efforts in the promotion and protection of human rights in the country.

461. The Lao People’s Democratic Republic noted that it was a party to 7 core human rights conventions, namely ICERD, CEDAW, ICCPR, ICESCR, CRPD, CAT, and CRC and OP-CRC-AC and OP-CRC-IC. It was considering ratifying the CPPED. Regarding other conventions and optional protocols, including ICRMW and the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC), it needed more time to study and create necessary conditions for future accession. On the optional protocols allowing individual complaints, it needed to concentrate its efforts on implementing the ratified conventions as a first priority, including strengthening the national procedures in dealing with complaints.

462. The Lao People’s Democratic Republic stated that it would extend an invitation to the Special Rapporteur on the right to Adequate Housing, and would maintain regular dialogue with other special rapporteurs. Invitation to other Special Rapporteurs would be studied and considered by the Government on a case by case basis.

463. The Lao People’s Democratic Republic noted that although death penalty was in existence in the Penal Law, no case of death sentence had ever been executed for a long time. Furthermore, death penalty was not applicable to a minor under 18 and a pregnant woman. While it is determined to consider revising the Penal Law so as to fully be in line with the obligations under the ICCPR, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic needs more time to further study the ICCPR-OP2.

464. The Lao People’s Democratic Republic highlighted that all citizens had the right to express their opinions and make comments on the state administration. No laws in the country allowed for the suppression or obstruction of the exercise of fundamental rights. In 2014, the Government issued a Decree on Internet in order to manage and facilitate internet use, which provides a legal basis for the enjoyment of the right to access to information and expression of opinion in a more responsible manner. It also noted that the Law on Mass Media, the Decrees on Associations, Foundations, and INGOs and the Guidelines on the Implementation of the INGOs Decree should provide a legal framework for activities of these organizations.

465. On the missing case of Mr. Sombath Somphone, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic emphasized that during the UPR session in January 2015, the Head of the Lao delegation provided clarification and explanation on the missing case and the concerned authorities had conducted and were still seriously conducting the investigation, and would continue to do so to find out the truth and to bring perpetrators to justice in accordance with the law of the country. It also highlighted that a missing case was complex and difficult to solve quickly, which requires more time.

466. The Lao People’s Democratic Republic expressed its sincere appreciation to the international community for the valuable support towards the country’s development and for the contribution, including through the UPR process, to its efforts to better promote and protect human rights in the country.

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

467. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, 17 delegations made statements.

468. Burkina Faso encouraged the Lao People’s Democratic Republic to implement the accepted recommendations and hoped that support from the international community will enable the Laotian authorities to fulfil the commitments it has taken on as follow-up to the second UPR cycle.

469. Cambodia noted that the Lao People’s Democratic Republic had accepted a large majority of its recommendations put forward during the review, including two recommendations by Cambodia on efforts to promote and protect the cultural rights of the Lao people, and on the implementation of the international human rights treaties, to which it is a party, as well as the ASEAN Human Rights Declaration.

470. China welcomed the Lao People’s Democratic Republic’s constructive engagement with the UPR and its decision to accept most recommendations. China appreciated that it had accepted China’s recommendations to: increase input in education; further raise enrolment rate for girls; and use legislation, policies, education and other means to enhance women’s status in society.

471. Cuba appreciated the work done by the Government to reduce poverty. Cuba commended on public health and education reforms, which has improved health and education services for the whole population. Cuba was of the view that by implementing its national, social and economic development policies, Lao will be able to lift its people out of poverty.

472. Democratic People’s Republic of Korea appreciated commitments and positive efforts by the Government to pursue activities in the area of the promotion and protection of human rights. It expressed the view that this will contribute to the enjoyment by all people of their human rights, including economic, social and cultural rights, particularly the right to development.

473. Djibouti noted the great importance attached to the recommendations of the 2010 UPR review as evidenced by subsequent distribution of translated materials into Lao language among government officials, stakeholders and the general public. Djibouti also greatly appreciated the fact that the Government had accepted its recommendations in the 2010 UPR review.

474. Egypt welcomed efforts in promoting human rights through positive policy and legislative reforms such as the 5-year plan, strengthening anti-corruption measures, stepping up progress achieved in eradication of extreme poverty. Egypt also reiterated its call on the international community to assist the Government financially and technically in addressing the challenges of the unexploded ordnances.

475. Kuwait commended the achievements in the field of human rights, despite obstacles and challenges, including underdeveloped infrastructure, natural disasters, spread of disease, lack of human resources and budgetary constraints. Kuwait noted that the Government focused on economic and social development and the fight against poverty, and encouraged continued efforts to enhance the right to work, education and health.

476. India commended on the constructive participation in the UPR mechanism and its acceptance of as many as 116 recommendations, including two of the three recommendations made by India. India believed that the Lao People’s Democratic Republic would continue with its efforts to implement the accepted recommendations in the coming years.

477. Indonesia commended the Government for its continued commitment in advancing the promotion and protection of human rights by accepting many recommendations in the second cycle of the UPR. Indonesia particularly appreciated the acceptance of its own recommendation to speed up the drafting of the anti-human trafficking law.

478. Viet Nam appreciated continued efforts, and congratulated the significant achievements in human rights protection and promotion. Vietnam commended on the acceptance and commitment to implement many recommendations, including those made by Vietnam. Vietnam reaffirmed that it would continue to work closely with the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, and contribute to national development of socio-economic conditions in the country.

479. Malaysia noted with satisfaction that the Lao People’s Democratic Republic accepted Malaysia’s recommendations relating to eradication of poverty and capacity building programmes for law enforcement officials dealing with issues of trafficking in persons. Malaysia commended on continuous efforts in the promotion and protection of human rights through strengthening the rule of law, governance and public administration.

480. Myanmar acknowledged the constructive participation in the UPR mechanism and noted the acceptance of a large number of recommendations, including the three made by Myanmar.

481. Philippines noted the constructive engagement with the UPR process. It was pleased to note that measures had been taken to further enhance the normative and institutional framework for the promotion and protection of human rights such as the implementation of the Master Plan on the Development of the Rule of Law.

482. Sierra Leone noted that many of the recommendations proposed during the second UPR cycle had been integrated into national norms and policies as well as into the National Socio-economic Development Plan of 2011-2015. It expressed the hope that further recommendations such as those related to the ICRMW, will enjoy the support of the Government with a view towards future implementation.

483. Singapore welcomed the commitment to continue seriously investigating the disappearance of Mr. Sombath Somphone. Singapore further hoped that the relevant Laotian authorities would resolve the case expeditiously and bring about much needed relief to his family. Singapore remained committed to continuing cooperation with the Lao People’s Democratic Republic to attain its development goals.

484. Sri Lanka commended on the progress made in promoting human rights. It noted the adoption of the 2014 Decree on people with disabilities and the allocation of approximately 75 million dollars for the development of the national prison system. It further commended the efforts towards ensuring the rule of law and reducing poverty.

 3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

485. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, 6 other stakeholders made statements.

486. Asian Forum for Human Rights and Developmentregretted that the Government had noted recommendations related to the protection of human rights defenders and to the freedom of peaceful assembly, association and expression. Despite committing at the first UPR cycle to work towards an enabling environment for civil society and human rights defenders, the Government continued to restrict the activities of these groups. As an example of this, it noted the newly introduced Decree on Information Management on the Internet that criminalizes criticism of the Government online. Furthermore, it deplored the Government’s unwillingness to effectively investigate the enforced disappearance of Sombath Somphone and reiterated its call to immediately undertake a thorough and impartial investigation into his disappearance. It also expressed concern about existing laws that continue to impose severe restrictions on media freedom. It further called on the Government to set out a comprehensive action plan for the implementation of UPR recommendations.

487. Human Rights Watchnoted that the review showed the serious gap in the Government’s statements of intent and associated plans, laws and decrees, versus the minimal progress made on human rights in the country since the previous 2010 UPR. The declaration that the Lao People’s Democratic Republic is considering ratifying the ICPPED contrasted significantly with its failure to conduct a credible and impartial investigation into the enforced disappearance of a renowned civil society leader, Mr. Sombath Somphone. It noted that while the Government claims that it is open to views or suggestions to help the investigation, it had turned down multiple offers of technical assistance from international Governments. In addition, it noted that the Government did not provide an explanation as to why it passed an internet decree that contains provisions that accept limits on free speech. It also stated that the Lao People’s Democratic Republic failed to accept those recommendations that represent genuine, concrete commitments for progress.

488. International Federation for Human Rights Leagues regretted that the Lao People’s Democratic Republic did not support a number of recommendations in key human rights areas. It encouraged the Government to implement recommendations related to cases of arbitrary arrests and enforced disappearance. It stressed that the judicial authorities should conduct an independent and thorough investigation into the disappearance of a renowned civil society advocate, Sombath Somphone with the help from the international community. It also stated that the Government has the obligation to respect the right to freedoms of expression and of the media, including on the Internet while noting that since the adoption of Decree 327 in September 2014, the authorities had harassed and arrested a number of people for legitimate criticism of the Government. It demanded that the Government establish an independent national human rights institution in conformity with the Paris Principles.

489. United Nations Watch expressed grave concern in particular about the numerous enforced disappearances, as well as about continuing restrictions on freedoms of speech, association and peaceful assembly. It regretted that the Government did not support the recommendations to conduct an independent and in-depth investigation on the cases of disappearances or amend the Prime Minister’s Internet decree. It noted the disappearance of Sombath Somphone noting that the Government failed to abide by its international obligation of transparency and accountability. It urged the Government to investigate all cases of enforced disappearances and to put an end to such practices. It also expressed concern that the Government adopted an extreme Internet decree restricting freedom of speech in a manner that exceeds the limits set forth by the ICCPR.

490. Jubilee Campaign noted some improvements in the protection of freedom of religion or belief, including a reduction in the number of long-term Christian prisoners of conscience. It however expressed concern that religious minorities continue to be subjected to discrimination and harassment, including arrest, detention, eviction, fines and forcible renunciation of faith. It urged the Government to release all prisoners detained on religious grounds and, in cases of wrongful detention, ensure full investigations. It also requested the Government to amend its legislation to conform to the international agreements, to which the Lao People’s Democratic Republic is a party. It noted that the Government was reviewing Decree 92 regarding Governance and Protection of Religious Activity, which is discriminatory and open to abuse as it uses vague terms prohibiting religious believers from “dividing ethnic groups or religions in order to cause social disorder”.

491. Amnesty International regretted that the Government did not support many recommendations related to the case of enforced disappearance of Sombath Somphone while noting that the Government committed to undertaking a thorough and impartial investigation into his disappearance. It also noted that the Government was considering ratifying the ICPPED. However, it regretted that the Government rejected calls to extend a standing invitation to special procedures, and specifically a visit by the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances. In addition, Amnesty International stated that the decision by the authorities to reject offers of technical assistance in the search for Sombath Somphone signalled a lack of genuine commitment to uphold the rule of law and to protect the rights of its citizens.

 4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

492. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 196 recommendations received, 116 enjoyed the support of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic and 77 were noted. Detailed clarifications were provided on 3 recommendations indicating which part of these recommendations was supported and which part was noted.

493. The Lao People’s Democratic Republic reiterated its sincere thanks to the delegations for their positive assessment on achievements in the area of human rights and for their understanding of the constraints and challenges faced by the country in the national efforts to promote and protect human rights for the Lao people.

494. The Lao People’s Democratic Republic highlighted that it had gained a lot of experience from the UPR process, which provided an opportunity for the Lao People’s Democratic Republic to move forward in its endeavours to promote and protect human rights at the national level and to further cooperate and share best practices with the international community to advance the cause of human rights globally.

495. The Lao People’s Democratic Republic as a member of the United Nations was committed to realizing the UN Charter’s spirit of the promotion and protection of human rights through the implementation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the human rights treaties to which it is a party, as well as the accepted UPR recommendations. The Lao People’s Democratic Republic looked forward to continuing cooperation and exchange of experiences on human rights with the international community, including in implementing the UPR recommendations.

 Spain

496. The review of Spain was held on 21 January 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 Spain in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/ESP/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/ESP/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/ESP/3).

497. At its 27th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Spain (see section C below).

498. The outcome of the review of Spain comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/8), the views of Spain 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/29/8/Add.1 and 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

499. The delegation reiterated its gratitude to the States who participated in the second review of Spain. It also recognized the role played by civil society and by the national human rights institution, the *Defensor del Pueblo,* in this exercise. The involvement of all stakeholders ensured that the UPR would have a maximum impact for the promotion and protection of human rights in Spain.

450. Several ministries analysed in detail the 189 recommendations received by Spain. The Government also conducted, in March 2015, a productive meeting with civil society to hear the views of the NGO’s.

451. The Addendum to the Working Group Report submitted by Spain was the result of lengthy discussions between the concerned ministries to ensure that the Government's position regarding each recommendation would be realistic and feasible. To this end, following the model used by other countries, Spain classified the recommendations into three groups: supported, partially supported and noted.

452. Initially, the partially accepted category was used for recommendations where Spain either agreed with their spirit but could only implement them partially; was not in agreement on the best way to implement them; could accept part of them and note the rest. The delegation informed that the Government had decided to reconsider its position on most of the partially accepted recommendations so that OHCHR could statistically collect the exact number of recommendations supported and noted.

453. As a result of this review, Spain supported 169 recommendations out of which 5 were partially accepted. These are recommendations 131.45, which Spain considers implemented without needing to adopt a comprehensive law on the subject; 131.59 and 131.61, which Spain considers that the part requesting to ensure immediate access of detainees to legal assistance is already implemented; 131.180 with regard to the amendment to the law of public security which Spain considers it is already implemented, since this norm, comprising an explicit provision on the respect of human rights law and obligations, was reviewed during the latest parliamentary debate; and 131.187, where Spain considers that it already observes the principle of the best interest of the child through the adoption of a protocol concerning unaccompanied minors.

454. Also, Spain noted 20 recommendations. The 15 mentioned in Addendum 1 plus recommendations 131.37, 131 100, 131 184, 131 185 and 131 186.

455. The delegation announced that it would prepare a corrigendum to Addendum 1 to reflect the aforementioned changes with the assistance of the Secretariat. Also, the Government, as proof of its commitment to the process and its transparency, had prepared an annex explaining in detail the position vis-à-vis each recommendation which would be provided to the Secretariat both in Spanish and English.

456. The delegation concluded by referring to some of the recommendations received during the second cycle that the Government considered would have a particular impact in the promotion and protection of human rights in Spain.

457. The Government has accepted the recommendation to establish an Inter-Ministerial Commission for Human Rights, which would, among other important responsibilities, develop indicators in the area of ​​human rights, as recommended also during the UPR that could improve those already existing in Spain. The Spanish authorities have already started the consultations on the ideal structure of the aforesaid Commission.

458. The Delegation referred to the advanced legislation and measures adopted in the fight against discrimination, racism and xenophobia. Spain considered that current legislation implied high standards of protection and there was no need for a comprehensive anti-discrimination law. Therefore the Government could not accept the recommendations in that sense. The goal of the Government was to implement the above mentioned legislation, while making all the necessary adjustments when need be.

459. Some recommendations addressed domestic violence figures. In this regard, the delegation recalled that Spain was one of the few countries in the world with a system of data collection on domestic violence that was considered a model by other countries. The delegation reiterated Spain’s zero-tolerance policy vis-a-vis domestic violence, through a wide range of measures including legal, administrative, judicial, education and awareness-raising campaigns.

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

460. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Spain, 17 delegations made statements.

461. Sierra Leone welcomed the delegation of Spain and thanked them for their oral update. It commended their ongoing efforts to effectively address hate crimes, discrimination and human trafficking. It applauded Spain’s ongoing penal code reform and its efforts in criminalizing forced marriage. It commended the new national human rights plan that Spain intends to create. It encouraged Spain to enact the accepted recommendations into national laws, and to continue to actively engage with the various human rights mechanisms.

462. Sudan welcomed the delegation of Spain and thanked them for the presentation and oral update. It commended Spain for its acceptance of most of recommendations, including one of the two recommendations presented by Sudan. It wished all the success to the Government and People of Spain.

463. Togo thanked the delegation for the information shared during the adoption of the report and took note of the Spanish commitment to implement the recommendations accepted despite the severe constraints caused by the economic and financial crisis that had spared no country.

464. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela recognized the disposition of the delegation during the UPR to provide information that allowed a positive interactive dialogue on the achievements and challenges of Spain in the field of human rights. Venezuela stressed that Spain had ratified most international human rights treaties, in addition to the adoption of the necessary legislative framework for their implementation. Venezuela appreciated the efforts carried out made by Spain to overcome obstacles to implement the recommendations accepted during its first UPR.

465. Albania welcomed Spain’s acceptance of most of the recommendations, and commended its commitment to implement those recommendations. It thanked Spain for accepting all recommendations from Albania. It encouraged further efforts on implementing the Strategic Plan on Equality of Opportunity, on procedures for identifying trafficking victims and addressing the special needs of child victims, and on the National Strategy for the Social Inclusion of Roma community. It also complimented Spain for its high assessment and appreciation of the civil society suggestions.

466. Algeria welcomed the acceptance of two recommendations it put forward regarding the impact of austerity measures on the most vulnerable social groups, and access of children belonging to vulnerable groups to health and education. Algeria encouraged Spain to continue its efforts in protecting the rights of migrant workers especially in the context of repetitive migrant tragedies in the Mediterranean and elsewhere. That is why the ratification of the Convention on migrant workers was highly recommended.

467. Angola welcomed that Spain had accepted many of the recommendations it received, including one put forward by Angola. It also welcomed the cooperation of the Government with the human right mechanisms, the reform of the Penal Code and the adoption of the second strategic plan for the integration of citizens in society. Angola noted with satisfaction the qualitative improvement of the education system, which had contributed to the reduction of gender violence.

468. Bulgaria welcomed the adoption of UPR of Spain and was satisfied that Spain attaches priority to the promotion and protection of human rights. It was confident that Spain would further improve coordination between various national administrations and increase the effectiveness of the Human Rights Office. It also thanked Spain for its commitment to continue to mainstream gender equality policy and implement Law on comprehensive protection measures against gender based violence.

469. Burkina Faso appreciated the commitment of Spain to the promotion and protection of human rights, reflected, in particular, by the exemplary cooperation it had with OHCHR and the Human Rights Council. Burkina Faso welcomed that Spain had accepted many of the recommendations it received and welcomed the commitment by the Government to submit a mid-term report on their implementation.

470. Chad commended that Spain had ratified most instruments on human rights, submitted its reports to treaty bodies, extended a standing invitation to the special procedures and conveyed a mid-term report in 2012. Chad asked the difference between the *Defensor del Pueblo* and the mediator.

471. China welcomed the constructive engagement of Spain with the UPR mechanism, and its acceptance of most of the recommendations. China appreciated that Spain accepted China’s recommendations to continue to strengthen the fight against racial discrimination and intolerance, protect the legal rights of migrants and minority groups, and highlight the employment issue, in particular the reduction of the youth unemployment.

472. Côte d'Ivoire thanked the Government for the attention given to the recommendations it received as well as for the answers provided during the adoption of the report. It reiterated its support to the efforts by the Government to ensure the respect, protection and enjoyment of human rights for all in the Spanish territory and wished success to Spain in the implementation of the accepted recommendations.

473. The Council of Europe highlighted three challenges facing Spain: the deficient asylum procedure and illegal immigration issues, the ethnic profiling by law enforcement authorities, and unfavourable detention conditions. It welcomed measures taken to address those issues, and commended the ratification of the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence. It welcomed the signature of the COE Additional Protocol to the Convention on the Transfer of Sentenced Persons, and encouraged Spain to ratify it.

474. Cuba recognized that Spain had accepted the two recommendations it put forward related to measures of protection for the most affected by the economic crisis and combating violence against women. Cuba encouraged Spain to continue its efforts to comprehensively address the negative effects of the crisis for the benefit of the most vulnerable. Cuba hoped that the implementation of the accepted recommendations would help to improve the situation of human rights of all residents in Spanish territories.

475. Ghana thanked the efforts of Spain to improve its human rights situation. It appreciated that Spain accepted most of the recommendations including those submitted by Ghana. It mentioned recommendations of ensuring women’s participation in decision-making, further combating violence against women and children, and ensuring the right to vote for the disabled people. It applauded Spain’s acceptance of Ghana’s recommendation to end ethnic and racial profiling and racial discrimination, and encouraged Spain to ratify ICRMW.

476. India thanked the delegation of Spain for the information provided, and their constructive engagement with the UPR mechanism. It noted with satisfaction that Spain has accepted a number of recommendations, which include four out of five recommendations from India. It was confident that Spain would further strengthen its efforts in implementing recommendations accepted.

477. The Islamic Republic of Iran wished that Spain could implement a number of examined recommendations provided during the UPR session. It highlighted a number of concerned issues in Spain, which include: the discrimination against migrants and ethnic minorities; discrimination and ill-treatment of unaccompanied migrant children and obstacles for immigrant children to access education and health; excessive use of force in border areas; the situation of migrant women; and the lack of equality before the law of foreigners.

 3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

478. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Spain, 10 other stakeholders made statements. The statements of the stakeholders that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints[[47]](#footnote-48) are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.

479. The European Bureau for Lesser used Languages (EBLUL) recalled that the submission it prepared for the UPR of Spain detailed cases of language discrimination against speakers of Catalan, Basque, Galician, Aragonese and Asturian. This discrimination included physical abuse by the police and humiliating treatment in the courts. The submission concluded that it was impossible to obtain justice in Spain for this form of hate crime. EBLUL considered that such discrimination was systematic and institutionalized. EBLUL recommended to the Government to stop such discrimination. It also asked the Council to call to order Spain so that it takes measures to ensure the end of linguistic discrimination against speakers of indigenous languages.

480. Save the Children International highlighted Spain’s acceptance of a number of recommendations regarding child poverty and education. It noted that policy reforms and budget cuts already had a negative impact on child’s rights in education, health, and social services. It called for sufficient resources for an in-depth and comprehensive analysis of the impact of regulations on children’s rights. It recommended resorting to the European Social Fund to counterbalance the decrease of the budget of education and the Royal Decree-Law 14/2012. It also called on Spain to ensure the full access and integration of minority children and migrant children in the educational system.

481. The FIDH urged the Government to guarantee the right to justice, truth and reparation for crimes committed during the Civil War and the Franco dictatorship. FIDH also asked Spain to ensure access to justice for crimes committed outside the country under the principle of universal justice and recalled that the 2014 amendment of Article 23.4 of the Organic Law of the Judiciary established requirements of territoriality and nationality contrary to international law. FIDH urged Spain to amend those provisions; recognize the right to truth, justice and reparation for victims of the Franco dictatorship; cooperate with the Argentine judicial authorities investigating these crimes; and repeal the amnesty law.

482. Action Canada for Population and Development welcomed that Spain accepted the recommendations on violence against women and recommendation 131.70 urging to ensure sexual rights. This must include the provision of contraceptives, the provision of sexual health services and reproductive health information in all autonomous regions and for all women. It added that the implementation of these measures should be accompanied by legislative amendments incorporating sex education in schools from primary to high school. It considered that for this purpose the implementation of recommendation 131 141 was crucial. It concluded by urging the Government to take steps to ensure sex education in Spain.

483. International Service for Human Rights expressed concern about the new Law on Citizen Security and the recent reforms of the penal code, in force from July 1 2015, creating offenses that criminalized the peaceful exercise of freedom of expression, assembly and information. Five special rapporteurs had criticized these laws that introduce vague and imprecise concepts that can be arbitrarily applied. The lack of prior notification, being punished by the law, had become a de facto Government authorization to engage in peaceful protest. It also regretted the reform of the Legal Aid Act that would entail that fewer people could benefit from a legal defense.

484. Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice stated that the need to support all families receiving the minimum integration income was still a pressing need. It considered that the situation of young people was daunting due to lack of adequate jobs for the skills they possess. It welcomed the ratification of the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women but regretted that there were still a large number of women, mostly illegal immigrants, who were victims of trafficking. It recommended that Spain continue its efforts to combat poverty and malnutrition; promote and implement decidedly youth-friendly policies; and ensure the integral promotion of women victims of trafficking.

485. Amnesty International welcomed Spain’s acceptance of recommendations to guarantee the rights of freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly. It remained concerned that Spain’s law does not recognize the right to hold spontaneous demonstrations. It informed that though Spain accepted recommendations to ensure access to effective asylum procedures and to respect the principle of non-*refoulment*, it continues to prevent people facing human rights violations accessing such procedures, especially at the border with Morocco. It called upon Spain to guarantee the right to justice and reparation for the victims of civil war and Francoism (1936-1975), and to criminalize torture and enforced disappearance as separate crimes in the Criminal Code.

