



General Assembly

Distr.: General
1 November 2024

Original: English

Human Rights Council Fifty-seventh session

Summary record (partial)* of the 50th meeting

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Friday, 11 October 2024, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Zniber(Morocco)

Contents

Agenda item 4: Human rights situations that require the Council’s attention (*continued*)

Agenda item 10: Technical assistance and capacity-building (*continued*)

Agenda item 1: Organizational and procedural matters (*continued*)

Closure of the session

* No summary record was prepared for the rest of the meeting.

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of the present record to the Documents Management Section (DMS-DCM@un.org).

Any corrected records of the public meetings of the Council at this session will be reissued for technical reasons after the end of the session.



The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

Agenda item 4: Human rights situations that require the Council's attention

(continued) (A/HRC/57/L.8 as orally revised, A/HRC/57/L.40, A/HRC/57/L.41, A/HRC/57/L.42 and A/HRC/57/L.43)

1. **The President** said that statements of the programme budget implications of the draft resolutions under consideration at the current meeting had been published on the Council's extranet.

Draft resolution A/HRC/57/L.8, as orally revised: Situation of human rights in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela

2. **Ms. Fuentes Julio** (Chile), introducing the draft resolution, as orally revised, on behalf of the main sponsors, namely Argentina, Canada, Ecuador, Guatemala, Uruguay and her own delegation, said that, since the most recent renewal of their mandates on Venezuela, in 2022, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and the international independent fact-finding mission had both been working effectively to monitor the grave human rights violations taking place in that country. The fact-finding mission was pursuing its mandate to gather information with a view to combating impunity, ensuring accountability and protecting victims' right to justice, while OHCHR continued to provide technical assistance and capacity-building, despite the fact that its activities in the country had been unilaterally suspended by the national authorities in February 2024. The two mandates were complementary, and they remained vital if the international community was to continue to address the progressive deterioration of human rights in Venezuela.

3. **Mr. Foradori** (Argentina), continuing the introduction of the draft resolution, as orally revised, said that OHCHR and the international independent fact-finding mission had played a vital role before, during and after the 28 July 2024 presidential elections in Venezuela, reporting on human rights violations and restrictions on civic and democratic activity that were unprecedented in the country's history. Reported violations included arbitrary deprivation of life, arbitrary detention, in some cases possibly amounting to enforced disappearance, disproportionate use of force by law enforcement officials and armed individuals known as *colectivos*, acts of intimidation, attacks, harassment, reprisals and public defamation targeting opposition leaders, peaceful protesters, journalists and other media workers, lawyers, human rights defenders, persons who served in the electoral process, Indigenous Peoples and other civil society stakeholders. Added to that were abuses committed against persons for exercising their human rights and fundamental freedoms on the Internet, the closure of media outlets, surveillance, and blocking and shutdowns of websites and digital platforms. It was in that dramatic context that the sponsors were presenting the draft resolution, which would renew the mandate of OHCHR and the independent fact-finding mission for a further two years. The text, which was the outcome of several rounds of transparent consultations, enjoyed wide backing. He hoped that the members of the Council would support it.

4. **Ms. Micael** (Eritrea), introducing the proposed amendment contained in document A/HRC/57/L.40, said that her delegation wished to emphasize its solidarity with Venezuela and to reaffirm its firm opposition to country-specific mandates that did not have the consent of the State concerned. It was essential to ensure that the sovereignty of Venezuela and the political independence of its people were fully respected. She also wished to draw the Council's attention to the many challenges faced by Venezuelan citizens abroad, many of whom, according to reports from international organizations, faced repeated instances of xenophobia. In addition, several countries had enacted legislation that would promote discriminatory practices against Venezuelan migrants, thereby potentially institutionalizing xenophobia through judicial channels. In the light of those troubling trends, the proposed amendment was both timely and essential. It was consistent with the Council's mandate to safeguard human rights irrespective of race, religion, ethnicity, nationality or location. If the draft resolution was to uphold humanitarian principles, it needed to establish criteria to guarantee the rights of Venezuelans who were in transit or residing in other countries. The oral revision to the draft resolution failed to acknowledge the xenophobia, racism, racial

discrimination and exploitation they faced. The proposed amendment was therefore still necessary, and she urged all Council members to support it.

5. **Mr. Quintanilla Román** (Cuba), introducing the proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/57/L.41](#), said that its main purpose was to ensure that the draft resolution took account of the direct and indirect impact of unilateral coercive measures. His delegation had been obliged to submit an amendment, as none of the proposals it had made during the informal consultations had been accepted, and the oral revision to the draft resolution in no way reflected the contents of the amendment it was proposing. That amendment was based on Council resolution 55/7, which had been supported by the vast majority of members, including some of the sponsors of the current draft resolution. Unilateral coercive measures had to be called by their name, and it was unacceptable that ambiguous language or euphemisms should be used to draw attention away from the responsibility of the countries imposing such measures or to hide their devastating economic, humanitarian and social consequences for all aspects of public and private life in Venezuela. Those consequences had been recognized by OHCHR, the Special Rapporteur on the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on the enjoyment of human rights and other special procedure mandate holders. International law clearly prohibited interference in the internal affairs of States and the use of economic pressure for political ends. For those reasons, his delegation urged members of the Council to support the proposed amendment.