486. The Centre for Economic and Social Rights recalled that the economic crisis had a greater impact on the immigrant population. From 2012, immigrants in an irregular situation had been excluded from the national health system. Therefore, it supported the recommendations urging the Government to ensure access to the social rights and health of all people living in Spanish territory, without discrimination. To date there was no change in legislation, beyond Government public statements announcing them. It urged the Government to comply with its obligations regarding social rights.

487. Caritas Internationalis called the attention to the recommendations calling for the implementation of the second Plan on Human Rights; the signing of the Convention on the rights of migrant workers; the abolition of summary returns from Ceuta and Melilla; further deepen the training of public agents to combat racial discrimination; the creation of systems for monitoring and observation of the Law on Protection of Public Safety; structurally address the housing emergency; a law against trafficking in persons; and considering international cooperation as a public policy that should be consulted with all stakeholders.

488. The Federación de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos regretted that Spain had not accepted the recommendations requiring it to analyse the impact of austerity measures on the enjoyment of economic and social rights. It also considered that there was a decline in the effectiveness of civil liberties as the Public Security Act would come into force in the near future. Finally, it referred to the foreigners who crossed the fences of Ceuta and Melilla, cities that were like prisons, and regretted that the hot returns already in force severely limited the right to asylum.

 4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

489. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 189 recommendations received, 164 enjoy the support of Spain, additional clarification was provided on another 5 recommendations indicating which part of those recommendations was supported and which part was noted, and 20 are noted.

490. The delegation thanked the remarks of States and civil society, and referred to some of the issues mentioned during their statements, while recalling that detailed explanations of their national position on all the received recommendation would be available in the voluntary annex available in the OHCHR website. Regarding the impact of the economic crisis on the enjoyment of human rights, the delegation recalled that the Government had carried out regular impact assessments of the measures undertaken. Also, the National Action Plan for Social Inclusion 2013-2016 included more than 240 actions aimed at addressing the consequences of the crisis for the society and specifically for the most vulnerable groups.

491. The delegation recalled that the Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families had not been ratified by any country belonging to the European Union. However, Spain has at all times sought to guarantee the rights of foreign workers in the country and the law provides ample protection for the rights of migrants, under the Constitution, in the Act passed in 2000 on the Rights and Freedoms of Foreigners in Spain and their Social Integration, and in the implementing regulations. Any decision on the Convention would be taken in coordination with other EU members.

492. As for the Law on protection of public safety, the delegation noted that there was no legal limitation to freedom of expression, assembly and association. Moreover, the right to peaceful demonstration did not require prior authorization, but only a communication to the authority, which could proscribe such demonstrations in exceptional cases specified by law, or condition its development to protect other fundamental rights.

493. The delegation stated that the *gitano* population in Spain was entitled to the same rights as the rest of the population, including working conditions and legal protection. Similarly, the National Strategy for the Social Inclusion of the *gitano* population for 2012-2020 aimed to improve access to formal employment, reduce job insecurity and improve the professional qualifications of this vulnerable group.

494. The delegation reported that various ministries were reviewing the draft for the second national plan for human rights in order to adopt a long-term document which would have a time span beyond four years and which would not be contingent to changes in the legislature. In the meantime pending measures from the first national plan for human rights were still being implemented.

495. The delegation reiterated the commitment of Spain to present a mid-term report to strengthen the follow-up of the recommendations supported or partially supported.

496. The delegation concluded by noting that the UPR was a valuable and constructive exercise that, inter alia, permitted Spain to assess the perception that other governments had vis-à-vis its architecture for the promotion and protection of human rights and favoured dialogue between civil society and the Government. The delegation reiterated its appreciation for all the participants in the process and thanked the Secretariat for its permanent assistance and the interpreters for the quality of their job.

 Lesotho

497. The review of Lesotho was held on 21 January 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 Lesotho in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/LSO/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/LSO/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/LSO/3).

498. At its 27th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Lesotho (see section C below).

499. The outcome of the review of Lesotho comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/9), the views of Lesotho 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/29/9/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

500. The delegation recalled that at the review, 169 recommendations had been received, of which 121 recommendations enjoyed the support of Lesotho. Twenty–four recommendations had been rejected and a further 24 recommendations had been deferred to the current session, and the delegation apprised the Council on the Government’s position on those recommendations.

501. Lesotho welcomed the recommendations on ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OP-CAT) Lesotho also welcomed the recommendation on allowing visits by Special Rapporteurs to places of detention. The Government shall endeavour to ratify OP-CAT in the near future. With regard to recommendation 114.9, Lesotho has accepted the recommendation in part and has rejected that part of the recommendation on ratification of the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

502. Lesotho welcomed the recommendations relating to ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure and the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Consultations with relevant stakeholders will be held in this regard.

503. Lesotho supported the recommendation to adopt legislative measures to check trafficking in women and girls. The delegation stated that the Anti-trafficking in Persons Act was enacted in 2011 and the National Anti-Trafficking in Persons Strategic Framework and Action Plan 2014-2016 which was launched in 2014. Trainings of stakeholders and public awareness campaigns were being held. Additionally, the Children’s Protection and Welfare Act 2011 has a dedicated chapter on child trafficking as a way to protect children. The Act has been simplified and translated into the local vernacular for easier dissemination and accessibility.

504. Lesotho supported the recommendation to implement the July 2014 National Anti-Trafficking Action Plan and enact implementing Regulations for the 2011 Anti-Trafficking Act, including by making the changes necessary to ensure that the cases are prosecuted in the Magistrate Courts, not just the High Court.

505. Lesotho supported the recommendation to continue developing Human Rights Indicators. The Government will continue to assess and monitor promotion and implementation of human rights in all sectors. Policies such as the National Strategic Development Plan, Vision 2020 as well as other policy frameworks and national initiatives will continue to be evaluated. A human rights policy was being developed to serve as a guiding tool for a coherent and coordinated fulfilment of human rights obligations.

506. Lesotho supported the recommendation to take measures to ensure universal registration of births, including the inclusion of necessary requirements and the removal of costs it is worth clarifying that registration of births and deaths were free of charge throughout country. Officers regularly held public gatherings and visited schools, churches, social gatherings, where registration took place.

507. Lesotho welcomed the recommendation to investigate all cases of gender violence, punish the perpetrators and compensate the victims. All cases of violence including gender-based violence that are reported to the police are investigated. Victims were offered temporary shelter. Various pieces of legislation provided for a fund for compensation to victims of crime including victims of gender-based violence, which was yet to be established.

508. Lesotho supported the recommendation to meet the target of allocating 15 percent of Government spending to health. However, due to limited resources, such an allocation was not be possible at this stage. The delegation stated that over the last three years, there has been an increase in budget allocation for the health sector.

509. The recommendations to ratify the Optional Protocol to International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights did not enjoy the support of Lesotho. Chapter III of the Constitution of Lesotho spelt out Principles of State Policy which entailed rights of a socio-economic nature. It would therefore be paradoxical to ratify this Convention.

510. The recommendation to accede to the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity did not enjoy the support of Lesotho. The priority was the incorporation into national laws those Conventions that have already ratified Conventions.

511. The recommendation to decriminalize defamation and review the media related laws did not enjoy the support of Lesotho. The draft Media Policy, which was soon to be approved by Cabinet, will set the bar and old laws will be reviewed in conformity with the Policy.

512. The recommendation to strengthen at the constitutional level and in a specific manner, the provisions that prohibit discrimination against women did not enjoy the support of Lesotho. The Government has made strides in prohibiting discrimination against women. The issues relating to succession to the throne and chieftainship, which was the basis of the reservation to Article 2 of CEDAW, was yet to be addressed.

513. The recommendation to review and update laws that could lead to self-censorship, such as the Sedition Proclamation and the Internal Security (General) Act, to ensure compliance with international human rights obligations does not enjoy the support of Government. Those laws ensure respect for the rights of citizens.

514. The recommendation to offer comprehensive sexuality education and ensure access to sexual and reproductive health services, including legal and safe abortion, did not enjoy the support of Lesotho. Family planning services as well as education on the use of a preferred contraceptive method is offered in most Government health facilities. Abortion was generally illegal, however the Penal Code 2010 provided for circumstances under which legal and safe abortion may be performed.

515. The delegation stated that despite the challenges, Lesotho reiterated its commitment to accelerate sustainable economic growth, continue to work on the establishment of the National Human Rights Commission, improve access to justice for all, intensify efforts in the fight against corruption, and strive to achieve the objectives of Vision 2020 and the National Strategic Development Plan.

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

516. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Lesotho, 17 delegations made statements.

517. Mali appreciated the positive efforts made by Lesotho to implement the recommendations accepted at the first review. It congratulated Lesotho on the ratification of the International Convention for the Protection of Persons from Enforced Disappearance. It noted with satisfaction the adoption of a public policy on human rights, an action plan against human trafficking, as well as the elaboration of a law on the protection and wellbeing of children.

518. Niger welcomed Lesotho’s achievements in the area of human rights since the previous review. It acknowledged the multiple legislative and regulatory measures Lesotho had taken towards child welfare, to fight violence against women, and fight against human trafficking. Niger further acknowledged the establishment of a national human rights commission.

519. Rwanda thanked Lesotho for the constructive manner in which it participated in the UPR process. It noted with appreciation update provide on the new developments in promoting and protecting human rights since the last review.

520. Sierra Leone commended Lesotho for ratifying several key human rights instruments and for the recent establishment of a national human rights commission. Also, all recommendations made by Sierra Leone enjoyed the support of Lesotho.

521. South Africa welcomed the positive development in Lesotho and conveyed its congratulations on a successful review and the acceptance of a large number of recommendations. It also welcomed efforts in implementing the National Action Plan to end gender-based violence and the enactment of the draft national Policy on Social Development and the Government’s commitment to ratify outstanding international instruments.

522. Sudan noted with satisfaction the positive engagement of Lesotho with the UPR process and appreciated the acceptance of a large number of recommendations, including the recommendations made by Sudan.

523. Togo thanked Lesotho in advance for the efforts that will be made in the implementation of the recommendations, in particular those put forward by Togo in relation to increasing access to water and sanitation, to overcome disparities between rural and urban areas, and the implementation of a more efficient strategy to prevent and combat HIV/aids.

524. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela stated that Lesotho gave total and open cooperation with the UPR, confirming its commitment to human rights. Venezuela welcomed the responses by Lesotho on the establishment of a national human rights institution and the sixth amendment to the Constitution in this regard. Venezuela expressed recognition for the efforts by Lesotho to comply with the commitments it had entered into in the area of human rights and wished it success in the implementation of the recommendations.

525. Algeria congratulated Lesotho on the acceptance of the majority of recommendations received during the second cycle UPR. It congratulated Lesotho on the acceptance of the recommendations regarding access to health care across the country, and the guarantee of universal primary education. It wished Lesotho success in the implementation of the recommendations.

526. Angola welcomed the acceptance by Lesotho of the majority of the recommendations it had received. It commended Lesotho for the efforts made in promoting and protecting human rights, particularly through the ratification of international instruments. It also commended Lesotho for the progress made in the areas of education, women’s rights and in the implementation of the millennium development goals.

527. Botswana commended Lesotho for efforts made to achieve democracy and rule of law and congratulated Lesotho for the successful formation of a government. It noted that Lesotho was affected by abject poverty and expressed appreciation for efforts to address inequality and poverty. Botswana stated that measures put in place, such as agricultural subsidies, poverty reductions programmes and policies were commendable.

528. Burkina Faso acknowledged the numerous resource and capacity based obstacles Lesotho faced in the endeavour to improve human rights. It welcomed the fact that Lesotho had accepted most recommendations from the review and encouraged Lesotho to make extensive efforts to implement these recommendations. Burkina Faso wished Lesotho success in setting up universal primary education.

529. China welcomed the constructive participation of Lesotho in the UPR. It appreciated Lesotho’s comprehensive and positive response to the recommendations it had received. It also appreciated Lesotho’s acceptance of most of the recommendations, including those recommendations made by China.

530. Cuba congratulated Lesotho on the recommendations accepted and welcomed the acceptance of the two recommendations it had made. The commitment of the Government to continue to promote economic growth that will generate productive jobs and alleviate poverty, and to provide free and compulsory education for all children, was most encouraging. It called on the international community to provide technical assistance and capacity building to Lesotho.

531. Djibouti commended Lesotho for the efforts made in submitting the various reports to the Treaty Bodies. It encouraged the authorities to pursue the various initiatives to reduce poverty by providing benefits to the elderly, orphans and vulnerable children.

532. Ethiopia thanked Lesotho for accepting a significant number of recommendations, including the recommendations it had made. It noted the comprehensive country review conducted as part of the African Peer Review Mechanism, and its engagement with the Human Rights Council including the UPR mechanism.

533. Ghana was pleased to note that a significant number of recommendations made during the review enjoyed the support of Lesotho, as well as the recommendation made by Ghana to submit reports to treaty bodies and issue a standing invitation to special procedures. It encouraged Lesotho to sustain the momentum in establishing a national human rights institution. It hoped that the media policy that was being drafted would decriminalize defamation.

 3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

534. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Lesotho, two other stakeholders made statements.

535. COC Nederland stated that LGBT people faced discrimination and exclusion in all spheres of life, and were disadvantaged in access social protection schemes. Their right to privacy was infringed and in the labour market they continue to hide their sexuality. Young LGBT persons experienced estrangement from family and harassment at school. The impact of marginalization relegated LGBT persons to the margins of society. There can be no universality of rights, eradication of HIV or development, if the LGBT community is excluded or left behind.

536. RADDHO congratulated Lesotho for holding elections in 2015, and welcomed the progress made in promoting human rights since the first UPR. Women were subjected to all forms of violence, particularly in rural areas. RADDHO was concerned by the increase in cases of sexual violence and rape of girls by teachers in schools. It called on Lesotho to formulate a strategy to end sexual, ethnic and domestic violence, and to take additional measures to combat FGM. It invited Lesotho to abolish discriminatory laws, ratify OP-CAT, decriminalize defamation, and eliminate the death penalty.

 4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

537. The President stated that based on the information provided, of 169 recommendations received, 137 enjoyed the support of Lesotho, additional clarification was provided on one recommendation, and 31 were noted.

538. The delegation thanked the member and observer states of the Human Rights Council for their constructive dialogue and engagement in the Universal Periodic Review of Lesotho that culminated in the number of recommendations made to the Government of Lesotho.

539. It is the Government’s priority to ensure observance of human rights, democracy, and respect for the rule of law and good governance, which is reflected in the high level of implementation of recommendations from the previous review and the number of recommendations accepted by the Government in the present review.

540. A workshop was held on 16th February 2015 to disseminate the outcome of the review and to sensitize stakeholders to begin implementing recommendations that were specific to their mandates. Consequently, a Coordinating Committee, composed of Government Ministries, NGOs and Civil Society Organizations was formed, with the mandate to overseeing the implementation process.

541. Lesotho has taken this process as an opportunity to take stock of its achievements, shortcomings and challenges that lie ahead in promoting and protecting human rights.

542. The delegation concluded by reiterating the Government’s commitment to the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council and informed the Council that the Government held itself accountable, not only with regard to the UPR, but with the treaty monitoring bodies as well.

 Kenya

543. The review of Kenya was held on 22 January 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 Kenya in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KEN/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KEN/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KEN/3).

544. At its 29th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Kenya (see section C below).

545. The outcome of the review of Kenya comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/10), the views of Kenya 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

546. Kenya expressed its sincere appreciation to the Troika - Namibia, China and Germany - for their commitment and assistance during its second Universal Periodic Review (UPR). Kenya acknowledged the delegations that contributed actively to its review in January 2015 and stressed that their statements and recommendations will contribute immensely to its continued efforts in the fulfilment of human rights obligations.

547. Out of the 253 recommendations made by State delegations during the review, Kenya accepted 192. The acceptance of such a large number of recommendations bore testimony to the importance and commitment that Kenya attached to its human rights obligations and the UPR process in furthering the human rights agenda. Indeed, Kenya was already addressing most of the recommendations made, in line with its Constitutional imperatives and its development blue print- Vision 2030. It was, therefore, confident that their full implementation will contribute to the formulation and development of effective public policies in the country.

548. During the January session, 61 recommendations, though pivotal in improving the human rights situation in Kenya, were noted. Out of the 61, 33 of them related to the ratification of various international instruments that Kenya was not a party to, 7 to the abolition of the death penalty and 5 to laws relating to freedom of expression and information among others. About 2/3 of the noted recommendations were stated in absolute terms which in Kenya’s view amounted to limiting the Government’s ability to prioritize, taking into account its resources and circumstances when determining the most effective way to fulfil its obligations.

549. The recommendations relating to the ratification of international instruments were a case in point. The Constitution of Kenya, 2010, introduced a more detailed procedure for the ratification of any treaty that would be binding on Kenya. All treaties were ratified on a case by case basis after extensive internal analysis, public participation and concurrence by Parliament. These processes took time and it was critical that all recommendations that Kenya accepted under the UPR were implemented in a timely and comprehensive manner in accordance with Constitutional provisions.

550. Another example related to recommendations relating to budgetary increases to various sectors. Kenya was given a recommendation to increase the budget allocation to the health sector to 15% of GDP. While the Government was committed to providing quality healthcare in Kenya, there was uncertainty as to whether the allocation would have attained that threshold by the next UPR review, given the financial challenges the country was facing. The same went for the recommendation on the allocation of at least 10% of the State budget to agriculture development in line with the Maputo Declaration. The recommendation to allocate more resources to the various National Human Rights Institutions also fell within this category. The resources allocated to these sectors would depend on the Government’s overall ability to raise the necessary funds. However, Kenya was grateful to its development partners who gave budgetary support to it and used this opportunity to call upon them to continue doing so.

551. Although the recommendations on the abolition of the death penalty in its absolute form were noted, the Government continued to take steps towards its abolition. Since the review, the Honourable Attorney General had directed the Power of Mercy Committee to work with other stakeholders to initiate a National dialogue on the abolition of the death penalty as a way of promoting human worth and dignity.

552. Regarding some of the other noted recommendations on various outstanding bills and Acts such as the Kenya Information and Communication Act, the Media laws, the Freedom of Information Bill, 2014, Data Protection Bill 2013 and The Public Benefit Organization Act, 2013, the delegation stressed that the Bills and the Acts were still undergoing stakeholders’ consultations and analysis with a view to improving their content and to secure consensus on the same. Kenya indicated that it would update the Council on the progress in due course.

553. Kenya emphasized that the noting of the recommendations did not imply a bar to their implementation. The Government recognized the importance of the UPR process in improving the situation of human rights in Kenya. It would therefore take all the necessary and possible steps, taking into account, budgetary considerations, public participation and the various processes taking place in the country, to ensure that all recommendations were effectively implemented. It should be noted that the Constitution of Kenya embraced a comprehensive Bill of rights which reflected international human rights standards. Based on the Constitutional provisions, Kenya’s courts of Law ensured that laws were interpreted in a way that complied with the rules of international law and human rights instruments that Kenya was a State Party to.

554. Kenya had fully and unreservedly embraced the UPR process as a most effective tool for policy development initiatives and programmatic interventions for effective realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The UPR has helped in the definition of its human rights priorities, and facilitated the exchange of international experience and best practices to strengthen its laws, policies and institutions.

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

555. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Kenya, 15 delegations made statements. The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints[[48]](#footnote-49) are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.

556. Botswanacommended Kenya for accepting a majority of recommendations received during its review. It also applauded Kenya for the adoption of its new Constitution, and in particular the entrenchment in its Constitution of the National Gender and Equality Commission and of the Commission on Administrative Justice. Botswana welcomed the enactment of the Prohibition of Female Genital Mutilation Act of 2011 which criminalized that practice. It encouraged Kenya to step up efforts in raising awareness on the Act. Botswana noted with appreciation reforms made in the justice sector as an effective judicial system was key in the protection of human rights.

557. Burkina Faso congratulated Kenya for its exemplary cooperation with the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and all human rights mechanisms. Burkina Faso believed that Kenya will spare no efforts to continue to meet the challenges it faced in terms of realizing human rights. In the context of the recommendations accepted, Burkina Faso urged Kenya to focus its efforts in combating gender stereotyping, violence against women and girls and female genital mutilations. The reform of the judicial system, equality of treatment between citizens and birth registration of children deserved attention.

558. Chad congratulated Kenya for the adoption of a new Constitution whereby legislative, general policy and institutional reform measures were put in place to meet Kenya’s international commitments. Chad regretted that significant progress made had unfortunately been undermined by poverty, corruption, terrorism and diseases. Chad urged Kenya to implement the recommendations it had accepted.

559. China commended Kenya’s constructive participation in the UPR and its acceptance of a large number of recommendations. This demonstrated Kenya’s willingness to continue strengthening international cooperation in the field of human rights and to protect and promote its people’s human rights. China appreciated that Kenya had accepted its recommendation to continue to prioritize the reduction of poverty in its national development to improve the people well-being. China encouraged Kenya to steadily implement the recommendations accepted with the international community support and to achieve comprehensive progress in the human rights cause.

560. Cuba drew attention to Kenya’s commitment to reduce hunger and malnutrition that should be seen in the series of measures adopted to alleviate poverty. Cuba was firmly convinced that with the implementation of recommendations accepted by Kenya, Kenya would continue to make progress in promoting and protecting human rights. Cuba wished every success to Kenya in implementing the 192 accepted recommendations.

561. Djibouti encouraged Kenya to continue initiatives to promote human rights. It also encouraged Kenya to continue efforts to combat poverty.

562. Egypt congratulated Kenya on the many reforms and policies taken after the adoption of a new Constitution, such as the reforms of the judiciary and police forces, as well as elections in March 2013. Egypt thanked Kenya for having accepted the Egyptian recommendations such as the elimination of discriminatory practices against women, combating child labour and the enjoyment of education by all. It urged Kenya to continue its institutional reforms. It also recognized that Kenya was facing many challenges such as poverty, illness, corruption and terrorism which were a threat to the gains achieved so far. Finally, Egypt called upon the international community to provide the assistance needed for the promotion and protection of human rights in Kenya.

563. Ethiopiacommended Kenya for accepting a considerable number of recommendations from the second review including Ethiopian recommendations to strengthen the monitoring and evaluation efforts on women’s empowerment and child protection. Ethiopia also appreciated visionary projection of Kenya to become middle income country in 2030. It strongly believed that ensuring economic progress was the right way to boost promotion and protection of human and peoples’ rights. Ethiopia indicated that terrorism was an obstacle for the enjoyment of human rights and considered that Kenya was playing a key role in combatting it in all its forms and manifestations in the region. Ethiopia stated that it was pleased to work with Kenya and other stakeholders to weaken and eliminate terrorist elements in the Horn of Africa.

564. Gabon was happy to see that Kenya had been fully cooperating with the United Nations mechanisms and procedures for the promotion and protection of human rights. Gabon was particularly impressed by the measures taken by Kenya to fight against all kind of gender-based discrimination and any violence against women. However, it regretted that the progress made was being undermined by poverty, corruption, terrorism and disease. Gabon recommended to the international community to continue to support Kenya in its efforts to restructure its system and to fight terrorism.

565. Ghanaassured Kenya of its continued support and solidarity in the fight against terrorism in the Horn of Africa which was threatening the enjoyment of the right to life and property. It was pleased to note that the recommendation it made for the respect, protection, promotion and fulfilment of all the rights and fundamental freedoms as stipulated in the Bill of rights during the review process enjoyed the support of Kenya. Furthermore, it was pleased to note the acceptance by Kenya of its recommendation to ensure the full and continued implementation of various pieces of legislations put in place to safeguard the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all persons. Ghana encouraged Kenya to continue to ensure the full eradication of the harmful practice of female genital mutilation.

566. Kuwait welcomed the efforts made by Kenya to promote and protect human rights. It very much welcomed the steps taken by Kenya not only to accept the recommendations made to it but also to implement them. That was an indication that Kenya was willing and perfectly able to fully show its responsibilities in terms of respect for human rights. Kuwait wished Kenya full success in promoting human rights, well-being and prosperity.

567. Latviawelcomed the renewed commitment of Kenya to ensure investigation into and accountability for post-election violence through its full cooperation with the Office of the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court (ICC). Latvia appreciated the willingness of Kenya to address cases of torture and the use of excessive force by security forces in the country. It encouraged Kenya to ensure that terror was fought within the law. Latvia welcomed the leadership of Kenya in organizing a regional conference on violent extremism. It hoped that the conference participants could share good practices on how to ensure that measures aimed at addressing the terrorist threat were developed and implemented in full compliance with international law and in particular international human rights law.

568. Mali welcomed Kenya’s great efforts to stabilize its situation, including through the organization in 2013 of elections which took place happily in a very peaceful environment. Mali congratulated Kenya on the adoption of its new Constitution in 2010 which gave a preeminent place to the promotion and protection of human rights. Mali welcomed Kenya’s renew commitment to continue strengthening its cooperation with the United Nations human rights protection mechanisms and procedures. It also welcomed initiatives by Kenya to follow up on the recommendations made to it at the first UPR. Mali was particularly happy to see the efforts to reform the judiciary and to draw up a national gender policy.

569. Niger noted the efforts by Kenya to strengthen its legal and institutional framework within which human rights could be promoted and protected. Niger also emphasized the adoption by Kenya of several laws including that on Kenyan citizenship and immigration, female genital mutilation and three specific laws on a Human Rights Commission and a law on the protection of victims of violations. The recommendations made to Kenya will certainly help the country to further improve its framework for the respect and promotion of human rights.

570. Rwandaappreciated that Kenya accepted the vast majority of recommendations received. It also was pleased that Kenya accepted its recommendations on continuing to strengthen counter terrorism measures as well as continuing efforts towards the abolition of the death penalty.

 3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

571. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Kenya, 12 other stakeholders made statements.

572. Kenyan National Commission on Human Rights (KNCHR)attested to the benefits that the UPR process had achieved in Kenya, and called on the State to put in place measures to ensure the implementation of accepted recommendations. It further assured the State of its commitment to continued collaboration in implementing the human rights agenda, on issue such as the abolition of the death penalty. KNCHR called upon the State to intensify its collaboration with civil society organisations and urged development partners to offer technical and financial support to ensure that recommendations were implemented.

573. Minority Rights Group(MRG) stated that the adoption of the Kenya’s report came at a crucial time for its minorities and indigenous peoples, whose rights continued being disrespected. It highlighted that there was a clear need for recognition of indigenous peoples’ rights over their ancestrally owned land. These were repeatedly being breached and violated, despite being protected under domestic and international law. MRG also called for the implementation of judicial decisions, including the African Commission’s *Endorois* judgement that had remained unimplemented since five years. Lastly, it expressed concern regarding the persistent exclusion of indigenous peoples from decision-making.

574. Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative(CHRI) expressed concern on the Security Laws Act, which jeopardized the independence of the police and intelligence services from the executive. It also expressed concern about the Government crackdown on civil society and pointed to the Public Benefits Act that had been used to refuse registration of a LGBT group. CHRI equally stressed concern on how cases involving Kenya at the ICC had been impeded. It urged Kenya to review the Security Laws Amendment Act to ensure that Kenya’s constitutional and civil liberties safeguards were honoured, as well as fully cooperate with the ICC.

575. Centre for Reproductive Rights emphasized the issues of inadequate access to quality maternity care and unsafe abortion in Kenya. It welcomed Kenya’s commitment to ensure reproductive health and rights and urged the country to address barriers to access reproductive health information. It was concerned that Kenya had not accepted the recommendations to allocate 15% of GDP to its health budget and to ensure the effective implementation of reproductive health through an inter-sectorial policy and action plan. It equally regretted that Kenya had not accepted the recommendations to ensure that women had access to legal and safe abortion.

576. Human Rights Watchnoted that impunity for serious violations by police and other security forces remained a profound concern. It also noted Kenya’s acceptance of some important recommendations but remained concerned that there had been no little tangible progress in many key areas. It stressed that some of the measures Kenya was listing as milestones were in fact far from achieving meaningful outcomes. It urged Kenya to make tangible efforts to set up a clear timeline for progress.

577. International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (FIDH**)** applauded Kenya for supporting 192 out of 253 recommendations received. FIDH suggested that Kenya put in place administrative and legislative measures to ensure equality and freedom from discrimination for all persons irrespective of their sexual orientation or gender identity. It also urged Kenya inter alia to eliminate extrajudicial killings and torture and further align its counter terrorism and security measures with international standards. FIDH expressed concern about the non-acceptance by Kenya of 61 recommendations. It referred to some of them urging Kenya to implement them with the support of the international community.

578. Action Canada for Population and Development(ACPD) indicated that the fact that Kenya had rejected a number of recommendations concerning the decriminalization of sexual relations between consenting adults of the same sex was of great concern. ACPD stated that this clearly showed how human rights in Kenya only applied to certain individuals that the State approved of, even though such actions were against Kenya’s own Constitution.

579. International Service for Human Rights(ISHR) noted that despite Kenya’s commitment to create a safe and enabling environment for human rights defenders, such activists continued to be murdered, arbitrarily arrested and threatened. Moreover, NGOs were targeted through the misuse of legislation, such as the Prevention of Terrorism Act, which was used to equate them to terrorist groups. ISHR additionally expressed concern regarding the criminalisation of same sex conduct, which put those who worked to protect LGBT people at great risk. It called on Kenya to take serious steps to create a safe environment for human rights defenders.

580. Article 19 – International Centre Against Censorshipnoted that there has been an increase in attacks against journalists in Kenya since the last review. It welcomed recommendations to “abolish criminal sanctions for media offences” and to ensure that journalists were able to practice in a free and safe environment. Furthermore, it stated that the harassment and intimidation of civil society organisations should cease. Finally, Article 19 underlined the necessity for the enactment of the long overdue Access to Information Bill.

581. International Lesbian and Gay Associationnoted with concern that despite legal protection in the Constitution, violence towards people due to their sexual orientation or gender identity was increasing. It also noted that there was unwillingness from Kenya to register organizations with the words “gay” or “lesbian” in their names. It urged Kenya to ensure the protection of gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and intersex people in the country, as they deserved protection as any other individuals.

582. In a joint statement, Franciscans International, Pax Romana and Edmund Rice international Limited noted that despite the State’s commitment to the transitional justice agenda, aiming to ensure the right to truth, justice and reparation to the victims of gross human rights violations of the past, the independence of the judiciary was often questioned. They appreciated Kenya’s acceptance of several recommendations pertaining to the protection of economic, social and cultural rights. Nevertheless, they noted that the enjoyment of these rights was often not a reality for marginalised and vulnerable groups in the society. They urged Kenya to empower anti-corruption institutions to ensure that finances were effectively transmitted and monitored.

583. Amnesty Internationalurged that any responses by Kenya to terrorist attacks did not circumscribe human rights ostensibly with a view to protecting public security. It also requested that the Security Laws (Amendment) Act 2014 should not be used to excessively restrict freedom of expression. Kenya should also refrain from listing human rights organisations as “specific entities”, under the Prevention of Terrorism Act, which equated them to “terrorist groups”. Amnesty International further encouraged Kenya to strive, as recommended by several States, to cooperate with the ICC.

 4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

584. The President stated that based on the information provided, out of 253 recommendations received, 192 enjoy the support of Kenya while 61 are noted.

585. The delegation of Kenya thanked the President and all those who have taken the floor to provide it with constructive comments and remarks. It found this engagement since the beginning of that process very useful. Kenya assured State delegations that the issues and comments they have conveyed to it will form the subject of serious reflection and attention. Kenya emphasized that it remained firmly committed to the UPR process, both in principle and practice. This commitment would be evidenced in the implementation process as well. Kenya underlined that it looked forward to sharing with delegations its experience both in terms of progress and challenges during the Council’s sessions. It finally expressed hope to count on other States’ support.

 Armenia

586. The review of Armenia was held on 22 January 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 Armenia in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/ARM/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/ARM/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/ARM/3 and A/HRC/WG.6/21/ARM/3/Corr.1).

587. At its 29th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Armenia (see section C below).

588. The outcome of the review of Armenia comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/11), the views of Armenia 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/29/11/Add.1)*.

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

589. The Head of the delegation stated that Armenia supported the UPR process as an effective tool for assessment of positive developments and human rights challenges. Armenia particularly noted the practice of submitting mid-term reports and believed that the UPR format provided an opportunity for consensus-building among member states on the main principles for the protection and promotion of human rights. Armenia expressed its appreciation to all participants, especially those who had contributed to improvements and positive developments in Armenia and the Government's human rights reform initiatives.

590. The recommendations received by Armenia had been thoroughly analysed and discussed by the relevant authorities and members of the inter-ministerial working group. Armenia had received 189 recommendations of which 155 were supported, 20 supported partially, 4 not supported and 10 rejected. Armenia mentioned that some recommendations consisted of more than one part and, in case that one part was accepted, but the other was not, the recommendation would be considered to be noted and asked that in future each recommendation should be clearly presented so as to avoid this practice.

591. The partially accepted recommendations were supported by Armenia in principle. The Government supported the idea and reasoning behind them, however, it was not in a position to accept them.

592. Armenia stated that its position on recommendations 120.1 to 120.4 was based on Article 15 of its Constitution: “Everyone shall have the right to life. No one may be sentenced or subjected to the death penalty”. The death penalty has been eliminated from the general part of the Criminal Code, which entered into force in 2003. The Constitutional Court has been systematically scrutinizing the Armenian legislation, as well as studying the content of the international treaties which the country was a party to, and has found that Armenia rejected the death penalty as a sanction and provided for the abolition of the death penalty as a rule.

593. The process of incorporating the constitutional requirements for the respect and protection of the right to life was underway and many changes have been reflected in national laws regulating the activity of law enforcement and other state bodies within the framework of the judicial reforms. Therefore, the ratification of international treaties was linked with appropriate legislative changes and the finalization of the judicial reform. Similarly, the implementation of recommendations 120.15 to 120.22 was linked to constitutional reform. The recognition of rights under legal norms, including those provided for in acts of supreme legal power - would be of a mere declarative nature in the absence of norms and guarantees called to assure the effective protection of these rights.

594. Regarding recommendations 120.6 and 120.23, there was a need for an additional study and the opinions of various ministries and agencies.

595. The implementation of recommendation 120.14 will be possible after the implementation of legislative and practical changes enabling the full implementation of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with disabilities.

596. Armenia had not supported recommendations with inappropriate content or those which were factually inaccurate. It had rejected 10 recommendations and the reasons had been presented in the Report of the Working Group and its Addendum.

597. Armenia recognized that protection of human rights was a continuous process and there was always room for improvement. It reiterated the importance that the Government attached to the implementation of the judicial reforms.

598. Armenia highlighted the Constitutional amendments of 2005 and the 2012-2016 Strategic Program for legal and judicial reforms and the measures derived from that Program aimed at ensuring fair and efficient judicial power accountable to the public. In 2014 legislative changes had introduced a system of examinations in the criminal, civil and administrative specializations, increasing fairness in the selection of judges. A system of regular evaluations of judges, carried out based on qualitative and quantitative criteria, had been introduced under the same legislation. The relevant ethics and disciplinary commissions had been transferred to work under General Assembly of Judges. A statute had been adopted to regulate the new Commission’s work and the rights of judges subject to disciplinary proceedings would be safeguarded under the Constitution and European treaties. All the above-mentioned legislative changes had been enacted to ensure the independence of judges and provide more precise legal standards in their appointment, promotion and disciplinary procedures. An Academy of Justice had also been established for the education and training of judicial and prosecutorial staff, and a public reporting system for the judiciary with regard to its activities and the objective general criteria used in distributing cases among judges had been introduced.

599. Implementation of the principle of non-discrimination was another important area within the Government's agenda. In 2014 the Ministry of Justice examined the compatibility of national legislation with the international legal norms. Following public discussions in April 2015, it decided to begin the elaboration of standalone legislation. The relevant draft law will include the following notions: indirect discrimination, associated discrimination, persecution, incitement to discrimination and victimization. The Constitutional norms on non-discrimination envisaged the establishment of appropriate mechanisms for implementation. Another law, adopted in May 2013, ensured equality between women and men in all spheres, including legal protection from discrimination.

600. Armenia mentioned that the 2011-2015 Strategic Program against Gender Violence had been adopted which identified the core directions of early prevention, protection and prosecution. Further development of the programs required close cooperation between Government and NGOs. As evidence of the importance it attached to the UPR process, the Government had discussed the possibility of signing the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence.

601. Armenia stressed that for the purpose of prevention of torture, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, comprehensive legislative reforms aimed at bringing the national legislation fully into line with international best practices had already been implemented. The legal definition was being brought into compliance with the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the amended draft legislation ensured that all officials found to have committed such acts would receive punishments reflecting the gravity of the act in accordance with the Convention. The new legislation provided for public prosecution in cases of torture with guarantees to ensure that criminal processes are instituted in every case identified. The new legislation passed its first reading in the National Assembly in May 2015.

602. A comprehensive National Human Rights Strategy, through which Armenia's obligations in the field of human rights are implemented, was approved by Presidential decree in 2012. The Strategy also defines the tasks and the relevant programmes for further implementation of the UPR recommendations as well. A Plan of Action was adopted in February 2014.

603. Armenia had already planned joint discussion with civil society representatives on further actions for ensuring implementation of adopted recommendations during which they will be able to present their ideas on the implementation of the UPR recommendations to the Government.

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

604. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Armenia, 17 delegations made statements.

605. Kuwait welcomed the positive response of Armenia to most of the recommendations given to it in the course of its review and this underlined the importance which Armenia attached to the protection and protection of human rights. It urged the Human Rights Council to adopt the report and wished Armenia success in strengthening human rights principles.

606. Rwanda recognized the positive engagement of Armenia with the Human Rights Council during the review process and commended it for its acceptance of a significant number of recommendations, including those which Rwanda had proposed. This indicated the commitment of Armenia to the protection and promotion of human rights.

607. The Russian Federation noted that Armenia had accepted the majority of the recommendations addressed to it and was pleased to see measures being undertaken for the strengthening of the legal instruments for the protection of human rights, especially the new legislation and reforms to the administrative and judicial systems. It particularly noted the positive effects of the measures taken to protect the rights of the child. These measures bore witness to Armenia’s readiness to improve the national legal system in relation to the protection of human rights.

608. Sierra Leone was pleased to note the ratification of several core human rights instruments, including ICPPED, since its first review. It noted the development of a strategic programme for the protection of the rights of the child, but encouraged Armenia to consider acceding to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a Communications Procedure. It also encouraged Armenia to incorporate the outcome of the review into the appropriate national mechanisms in a systematic manner.

609. Tajikistan welcomed the activities of Armenia undertaken under its second review and noted the Government’s achievements in establishing a mechanism for cooperation with civil society; the adoption of the Action Plan for the protection of human rights;and its efforts in combatting trafficking in persons. It also welcomed the definition of the priorities in the protection of human rights, among them the fight against corruption.

610. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela appreciated the commitment of Armenia to the implementation of the UPR recommendations which it had supported. It highlighted the commencement of the implementation of the National Strategy for the Protection of Human Rights, and its accompanying Action Plan, and Armenia’s strong efforts to fulfil its human rights commitments.

611. Albania commended Armenia for its commitment to implement the recommendations received. It appreciated Armenia’s achievements in improving the legal framework and institutional capacities for the protection and promotion of human rights. Albania commended in particular the measures undertaken to implement the Strategic Program for the Protection of the Rights of the Child for 2013-2016. It encouraged the Government to further advance work on anti-trafficking issues.

612. Algeria congratulated Armenia for the acceptance of the majority of the recommendations made to it in the second UPR cycle. It appreciated particularly the acceptance of the two recommendations which it had made relating to reducing gender inequality and strengthening the training provided to officials responsible for dealing with minority rights.

613. Angola commended Armenia for the additional information which it had provided. It noted with satisfaction the acceptance by Armenia of most of the recommendations, in particular those from Angola. It welcomed the readiness of Armenia to continue its cooperation with the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council and supported the adoption of the report. It wished Armenia success in the implementation of the recommendations.

614. Belarus thanked Armenia for the comments it had provided on the recommendations made to it. The thorough attention given by the Government to all the recommendations demonstrated the high level of attention Armenia was giving towards fulfilling its international obligations in the field of human rights. It noted with satisfaction the acceptance of a large number of recommendations, including those made by Belarus in relation to increasing the protection of the vulnerable children and increasing the participation of women in political life.

615. Bulgaria appreciated the adoption of several of Armenia’s strategies and action plans, including the Strategic Program for Legal and Judicial Reforms. It welcomed the measures taken by Armenia aimed at promoting and protecting the rights of the child and encouraged it to establish mechanisms to identify and monitor children in vulnerable situations and at risk of becoming victims of violations under OP-CRC-SC. It appreciated the acceptance of its recommendation relating to the protection of the rights of the human rights defenders and the journalists.

616. Burkina Faso noted with satisfaction that measures had been taken by Armenia of a legal, political and institutional nature to improve the protection of human rights. It noted, in particular, the ratification of certain international human rights conventions; reforms to the legal system; measures to protect the most vulnerable groups in the population: children, migrants, and members of ethnic minorities; and the establishment of an inter-agency commission for monitoring the implementation of measures.

617. Chad noted with pleasure the legal and practical measures that Armenia had taken since the first review and its submission of a mid-term report. Chad agreed with Armenia that one way to improve the system of human rights protection is to have better coordination between the state and civil society. Chad urged Armenia to act upon the recommendations it had accepted during this review.

618. China appreciated Armenia’s constructive participation in the review and its decision to accept most of the UPR recommendations, including those from China. China further appreciated Armenia’s commitment to the effective implementation of the Action Plan for the protection of human rights*.* China also appreciated the efforts of Armenia to submit reports to the treaty bodies; strengthen the anti-discrimination legislation and its implementation; combat violence against women and girls; and to promote the rights to education and employment.

619. The Council of Europe referred to some of the recommendations made to Armenia by the organization’s monitoring bodies and noted three challenges facing Armenia. These challenges were: the use of excessive force by the police, ill-treatment in the armed forces and degrading treatment in custody combined with poor conditions of detention; corruption; and the lack of judicial independence. It welcomed the measures already taken by Armenia in these fields and also invited Armenia to ratify the Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence.

620. Ghana commended the commitment of Armenia to the UPR mechanism. It looked forward to the adoption of the amendments to the Criminal Code which would align the definition of torture with that contained in the Convention against Torture. It hoped that the support expressed by Armenia for the ratification of the ICRMW would be translated into action and that Armenia would accede to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court as soon as possible.

621. The Islamic Republic of Iran appreciated the willingness of Armenia to consider many of the recommendations which it had received, including all of those which the Islamic Republic of Iran had made. It commended the measures taken by Armenia, including the adoption of the Strategic Program on the Protection of the Rights of the Child. It was encouraged by the efforts of Armenia in addressing trafficking in persons and to and to eliminate domestic violence*.*

 3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

622. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Armenia, 5 other stakeholders made statements.

623. The national human rights institution, the Human Rights Defender, noted that processes were underway to address several of the issues it had raised in its submission to the UPR, but there were still serious challenges to be addressed. Although the legislation on freedom of assembly was in line with international standards, there were still cases of the improper policing of assemblies in practice. Aligning the definition of torture in the Criminal Code with international standards had been a positive development, nonetheless, the lack of effective investigation of cases of torture or ill-treatment remained a serious concern. The Defender also recommended providing video recording equipment in interrogation rooms as a potential tool for the prevention of ill-treatment in this stage. In a number of recorded cases, conditions of detention in the penitentiary institutions could be qualified as constituting inhuman and degrading treatment and the provision of healthcare inadequate. He also had concerns in the areas of child protection, including high rates of child poverty, the ineffective deinstitutionalization of children in care institutions and the inefficiency of custody and guardianship bodies. He was further concerned at the lack of comprehensive legislation to effectively combat domestic violence and provide protection, including shelters, for victims.

624. Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik appreciated that Armenia was one of the few countries that supported all recommendations during its first review, but regretted that this approach had changed in the second review. It referred to reports of the use of violence to oppress peaceful protests during the past weeks and of the arbitrary detention of journalists covering the protests. It called upon Armenia to stop violation of the right of freedom of peaceful assembly and to respect the rights of its citizens to access legal representation upon arrest. It insisted upon the enforcement of legislation against hate speech and discrimination in all forms by state officials and that Armenia ensure that the courts investigate hate-based cases fairly, objectively and comprehensively. It regretted that Armenia had missed the opportunity to begin the process of adopting a standalone law to prohibit discrimination and violence based on sexual orientation.

625. Human Rights House Foundation (HRHF) commented on the high number of repeated recommendations in the second review and considered that Armenia had taken insufficient steps to implement recommendations from the review. It stated that on 23 June 2015 excessive force was used against peaceful demonstrators, journalists and human rights defenders in Yerevan and called upon the government to investigate the excessive use of force by the police and those responsible accountable. It emphasized the need to ensure the independence of the judiciary and establish a system for the management of complaints of torture or ill-treatment by police and security forces. HRHF called for the effective implementation of the recommendations accepted and the presentation of a mid-term report. It also called upon the leaders in Armenia to publicly express support for the work of human rights defenders, especially when they were targets of violence of hate speech.

626. The International Catholic Child Bureau and Pax Romana noted that the recommendations related to the rights of the child had not been fully implemented. As the draft law on domestic violence is in progress it recalled the recommendation from Thailand to take measures to combat violence against children and expedite the adoption of the draft law. They also urged Armenia to amend its National Plan on the Protection of the Rights of the Child to incorporate specific measures aiming at preventing, protecting and assisting children at risk of sexual abuse. They further urged Armenia to implement the 2010 recommendation from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to make rape and sexual assault a criminal offence, as well as to take steps to sensitize public opinion in relation to child abuse issues, and ensure effective access to justice for victims.

627. Minority Rights Group welcomed Armenia's acceptance of the recommendations calling on the authorities to adopt a comprehensive anti-discrimination law the need for which was stressed by two treaty bodies and called for immediate steps toward the design and adoption of such a law, in cooperation with civil society organizations and representatives from marginalized groups. It welcomed the support extended by Armenia to most of the recommendations related to ethnic and national minorities, but was not encouraged by the rejectionof a recommendation from Namibia with the claim that “[t]here is no discriminatory treatment of ethnic minorities in Armenia”. It stated that the authorities must accept and recognize that discrimination of minorities is an issue, in order to be able to combat it. It echoed the expressions of concern over the use of excessive force by the police in the repression of peaceful demonstrations in Yerevan.

 4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

628. The President stated that, based on the information provided, out of 189 recommendations received, 155 enjoyed the support of Armenia, additional clarification had been provided on another 2 recommendations, and 32 were noted.

629. Turning to recent events in the country, Armenia regarded the interest shown as evidence of its partners’ interest in strengthening democracy in the country, an issue to which itremained committed. An inquiry was being undertaken by the competent authorities, the results of which would be shared with Armenia’s partners. The required steps were being taken to address deficiencies which the police had themselves already identified.

630. In conclusion, the Head of Delegation thanked all who had participated in the discussions and assured the meeting participants that their valuable contributions would be considered and appropriate measures taken. He recalled that Armenia’s positions were explained in more detail in the Addendum it had provided. The majority of the recommendations were useful for the consolidation of efforts in the country’s human rights agenda. He also reiterated Armenia’s human rights priorities. Work would continue in a collaborative manner, including civil society and international partners.

 Guinea-Bissau

631. The review of Guinea-Bissau was held on 23 January 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 Guinea-Bissau in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GNB/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GNB/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GNB/3).

632. At its 29th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Guinea-Bissau (see section C below).

633. The outcome of the review of Guinea-Bissau comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/12), the views of Guinea-Bissau 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/29/12/Add.1)*.

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

634. Guinea Bissau recalled that on 4 July 2015 the country would be celebrating the first anniversary of its return to constitutional order, after having once again, undergone a period of political instability from 2012 to 2014.

635. Throughout the year, the national authorities which were chosen following the free, fair and transparent elections of 2014, worked to define the country’s short, medium and long term priorities for the 2014-2015 period, reflecting this in the national strategy for development and poverty reduction and the strengthening of the rule of law.

636. The recommendations received in the context of the Universal Periodic review which addressed these issues, have been accepted by Guinea-Bissau. A certain number of these recommendations have already been implemented and others are in the process of being implemented. This reflects the country’s commitment in the field of the promotion and protection of human rights.

637. Guinea-Bissau informed the Human Rights Council that it had accepted a total of 147 recommendations of the 151 it had received during the review.

638. The Government stressed its efforts regarding, among others: the effective implementation of the domestic law on female genital mutilation and violence against women; the promotion of measures aimed at attaining gender equality in all spheres of society; improving access to education and health care; speeding up the modernisation and reform of the justice system, strengthening the fight against impunity and transnational organized crime.