6. **Ms. Belskaya** (Observer for Belarus), introducing the proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/57/L.42](#), said that her delegation remained opposed to country-specific resolutions that did not have the support of the State concerned. Although the draft resolution expressed concern about the situation of migrants from Venezuela, it failed to address the root cause of that migration, which was the imposition of harsh sanctions by the United States of America, the European Union and other Western countries, which deliberately sought to destroy the oil sector in Venezuela and to block foreign trade and imports of food and medicines. The draft resolution attributed migration solely to political instability inside the country, entirely disregarding the fact that such instability was fuelled and openly encouraged and financed from outside. The text as a whole was unacceptable, but she was particularly concerned about paragraph 20, which referred to efforts to address the issue of Venezuelan migrants without involving the Venezuelan authorities. Moreover, the activities of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and other specialized agencies should not be conditioned by politicized country-specific resolutions. Lastly, it was unacceptable that the draft resolution should interfere in asylum issues, which were regulated by international legal instruments and the national legislation of States. While appreciating the efforts made by the main sponsors to hold consultations to address her delegation's concerns, she regretted that no mutually acceptable outcome had been reached. She therefore hoped that members of the Council would support the proposed amendment.

7. **Ms. Khusanova** (Observer for the Russian Federation), introducing the proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/57/L.43](#), said that her delegation opposed any misuse of human rights-related issues to achieve geopolitical goals. The draft resolution was a stark example of such misuse, as it openly disregarded the fact that the situation in Venezuela remained stable, despite active attempts to undermine it from outside. The country's economic outlook was positive and the Government was seeking to attenuate the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures, to enhance living standards and to provide the best life it could for its citizens on the basis of universally recognized norms of international law. The bias evident in the draft resolution extended even to OHCHR, which had expressed concern at the clampdown on protests which it described as peaceful but which had, in fact, been marked by violence and loss of life. The draft resolution envisaged at least six Council meetings on the situation in Venezuela over the next two years. Such a disproportionate and selective approach not only discredited the Council but also ran counter to logic and common sense, particularly in the light of the liquidity crisis and the Council's inability to fulfil its existing mandates. Under the proposed amendment, the six meetings would be reduced to two and OHCHR would be requested to prepare a comprehensive report on the human rights situation in Venezuela containing a detailed assessment of the implementation of previous recommendations for consideration at the Council's fifty-ninth

and sixty-second sessions, to be followed by an interactive dialogue. She called upon members of the Council to support the proposed amendment.

8. **Mr. Quintanilla Román** (Cuba) said that he wished to propose an oral amendment to the draft resolution, consisting in the elimination of paragraph 16. No credible authority had yet been capable of demonstrating the utility of the independent international fact-finding mission on the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, the mandate of which should never have been created and certainly did not need to be renewed. Not only was the mechanism an ineffective and partisan body that systematically violated the Code of Conduct for Special Procedure Mandate Holders of the Human Rights Council, but it also arrogated to itself the powers of an international tribunal, making accusations that should arouse the indignation of all peoples who had truly been victims of genocide, ethnic cleansing or war crimes. It was also extremely costly, with a budget of \$5.7 million for 2023–2024, which was expected to go up to \$6 million in 2025–2026. By contrast, its impact on the ground was negligible. Those figures were an affront at a time when the United Nations was affected by a liquidity crisis and many development and cooperation programmes could not be carried out due to a lack of resources. Venezuela had no need for interventionist mechanisms with such overtly geopolitical aims. For those reasons, his delegation urged all members to support the oral amendment.

9. **Mr. Foradori** (Argentina) said that the main sponsors of draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.8](#), as orally revised, had maintained an open and constructive attitude throughout the consultation process and had attempted to accommodate all the issues raised. Unfortunately, their proposals had all been rejected. The main sponsors could not support any of the proposed amendments and requested the Council to put each amendment to a vote. They would vote against the proposals and invited other members of the Council to do likewise.

10. **The President** said that eight States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution. He invited members of the Council to make general statements on the draft resolution and the proposed amendments.

11. **Mr. Payot** (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Union that were members of the Council, said that the European Union remained deeply concerned about the situation of human rights in Venezuela, particularly in the aftermath of the presidential election in July, and strongly supported the proposed extension of the mandates of OHCHR and the fact-finding mission. It was fundamental that human rights violations and abuses should be thoroughly investigated and those responsible held accountable. To that end, those mandates were not only necessary but complementary; indeed, the serious findings contained in the most recent report of the fact-finding mission ([A/HRC/57/57](#)) demonstrated the importance of continued scrutiny by OHCHR. He wished to echo the call made in the draft resolution for the national authorities to allow the unconditional return of OHCHR to the country. Venezuela should also grant access to the fact-finding mission and cooperate meaningfully with the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court.