639. Additionally, Guinea-Bissau welcomed the positive role played by civil society organizations in raising awareness on the protection and promotion of human rights in the country.

640. Finally, Guinea-Bissau reaffirmed its determination to strengthen its cooperation with the treaty bodies and expressed the hope that it would be able to count on the assistance of the international community in the support to its national efforts in the field of human rights.

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

641. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Guinea-Bissau, 19 delegations made statements.

642. Niger noted and welcomed the progress made since the previous cycle in the field of protection and promotion of human rights through the ratification of a large number of international legal instruments. Niger welcomed the adoption by Guinea Bissau of a number of legislative and regulatory texts to guarantee citizens’ access to justice including the decree law on the regulation of the organic law on the courts, its fights against repression and feminine genital mutilation, the law on prevention and against trafficking in persons, particularly women and children. It wished Guinea Bissau all the success in the implementation of its recommendations of the 2nd UPR cycle.

643. Portugal stated that the commitment of Guinea-Bissau to the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) was evidenced by its acceptance of 147 out of the 151 recommendations received. It welcomed that fact that Guinea-Bissau had accepted its recommendation to finalise the revision of the statutes of the National Human Rights Commission, in compliance with the Lisbon Declaration and Protocol of 2013 that created the network of national human rights institutions of the Community of Portuguese Language Countries (CPLP). It also noted the acceptance of its recommendation to strengthen its fight against female genital mutilation and forced child marriages. Portugal reiterated its willingness to continue working with Guinea-Bissau as all levels on the promotion and protection of human rights.

644. Rwanda welcomed the update given on developments in promoting and protecting human rights. It noted with appreciation that Guinea Bissau had accepted a large number of recommendations during the 2nd UPR cycle. Rwanda welcomed that its recommendations on creating conditions for the most vulnerable to have access to basic education and health services and improving detention conditions for all, particularly women and youth as well as promoting gender equality and women’s participation in public life had been given due consideration. Rwanda wished Guinea-Bissau the best in the implementation of their accepted recommendations.

645. Senegal appraised the positive progress made in the promotion of political, economic and social rights. It congratulated Guinea Bissau for having accepted its recommendations to enhance its fight against discrimination of women especially in the rural area and continue cooperation with the international community. It praised the ratification of several international instruments including the ICCPR, as well as the important reforms in the field of Defence and Security, the adoption of the law on family and advancement of women. Senegal called for the adoption of the Working Group report and urged the international community to provide technical and financial assistance.

646. Sierra Leone commended Guinea Bissau’s efforts to implement norms to better protect the rights of its citizens despite the major political challenges it faced in recent years. It highlighted the adoption of the Act on female genital mutilation, as well as the strategic plan to eliminate gender based-violence. Sierra Leone encouraged continuing its efforts towards consolidating democracy and the rule of law and the developments of the necessary infrastructure to provide free access to basic education for all, especially for girls and those in the most vulnerable communities.

647. Sudan thanked the comprehensive presentation and oral update from Guinea Bissau. It appreciated the positive engagement of Guinea Bissau with the Universal Periodic Review and the acceptance of its recommendations. It wished Guinea-Bissau all the success in the implementation of the accepted recommendations from the UPR.

648. Togo congratulated Guinea Bissau for commitment to respecting its international obligations despite the challenges it faced in the political and economic sphere. It praised the acceptance of the majority of the recommendations from the second UPR cycle. It invited the international community to provide its support for the implementation of the accepted recommendations.

649. Brazil expressed its appreciation for the Government’s efforts to ensure a constructive and fruitful participation in the second UPR cycle. It stressed the recent positive developments in different fields of human rights promotion and protection. Brazil congratulated the delegation for its acceptance of most of the second cycle recommendations. It reiterated its readiness to continue to cooperate through bilateral programs such as the one on the universalization of birth registration. Brazil acknowledged the progress made towards promoting the rule of law and fulfilling its human rights obligations.

650. Algeria welcomed the cooperation of Guinea Bissau with the UPR through the acceptance of 147 out of 151 made by the intervening States. It highlighted the acceptance of the two recommendations it made relating to the justice sector and reduction of poverty. Algeria praised the new national strategic plan on development and reduction of poverty for the period of 2015-2025. It recommended the adoption of Guinea Bissau’s UPR report.

651. Angola noted with satisfaction the normalisation of the social and political situation in Guinea-Bissau resulting in the realisation of free and fair elections. It noted that this climate of stability should lead to the strengthening of democracy and the rule of law, as well as the respect of fundamental rights. It appealed to the international community to continue to support the authorities of Guinea-Bissau for the success of current reforms. Angola congratulated Guinea-Bissau for having accepted the majority of the recommendations received during the UPR and recommended the adoption of the report.

652. Botswana noted with appreciation efforts made by Guinea-Bissau on reforms in the areas of defence, justice and security, which are crucial to the provision of legal assistance to victims of violence and the most vulnerable. It considered commendable the adoption of acts on domestic violence, female genital mutilation, trafficking in persons, and the national action plan on gender equality and equity.

653. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela expressed appreciation for efforts by Guinea-Bissau to implement accepted recommendations and its full and open cooperation with the UPR mechanism. It welcomed the responses provided in particular with regard to guaranteeing free health services for children under five, pregnant women and persons over sixty years of age. It noted that Guinea-Bissau had successfully completed it second review and demonstrated its work in the field of human rights, in particular in favour of vulnerable groups.

654. Burkina Faso welcomed the efforts made by Guinea-Bissau despite the grave crisis it faced in 2012. It particularly welcomed the return to constitutional order with the 2014 elections and encouraged the country to continue its efforts to create and strengthen democratic institutions. It congratulated Guinea-Bissau for creating centres for access to justice and creating a Fund in support of victims of violence. It also appreciated measures for the protection of the rights of women and children, in particular through the adoption of a strategy for the elimination of gender-based violence, the adoption of laws on domestic violence and female genital mutilation and human trafficking. It encouraged Guinea-Bissau to implement recommendations.

655. China welcomed Guinea-Bissau’s constructive engagement in the UPR and appreciated its pledge to implement accepted recommendations. It appreciated particularly Guinea-Bissau’s acceptance of its recommendations to step up the Government’s support to education and to include poverty reduction in its development strategy. It expressed the hope that the international community will provide Guinea-Bissau, after full consultation with that country, with urgently needed technical assistance and capacity building support.

656. Cuba noted that despite the serious challenges faced, Guinea-Bissau had demonstrated its serious commitment to making all possible efforts for the promotion and protection of human rights. It indicated that an important example was its fight against HIV/AIDS. Cuba called on the international community to continue supporting Guinea-Bissau in its fight against this scourge. Cuba stated that with the implementation of accepted recommendations the country would be in a better position in the promotion and protection of human rights.

657. Djibouti welcomed action taken by Guinea-Bissau to strengthen human rights protection, notably through its accession to most international and regional legal instruments. It encouraged Guinea-Bissau to continue its efforts to fight against female genital mutilation, maternal and child mortality and domestic violence.

658. Ethiopia expressed appreciation for Guinea-Bissau’s acceptance of a great number of recommendations from the second cycle including its own to further enhance efforts to reduce child and maternal mortality. It also appreciated Guinea-Bissau’s constructive engagement with the UPR mechanism and the progressive implementation of recommendations, noting in particular the National Policy of Equality and Gender Equity to improve the social, cultural and political status and economic advancement of women.

659. Ghana commended Guinea-Bissau for its continued commitment to the UPR mechanism. It congratulated the people of Guinea-Bissau on their celebration of the first anniversary of the return to constitutional order. It indicated the consolidation of the process of post conflict peace-building and reconstruction will provide a conducive environment for the promotion and protection of human rights in the country. It noted with appreciation that Guinea-Bissau had accepted Ghana’s recommendation to consider ratifying the ICRMW as well as to take steps to adopt all appropriate measures to combat the root causes of political instability in the country. It encouraged Guinea-Bissau to urgently consider the ratification of the Rome Statute as a part of the constitutional reform process.

660. Mali welcomed Guinea-Bissau’s positive cooperation with the Human Rights Council’s mechanisms and procedures. It congratulated Guinea-Bissau on progress achieved in re-establishing democracy and strengthening the rule of law and, in particular, for the holding of general elections in 2014. It further congratulated Guinea-Bissau for efforts made in the field of the reform of the justice system, and in particular the penitentiary system and the adoption of a strategic plan to fight against gender-based violence. It recommended the adoption of the report of Guinea-Bissau.

 3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

661. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Guinea-Bissau, one other stakeholder made a statement.

662. The Rencontre Africaine pour la Défense des Droits de l'Homme (RADDHO) transmitted a message from the widow of deceased President João Bernardo Vieira killed in 2009 in which she indicated that she cannot return to her country as her children want to know the truth about the murder of her husband and of his comrades. She asked that the member states of the Human Rights Council which defend the universal values of freedom and democracy aid Guinea-Bissau to end the cycle of impunity to build a State based on justice. She expressed the hope that Guinea-Bissau would effectively cooperate with the International Criminal Court and as well as special procedures mandate holders.

 4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

663. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 151 recommendations received, 147 enjoy the support of Guinea-Bissau while 4 are noted.

 Sweden

664. The review of Sweden was held on 26 January 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 Sweden in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/SWE/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/SWE/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/SWE/3).

665. At its 30th meeting, on 26 June 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Sweden (see section C below).

666. The outcome of the review of Sweden comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/13), the views of Sweden 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/29/13/Add.1)*.

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

667. The Swedish delegation, headed by Ambassador Jan Knutsson, stated that the consideration of the draft report of the Universal Periodic Review of Sweden was an event of great significance to the Government’s human rights work. It brought to a conclusion a period of hard work and active engagement with a process which had proved highly valuable.

668. The delegation stated that promoting and respecting human rights is a core value and priority for the Swedish Government and a cornerstone of its foreign policy. It welcomed the opportunity given by the Universal Periodic Review to engage in its human rights work with interested parties. The delegation underlined that ensuring respect for its international human rights obligations was a continuing process and that dialogue and scrutiny contributed to furthering the values, which Swedish society was based on.

669. In preparing for the review, the Government consulted civil society organisations, including organisations representing indigenous peoples and national minorities. Consultation meetings were held with stakeholders, both in Sweden and in Geneva and the draft national report was posted on the Government’s human rights website. Since the review in January, the Swedish Government had held a follow-up meeting with civil society. The dialogue with stakeholders would continue in the follow-up to the review.

670. The delegation stated that Sweden received 208 recommendations and accepted 154. Sweden underlined that it had wanted further time for the careful consideration of some of the issues raised in the review in January.

671. Several States had recommended that Sweden establish a national human rights institution. In that regard, the delegation stated that the Government had announced in its budget bill for 2015 that it would deliver a strategy for the systematic work for human rights to Parliament. One aspect of that strategy was to set out how an independent monitoring of the implementation of human rights in Sweden could be organised. It would include vesting a national institution with the competencies to promote and protect human rights in accordance with the Paris Principles.

672. Several States had made recommendations relating to racism, intolerance and discrimination. The delegation highlighted that the Government wanted Sweden to be an open and inclusive society, where people with roots in various parts of the world and of different religions could live side by side. Sweden sought to combat all forms of discrimination and crimes of a racist, xenophobic or homophobic nature that ran contrary to its fundamental values. Sweden would continue to counter such hate crimes.

673. The delegation stressed that Sweden had comprehensive legislation in place that prevented religious and racial profiling. It also had laws and regulations governing the use of personal data that applied in both the public and the private sector. The police were not allowed to register data solely on grounds concerning race, ethnic origin, political view or religion.

674. The delegation recalled that Sweden accepted the recommendation to adopt a national plan on combating crimes of hatred, racism, and xenophobia; and that the Government was paying continuous attention to those issues.

675. Concerning the ratification of the third Optional Protocol to the Convention of the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure, Sweden explained that several questions needed to be further analysed for the Government to take a final position. Concerning the recommendations on children in detention, the Government was considering appointing an Inquiry to examine the legal framework on pre-trial detention, such as alternative measures to pre-trial detention and measures to counteract the isolation of detainees. Sweden also noted that special attention should be given to the treatment of minors in pre-trial detention.

676. Some States recommended that Sweden incorporate the crime of torture as a specific criminal offense. On that question, Sweden explained that in June 2014, the Government had commissioned an independent inquiry to consider whether a specific provision on torture should be introduced in Swedish penal law. The report was due on 1 September 2015 and the Government had therefore chosen not to accept the recommendations at this point.

677. The delegation stated that more explanations to the 44 recommendations that were postponed for consideration was provided in the addendum to the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review. The Swedish government saw the Universal Periodic Review as part of its national endeavours to ensure systematic human rights work and that the recommendations received would be an important reference point.

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

678. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Sweden, 15 delegations made statements.

679. The Sudan commended Sweden’s engagement with the Universal Periodic Review process. It appreciated that Sweden accepted most of the recommendations presented during the second cycle, including the two recommendations made by Sudan to raise public awareness and to include human rights education in the school curricula as well as to eliminate any remaining forms of discrimination and xenophobia.

680. Viet Nam welcomed the developments in promoting and protecting human rights in Sweden since the last review. It appreciated that Sweden had accepted a majority of the received recommendations and looked forward to further efforts and seriousness in implementing all feasible recommendations. Viet Nam expressed the firm belief that Sweden would make greater efforts to ensure the enjoyment of all human rights for all of its people.

681. Albania stated that Sweden’s Universal Periodic Review outcomes had demonstrated that human rights were a core value and central priority of the Government, including its appreciation of the role of civil society. Albania congratulated Sweden on measures undertaken vis-à-vis organizations representing indigenous peoples and national minorities, in particular regarding the rights of the Sami Parliament, and on the Minerals Act and Ordinance Amendment in 2014, which was one of the Albanian recommendations. Albania complimented the work of the Swedish Government against discrimination of Roma by approving its national strategy, and on the process to incorporate the Convention on the Rights of the Child into national legislation and in continuing with the formulation of a third plan of action for human rights.

682. Algeria commended Sweden for accepting most of the recommendations made by States, including the three made by Algeria regarding the reduction of the gender pay gap, combating hate speech and crimes committed on the grounds of religious hatred as well as combatting racism, violence and discrimination against persons of African descent.

683. Angola congratulated Sweden on accepting most of the recommendations made, in particular those from its delegation. Angola encouraged Sweden to continue its cooperation with human rights mechanisms, and for the incorporation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child into national legislation.

684. Botswana commended Sweden for accepting a majority of recommendations made at the review. It noted with appreciation that Sweden accepted many recommendations on strengthening measures to address racial discrimination, xenophobia and hate speech. Botswana commended Sweden’s commitment to the protection of children’s rights, in particular for putting in place measures for granting residence permits to unaccompanied asylum seeking children.

685. Bulgaria encouraged the Government’s efforts to secure full respect for Sweden’s international human rights commitments. It encouraged Sweden to strengthen its efforts to combat discrimination, xenophobia and religious-based hate crimes and harassment, especially with regard to migrants. Bulgaria noted positively that Sweden had accepted the recommendations related to combating discrimination and hatred of foreigners, to promoting equal opportunities and enhancing strategies against discrimination faced by immigrants, refugees and minority groups, both ethnic and religious.

686. Burkina Faso stressed that Sweden had made considerable efforts to make human rights effective in Sweden particularly regarding the situation of migrants, asylum seekers, the rights of minorities, gender equality and child protection. Burkina Faso noted steps taken by Sweden to strengthen its legal, institutional and policy framework for the implementation of the first cycle Universal Periodic Review recommendations and encouraged Sweden to continue pursuing the implementation of accepted recommendations.

687. Chad welcomed the fact that Sweden had made the promotion and respect for human rights for all a fundamental value and a central priority of its Government. Chad noted with satisfaction that the Swedish authorities considered that there was no place for Anti-semitism, Anti-tziganism, Islamophobia or Afrophobia and that the police tirelessly struggled against hate crimes.

688. China commended Sweden for its active and constructive engagement with the second cycle of the Universal Periodic Review, and for its acceptance of most of the recommendations. China appreciated that Sweden had accepted China’s recommendations to commit itself to the promotion and protection of the rights of vulnerable groups, to enhance anti-discrimination awareness campaigns, and to adopt relevant national policies and laws. China hoped that Sweden could continue its efforts to provide more equal development opportunities for vulnerable groups.

689. The Council of Europe congratulated Sweden on its successful examination under the Universal Periodic Review. Council of Europe referred to three challenges raised in recommendations made to Sweden by its monitoring bodies. Firstly, that there was a need to ensure the protection of migrants expelled on account of national security without the right of appeal to an independent body. Secondly, reference was made to the challenge of discrimination based on age, religion and ethnicity, particularly of Roma and Sami. Finally, the Council of Europe stated that the extended isolation of prisoners and detainees should be an exceptional restriction rather than the rule.

690. Cuba expressed appreciation for Sweden’s responses to the recommendations made during the Working Group on which it had to take a position. Cuba noted that significant challenges remained such as discrimination and incitement to racial hatred, despite all measures adopted by Sweden to change the situation. Cuba was pleased that Sweden had accepted Cuba’s recommendations in that regard. Cuba deplored the fact that Sweden did not accept its recommendation to take concrete measures to guarantee access to evidence for persons deprived of their liberty, under any form. Cuba hoped that Sweden in implementing those recommendations could counter negative phenomena, which were sadly increasing in society, as Sweden recognized in the Universal Periodic Review report.

691. India commended Sweden’s receptive and constructive participation in the Universal Periodic Review and believed that Sweden had gained much from its participation in that review. India referred to the strong engagement of peer countries with as many as 89 delegations making statements and 208 recommendations, covering a range of issues. India was encouraged to note that Sweden accepted as many as 154 recommendations, including all four from India.

692. The Islamic Republic of Iran expressed concern that the prohibition of engagement in racist activities was not satisfactorily implemented; and that racist and xenophobic crimes against Roma and Sinti and hate crimes against minorities still persisted. It expressed serious concern that Muslims were targeted with harassment, verbal threats, sabotage and vandalism and noted that there were also discrepancies in health care provided to persons with disabilities.

693. Sierra Leonecommended Sweden for its on-going efforts to more effectively address the high rate of suicides. Sierra Leone further encouraged the Government to integrate the Convention on the Rights of the Child in national legislation and expressed the view that ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the International Convention on the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights would be beneficial and worthy of Sweden’s future consideration.

 3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

694. During the adoption of the outcome of the review, 4 other stakeholders made statements.

695. Verein Südwind Entwicklungspolitik (Südwind) commended Sweden’s commitment to protecting and promoting human rights. Südwind was concerned at reports of extremely long asylum procedures and that migration boards’ caseworkers had insufficient training and made severe errors in asylum assessments. Südwind stated that political asylum seekers in grave danger of arrest and other persecution in their home countries were often denied asylum in Sweden, based on so-called evidentiary shortcomings. Südwind strongly urged the Swedish authorities to abide by their obligations to the principle of *non-refoulement*. Südwind recommended that Sweden enhance measures to shorten the asylum process, provide caseworkers with sufficient education, provide clear guidelines as to the standard of proof in asylum assessments and on the use of homeland reports to make correct evaluations and eliminate discretionary assessments. Südwind stated that its observations were especially extended to asylum seekers from a specific third country.

696. Save the Children International welcomed the Government’s acceptance of recommendations to incorporate the Convention on the Rights of the Child in national legislation, the prioritization of children’s rights, combatting discrimination against children and ensuring children’s rights in judicial procedures. Save the Children regretted the Government’s rejection of the recommendations to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure. Save the Children reported that children in Sweden had no possibility to receive redress for rights’ violations without their guardian’s consent and were not seen as legal parties in cases that concerned them. Save the Children called on Sweden to provide the Ombudsman for Children with the mandate to receive individual complaints from children, without the consent of the legal guardian. Save the Children noted that no recommendations had been made on the disparities between municipalities and of support available to the most vulnerable children at the local level, which it reported was a major driver of inequalities between children. Save the Children called on the Government to take on the recommendation from the Committee on the Rights of the Child to establish a high level mechanism with a clear mandate and authority to ensure equal access to all rights at the regional and local levels, including sufficient resources for its effective operation by the end of 2016.

697. Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) welcomed Sweden’s acceptance of the recommendations to continue its work combating violence against women, while noting that on average 17 women and girls were killed each year by their partner and women’s shelters had denied support due to lack of resources. WILPF welcomed the increased funding for local women’s shelters announced in April 2015. WILPF strongly urged Sweden to redistribute resources from the military sector to human security in order to forcefully work to prevent gender-based violence. Noting the recommendations made to stop racism and to strengthen the rights of minorities, indigenous people and migrants, WILPF criticized and expressed worry at the opportunities for allegedly racist and fascist organizations to spread their ideology and hate through public manifestations and stated that the law against hate speech was not adequately enforced and few people were convicted. WILPF urged the Government to work to ensure people’s sense of safety by not allowing racist manifestations in public places and working actively against the increased influence of those movements within the democratic system. WILPF also recommended that a clear gender perspective be applied in that work to address the underlying problem of violent and stereotypical norms around masculinity which it believed were often at the centre of those movements.

698. Swedish Federation of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Rights (RFSL) recognized Sweden’s commitment to combat discrimination, including multiple discrimination. RFSL urged the Government to ensure especially that transgender persons were also protected by legal provisions on hate crimes and hate speech. While acknowledging Sweden’s acceptance of recommendations giving precedence to the principle of *non-refoulement* when considering the situation of asylum seekers, RFSL believed it was critical that the Government guarantee that the principle apply also to grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity. RFSL commended Sweden’s involvement of civil society in the Universal Periodic Review process and hoped for the continuous wide participation of such organizations in the implementation of accepted recommendations especially when they concerned Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Intersex and sexual and reproductive health rights’ issues. RFSL welcomed the Government’s acceptance of recommendations, including for establishing a national human rights institution in accordance with the Paris Principles, and noted that civil society would be following their implementation.

 4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

699. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 208 recommendations received, 154 enjoyed the support of Sweden, and 54 were noted.

700. The delegation concluded by thanking participants, the Troika and the Secretariat. It was particularly grateful for the interventions by non-state stakeholders and stated that the participation by stakeholders, including in the Universal Periodic Review process, is one of the true institutional strengths of the Council.

701. The delegation listed ongoing inquiries and initiatives regarding the future work for human rights in Sweden and the announcement in February 2015 of the development of a new strategy for human rights, democracy and the rule of law in Swedish Foreign Policy. Sweden stated that the work had started and would be conducted in close cooperation with civil society.

702. The delegation underlined that Sweden would closely consult with civil society and other stakeholders in the follow-up. The delegation also provided the information that follow-up would be a central part of the mandate of the Inter-Ministerial Working Group for Human Rights.

703. The delegation stated that Sweden would begin preparations for the Swedish mid-term report next year and that it looked forward to engaging with the Council ahead of its next review in 2019. The Swedish Government intended to maintain a high level of ambition regarding the implementation of human rights issues on a national level and the Universal Periodic Review process constituted a vital part of that work.

 Grenada

704. The review of Grenada was held on 26 January 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 Grenada in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GRD/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GRD/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GRD/3).

705. At its 30th meeting, on 26 June 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Grenada (see section C below).

706. The outcome of the review of Grenada comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/14 and Corr.1), the views of Grenada 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/29/14/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

707. On behalf of Grenada, the delegation presented Grenada’s response to the recommendations received during the second review by the UPR Working Group. The delegation thanked delegates who participated in the review and for their positive assessment of Grenada’s achievements in the area of human rights and their recognition of the challenges faced by small islands developing states such as Grenada.

708. Grenada also thanked the troika: Japan, Mexico and the United States of America for their assistance in compiling the recommendations and the support of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights.

709. Grenada welcomed the recommendations made at the occasion of its second cycle of the universal periodic review in January 2015. Subsequent to the review Grenada met with a broad based group of relevant stakeholders including the Grenada Human Rights Organization with a view to conducting an evaluation of the 104 recommendations that were received including a four year implementation plan to address the accepted recommendations.

710. Grenada was delighted to report that of the 104 recommendations received, 62 have been accepted and 42 have been noted. Grenada’s responses to the recommendations are organized according to thematic areas.

711. The accepted recommendations include the establishment of a National Human Rights Institution and in that regard, consultations have already begun on whether a national human rights institutions should be established or whether the office of the Ombudsman should be strengthened and expanded in accordance with the Paris Principles.

712. The Grenada Government accepts the recommendations dealing with the right to education and will continue to strengthen on-going initiatives within the education sector.

713. Accepted recommendations also include the thematic area of persons with disabilities. Grenada ratified the convention on the rights of persons with disabilities in 2014 and will continue to address the concerns of persons with disabilities in its jurisdiction.

714. Grenada could not support some recommendations, such as the abolition of the death penalty, however it is to be noted that a de facto moratorium on the death penalty has been in place in Grenada since 1978.

715. The recommendation to take temporary measures (quotas) to guarantee the equal representation in Parliament and government of women was not supported by Grenada, but they were pleased to draw the working group’s attention to the fact that Grenada is currently ranked 23 out of 142 democracies in the Inter-parliamentary Union world classification of “women in National Parliaments having 33.3% of women participation in parliament”. On average, women in Grenada make up 28% representation on public sector boards, 29.1% on trade union boards and 54% on NGO Boards.

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

716. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Grenada, 4 delegations made statements.

717. Sierra Leone commended the legal measures that Grenada has undertaken to improve human rights promotion and protection nationally. It took note with appreciation the on-going constitutional reform process, as well as the creation of a new Child Protection Act and the Education Act. Sierra Leone believed that implementing into national laws the proposals that best match their specific national concerns, such as policies to integrate climate change measures would be most beneficial, and would therefore encourage international partners to collaborate with Grenada and support its efforts. Sierra Leone encouraged Grenada to take the necessary steps to implement recommendations presented during the review process which enjoyed their support.

718. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela welcomed the commitment of Grenada to sharing information on progress made in the area of human rights. It highlighted that education is a priority for Grenada and valued positively the social programmes that support working parents. Venezuela recognized Grenada’s efforts in the field of human rights, as well as their cooperation with the universal periodic review mechanism.

719. China welcomed Grenada for providing feedback to the Human Rights Council on the recommendations of the universal periodic review and their commitment to implement the recommendations it has accepted. China thanked the delegation for accepting its recommendation committing to further improve the education standard and providing quality human resources to the economic and social development and further promoting poverty reduction achieving a balanced and inclusive growth. China is convinced that the commitment and efforts of Grenada will further contribute to the realization of all human rights, including economic, social and cultural rights and the right to development.

720. Cuba welcomed the delegation and commended Grenada for its efforts towards the implementation of recommendations from the first cycle of the universal periodic review mechanism, which reflect the commitment of Grenada to promote and protect human rights effectively in the country. Cuba recognized, inter alia, their work in the areas of education, to address poverty and the improvement of the health system. It considered that the international community should continue supporting Grenada, in accordance with their national priorities. Cuba encouraged to continue efforts to improve the education system and the rights of persons with disabilities.

 3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

721. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Grenada, no other relevant stakeholders made statements.

 4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

722. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 104 recommendations received, 62 enjoy the support of Grenada and 42 are noted.

723. In concluding, Grenada reaffirmed its commitment to the protection and promotion of human rights through the implementation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the human rights treaties to which the country is a party and the accepted UPR recommendations. Grenada is proud of its human rights record and with the support of the international community will continue to engage its citizens in the range of human rights issues.

724. On behalf of Grenada, the delegation expressed its appreciation to all delegations for their interventions, the Human Rights Council President, the Troika, namely Japan, Mexico and the United States of America, the UPR Secretariat and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, and all those that contributed to the smooth conclusion of the second review for Grenada. The delegation noted that their participation in the process will greatly assist in the promotion and protection of human rights in Grenada.

 Turkey

725. The review of Turkey was held on 27 January 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 Turkey in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/ TUR /1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/TUR/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/TUR/3).

726. At its 30th meeting, on 26 June 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Turkey (see section C below).

727. The outcome of the review of Turkey comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/15), the views of Turkey 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/29/15/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

728. H.E. Mehmet Ferden Çarıkçı, Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Turkey was pleased to address the HRC on the occasion of the adoption of the Outcome of Turkey’s second Universal Periodic Review. He stated that having the Deputy Prime Minister as Head of Delegation demonstrated the strong commitment of their Government to the UPR process at the second cycle review, conducted on 27 January 2015.

729. The Ambassador underlined that the UPR, inherently conducted in a constructive spirit and a non-politicized manner, presented a unique opportunity for further improvement of human rights.

730. The Ambassador reminded that during the adoption of its UPR Working Group report on 29 January, Turkey had accepted 199 out of the 278 recommendations and declared that responses to 52 recommendations would be provided in due course, while following a careful consideration by relevant authorities, Turkey was pleased to announce that, overall, out of the 278 recommendations, 215 enjoyed its support, some of them being considered to be already implemented. Proportionally, this meant that Turkey had accepted roughly 80% of the recommendations, which was a proof of strong commitment to the UPR.

731. The Ambassador shared that immediately after the second cycle review, Turkey acted decisively to establish a sound follow-up mechanism for the UPR recommendations in line with national human rights programmes. Accordingly, intra-governmental consultations had been held and the implementation of recommendations was decided to be followed by the Reform Action Group, which already played the leading role in Turkey’s human rights reform process. Turkey hoped that progress made with regard to the implementation would be reflected in their mid-term follow-up report, to be presented to the HRC in 2017.

732. Turkey always considered the protection and promotion of human rights as a priority for its own people. Turkey’s commitment to expanding the scope of fundamental rights and freedoms as well as upholding democracy and the rule of law continued unabated. Despite serious challenges endangering the stability in their region, Turkey had always opted for freedoms.

733. The Ambassador noted that the fact that the recent Parliamentary elections of June 7th were characterized by active and high participation, demonstrated again their commitment to democracy and holding democratic elections.

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

734. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Turkey, 17 delegations made statements. The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints[[49]](#footnote-50) are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.

735. Honduras welcomed Turkey’s transparent and constructive approach all along the UPR process and it reiterated its recommendations hoping that they will be accepted. Honduras urged Turkey to redouble its efforts to improve the human rights situation and to maintain the same willingness and commitment deployed in the implementation of the recommendations received at the first UPR cycle.

736. India commended Turkey for the review that reflected the high participation of peer countries addressed recommendations that cover a range of Human Rights both in the realm of promotion and protection. India was encouraged to note that Turkey accepted 22 recommendations including theirs. India believed that Turkey would continue with its efforts to implements the recommendations accepted by it in the coming years.

737. Kuwait thanked Turkey for its detailed report and welcomed Turkey’s acceptance of most of the recommendations which reflect its commitment to human rights and through effective legislative measures. It welcomed the creation of the NHRI in 2012, as well as Turkey’s accession to a number of human rights conventions. It also appreciated efforts made by Turkey in hosting Syrian refugees and granting them fundamental rights.

738. Oman welcomed the delegation of Turkey and appreciated their presentation. They appreciated the presentation that reflected the serious commitment to the effective tools to enhance human rights in accordance with the international mechanisms and international standards. It commended Turkey for its acceptance of numerous recommendations including recommendations presented by Oman.

739. Pakistan appreciated the steps taken to implement Turkey’s human rights obligations including through strengthening of empowerment and to eliminate discrimination against women. Pakistan highly valued Turkey’s commitment with the UPR process, which is well reflected through its decision to accept the majority of recommendations including theirs, and they wished them success in implementation through necessary administrative and legislative measures.

740. Rwanda thanked the delegation of turkey for their update on recommendations, and recognized the positive engagement by turkey with the Human Rights Council in the UPR process. Rwanda toke notes with appreciation of the fact that Turkey accepted a significant number of recommendations; this indicates a great commitment in promoting and protecting human rights.

741. Sierra Leone noted with interest Turkey’s intention to establish a new human rights mechanism as part of the Government’s political commitment. Sierra Leone also noted the high number of recommendations accepted by Turkey and was especially pleased to observe that all of the recommendations it presented enjoyed Turkey’s support. Sierra Leone wished to encourage Turkey to implement into national norms the recommendations which they accepted, and if possible, integrate them in the judicial reform process.

742. Sudan welcomed the delegation of Turkey and thanked them for the information provided. It noted with satisfaction the positive engagement of Turkey with the UPR process. It appreciated Turkey’s acceptance of most of the recommendations including theirs. It also wished all the success to Turkey in the implementation of the accepted recommendations.

743. The Syrian Arab Republic reminded that during the general debate under item 6 Turkey stressed that the UPR should not be used for politicization of matters relating to human rights, while contrary to that and during its review, Turkey rejected the recommendations made by Syria which were made in line with the relative documents. They regretted that Turkey politicized the UPR, as they were either rejected because they were made by a certain state or unwillingness to comply with binding resolutions on countering terrorism, the language of Syria’s recommendations.

744. Tajikistan noted the constructive participation of Turkey in the UPR process which demonstrates the state party's readiness to implement its international commitments as well as to cooperate with the international human rights mechanisms. Tajikistan noted the implementation of significant measures on improving the situation in the area of legislative reform, the protection of women, and the promotion of education.

745. Togo congratulated Turkey for its attachment to the universal values of human rights and its full adhesion to the UPR mechanism. Togo welcomed the openness and transparency which have marked the second review of Turkey and noted with satisfaction that the three recommendations it had proposed were accepted.

746. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (UK) welcomed Turkey’s acceptance of a number of recommendations, particularly its recommendation of ensuring freedom of expression and assembly. It welcomed steps taken to protect the rights of minority religious groups, and encouraged making further efforts. It reiterated the importance of respecting fundamental rights and proceeding with legislative reforms. It commended Turkey for hosting around two million refugees from Syria and Iraq, and expected to work closely with the new Turkish government.

747. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela valued Turkey’s efforts in the implementation of the recommendations it had received through the creation and starting of new mechanisms for the protection of human rights such as the Ombudsman Office, the National Human Rights Institution in conformity with the Paris Principles and the system of constitutional appeal. Venezuela also appreciated policies to guarantee the right to education, and access to it through equal conditions and opportunities.

748. Afghanistan was encouraged with the significant number of accepted recommendations, particularly the Constitutional amendments of September 2010 by bringing the system in line with its international obligations and by introducing positive changes to women, children, elderly and people with disability. They took note of the progress in establishing the “Law Enforcement Oversight Commissions” which will function independently from law enforcement bodies to examine and investigate allegations of ill-treatment made by law enforcement officials.

749. Albania commended Turkey on its successful measures undertaken in the field of protection and promotion of human rights considering them as political priorities. Albania complimented the “Judicial reform packages” (JRP) which introduced substantial legislative amendments with the aim of strengthening the further improvements in the freedom of expression. Albania appreciated Turkey’s acceptance of their recommendation namely on adoption of a law against different types of discrimination, on measures required in accordance with the “National Strategy on Children’s Rights and its Action Plan” and on the “ National Action plan for Gender Equality”.

750. Azerbaijan took positive note of accepting the majority of the recommendations including those by Azerbaijan. They commended the commitment to human rights and applauded the establishment of the Ombudsman Institution and Human Rights Institution, and the adoption of the JRP and Democratization Package which aimed at strengthening the independence and impartiality of the judiciary, and provide wide-spectrum of human rights and freedoms. They appreciated the legal and administrative arrangements to serve a better understanding among all peoples and religions.

751. Qatar thanked Turkey for the information provided, in which Turkey considers that strengthening human rights is an important political goals it aims to achieve. It welcomed Turkey’s cooperation with the UPR mechanism and the HRC to fulfill its obligations, which was reflected by accepting 215 recommendations, including those two presented by Qatar. It also thanked the role of the Turkish permanent representative in the work of the Council through the follow-up of Istanbul track related to the implementation of resolution 16/18.

 3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

752. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Turkey, 11 other stakeholders made statements. The statements of the stakeholders that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints[[50]](#footnote-51) are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.

753. Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik regretted that Turkey declined Cyprus recommendations. They noted extensive reports on the grave situation of refugees and their asylum process, living and working conditions. Sudwind appreciated Turkey’s continued support for Syrian refugees but noted the failure to report on asylum seekers rights. It was concerned with the living and working conditions of Iranian refugees, LGBTI persons, political prisoners, and women victims of domestic violence and discrimination as these minority groups are in danger of prosecution and vulnerable. Sudwind noted reports of shortcomings regarding the CRMW, particularly their enjoyment of the right to work and heath care, in addition to the issue of child labor amongst refugees.

754. Minority Rights Group (MRG) regretted the selective and discriminatory conception of minority rights. Based on Lausanne treaty, Turkey recognizes only Armenians, Jews and Greek Orthodox as minorities. Muslim minorities, including the large Kurdish community, are excluded from the definition. MRG regretted rejecting recommendations calling on the ratification of the UNESCO Convention against discrimination in education and to maintain its reservation on article 27 of the ICCPR. It regretted the rejection of recommendation of France to end mandatory religion courses for Alevis, and urged removing compulsory religious classes from the curriculum. They called for more efforts to ensure the right to education of most disadvantaged communities, such as displaced Kurds and Roma.

755. Joint statement of International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission and Co-sponsored with International Lesbian and Gay Association welcomed Turkey’s positive approach to recommendations regarding sexual orientation and gender identity. It urged Turkey to bring domestic laws in line with international conventions to protect LGBT individuals. It informed with concern that leading figures of political party in Turkey made homophobic discourses, and a number of individuals were killed due to their gender identity. It urged supporting initiatives in the HRC regarding the rights of LGBT individuals.

756. Syriac Universal Alliance, the Federation Syriaque International welcomed Turkey’s acceptance of the recommendations regarding human rights, minority rights and anti-discrimination measures and legislations to ensure equality to all citizens. Remained concerned that Turkey’s report does not address the struggle of the Aramean (Syriac) people. It called on Turkish government to give the Aramean people legal status, take measures to protect the Aramean people’s cultural heritage, property rights, and Aramaic language, increase investment to improve their living standards, and to preserve their habitat and population.

757. Action Canada for Population and Development made statement in collaboration with the Sexual Rights Institute. It regretted that Turkey did not accept some recommendations presented. It welcomed Turkey’s acceptance of recommendations including ensuring gender equality and all women’s access to safe abortion, combating early marriage, and preventing gender violence. It urged Turkey to amend its law and take a series of measures to guarantee women’s right to abortion, and provide comprehensive sex education to promote gender equality.

758. Article 19 thanked states who made recommendations on freedom of expression including decriminalizing defamation and amending the Internet Law to end illegitimate censorship. It questioned Turkey’s claim of media pluralism with cases of illegitimate arrests of journalists. Particularly it was concerned about the arrest of an editor which involved Turkish President. It noted the devastating effect of harassment and prosecution of media workers, and called on Turkey to ensure freedom of expression and right to fair trial.

759. Gazeteciler ve Yazarlar Vakfi took note of Turkey’s commitment to improve women’s rights and bring national law in compliance with international standards. While noting that Turley was signatory of the Istanbul Protocol, the Foundation stated that the increase in violence against women and feminicide in recent years indicated that this phenomenon is part of a structural problem. The Foundation called Turkey to: consider gender-sensitive education; avoid that media use a discriminatory language against women; avoid that senior State officials use discriminatory language against women; implement effectively ratified international human rights conventions; avoid reduced sentences for perpetrators of violence against women.

760. Organisation pour la Communication en Afrique et de Promotion de la Cooperation Economique Internationale - OCAPROCE Internationale welcomed Turkey’s initiatives like the 2015 review of the national plan of action on domestic violence against women, the 2014 project for the elimination of domestic violence against women in collaboration with the European Union, and the creation of a national council for surveying and coordinating women employment. OCAPROCE remained concerned at women’s conditions and urged adopting a comprehensive legislation on discrimination against women, including a clear definition of this crime.

761. Africa Culture International Human Rights valued the initiatives undertaken by Turkey since 2010. More recently, in 2013, Turkey adopted a democratization package introducing broad reforms to improve the enjoyment of civil and political human rights. A plan of action for the prevention of human rights violations has been adopted in 2014, together with the law on the reinforcement of social integration. A number of measures have been taken to improve human rights training and awareness, and cooperation with international organizations. Africa Culture International Human Rights encouraged Turkey to continue with its engagement in the various areas of development.

762. Jubilee Campaign and Christian Solidarity Worldwide urged Turkey to implement the recommendations received in the 2015 review, especially those related to freedom of expression and freedom of religion. While noting that Turkey accepted a number of recommendation made on freedom of expression at its first UPR, they were concerned at the situation of journalists and social media in the light of current legislation and practice, and it called on removing reservations to Article 27 of the ICCPR with a view to protect religious minority groups and remove a number of legislative measures penalizing them. It also encouraged reviewing anti-terrorism law and to ensure a civilian alternative to military service with no discriminatory effects.

763. Amnesty International (AI) noted that Turkey accepted a number of general recommendations; however, the more specific recommendations addressing these challenges have been rejected or considered “already implemented”, similar to the first UPR where it accepted a number of recommendations which have since deteriorated. AI was disappointed the position on recommendations to amend or abolish laws which are used to unfairly limit freedom of expression. They noted hundreds of abusive prosecutions against journalists, activists and ordinary people, for criticizing the government. They urged bringing its laws in line with international standards on freedom of expression and recognise the right to peaceful assembly. AI was surprised that Turkey considered a recommendation to redraft the Law on Meetings and Demonstrations as implemented, in contradiction to the findings of the European Court of Human Rights.

 4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

764. The President stated that based on the information provided, out of the 278 recommendations received, 215 enjoyed the support of Turkey and 63 were noted.

765. The Ambassador thanked those who presented comments, nevertheless, he expressed his regret that there were attempts to divert the focus of this very important discussion. He stated that universal values such as democracy, human rights and fundamental freedoms are an inseparable part of Turkey’s legislation, and perhaps more crucially, are deeply ingrained in its social fabric. Therefore, regarding the implementation of those universal values, any constructive advice or criticism was welcomed. He noted however that Turkey expected critical advice coming from parties that had adopted the very same universal and common values with them. Otherwise, the result could be an unwanted politicization of the UPR.

766. The Ambassador stated that the scope of fundamental rights and freedoms in Turkey had considerably expanded. Minority rights were regulated in accordance with the 1923 Lausanne Peace Treaty, which recognized non-Muslim Turkish nationals as minorities. No other definition of minorities existed in Turkey based on ethnicity, race, language or other grounds. Turkish citizens belonging to non-Muslim minorities are entitled to the same rights and freedoms as other nationals and are also able to enjoy minority rights accorded to them under the Lausanne Peace Treaty.

767. The Ambassador shared the important achievements made over the last five years regarding education in different languages and dialects and said that Literature Institutes had been established in a number of universities. Restrictions on political propaganda in different languages and dialects had been lifted and restoring the old names of villages had been enabled. Positive steps were taken in the field of education and culture for non-Muslim citizens. Among others, it has become possible to teach Syriac language on certain days of the week at a kindergarten belonging to a Syriac community foundation in addition to the curriculum of the Ministry of National Education.

768. The Ambassador highlighted the progress made in recent years on the protection of the property rights of religious foundations. He provided testimonies of Turkey’s goodwill and commitment to address the religious freedom and social life requirements of various groups in Turkey.

769. The Ambassador stated that over the last five years, developing democratic relations based on equality, regardless of one’s identity, had been their basic philosophy. To this end, new efforts had been made to ensure equality in practice and combating discrimination. No discriminatory provisions existed in Turkish law with regard to LGBTI persons. Equality before the law had been laid down in Article 10 of the Constitution. The absence of specific provisions in respect of the LGBTI did not mean that the rights of this group are not legally guaranteed. Moreover, pursuant to Article 90 of the Constitution, international agreements ratified by Turkey such as the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence (İstanbul Convention) which prohibited discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation, bore the force of law. Investigations were carried out upon cases of killings and acts of violence towards LGBTI persons and all kinds of hate crimes for the identification of perpetrators and to bring them to justice. He stated that Turkey was vigilant in eliminating violence against women and domestic violence and their efforts were guided by the İstanbul Convention.

770. The Ambassador stated that in order to address the demands of the Alevite community, open debates were regularly organized with opinion leaders and community representatives, including on issues related to Cemevis.

771. The Ambassador noted that the law commonly referred to as Internal Security Package, recently entered into force, was adequate with the universal principles. Utmost care was given in order to strike a balance between freedom and security. He underlined that, some provisions are intended for the effective fulfilment of the obligations to ensure the implementation of laws as in any state governed by the rule of law, to fight against crimes and offenders, to locate the offenders and bring them to justice, and to ensure public order and peace in the community.

772. The Ambassador addressed comments about freedom of expression and the media as Turkey had taken decisive steps in recent years both in law and in practice to expand its scope. Most important examples were the third and fourth JRPs adopted in 2012 and 2013, which brought about the release of many detainees. With respect to media organizations, a complete pluralism existed in Turkey. In addition to the national channels, there were a total of 221 private television channels. Among more than 4000 newspapers, 66 were national. The Ambassador maintained that imprisonment of journalists for their journalistic work should not be tolerated, at the same time; a person could not be considered immune from prosecution because of his/her profession, if he/she was guilty of committing a crime. He underlined that no journalist was prosecuted or imprisoned on account of journalistic work. All those referred to as “journalists in prison” had been charged with serious crimes. He reiterated that none of these persons were prosecuted for their journalistic work or be qualified as politically motivated. This is a purely judicial matter.

773. The Ambassador stressed that Turkey would keep on addressing challenges with courage and try to find solutions based on goodwill and stand firm to pursue its close cooperation with the UN, including their constructive engagement with the UPR.

774. Finally, he expressed his gratitude to the Troika members, namely Cuba, Gabon and Saudi Arabia, as well as to the Secretariat of the OHCHR and to the interpreters for their dedicated contribution to Turkey’s UPR process.

 Guyana

775. The review of Guyana was held on 28 January 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 Guyana in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GUY/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GUY/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/GUY/3).

776. At its 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Guyana (see section C below).

777. The outcome of the review of Guyana comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/16), the views of Guyana 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/29/16/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

778. The delegation of Guyana expressed its gratitude to the Human Rights Council and its President for the opportunity to present its response to the remaining recommendations made on Guyana’s presentation.

779. The delegation drew the Council’s attention on the recent occurrences in Guyana which preceded this presentation. It stated that Guyana held its national and regional elections on May 11 2015 which saw the incumbent Government of Guyana being replaced by a multi-party coalition. It stated that elections were free, fair, with a clear majority for the current Government and that the actual process was held as transparent and very successful by international observers. It expressed that the new Government, which was sworn into Parliament on June 10 2015, was committed to all aspects of the human development of the Guyanese people from political freedoms and empowerment, to their sustainability and human security, and endeavours to work fervently towards the improvement of the lives of the Guyanese citizenry.

780. The delegation asserted the Government of Guyana was ready to work with its international partners for the development of all Guyanese in pursuit of its national objectives and goals and international obligations and responsibilities.

781. The delegation affirmed Guyana was determined to refashion the society into one that promulgates social and economic advancement. In pursuit of this, the Government had undertaken to introduce measures to promote social cohesion and protection of vulnerable groups, secure economic development, implement policies that would equip the young people of Guyana to attain higher educational standards to ensure that their time and talents were not wasted but were spent instead on gainful employment; for a society in which women and girl children could look forward to living in safety and to being protected from abuse and violent crime; where there was equal development for indigenous peoples, press freedom and freedom of access to information was enjoyed, in an atmosphere of national peace and security.

782. The delegation also noted the Government was commitment to working assiduously in the Eleventh Parliament on the issues which would positively impact national development and the welfare of the people of the Cooperative Republic of Guyana.

783. The delegation then responded to the recommendations as follows, as referred to in its Addendum:

784. On recommendations regarding right to life and death penalty, Guyana noted these recommendations because the death penalty was still part of the laws of Guyana. A de facto moratorium had been in place since 1997 and as a result over 15 prisoners on death row had had their sentence commuted to life imprisonment and some of them would be coming up for parole in the next 3 years. The death penalty was retained in limited cases such as murder of a police officer on duty or treason. The delegation also asserted that it was anticipated that the matter would continue to engage the attention of the Parliamentary Special Select Committee in the recently convened 11th Parliament.

785. On women’s rights, Guyana noted the related recommendations and stated it was committed to the observance of rights of women as set out in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and incorporated into domestic law in the Constitution of Guyana. It stated that however, it was the view of the Government that the Women and Gender Equality Commission and other Human Rights Commissions established by the Constitution as well as the Supreme Court of Guyana provided easily accessible and timely relief where it was alleged that a right had or was being violated.

786. On the American Convention on Human Rights (ACHR), the delegation pointed out the related recommendation was noted, and that Guyana was committed to the observance of human rights and the promulgation of the principles of the Charter of the Organisation of American States and that most of these rights were already enshrined in Guyana’s Constitution. However, Guyana was not in a position to become a State Party to the ACHR at this juncture as outstanding issues including the position on the death penalty and LGBT needed to be resolved. These were expected to engage the attention of the Eleventh Parliament. Nevertheless, Guyana was confident that adequate safeguards exist to protect the fundamental and human rights of all Guyanese.

787. Regarding recommendations on torture, the delegation stated Guyana noted them. It explained that Guyana strictly prohibited torture and mistreatment of detainees and inmates. The Government of Guyana had publicly gone on record and condemned any form of abuse and torture and repeatedly demanded that any allegation of torture and mistreatment of citizens, including prisoners, must be expeditiously investigated and action taken against defaulting ranks. It added that the Police Office of Professional Responsibility and Criminal Investigation Department, along with the recently strengthened Police Complaints Authority and the Chambers of the Director of Public Prosecutions had all been playing a pivotal role in the prevention and prosecution for torture.

788. On enforced disappearance, Guyana noted the related recommendation and stated it had initiated the relevant consultation processes to accede to the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

789. Regarding the recommendation on Genocide, Guyana noted it and stated that it recognized that the crime of genocide was reprehensible and condemned by the civilized world. The delegation also reminded that Guyana was a party to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court which criminalises genocide.

790. On the recommendation related to the International Criminal Court, the delegation expressed that Guyana noted the recommendation and that, as a party to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, it was cognisant of the obligations arising therefrom and undertook to enact the relevant laws.

791. On recommendations regarding the national human rights institution, Guyana accepted them and asserted that the Constitution of Guyana established a Human Rights Commission, a Woman and Gender Equality Commission, an Indigenous People’s Commission, a Right of the Child Commission and an Office of the Ombudsman.

792. In relation to cooperation with special procedures, Guyana noted the related recommendations, and considered there was willingness on Guyana’s part to accommodate and cooperate with all UN bodies but that however, a commitment for a standing invitation to all special procedures might not be within the capacity of the government at this time.

793. Regarding the recommendation on women, peace and security, Guyana accepted it and underscored it will continue to make every effort to safeguard the women and children from the effects of conflict and violence.

794. Guyana noted the recommendations related to LGBT discrimination and expressed that the Government undertook to reconvene the Parliamentary Special Select Committee to receive and hear submissions on the attitude of the Guyanese to any changes in legislative provisions and the criminal laws regarding consensual adult same sex relationships and discrimination, perceived or real, against Lesbians, Gays, Bi-Sexual and Transgender persons.

795. On children and corporal punishment the delegation stated that the related recommendations were noted by Guyana, and asserted that the Government undertook to reconvene the Parliamentary Special Select Committee to receive and hear submissions on the attitude of Guyanese to any changes in legislative provisions permitting corporal punishment. It added that substantial public consultations on the issue had already been completed and that there was in place a Manual of Guidelines for the Maintenance of Order and Discipline in Schools which significantly curtailed the instances in which corporal punishment could be administered. It mentioned that the Training School (Amendment) Act 2010 and the Juvenile Offenders (Amendment) Act 2010 abolished corporal punishment in juvenile correctional institutions and that the Child Care and Development Services Act (2011) also prohibited corporal punishment in institutional residences.

796. Regarding the recommendation about the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure, Guyana noted this recommendation and expressed its wish to remind that the protection of children was given the highest priority. The delegation mentioned that the Protection of Children Act 2009 provided several avenues for protection of children. There was also the Childcare and Protection Agency within the Ministry of Social Protection and Schools Welfare Department within the Ministry of Education which oversaw the best interests of children in Guyana.

797. On an independent organ to investigate complaints of abuses by members of the security forces, the delegation stated Guyana accepted this recommendation and explained that Parliamentary oversight was provided in this area by the Security Sectorial Committee. The Office of Professional Responsibility and the Police Complaints Authority were also independent organs which investigated complaints of wrongdoing by members of the Guyana Police Force. Reports of all investigations were forwarded to the Director of Public Prosecutions for legal advice.

798. On the age of criminal responsibility, Guyana noted the related recommendations and stated that a draft legislative instrument addressing Juvenile Justice was under consultative review by the Government of Guyana, after which definitive consideration would be given to these matters.

799. Regarding online freedom of expression and defamation, Guyana noted this recommendation and reminded that freedom of expression was enshrined in Article 146 of the Constitution of the Co-operative Republic of Guyana. The Government of Guyana acknowledged that modernization of local laws was required and that it would explore this area in due course.

800. Regarding quality education and dropout rates, Guyana accepted the related recommendations and asserted that the Government would continue to engage various stakeholders, including parents, to significantly reduce the school dropout rate and improve the quality of education as set out in the Ministry of Education Strategic Action Plan 2014-2018.

801. Finally, regarding the quality of life for indigenous people, Guyana accepted the related recommendations and affirmed it had initiated the relevant consultation processes to sign and ratify the Indigenous People’s Convention. The delegation noted that the Amerindian Act of 2006 relied on the Convention and that there were several ongoing programmes to improve the lives of Guyana’s Indigenous people.

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

802. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Guyana 7 delegations made statements.

803. Brazil recognized advances which took place in the country, particularly the fact that Guyana had filled the vacant position of constitutional Ombudsman, as well as the launching of “the Amerindian Act 2006”, an important tool for the empowerment of the indigenous peoples of the country. It congratulated Guyana for accepting the majority of the recommendations received, and reiterated that their implementation constituted an important guidance to step up progress on the realization of human rights in the country. Brazil reiterated its commitment to support Guyana in the fulfilment of the recommendations received, both in the multilateral field and in the framework of regional and bilateral cooperation mechanisms.

804. China welcomed Guyana’s constructive engagement with UPR process, and appreciated Guyana’s timely feedback and acceptance of most recommendations made during the process. China thanked the delegation for accepting China’s recommendation to continue to increase the inputs of financial and human resources into education so as to improve quality of education and reduce dropout rates and its recommendation to continue to strengthen the construction of drinking water and basic sanitation facilities to provide better basic services for its people. China encouraged Guyana, in accordance with its national development plans to gradually implement the accepted UPR recommendations and called upon the international community in full consultation with Guyana, to provide it with the necessary support.

805. Cuba thanked for the information on the position of recommendations as well as the acceptance of the two recommendations delivered by Cuba, which were made with a view to increasing the advance of the country in the fight against poverty and in gender equality.

806. Ghana was gratified to note that its recommendation to ratify the UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education as well as to implement measures aimed at building an all-inclusive society enjoyed the support of Guyana. It commended Guyana for initiating steps to ratify and accede to several conventions, including the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol. It stated that these achievements demonstrated Guyana’s commitment to promoting and protecting the fundamental freedoms and rights of its people. Ghana looked forward to the abolition of corporal punishment in Guyana soon, in keeping with the letter and spirit of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Ghana reiterated its call for Guyana to favourably consider ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture and to establish a national Human Rights Institution in full compliance with the Paris Principles, and to issue a standing invitation to all special procedures.

807. India took positive note of the receptive and constructive manner in which Guyana participated in the UPR mechanism. The review reflected the intense participation and engagement by peer countries, with as many as 54 interventions delivered from the floor and 143 recommendations made. It trusted that Guyana would further intensify its efforts to implement the recommendations accepted by it in the coming years.

808. UNICEF welcomed initiatives by the Government to review the issue of corporal punishment, review the draft Juvenile Justice Bill, and continue the investments in health, education, housing and water as a means of ensuring the bridge in income and other inequality rations. Further, it commended Guyana for prioritising the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and looked forward to join efforts in the implementation of this Convention, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and other human rights treaties related to children. To accelerate progress for children of Guyana, UNICEF reiterated its commitment on the following issues: the legal removal of corporal punishment in all settings; the Parliamentary approval of CRC compliant juvenile justice legislation, the implementation of the Sexual offences Act and the Domestic Violence Act- as part of the action to systematically prevent and treat the issue of violence (especially against children and women); the articulation and implementation of child-sensitive and pro-poor policies which would offer a better chance of ensuring equity for all; and the full implementation of the Maternal, Perinatal and Integrated Child Health Strategy and prevention of Vector-Borne, other communicable diseases. It also mentioned emerging issues such as possible exploitation of children in the natural resources and business sectors and issues surrounding participation rights, especially of youth and LGBTQ youth and those matters raised in the Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child in 2013.

809. The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela highlighted efforts by Guyana in the fight against poverty, with the implementation of the Program for Poverty Reduction 2011-2015, which facilitated equal access to goods and services to those in more need, therefore increasing the quality of life of its people. It highlighted that Guyana had complied with the objective of eliminating gender disparity in education, which was free from pre-scholar level. Venezuela affirmed that the open participation of the Government in this review confirmed its commitment to advance towards the full enjoyment of the fundamental rights of its people.

 3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

810. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Guyana, 3 other stakeholders made statements.

811. The Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative (CHRI) welcomed Guyana’s affirmation to consider establishing a national human rights institution, and encouraged it to seek support from the Commonwealth Secretariat, which had previously helped countries in the Caribbean and Americas region on the same subject. It stated that a national human rights institution would also help keep a closer track of Guyana’s engagement with UN human rights mechanisms and hopefully avoid delays in complying with reporting obligations. For instance, Guyana was scheduled next year to submit a report to the UN Committee against Torture next year and to comply with this obligation it must take measures to the tune of empowering the national institution with independent investigative authority and issue a standing invitation to the UN Special Rapporteurs. It also referred to the government’s efforts to hold consultations on issues concerning sexual orientation and gender identity, and stated that earlier this year the Government had confirmed that the designated parliamentary committee was facing challenges in reaching consensus over the issue of decriminalising same sex relations. CHRI requested the appropriate UN agencies and offices to support Guyana in order to address the intricacies and reach positive outcomes on this subject. Finally, CHRI congratulated Guyana for having ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities last year and positively hoped that it would ratify other conventions such as the convention against enforced disappearances, and the optional protocol to the convention against torture before next UPR cycle.

812. Action Canada was deeply concerned by the failure of the government to provide an addendum report that responded to recommendations concerning decriminalisation of adult consensual same-gender sexual activity. Action Canada was pleased to note that recommendations 130.25 to 130.27 calling for the strengthening of protection measures for LGBT people, the investigation of hate crimes and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity enjoyed the support of Guyana. However, measures to achieve these recommendations would not be effective as long as homophobia was State-sponsored through legislation and the criminalisation of same-gender sexual activity. It underscored that the lack of respect for the right to equality and non-discrimination for LGBT people in Guyana reinforced stigma and discrimination, abuse and violence to the relevant authorities. It urged the Government of Guyana to adopt a holistic approach when dealing with violations of human rights, and to repeal laws that criminalise persons based on their gender or sexual orientation of consensual activity, and affirm the rights of persons marginalised based on sexual and gender norms. Action Canada further urged the Government to take a strong stand or position towards equality and non-discrimination by making a suitable amendment to the Constitution.

813. Amnesty International expressed concern that death sentences continued to be imposed in Guyana, and mentioned that at least five people were sentenced to death in 2013 and as of June 2014 there were reportedly 14 people on death row. It stated that during the review of Guyana a large number of recommendations called for the abolition of the death penalty. It noted Guyana’s remarks in this session and welcomed Guyana’s acceptance of some of the recommendations. Amnesty International urged Guyana to implement all the recommendations on the death penalty in full and without delay. It also welcomed Guyana’s acceptance of recommendations to strengthen the protection of LGBTI persons, including by taking measures to ensure that hate crimes and discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity were vigorously investigated and appropriately prosecuted. It stated that currently national legislation did not provide protection from discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. It underscored that moreover, Guyana continued to criminalize consensual same-sex conduct, and that this legislation created a discriminatory environment in which LGBTI persons were not able to fully enjoy their human rights. Amnesty International urged the Government to implement with immediate effect the numerous recommendations to repeal all provisions that discriminate against persons on the basis of their sexual orientation or gender identity, including those that criminalise consensual same-sex relations among adults. Finally, Amnesty International stated it continued to receive allegations of excessive use of force by the Guyana Police Force during arrests and detentions. It also welcomed Guyana’s acceptance of recommendations to increase the capacity and strengthen the independence of the Police Complaints Authority to undertake prompt and impartial investigations of police abuse. It urged the Government to implement these recommendations as a matter of priority.

 4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

814. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 143 recommendations received, 88 enjoy the support of Guyana and 55 are noted.

815. In conclusion, Guyana thanked all the speakers and countries as well as the OHCHR and international organizations which have given support to Guyana in the UPR process. The delegation underscored that the current Government which was sworn into office on June 10, was committed to all aspects of human development of all Guyanese, working towards ensuring political freedoms and empowerment of all citizens.

 Kuwait

816. The review of Kuwait was held on 28 January 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 Kuwait in accordance with the annex to Council resolution 5/1, paragraph 15 (a) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KWT/1);

(b) The compilation prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KWT/2);

(c) The summary prepared by OHCHR in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) (A/HRC/WG.6/21/KWT/3).

817. At its 31st meeting, on 26 June 2015, the Council considered and adopted the outcome of the review of Kuwait (see section C below).

818. The outcome of the review of Kuwait comprises the report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review (A/HRC/29/17), the views of Kuwait 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/29/17/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

819. The delegation of Kuwait expressed its appreciation for the UPR mechanism and its role in the development of human rights system. Kuwait was convinced of the importance of work and cooperation with regional and international mechanisms for promotion and protection of human rights. For this reason, Kuwait had made annual voluntary contributions to the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights to support the UPR mechanism. In this regard, the delegation expressed its appreciation for the fruitful interactive dialogue witnessed at the second cycle review of Kuwait, which took place on 28 January 2015 and resulted in a significant number of recommendations.

820. The delegation highlighted that Kuwait had created a National Standing Committee comprising all government agencies and institutions. Its task was to study and follow-up on these recommendations and to determine the position on them, leading to their implementation. The Committee and non-governmental organizations had sat down twice for consultations, in March and June 2015. What had been reached today was the fruit of a joint effort.

821. Out of 278 recommendations received, Kuwait had accepted 178, noted 25, and partially accepted 4. 71 recommendations had been rejected, as some of them were in conflict with the provisions of the Islamic law, the Constitution, and laws of the State, while others contained elements incompatible with the national identity and values ​​of the society and culture. Therefore, Kuwait had divided some of those recommendations into different segments.

822. As for the recommendations related to freedom of expression and peaceful assembly, there were 11 of them, and Kuwait had accepted nine, noted two, and had not rejected any.

823. With regard to employment, Kuwait had accepted 14 recommendations and taken note of four and had not rejected any. The delegation highlighted the recent approval of the law governing the use of domestic labour in Kuwait.

824. In the area of legal frameworks for human rights, all the recommendations made ​​under this subject had been accepted. There were 21 of them.

825. Concerning cooperation with human rights mechanisms, Kuwait had accepted all the 14 recommendations.

826. In the field of anti-trafficking, Kuwait had received six recommendations and all had been accepted. The delegation underscored the adoption of the law to combat human trafficking.

827. In the area of women's participation in public life, Kuwait had accepted all five recommendations as well. The delegation informed that Kuwait had approved 16 May of every year as a day for Kuwaiti women, in order to pay tribute to their contribution to the public life.

828. As for recommendations related to development, Kuwait had received 11 of them, and all had been accepted.

829. Regarding the rights of persons with disabilities and the elderly, Kuwait had received 14 recommendations and accepted them fully. This was separate from the recent adoption of the law on children.

830. In the field of humanitarian aid, Kuwait had received nine recommendations and all had been accepted. The delegation confirmed that Kuwait would continue its humanitarian efforts and around the world.

831. The delegation indicated that some of the 178 accepted recommendations had already been implemented or begun to be implemented, such as those on the establishment of a national human rights institution. The Executive Branch had submitted a proposal on the establishment of a Human Rights Office, and it was at the stage of the second deliberation in the Parliament.

832. Kuwait was a country blessed with peace, security, serenity, the rule of law, justice, and economic and social welfare and attracted many expatriates to come and work. More than 180 different nationalities were residing in Kuwait. Under this demographic reality, human rights, rule of law, promotion and respect for justice, respect for the rights and dignity of others and their religions are all that Kuwait attached the utmost importance to, and this explained the fact that Kuwait had accepted the large number of recommendations.

833. The delegation stated that the ambition of Kuwait had gone beyond what had already been achieved at national and international levels and that Kuwait was driven to continue to scale up its efforts to overcome the challenges that remained. Hence, Kuwait sill had not reached the desired perfection, because the perfection only belonged to Almighty God. Nevertheless, despite the fact that Kuwait was a relatively young country, it was making efforts.

834. The complex regional context and instability surrounding Kuwait could give a negative impact on its national context. The delegation informed that, just in the last three hours, there had been a terrorist attack against a mosque in Kuwait and that this had happened during Ramadhan, sacred month, on a sacred day, Friday. The attack resulted in the loss of innocent lives and injuries. This was clearly a terrorist assault, which had nothing to do with the Islam.

835. The delegation stated that Kuwait considered this forum to be an opportunity to benefit from the experiences, observations, and opinions and that it would welcome comments and statements of States and stakeholders.

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

836. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Kuwait, 17 delegations made statements. The statements of the delegations that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints[[51]](#footnote-52) are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.

837. Morocco noted the important efforts that had been made to ensure the effective exercise of human rights. It appreciated the positive cooperation of Kuwait with the Human Rights Council and its mechanisms, and appreciated Kuwait's renewed commitment to establishing the foundations of the rule of law and respect for human rights.

838. Myanmar appreciated Kuwait’s constructive engagements and active in the UPR process. It was pleased to note Kuwait had accepted recommendations, including those made by Myanmar.

839. Nepal noted the remarkable progress in Kuwait’s socio-economic development in the recent years. It encouraged continued efforts by Kuwait to ensure the safety, security and dignity of the migrant workers in the country, including women domestic workers and protection of their interest through requisite institutional and legislative measures.

840. Niger welcomed the progress made by Kuwait to promote and protect human rights through the adoption of several legislative and regulatory texts, including the law on the fight against human trafficking and smuggling of migrants (2013) and the law on the residence of foreigners (2014). Kuwait had put in place national policies and strategies for advocacy for human rights and taken regulatory measures on the creation of the Department of the Health Services for the Elderly and health teams to protect children from abuse.

841. Oman welcomed the creation of national mechanisms for protection of children and the setting up of the Development Plan for enhancement of capacities of Kuwait’s women. It also appreciated the unique role played by Kuwait in the field of aid and relief to relieve human suffering in many places of tension and conflict.

842. Pakistan commended the humanitarian and development work and relief operations undertaken by Kuwait all around the world, which reflected its commitment towards protection and promotion of human rights and alleviate human suffering. It also appreciated the constructive engagement of Kuwait with the human rights machinery, including treaty bodies and UPR mechanism.

843. The Philippines noted that Kuwait had made significant advances in the realization of the socio-economic rights of its people and had taken steps towards the promotion of the rights of women and migrant workers. It believed that Kuwait could choose to take the lead in the region in pursing the ratification of the ICRMW. It congratulated Kuwait for enhancing protection mechanisms for domestic workers and hoped that this would pave the way for Kuwait’s future ratification of ILO Convention no. 189.

844. Qatar stated that the review of Kuwait had demonstrated its commitment to the leadership in promoting and protecting human rights. It noted the global humanitarian role that Kuwait played in providing aid to countries in need from all over the world through its belief that democracy, development, and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms were interdependent and mutually reinforcing.

845. Rwanda applauded Kuwait for accepting to establish the national human rights institution and to adopt a comprehensive national plan of action to achieve gender equality. It commended Kuwait for significant steps being taken to promote and protect human rights.

846. Saudi Arabia appreciated the attention that Kuwait had paid to the promotion and protection of human rights through numerous efforts, including the ratification of CRPD, and the creation of national mechanisms for the promotion of human rights, such as a committee to defend human rights in the Kuwaiti National Assembly, and the development of social welfare, and health, culture for all children.

847. Senegal welcomed the measures announced concerning, in particular, the presentation of national reports to the treaty bodies and the establishment of the national human rights institution in conformity with the Paris Principles. It noted Kuwait’s commitment to promoting the rights of women and migrants as well as agreement to receive the Special Rapporteurs on contemporary forms of slavery and on the right to freedom of opinion and expression.

848. Sierra Leone commended Kuwait for the creation of the National Assembly’s Committee for the Defence of Human Rights and the intention to establish a human rights institution in conformity with the Paris Principles. It noted Kuwait’s endeavours as regards international humanitarian assistance and the creation of various mechanisms to address its human rights obligations nationally. It encouraged Kuwait to give due consideration to ratifying ICRMW.

849. Singapore welcomed Kuwait’s commitment to the full protection of women’s rights and to the implementation of practical measures to eliminate discrimination against women. It also commended Kuwait’s consistent approach to providing impactful humanitarian assistance to those affected by natural and man-made disasters.

850. Somalia noted the significant advances in the promotion and protection of human rights in Kuwait. It welcomed the laws, policies and programs to address discrimination and violence against the most vulnerable, particularly women, the elderly, children and foreign migrants.

851. South Sudan applauded the efforts of Kuwait in providing official development assistance worldwide, in particular to developing countries. It also commended Kuwait for the efforts to strengthen promotion and protection of human rights.

852. Sri Lanka was encouraged by the efforts made by Kuwait in strengthening its policies and reviewing legislation for enhancing women’s empowerment and equality, such as the establishment of the principle of equal pay between men and women for work of equal value in the private sector and the approval of employment of women in the judiciary.

853. The State of Palestine welcomed the acceptance by Kuwait of the overwhelming majority of the recommendations, including theirs, which reflected Kuwait's commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights. It also welcomed the establishment of the National Standing Committee, which would prepare national reports on human rights and to oversee their follow-up.

 3. General comments made by other relevant stakeholders

854. During the adoption of the outcome of the review of Kuwait, 10 other stakeholders made statements. The statements of the stakeholders that were unable to deliver them owing to time constraints[[52]](#footnote-53) are posted on the extranet of the Human Rights Council, if available.

855. Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik expressed its disappointment at the rejection of recommendations to ratify ILO Convention No. 189, to abandon the Kafala sponsorship system, and to adopt legislation criminalizing domestic and sexual violence, including marital rape. The recommendations to establish a formal moratorium on the use of death penalty had also been rejected. Kuwait’s efforts in combating trafficking were far from sufficient. Kuwait had rejected to recognize the right to nationality, resulting in thousands of stateless citizens facing severe restrictions in access to employment, health care, and education. Kuwait continued to restrict freedom of expression, press and belief and criticism of the State. In May 2014, the National Assembly had passed a new telecommunications law allowing the authorities to monitor, block, and censor online material. The same sex relationships were still punishable in accordance with the Penal Code.

856. Human Rights Watch stated that, in 2015, Kuwait had prosecuted at least six people for twitter posts critical of Saudi Arabia. On 16 June, Kuwait’s national assembly adopted a new cybercrime law that would further criminalize political speech on the internet. On 7 May, the Ministry of Social Affairs had issued a decree that dissolved the board of the Kuwait chapter of Transparency International and replaced them with governmental appointees. Last year, the authorities stripped 33 Kuwaitis of their nationality. Kuwait had made no significant progress in the last year on addressing the nationality claims of at least 105,000 stateless Bidoun. It called on Kuwait to immediately put an end to its ongoing crackdown on free speech and to engage in a genuine effort to undertake much needed reforms to guarantee the rights of the Bidoun population.

857. Alsalam Foundation recalled that many recommendations had been made in the areas of freedom of expression, which was severely curtailed in Kuwait. Many bloggers were victimized by controls and restrictions of freedom of expressions on the internet. Furthermore, people were still imprisoned for criticizing the government of neighbouring countries. It hoped that Kuwait would implement recommendations from France, Czech Republic, Uruguay and Estonia by releasing political prisoners, dropping charges against them, who were purely exercising their freedom of expression, and by respecting the international agreements and treaties that Kuwait was party to. It also mentioned that, just recently, an activist had been arrested after he returned to Kuwait for having cooperated with the Human Rights Council.

858. International Federation for Human Rights Leagues welcomed Kuwait's acceptance of recommendations on eliminating discrimination against women and combating violence against women. However, it remained concerned at the rejection of recommendations on withdrawing its reservations to CEDAW and on abolishing the death penalty. While Kuwait had accepted recommendations to guarantee freedom of expression, bloggers and activists continued to be sentenced and arbitrarily detained. It urged Kuwait to immediately release them. Kuwait had also rejected recommendations on improving the status of the Bidoun. It urged Kuwait to launch a vast naturalization programme and guarantee respect for their fundamental rights in cases of refusal of their applications for citizenship. It welcomed the adoption of a law on domestic work and acceptance of recommendations on protection of migrants' rights. However, it regretted the rejection of recommendations on the ratification of ICRMW.

859. International Service for Human Rights urged Kuwait to implement the recommendations to respect and protect journalists, defenders and demonstrators and to repeal or amend the Public Gatherings Law, the Penal Code, national security laws, press regulations, and lese-majeste and blasphemy laws. Kuwait had also received recommendations to cooperate with international human rights mechanisms. However, it remained deeply concerned at reprisals against human rights defenders such as Nawaf Al-Hendal in retaliation for their UPR advocacy and their peaceful exercise of the rights to freedom of expression, association and assembly. It called on Kuwait to desist from reprisals and ensure accountability where they occurred. It also encouraged Kuwait in its efforts to establish a national human rights institution in conformity with the Paris Principles.

860. International Lesbian and Gay Association stated that the Kuwaiti criminal law punished consensual homosexual relationships between men over 21 years old by imprisonment up to 7 years. The Parliament had also added restrictions to the right to privacy and freedom of expression in choosing what to wear by criminalizing in article 198 the “imitation of the appearance of the opposite sex” with a punishment by imprisonment up to one year and a fine up to 3500 USD. Since then, a large number of LGBT people had been reported to be arrested, humiliated, forced to stay in the country with court order. They suffered from discrimination, stigma and inaccessibility to almost all services, including necessary health services. The organization urged the Human Rights Council to fulfil its obligation to protect human rights of everyone, including LGBT persons in the MENA zone.

861. Indian Council of South America commended Kuwait for its humanitarian assistance to developing countries. It recommended that Kuwait continue the effort to advance the life of women in society; improve the situation of the Bidouns and move toward ratifying the refugee and statelessness conventions; continue to develop its human rights by working with the Special Procedures and by developing the human rights institution in accordance with the Paris Principles with the participation of civil society; continue to work with the Special Rapporteur on freedom of opinion and expression and invite other independent experts; and move towards reviewing juvenile justice system in line with international standards. It also called upon Kuwait to assist in convening a conference on the issue of the death penalty.

862. Organisation pour la Communication en Afrique et de Promotion de la Coopération Economique Internationale commended Kuwait for attaching the importance to the rights of women. The development indicators for 2010-2013 showed the increase in the proportion of Kuwaiti women in the labour market. The reduction in the gap between girls and boys (enrolment rate of girls in general and higher education exceeded that of boys) contributed to ensure gender equality in education before 2015, the deadline set for the MDGs. It encouraged Kuwait to redouble its efforts to create a law of general scope to punish discrimination, especially discrimination against women, as well as a law prohibiting early marriage and forced marriage of girls.

863. Africa Culture International Human Rights noted significant efforts made by Kuwait in different areas, such as struggle against poverty, respect for laws and regulations, social rights, employment of women, fight against trafficking and trafficking of migrants, law in relation to the stay of foreigners, ratification of CRPD, as well as protection of environment. Provisions related to the fundamental rights and liberty in the Constitution would be interpreted in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international treaties and agreements ratified by Kuwait. It urged human rights organizations to better consider progress made by Kuwait in social and economic areas at national and international levels.

864. African Development Association welcomed the constant initiatives by Kuwait in favour of developing countries and reforms undertaken in various sectors of human rights. It noted a draft law on the establishment of an independent national human rights institution in accordance with the Paris Principles, creation of the Public Manpower Authority, and establishment of the Central Agency for Regularization of the Status of Illegal Residents. The Development Plan 2015-2020 foreseeing a revision of the legislation to accelerate the emancipation of women and abolition of discriminatory provisions had caught its attention. It encouraged Kuwait to continue its ongoing legislative reforms to improve the legal and social situation of foreign workers.

 4. Concluding remarks of the State under review

865. The President stated that based on the information provided out of 278 recommendations received, 178 enjoy the support of Kuwait, additional clarification was provided on another 4 recommendations, and 96 are noted.

866. The delegation thanked once again all who had participated in this session. Kuwait was keen to take advantage of all the remarks and constructive interventions. It had also benefitted from best practices at the international level, taking into account the fact it did not live on an isolated island, but rather in a regional and international environment. A war against Daesh, situation in Iraq, and conflict with the Houthis, repercussions of the Arab Spring in the region, and the spread of terrorism and extremism, and the situation in Syria, Libya, Palestine, and Yemen, and other countries. Definitely, these had negative repercussions at the national level, but that would not prevent Kuwait from facing and addressing them through the sovereignty and the rule of law, and advancing human rights and the overall international humanitarian action.

867. The delegation also thanked non-governmental organizations for their views with constructive criticism, which Kuwait would carefully study. However, there were shortcomings in some of their comments on the laws and regulations in Kuwait. Kuwait would urge them to study them accurately and objectively to know the facts. The delegation stressed that that the doors of Kuwait had always been and would remain open to the views aiming at the defence of human rights, not only at the national level, but also at the international level. The Permanent Mission of Kuwait in Geneva was ready to provide any clarifications with regard to human rights.

868. The promotion and protection of human rights was a strategic option for Kuwait, and its approach was an integrated one, inclusive of economic, social and cultural issues. Efforts for protection of human rights in Kuwait revealed its eagerness to lay its foundations at the national level and to support these efforts at regional and international levels, bearing in mind values, cultures and customs and traditions of society. The cooperation of Kuwait with the UPR mechanism, its support for most of the recommendations, and its eagerness to put them into practice clearly reflected its commitment to the principles contained in Resolution 5/1.

869. The delegation reiterated its appreciation for the great trust and esteem shown in the adoption of the UPR outcome of Kuwait. Kuwait considered this unanimity and words of praise were a tribute to a series of achievements that Kuwait had made not only in the field of human rights, but also in the overall humanitarian work.

 B. General debate on agenda item 6

870. At its 32nd meeting, on 26 June 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), China, India, Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine), Maldives, Montenegro, Morocco, Paraguay, Tunisia[[53]](#footnote-54) (on behalf of the Group of Arab States);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Burkina Faso, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Trinidad and Tobago;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Amnesty International; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Colombian Commission of Jurists; Human Rights Commission of Pakistan; Indian Council of South America (CISA); International Fellowship of Reconciliation; International Service for Human Rights; Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture; Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development; Rencontre Africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme; UPR Info; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik.

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

C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

 Kyrgyzstan

872. At the 26th meeting, on 24 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/101 without a vote.

 Guinea

873. At the 26th meeting, on 24 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/102 without a vote.

 Lao People’s Democratic Republic

874. At the 27th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/103 without a vote.

 Spain

875. At the 27th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/104 without a vote.

 Lesotho

876. At the 27th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/105 without a vote.

 Kenya

877. At the 29th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/106 without a vote.

 Armenia

878. At the 29th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/107 without a vote.

 Guinea-Bissau

879. At the 29th meeting, on 25 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/108 without a vote.

 Sweden

880. At the 30th meeting, on 26 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/109 without a vote.

 Grenada

881. At the 30th meeting, on 26 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/110 without a vote.

 Turkey

882. At the 30th meeting, on 26 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/111 without a vote.

 Kuwait

883. At the 31st meeting, on 26 June 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/112 without a vote.

 Kiribati

884. At the 41st meeting, on 1 July 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/113 without a vote.

 Guyana

885. At the 42nd meeting, on 2 July 2015, the Human Rights Council adopted draft decision 29/114 without a vote.

 VII. Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories

 A. Interactive dialogue with the Independent International Commission of Inquiry to investigate all violations of international humanitarian law and international human rights law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, particularly in the occupied Gaza strip, in the context of the military operations conducted since 13 June 2014

886. At the 33rd meeting, on 29 June 2015, the Chairperson of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry to investigate all violations of international humanitarian law and international human rights law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, particularly in the occupied Gaza strip, in the context of the military operations conducted since 13 June 2014, Mary McGowan Davis, presented the report of the Commission (A/HRC/29/52), pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution S-21/1.

887. At the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made a statement as the State concerned.

888. 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: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Cuba, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)[[54]](#footnote-55) (also on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), Ireland, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Tunisia[[55]](#footnote-56) (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Chile, Egypt, Iceland, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, New Zealand, the Niger, Norway, Senegal, the Sudan, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey;

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

(d) Observer for a national human rights institution: International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights (ICC) (also on behalf of the Independent Commission for Human Rights of the State of Palestine);

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: ADALAH - Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel; Al Mezan Centre for Human Rights (also on behalf of BADIL Ressource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights); Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man; American Association of Jurists; Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies (also on behalf of Al Mezan Centre for Human Rights; Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man; BADIL Ressource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights); International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; Medical Aid for Palestinians (MAP); Touro Law Center, The Institute on Human Rights and The Holocaust.

889. At the same meeting, the representative of the State of Palestine made final remarks as the State concerned.

890. Also at the same meeting, the Chairperson answered questions and made her concluding remarks.

 B. General debate on agenda item 7

891. At its 34th meeting, on 29 June 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), China, Cuba, El Salvador, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of)[[56]](#footnote-57) (also on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement), Maldives, Morocco, Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia[[57]](#footnote-58) (also on behalf of the Group of Arab States), the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of);

(c) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Chile, Ecuador, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Malaysia, Oman, Senegal, Turkey, Uruguay, Yemen;

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

(e) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Al Mezan Centre for Human Rights; Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man; American Association of Jurists; Amnesty International; Amuta for NGO Responsibility; Arab Commission for Human Rights; B’nai B’rith; BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights; Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches; Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations; Defence for Children International; European Union of Jewish Students; Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos; Human Rights Watch; Ingénieurs du Monde (also on behalf of United Nations Watch); International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists; International Federation of Journalists; International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations; Medical Aid for Palestinians (MAP); Union of Arab Jurists; United Nations Watch; Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom; World Barua Organization (WBO); World Jewish Congress.

 C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

Ensuring accountability and justice for all violations of international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem

892. At the 46th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representative of Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.35, sponsored by Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Namibia, Nicaragua, Tunisia (on behalf of the Group of Arab States) and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). Subsequently, Angola, Brazil, Cabo Verde, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Slovenia, South Africa and Switzerland joined the sponsors.

893. At the same meeting, the representative of Pakistan (on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation) orally revised the draft resolution.

894. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Israel and the State of Palestine made statements as the States concerned.

895. 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.

896. At the same meeting, the representative of Saudi Arabia made general comments and the representatives of France, Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council), Paraguay, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

897. 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*:

Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, China, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Maldives, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

*Against*:

United States of America

*Abstaining*:

Ethiopia, India, Kenya, Paraguay, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

898. Draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.35 as orally revised was adopted by 41 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions (resolution 29/25).

899. At the same meeting, the representatives of India and Kazakhstan made statements in explanation of vote after the vote.

 VIII. Follow-up to and implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action

 A. General debate on agenda item 8

900. At its 34th and 35th meetings, on 29 June 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), Colombia[[58]](#footnote-59) (also on behalf of Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Mozambique, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam), Ireland, Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine), Morocco, the Netherlands, Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), the Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Slovenia[[59]](#footnote-60) (also on behalf of Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chad, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mali, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, Uruguay, Zimbabwe, the State of Palestine), Tajikistan[[60]](#footnote-61) (on behalf of the States members of the Collective Security Treaty Organization), the United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Croatia, Israel, Norway, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland;

(c) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Action Canada for Population and Development; Action internationale pour la paix et le développement dans la région des Grands Lacs; Agence Internationale pour le Développement; Alliance Defending Freedom; Alsalam Foundation; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Amnesty International; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development; Association of World Citizens; CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation; Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme; Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos; Global Network for Rights and Development; Groupe des ONG pour la Convention relative aux droits de l'enfant; Indian Council of South America (CISA); Institut pour la Paix, la Justice et les droits de l’Homme-IIPJDH; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission (also on behalf of International Lesbian and Gay Association); International Humanist and Ethical Union; International Lesbian and Gay Association (also on behalf of Allied Rainbow Communities International; Amnesty International; Article 19-International Centre Against Censorship; Forum for Women and Development-FOKUS; Human Rights Watch; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (FIDH); International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission; International HIV/AIDS Alliance; International Humanist and Ethical Union; International Service for Human Rights; United Nations Association of the United States of America; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik); International Muslim Women's Union; International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations; Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco; Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development; Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association; Minnesota Citizens Concerned for Life Inc. Education Fund; Rencontre Africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme; Servas International; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; World Barua Organization (WBO); World Muslim Congress.

901. At the 35th meeting, on the same day, a statement in exercise of the right of reply was made by the representative of Maldives.

 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

 Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

902. At the 35th meeting, on 29 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, Mutuma Ruteere, presented his reports (A/HRC/29/46 and Add.1, and A/HRC/29/47).

903. At the same meeting, the representative of the Republic of Korea made a statement as the State concerned.

904. Also at the same meeting, the National Human Rights Commission of Korea made a statement.

905. During the ensuing interactive dialogue at the 35th meeting, on 29 June 2015, and the 36th meeting, on 30 June 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), Botswana, Brazil, China, the Congo, Cuba, Ecuador[[61]](#footnote-62) (on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States), Estonia, France, India, Morocco, Nigeria, the Russian Federation, the United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belgium, Burkina Faso, Chile, Egypt, Fiji, Greece, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Spain, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL); International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR); Jubliee Campaign; Minority Rights Group; Society for Threatened Peoples; Verein Sundwind Entwicklungspolitik.

906. At the 36th meeting, on 30 June 2015, the Special Rapporteur answered questions and made his concluding remarks.

 B. General debate on agenda item 9

907. At the 36th meeting, on 30 June 2015, the Human Rights Council held a general debate on agenda item 9, during which the following made statements:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Cuba, Latvia (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine), Namibia, Pakistan (on behalf of the States members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation), Qatar, the Russian Federation, Tunisia[[62]](#footnote-63) (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), the United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Bahrain, Belgium, Egypt, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Turkey;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Agence Internationale pour le Developpement; Alsalam Foundation; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; Commission africaine des promoteurs de la santé et des droits de l'homme; Fraternité Notre Dame, Inc; Global Network for Rights and Development; International Humanist and Ethical Union; International Muslim Women's Union; International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations; Liberation; Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development; Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association; MINBYUN - Lawyers for a Democratic Society; Organization for Defending Victims of Violence; Rencontre Africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme; Servas International; Society for Threatened Peoples; United Nations Watch; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; World Barua Organization (WBO); World Jewish Congress; World Muslim Congress.

 C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

 The incompatibility between democracy and racism

908. At the 44th meeting, on 2 July 2015, the representative of Brazil (also on behalf of Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.1, sponsored by Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), and co-sponsored by Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Colombia, Cyprus, France, Georgia, Greece, Honduras, Luxembourg, Mali, Montenegro, Peru, Portugal, the Russian Federation, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, and the United States of America. Subsequently, Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Madagascar, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland joined the sponsors.

909. 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.

910. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 29/20).

 X. Technical assistance and capacity-building

 A. Interactive dialogue with special procedures mandate holders

 Interactive dialogue in the presence of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic and other relevant stakeholders

911. At the 38th meeting, on 30 June 2015, the Human Rights Council held an interactive dialogue in the presence of the Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic, Marie-Thérèse Keita Bocoum, and other relevant stakeholders, to assess developments in the human rights situation on the ground, with a particular focus on the fight against impunity.

912. The Independent Expert on the situation of human rights in the Central African Republic, Marie-Thérèse Keita Bocoum, made a statement.

913. At the same meeting, the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Deputy Head of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic made a statement.

914. Also at the same meeting, the representative of the Central African Republic Inter-Religious Platform, Kobine Layama, made a statement.

915. At the same meeting, the Minister of Justice of the Central African Republic, Aristide Sokambi, made a statement.

916. Also at the same meeting, the Minister for National Reconciliation of the Central African Republic, Jeannette Dethoua, made a statement.

917. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the same meeting, the following made statements and asked questions to the Independent Expert and the other stakeholders:

(a) Representatives of States Members of the Human Rights Council: Algeria (also on behalf of the Group of African States), Canada[[63]](#footnote-64) (on behalf of the States members and observers of the International Organization of la Francophonie), China, the Congo, Estonia, France, Gabon, Ghana, Ireland, Morocco, Portugal, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Angola, Australia, Belgium, Benin, Chad, Egypt, Luxembourg, Mali, the Niger, Norway, Rwanda, Senegal, Spain, Switzerland, Togo;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Arab Commission for Human Rights; Human Rights Watch; International Federation for Human Rights Leagues.

918. At the same meeting, the Independent Expert and the other stakeholders answered questions and made their concluding remarks.

 Independent expert on capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d’Ivoire in the field of human rights

919. At the 38th meeting, on 30 June 2015, the Independent expert on capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d’Ivoire in the field of human rights, Mohammed Ayat, presented his report (A/HRC/29/49).

920. At the same meeting, the representative of Côte d’Ivoire made a statement as the State concerned.

921. During the ensuing interactive dialogue, at the 38th meeting, on 30 June 2015, and the 39th meeting, on 1 July 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, Canada[[64]](#footnote-65) (on behalf of the States members and observers of the International Organization of la Francophonie), China, the Congo, France, Gabon, Ghana, Ireland, Morocco, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Belgium, Benin, Chad, Egypt, Mali, Mozambique, New Zealand, the Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Togo;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Human Rights Watch; International Catholic Child Bureau (also on behalf of Company of the Daughters of Charity of Vincent de Paul; Dominicans for Justice and Peace – Order of Preachers; Mouvement International d’Apostolate des Milieux Sociaux Indépendants; Pax Romana (International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs and International Movement of Catholic Students)); International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; International Service for Human Rights; United Nations Watch.

922. At the 39th meeting, on 1 July 2015, the representative of Côte d’Ivoire made final remarks as the State concerned.

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

 B. General debate on agenda item 10

924. At the 40th meeting, on 1 July 2015, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 18/18, the Director of the Field Operations and Technical Cooperation Division of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights made the annual oral presentation on the overview of and successes, best practices and challenges in technical assistance and capacity-building efforts, particularly those provided by the Office of the High Commissioner and relevant United Nations agencies.

925. At the same meeting, the Chairperson of the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Technical Cooperation in the Field of Human Rights, Mariclaire Acosta Urquidi, presented the report of the Board of Trustees (A/HRC/29/48).

926. At the 41st meeting, on the same day, 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, Cuba (also on behalf of Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe), Estonia, France, India, Ireland, Latvia, Luxembourg[[65]](#footnote-66) (on behalf of the European Union, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, the Republic of Moldova, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), Montenegro, Morocco, the Netherlands, Sierra Leone, Tunisia[[66]](#footnote-67) (on behalf of the Group of Arab States), the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America;

(b) Representatives of observer States: Australia, Georgia, Guatemala, Libya, Lithuania, the Sudan, Thailand, Ukraine, the Holy See;

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

(d) Observers for non-governmental organizations: Alsalam Foundation; Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc; Amnesty International; Arab Commission for Human Rights; Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development; Centre for Human Rights and Peace Advocacy; Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos; Human Rights Watch; Indian Council of South America (CISA); International Federation for Human Rights Leagues; Liberation; Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association; Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés (OIPMA); Rencontre Africaine pour la défense des droits de l'homme; United Nations Watch; Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik; World Barua Organization (WBO).

927. At the same meeting, statements in exercise of the right of reply were made by the representatives of Burundi, Maldives and the Russian Federation.

 C. Consideration of and action on draft proposals

 Cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights

928. At the 45th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representative of Ukraine introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.9, sponsored by Ukraine and co-sponsored by Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America. Before the Human Rights Council started taking action on the draft resolution, Ireland and the United States of America withdrew their co-sponsorship (see also paragraph 930). Subsequently, Andorra, Côte d’Ivoire, Ireland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Panama, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sierra Leone, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

929. At the same meeting, the representative of Latvia (on behalf of States members of the European Union that are members of the Human Rights Council) made general comments in relation to the draft resolution.

930. Also at the same meeting, the representatives of Brazil, China, Cuba, Indonesia, Ireland, Paraguay, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, the United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) made statements in explanation of vote before the vote.

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

*In favour*:

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

*Against*:

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

*Abstaining*:

Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Qatar, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam

932. Draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.9 was adopted by 21 votes to 6, with 20 abstentions (resolution 29/23).

 Capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d’Ivoire in the field of human rights

933. At the 46th meeting, on 3 July 2015, the representative of Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States) introduced draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.13/Rev.1, sponsored by Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States) and co-sponsored by Croatia, Georgia, Honduras, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Maldives, New Zealand, Poland and Turkey. Subsequently, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, France, Germany, Monaco, the Netherlands, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America joined the sponsors.

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

935. Also at the same meeting, the representative of Côte d’Ivoire made a statement as the State concerned.

936. 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.

937. At the same meeting, the draft resolution was adopted without a vote (resolution 29/24).

 Report of the High Commissioner on technical cooperation and capacity-building for South Sudan in the field of Human Rights

938. As notified to the Secretariat, draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.22, sponsored by Algeria (on behalf of the Group of African States), was withdrawn by the sponsors prior to its consideration by the Human Rights Council.
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**Documents issued for the twenty-ninth session**

| *Documents issued in the general series* |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Symbol* | *Agenda item* |  |
|  |  |  |
| A/HRC/29/1 | 1 | Annotations to the agenda for the twenty-ninth session of the Human Rights Council: note by the Secretary-General |
| A/HRC/29/1/Corr.1 | 1 | Corrigendum |
| A/HRC/29/2 | 1 | Report of the Human Rights Council on its twenty-ninth session |
| A/HRC/29/3 • E/CN.6/2015/6 | 2 | Report of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women on the activities of the United Nations Trust Fund in Support of Actions to Eliminate Violence against Women |
| A/HRC/29/4 | 6 | Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Kyrgyzstan |
| A/HRC/29/4/Add.1 | 6 | Addendum |
| A/HRC/29/5 | 6 | Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Kiribati |
| A/HRC/29/5/Add.1 | 6 | Addendum |
| A/HRC/29/6 | 6 | Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Guinea |
| A/HRC/29/6/Add.1 | 6 | Addendum |
| A/HRC/29/7 | 6 | Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Lao People’s Democratic Republic |
| A/HRC/29/7/Add.1 | 6 | Addendum |
| A/HRC/29/8 | 6 | Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Spain |
| A/HRC/29/8/Add.1 | 6 | Addendum |
| A/HRC/29/8/Add.1/Corr.1 | 6 | Corrigendum |
| A/HRC/29/9 | 6 | Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Lesotho |
| A/HRC/29/9/Add.1 | 6 | Addendum |
| A/HRC/29/10 | 6 | Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic review on Kenya |
| A/HRC/29/11 | 6 | Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Armenia |
| A/HRC/29/11/Add.1 | 6 | Addendum |
| A/HRC/29/12 | 6 | Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Guinea-Bissau |
| A/HRC/29/12/Add.1 | 6 | Addendum |
| A/HRC/29/13 | 6 | Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Sweden |
| A/HRC/29/13/Add.1 | 6 | Addendum |
| A/HRC/29/14 | 6 | Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Grenada |
| A/HRC/29/14/Corr.1 | 6 | Corrigendum |
| A/HRC/29/14/Add.1 | 6 | Addendum |
| A/HRC/29/15 | 6 | Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Turkey |
| A/HRC/29/15/Add.1 | 6 | Addendum |
| A/HRC/29/16 | 6 | Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Guyana |
| A/HRC/29/16/Add.1 | 6 | Addendum |
| A/HRC/29/17 | 6 | Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review on Kuwait |
| A/HRC/29/17/Add.1 | 6 | Addendum |
| A/HRC/29/18 | 2, 3 | Feasibility of a global fund to enhance the capacity of stakeholders to implement the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights |
| A/HRC/29/19 | 2, 3 | Summary report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the outcome of the full-day discussion on specific themes relating to human rights and climate change |
| A/HRC/29/20 | 2, 3 | Good practices and major challenges in preventing and eliminating female genital mutilation: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights |
| A/HRC/29/20/Corr.1 | 2, 3 | Corrigendum |
| A/HRC/29/21 | 2, 6 | Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the operations of the Voluntary Fund for Participation in the Universal Periodic Review |
| A/HRC/29/22 | 2, 6 | Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the operations of the Voluntary Fund for Financial and Technical Assistance in the Implementation of the Universal Periodic Review |
| A/HRC/29/23 | 2, 8 | Discrimination and violence against individuals based on their sexual orientation and gender identity: report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights |
| A/HRC/29/24 | 3 | Report of the Special Rapporteur on minority issues, Rita Izsák - Comprehensive study of the human rights situation of Roma worldwide, with a particular focus on the phenomenon of anti-Gypsyism |
| A/HRC/29/25 | 3 | Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, Maina Kiai |
| A/HRC/29/25/Add.1 | 3 | Mission to Oman |
| A/HRC/29/25/Add.2 | 3 | Mission to Kazakhstan  |
| A/HRC/29/25/Add.3 | 3 | Observations on communications transmitted to Governments and replies received |
| A/HRC/29/25/Add.4 | 3 | Mission to Oman: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur |
| A/HRC/29/25/Add.5 | 3 | Mission to Kazakhstan: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur |
| A/HRC/29/26 | 3 | Report of the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers, Gabriela Knaul |
| A/HRC/29/26/Corr.1 | 3 | Corrigendum |
| A/HRC/29/26/Add.1 | 3 | Mission to Qatar |
| A/HRC/29/26/Add.2 | 3 | Mission to the United Arab Emirates  |
| A/HRC/29/26/Add.3 | 3 | Report of the Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers on her mission to Tunisia |
| A/HRC/29/26/Add.4 | 3 | Mission to Portugal |
| A/HRC/29/26/Add.5 | 3 | Mission to Qatar: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur |
| A/HRC/29/26/Add.6 | 3 | Mission to United Arab Emirates: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur |
| A/HRC/29/26/Add.7 | 3 | Mission to Portugal: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur |
| A/HRC/29/27 | 3 | Report of the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences, Rashida Manjoo |
| A/HRC/29/27/Add.1 | 3 | Mission to Honduras |
| A/HRC/29/27/Add.2 | 3 | Mission to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland |
| A/HRC/29/27/Add.3 | 3 | Mission to Afghanistan |
| A/HRC/29/27/Add.4 | 3 | Addendum to the Human Right Council Thematic report of the Special Rapporteur on Violence, its Causes and Consequences (A/HRC/29/27) |
| A/HRC/29/28 | 3 | Report of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises |
| A/HRC/29/28/Add.1 | 3 | Visit to Azerbaijan  |
| A/HRC/29/28/Add.2 | 3 | Addendum - Report on the First African Regional Forum on Business and Human Rights |
| A/HRC/29/28/Add.3 | 3 | Addendum - Identifying emerging approaches and lessons learned in corporate respect for human rights: reflections from discussions held at the 2014 Forum on Business and Human Rights |
| A/HRC/29/28/Add.4 | 3 | Comments by the Republic of Azerbaijan |
| A/HRC/29/29 | 3, 5 | Summary of discussions of the Forum on Business and Human Rights: note by the Secretariat |
| A/HRC/29/30 | 3 | Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to education, Kishore Singh - Protecting the right to education against commercialization |
| A/HRC/29/30/Add.1 | 3 | Mission to Bhutan |
| A/HRC/29/30/Add.2 | 3 | Mission to Algeria |
| A/HRC/29/30/Add.3 | 3 | Visite en Algérie: commentaires de l'état sur le rapport du Rapporteur spécial |
| A/HRC/29/31 | 3 | Report of the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights, Philip Alston |
| A/HRC/29/31/Add.1 | 3 | Mission to Guinea-Bissau (23 February–1 March 2014) |
| A/HRC/29/32 | 3 | Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, David Kaye |
| A/HRC/29/33 | 3 | Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, Dainius Pūras |
| A/HRC/29/33/Add.1 | 3 | Visit to Malaysia (19 November–2 December 2014) |
| A/HRC/29/34 | 3 | Report of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons, Chaloka Beyani |
| A/HRC/29/34/Add.1 | 3 | Follow-up mission to Azerbaijan |
| A/HRC/29/34/Add.2 | 3 | Mission to Haiti |
| A/HRC/29/34/Add.3 | 3 | Mission to Ukraine |
| A/HRC/29/35 | 3 | Report of the Independent Expert on human rights and international solidarity, Virginia Dandan |
| A/HRC/29/36 | 3 | Report of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants, François Crépeau - Banking on mobility over a generation: follow-up to the regional study on the management of the external borders of the European Union and its impact on the human rights of migrants |
| A/HRC/29/36/Add.1 | 3 | Mission to Sri Lanka |
| A/HRC/29/36/Add.2 | 3 | Follow-up mission to Italy (2–6 December 2014) |
| A/HRC/29/36/Add.3 | 3 | Mission to Malta (6–10 December 2014) |
| A/HRC/29/36/Add.4 | 3 | Mission to Sri Lanka : comments by the State on the human rights of migrants |
| A/HRC/29/36/Add.5 | 3 | Mission to Malta: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants |
| A/HRC/29/36/Add.6 | 3 | Follow-up mission to Italy (2-6 December 2014) |
| A/HRC/29/37 | 3 | Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, Christof Heyns - Use of information and communications technologies to secure the right to life |
| A/HRC/29/37/Add.1 | 3 | Mission to Papua New Guinea (3 to 14 March 2014) |
| A/HRC/29/37/Add.2 | 3 | Mission to the Gambia |
| A/HRC/29/37/Add.3 | 3 | Follow-up to country recommendations : India |
| A/HRC/29/37/Add.4 | 3 | Follow-up to country recommendations : Turkey |
| A/HRC/29/37/Add.5 | 3 | Observations on communications transmitted to Governments and replies received |
| A/HRC/29/37/Add.6 | 3 | Mission to the Gambia: comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions |
| A/HRC/29/37/Add.7 | 3 | Follow-up country recommendations: Turkey - Comments by the State on the report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions |
| A/HRC/29/38 | 3 | Report of the Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons, especially women and children, Maria Grazia Giammarinaro |
| A/HRC/29/38/Add.1 | 3 | Mission to Malaysia |
| A/HRC/29/38/Add.2 | 3 | Second consultative meeting on strengthening partnerships with national rapporteurs on trafficking in persons and equivalent mechanisms |
| A/HRC/29/39 | 2, 3 | Progress report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on legal options and practical measures to improve access to remedy for victims of business-related human rights abuses |
| A/HRC/29/40 | 3 | Report of the Working Group on the issue of discrimination against women in law and in practice |
| A/HRC/29/40/Add.1 | 3 | Mission to Chile |
| A/HRC/29/40/Add.2 | 3 | Mission to Peru |
| A/HRC/29/40/Add.3 | 3 | Mission to Spain |
| A/HRC/29/40/Add.4 | 3 | Comentarios del Estado relativos al informe sobre la visita del Grupo de Trabajo a Chile del 1 al 9 de septiembre de 2014 |
| A/HRC/29/40/Add.5 | 3 | Comentarios del Estado relativos al informe sobre la visita del Grupo de Trabajo a Perú del 11 al 19 de septiembre de 2014 |
| A/HRC/29/40/Add.6 | 3 | Comentarios del Estado relativos al informe sobre la visita del Grupo de Trabajo a España del 9 al 19 de diciembre de 2014 |
| A/HRC/29/41 | 4 | Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Eritrea, Sheila B. Keetharuth |
| A/HRC/29/42 | 4 | Report of the commission of inquiry on human rights in Eritrea |
| A/HRC/29/43 | 4 | Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus, Miklós Haraszti |
| A/HRC/29/44 | 5 | Report of the 2015 Social Forum (Geneva, 18–20 February 2015) |
| A/HRC/29/45 | 5 | Report of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on a draft United Nations declaration on the right to peace on its third session |
| A/HRC/29/46 | 9 | Report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, Mutuma Ruteere |
| A/HRC/29/46/Add.1 | 9 | Visit to the Republic of Korea |
| A/HRC/29/47 | 9 | Report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 69/160 |
| A/HRC/29/48 | 10 | Report of the Chairperson of the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Technical Cooperation in the Field of Human Rights |
| A/HRC/29/49 | 10 | Report of the Independent Expert on capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d’Ivoire in the field of human rights, Mohammed Ayat |
| A/HRC/29/50 | 3,4,7,9,10 | Communications report of Special Procedures |
| A/HRC/29/51 | 3 | Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, Ben Emmerson |
| A/HRC/29/52 | 7 | Report of the independent commission of inquiry established pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution S-21/1 |
| A/HRC/29/53 | 2 | Measures taken to implement Human Rights Council resolution 9/8 and obstacles to its implementation, including recommendations for further improving the effectiveness, harmonization and reform of the treaty body system : report of the Secretary – General |
| A/HRC/29/54 | 9 | Group of independent eminent experts on the implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action : note by the Secretariat |

| *Documents issued in the conference room papers series* |
| --- |
| *Symbol* | *Agenda item* |  |
|  |  |  |
| A/HRC/29/CRP.1 | 4 | Report of the detailed findings of the Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in Eritrea |
| A/HRC/29/CRP.2 | 2, 3 | Initiatives taken to raise awareness and promote the protection of the rights of persons with albinism - Conference Room Paper of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights |
| A/HRC/29/CRP.3 | 4 | Oral Update of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic |
| A/HRC/29/CRP.4 | 7 | Report of the detailed findings of the independent commission of inquiry established pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution S-21/1 |

| *Documents issued in the limited series* |
| --- |
| *Symbol* | *Agenda item* |  |
|  |  |  |
| A/HRC/29/L.1 | 9 | The incompatibility between democracy and racism |
| A/HRC/29/L.2 | 3 | The fiftieth anniversary of the adoption and the fortieth anniversary of the entry into force of the International Covenants on Human Rights |
| A/HRC/29/L.3 | 3 | Protection of the human rights of migrants: migrants in transit |
| A/HRC/29/L.4 | 4 | The grave and deteriorating human rights and humanitarian situation in the Syrian Arab Republic |
| A/HRC/29/L.5 and Rev.1 | 5 | The Social Forum |
| A/HRC/29/L.6 | 3 | Human rights and international solidarity |
| A/HRC/29/L.7 and Rev.1 | 3 | Elimination of discrimination against women |
| A/HRC/29/L.8 | 2 | Fact-finding mission to improve human rights, accountability and reconciliation for South Sudan |
| A/HRC/29/L.9 | 10 | Cooperation and assistance to Ukraine in the field of human rights |
| A/HRC/29/L.10 | 3 | Elimination of discrimination against persons affected by leprosy and their family members |
| A/HRC/29/L.11 | 3 | Independence and impartiality of the judiciary, jurors and assessors, and the independence of lawyers |
| A/HRC/29/L.12 | 4 | Situation of human rights in Belarus |
| A/HRC/29/L.13 and Rev.1 | 10 | Capacity-building and technical cooperation with Côte d’Ivoire in the field of human rights |
| A/HRC/29/L.14 and Rev.1 | 3 | The right to education |
| A/HRC/29/L.15 | 3 | Strengthening efforts to prevent and eliminate child, early and forced marriage |
| A/HRC/29/L.16 and Rev.1 | 3 | Accelerating efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women: eliminating domestic violence |
| A/HRC/29/L.17 and Rev. 1 | 3 | Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism |
| A/HRC/29/L.18 | 3 | Human rights and the regulation of civilian acquisition, possession and use of firearms |
| A/HRC/29/L.19 | 3 | The negative impact of corruption on the enjoyment of human rights |
| A/HRC/29/L.20 | 3 | The right to freedom of expression, including in the form of art |
| A/HRC/29/L.21 | 3 | Human rights and climate change |
| A/HRC/29/L.22 | 10 | Report of the High Commissioner on technical cooperation and capacity-building for South Sudan in the field of Human Rights |
| A/HRC/29/L.23 | 4 | Situation of human rights in Eritrea |
| A/HRC/29/L.24 | 3 | Unaccompanied migrant children and adolescents and human rights |
| A/HRC/29/L.25 | 3 | Protection of the family: contribution of the family to the realization of the right to an adequate standard of living for its members, particularly through its role in poverty eradication and achieving sustainable development |
| A/HRC/29/L.26 | 3 | Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.16 |
| A/HRC/29/L.27 | 3 | Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.16 |
| A/HRC/29/L.28 | 3 | Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.16 |
| A/HRC/29/L.29 | 3 | Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.16 |
| A/HRC/29/L.30 | 2 | Situation of human rights of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar |
| A/HRC/29/L.31 | 3 | Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.14 |
| A/HRC/29/L.32 | 3 | Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.20 |
| A/HRC/29/L.33 | 3 | Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.20 |
| A/HRC/29/L.34 | 1 | Enhancing the efficiency of the Human Rights Council |
| A/HRC/29/L.35 | 7 | Ensuring accountability and justice for all violations of international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem |
| A/HRC/29/L.36 | 3 | Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25 |
| A/HRC/29/L.37 | 3 | Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25 |
| A/HRC/29/L.38 | 3 | Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25 |
| A/HRC/29/L.39 | 3 | Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25 |
| A/HRC/29/L.40 | 3 | Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25 |
| A/HRC/29/L.41 | 3 | Amendment to draft resolution A/HRC/29/L.25 |

| *Documents issued in the Government series* |
| --- |
| *Symbol* | *Agenda item* |  |
|  |  |  |
| A/HRC/29/G/1 | 6 | Letter dated 20 January 2015 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council |
| A/HRC/29/G/2 | 7 | Note verbale dated 8 May 2015 from the Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic to the United Nations Office and Other International Organizations at Geneva addressed to the secretariat of the Human Rights Council |
| A/HRC/29/G/3 | 4 | Letter dated 5 June 2014 from the Permanent Representative of Georgia to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council |
| A/HRC/29/G/4 | 6 | Note verbale dated 3 June 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Bosnia and Herzegovina 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/29/G/5 | 4 | Note verbale dated 19 May 2015 from the Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic 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/29/G/6 | 4 | Note verbale dated 19 June 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Eritrea to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the President of the Human Rights Council |
| A/HRC/29/G/7 | 4 | Letter dated 23 June 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/29/G/8 | 4 | Note verbale dated 1 July 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Eritrea to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Office of the President of the Human Rights Council |
| A/HRC/29/G/9 | 3 | Note verbale dated 30 June 2015 from the Permanent Mission of Malaysia 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/29/G/10 | 3 | Note verbale dated 7 July 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/29/G/11 | 1 | Letter dated 6 July 2015 from the Permanent Representative of Haiti to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council |

| *Documents issued in the non-governmental organization series* |
| --- |
| *Symbol* | *Agenda item* |  |
|  |  |  |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/1 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Advocates Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/2 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the Alsalam Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/3 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the Americans for Democracy & Human Rights in Bahrain Inc, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/4 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the International Federation of University Women, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/5 | 3 | Exposición escrita presentada por la Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/6 | 3 | Exposé écrit présenté par la Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/7 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Social Service Agency of the Protestant Church in Germany, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/8 | 3 | Exposición escrita presentada por la Permanent Assembly for Human Rights, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/9 | 9 | Exposición escrita presentada por la Permanent Assembly for Human Rights, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/10 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/11 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/12 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/13 | 4 | Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/14 | 3 | Written statement submitted by Terre Des Hommes Federation Internationale, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/15 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Reporters Sans Frontiers International - Reporters Without Borders International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/16 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Reporters Sans Frontiers International - Reporters Without Borders International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/17 | 3 | Exposición conjunta escrita presentada por France Libertes : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, American Association of Jurists, Cultural Survival, Emmaus International Association, Netherlands Centre for Indigenous Peoples (NCIV), organizaciones no gubernamentales reconocidas como entidades consultivas especiales, Indian Council of South America (CISA), Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, organizaciones no gubernamentales reconocidas en la Lista |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/18 | 3 | Exposición conjunta escrita presentada por France Libertes : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, American Association of Jurists, Emmaus International Association, organizaciones no gubernamentales reconocidas como entidades consultivas especiales, Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, organización no gubernamental reconocida en la Lista |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/19 | 3 | Joint written statement submitted by France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, American Association of Jurists, Emmaus International Association, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, non-governmental organization on the roster |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/20 | 3 | Exposición conjunta escrita presentada por France Libertes : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, American Association of Jurists, Emmaus International Association, organizaciones no gubernamentales reconocidas como entidades consultivas especiales, Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, organización no gubernamental reconocida en la Lista |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/21 | 3 | Exposé écrit présenté par France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif spécial |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/22 | 4 | Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/23 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Europe-Third World Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/24 | 3 | Joint written statement submitted by France Libertés : Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, American Association of Jurists, Cultural Survival, Emmaus International Association, Netherlands Centre for Indigenous Peoples (NCIV), Stichting Forest Peoples Programme, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Indian Council of South America (CISA), Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples, non-governmental organizations on the roster |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/25 | 7 | Written statement submitted by the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (EAFORD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/26 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Association for Progressive Communications (APC), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/27 | 3 | Joint written statement submitted by the National Congress of American Indians, Native American Rights Fund, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Indian Law Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization on the roster |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/28 | 3 | Joint written statement submitted by the National Congress of American Indians, Native American Rights Fund, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Indian Law Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization on the roster |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/29 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/30 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/31 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/32 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/33 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/34 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the Reporters Sans Frontiers International - Reporters Without Borders International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/35 | 2 | Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/36 | 2 | Written statement submitted by the Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/37 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/38 | 5 | Written statement submitted by the Organization for Defending Victims of Violence, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/39 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/40 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/41 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/42 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/43 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/44 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/45 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/46 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non- governmental organization in general consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/47 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/48 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/49 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/50 | 4 | Joint written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, Odhikar - Coalition for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/51 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/52 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/53 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/54 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/55 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/56 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the Asian Legal Resource Centre, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/57 | 7 | Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/58 | 7 | Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/59 | 7 | Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/60 | 8 | Exposición escrita presentada por la Federacion de Asociaciones de Defensa y Promocion de los Derechos Humanos, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/61 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Arab NGO Network for Development, a non-governmental organization on the roster |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/62 | 3 | Joint written statement submitted by the Organisation Internationale pour le Droit à l’éducation et la liberté d’enseignement (OIDEL), Association Points-Coeur, Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, Catholic International Education Office (OIEC), Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, Dominicans for Justice and Peace - Order of Preachers, International Catholic Child Bureau (BICE), Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, Organisation pour la Communication en Afrique et de Promotion de la Coopération Economique Internationale (OCAPROCE Internationale) and Women's Board Educational Cooperation Society, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/63 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement, a non-governmental organization on the roster |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/64 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/65 | 7 | Written statement submitted by the Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/66 | 7 | Written statement submitted by the Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/67 | 7 | Written statement submitted by the Amuta for NGO Responsibility, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/68 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the Nazra for Feminist Studies, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/69 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the International Humanist and Ethical Union, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/70 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Marangopoulos Foundation for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/71 | 3 | Joint written statement submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD), non-governmental organizations in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/72 | 6 | Written statement submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/73 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/74 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Institut international pour la paix, la justice et les droits de l'Homme- IIPJDH, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/75 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Alulbayt Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/76 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Alulbayt Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/77 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/78 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/79 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/80 | 7 | Joint written statement submitted by the Al Mezan Centre for Human Rights, ADALAH - Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel, Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/81 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Alulbayt Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/82 | 7 | Written statement submitted by the Al Mezan Centre for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/83 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Human Rights Now, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/84 | 3 | Joint written statement submitted by the Franciscans International, Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches, International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, non-governmental organizations in general consultative status, Union of Arab Jurists, General Arab Women Federation, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, International Educational Development, a non-governmental organization on the roster |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/85 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Liberal International (World Liberal Union), a non-governmental organization in general consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/86 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the Human Rights House Foundation, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/87 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Aliran Kesedaran Negara National Consciousness Movement, non-governmental organization on the roster |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/88 | 3 | Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/89 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Society for Threatened Peoples, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/90 | 5 | Joint written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status, Asociación Española para el Derecho Internacional de los Derechos Humanos AEDIDH, American Association of Jurists, Armenian Constitutional Right-Protective Centre, Armenian Young Lawyers Association, Association "For Sustainable Human Development", Association of War-Affected Women, Autre Vie, Center for Development of Civil Society, Foundation for Human Horizon, International Association of Peace Messenger Cities, International Institute for Child Protection, International Network for the Prevention of Elder Abuse, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco, IUS PRIMI VIRI International Association, Lama Gangchen World Peace Foundation (LGWPF), Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada, MiRA Resource Center for Black Immigrant and Refugee Women, Organisation internationale pour les pays les moins avancés (OIPMA), Pax Christi International, International Catholic Peace Movement, Shirley Ann Sullivan Educational Foundation, Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur, Women Environmental Programme, Women's World Summit Foundation, World Association for Psychosocial Rehabilitation, Yayasan Pendidikan Indonesia, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, Dzeno Association, International Peace Bureau, International Society for Human Rights, non-governmental organizations on the roster |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/90/Corr.1 | 5 | Corrigendum |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/91 | 5 | Joint written statement submitted by the Associazione Comunita Papa Giovanni XXIII, United Network of Young Peacebuilders (UNOY Peacebuilders), non-governmental organizations in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/92 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/93 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/94 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/95 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the Al-khoei Foundation, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/96 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Verein Sudwind Entwicklungspolitik, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/97 | 9 | Written statement submitted by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/98 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/99 | 7 | Joint written statement submitted by the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, Al Mezan Centre for Human Rights, Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man, BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights, Medical Aid for Palestinians (MAP), non-governmental organizations in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/100 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Planetary Association for Clean Energy, Inc., a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/101 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/102 | 4 | Written statement submitted by the International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/103 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Asian-Eurasian Human Rights Forum, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/104 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Khiam Rehabilitation Center for Victims of Torture, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/105 | 7 | Written statement submitted by the Defence for Children International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/106 | 2 | Written statement submitted by the Article 19 - International Centre Against Censorship, a non-governmental organization on the roster |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/107 | 4 | Exposición escrita presentada por la Asociación Cubana de las Naciones Unidas, organización no gubernamental reconocida como entidad consultiva especial |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/108 | 6 | Written statement submitted by the European Bureau for Lesser Used Languages (EBLUL), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/109 | 5 | Joint written statement submitted by the Freemuse - The World Forum on Music and Censorship, International PEN, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status, the Article 19 - International Centre Against Censorship, a non-governmental organization on the roster |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/110 | 3 | Exposé écrit présenté par International Catholic Child Bureau, organisation non gouvernementale dotée du statut consultatif special |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/111 | 3 | Written statement submitted by The Arab Association for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/112 | 3 | Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/113 | 3 | Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/114 | 3 | Written statement submitted by Amnesty International, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/115 | 3 | Written statement submitted by The Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD), a non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/116 | 3 | Written statement submitted by the Global Network for Rights and Development (GNRD), non-governmental organization in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/117 | 4 | Exposé écrit présenté par Libération, organisation non gouvernementale inscrite sur la liste |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/118 | 2, 8 | Joint written statement submitted by Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status |
| A/HRC/29/NGO/119 | 4 | Joint written statement submitted by the American Civil Liberties Union, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS) Asociación Civil, Conectas Direitos Humanos, Washington Office on Latin America, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, International Federation for Human Rights Leagues, World Organisation Against Torture, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status |

| *Documents issued in the national institutions series* |
| --- |
| *Symbol* | *Agenda item* |  |
|  |  |  |
| A/HRC/29/NI/1 | 3 | Information presented by the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights of Hungary : Note by the Secretariat |
| A/HRC/29/NI/2 | 3 | Written submission by the Greek National Commission for Human Rights : Note by the Secretariat |
| A/HRC/29/NI/3 | 3 | Information provided by the National Human Rights Council of the Kingdom of Morocco: Note by the Secretariat |
| A/HRC/29/NI/4 | 3 | Information presented by the National Human Rights Council of the Kingdom of Morocco : Note by the Secretariat |
| A/HRC/29/NI/5 | 3 | Information presented by the National Human Rights Council of the Kingdom of Morocco: Note by the Secretariat |
| A/HRC/29/NI/6 | 6 | Information presented by the Argentine Office of the Ombudsperson : Note by the Secretariat |
| A/HRC/29/NI/7 | 6 | Information presented by the Guatemalan Human Rights Ombudsman’s Office : Note by the Secretariat |
| A/HRC/29/NI/8 | 3 | Information presented by the Commissioner for Human Rights (Ombudsman) of the Republic of Azerbaijan: Note by the Secretariat |
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 Special procedures mandate holders appointed by the Human Rights Council at its twenty-ninth session

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

 Ikponwosa Ero (Nigeria)

 Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers

 Mónica Pinto (Argentina)

 Special Rapporteur on the right to privacy

 Joseph Cannataci (Malta)

 Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences

 Dubravka Šimonović (Croatia)

 Working Group on Arbitrary Detention (member from Western European and other States)

 Leigh Toomey (Australia)

 Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances (member from Asia-Pacific States)

Tae-Ung Baik (Republic of Korea)
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