12. The European Union regretted that amendments had been proposed to the text, particularly the one contained in document [A/HRC/57/L.41](#), which referred to so-called unilateral coercive measures. It was important to note that all restrictive measures implemented by the European Union were targeted and calibrated. Their aim was to consolidate peace, democracy and human rights and they were always imposed in accordance with international law. Food, medicine and other essential supplies were exempt from such measures. The European Union and its member States remained the leading donor of external assistance in the world, including to countries where sanctions were in place. For those reasons, the States members of the European Union that were members of the Council would vote against all the proposed amendments and called on other members to do the same.

13. **Ms. Taylor** (United States of America) said that the rapidly deteriorating human rights situation in Venezuela was rooted in the ongoing lack of accountability and the refusal of the Maduro regime to respect its people's aspirations for democracy. The regime and its representatives needed to take concrete steps towards a peaceful transition. In that regard, she wished to commend Argentina and Brazil for seeking to protect defenders of democracy and

for leading regional calls to recognize the true results of the recent elections. She also wished to thank the many countries and communities that had welcomed Venezuelans fleeing the crisis in their country. Her delegation supported the draft resolution extending the mandates of the fact-finding mission and OHCHR. The work of those two bodies was more necessary than ever as the regime continued to restrict civic space in the country. She therefore urged all delegations to support the draft resolution as it stood and to vote against all the proposed amendments.

14. **Mr. Verdún Bitar** (Paraguay) said that his Government was following with concern the situation in Venezuela, where persistent patterns of violations of human rights and individual freedoms had reached intolerable levels, particularly following the elections of 28 July. The many refugees and asylum-seekers only increased the suffering of the civilian population, which had no access to mechanisms for obtaining justice and redress. When the previous draft resolution had been presented in 2022, his delegation had expressed the hope that progress could be made. However, the opposite had been the case and, following the expulsion of OHCHR, the situation in Venezuela had become among the most critical in Latin America. The text of the draft resolution was the result of a constructive and transparent consultation process. It reflected the real situation in Venezuela and highlighted the need to document the violations taking place so that those responsible could finally be held liable for their actions. The fact-finding mission and OHCHR were both vital to that end, and their mandates should be renewed, as envisaged in the draft resolution.

15. **The President** invited the State concerned by the draft resolution to make a statement.

16. **Mr. Yáñez Deleuze** (Observer for the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that his country, like most members of the Council, did not recognize mandates imposed on the basis of selective and politicized criteria and double standards. By using the Council as an instrument with which to coerce the peoples of the global South, Western States risked causing it to meet the same fate as the defunct Commission on Human Rights. The text of the draft resolution had first been put forward in 2019 by the regime of the United States of America – the greatest violator of human rights in history – alongside the European Union and the now-extinct Lima Group, with the declared intention of applying maximum pressure on Venezuela. Those parties had pursued a policy of regime change by recognizing a bogus interim government that was unelected and lacked popular support but could be used to justify the overthrow of the popular Government which the regime in Washington did not like. The fact that 94 per cent of the sponsors of the draft resolution had recognized that unelected government removed all doubts as to the political nature of the text. The list of sponsors included the countries chiefly responsible for invasions and coups d'état in Chile, Honduras, Guatemala, El Salvador, Grenada, Panama, Viet Nam, Afghanistan, Yugoslavia, Iraq, Libya, Syria, Palestine and Lebanon, among many others. Given such a record, Western States were in no position to impart lessons on human rights to countries of the global South. Was it conceivable that such States were truly concerned about human rights? Why were they silent or complicit in the face of the genocide in Palestine? Moreover, the estimated budget for the two mandates over two years stood at nearly \$9 million, equivalent to a daily outlay of \$12,322. The Council should not allow money to be thus wasted on politicized mandates that made no discernible impact in the field of human rights. To vote against the draft resolution would be to denounce a historical injustice against the countries of the global South.

17. **Mr. Soejono** (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights) said that the adoption by the Council of the proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/57/L.43](#) would result in a net reduction in the financial implications of the draft resolution by a total of \$195,300 under section 24, Human rights, of the programme budget. If the amendment was adopted, the statement of programme budget implications that had been posted on the Council's extranet would be revised to reflect those changes. The revised statement would also be brought to the attention of the General Assembly in the context of the report of the Secretary-General on the revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council in 2024.

18. **The President** invited the Council to take action on the proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/57/L.40](#).

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

19. **Mr. Bichler** (Luxembourg) said that the main sponsors of the draft resolution had engaged in constructive dialogue with the main sponsors of all the proposed amendments thereto, including the delegation of Eritrea. The Council's concern about the impact of the crisis on migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers was already set out in the sixth preambular paragraph, while the ninth preambular paragraph contained a reference to the efforts made by host countries to promote and protect the rights of migrants. The oral revision had supplemented that paragraph with language further encouraging host countries to continue to combat racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance against them. That addition showed that the main sponsors of the draft resolution had tried in good faith to arrive at a compromise text. It was unfortunate that the sponsors of the proposed amendments had not voiced their concerns during the informal consultations.

20. It should not be forgotten that the draft resolution primarily concerned the large-scale human rights violations that had forced Venezuelans to leave their country. His delegation wished to request the delegation of Eritrea to withdraw the proposed amendment. If it was put to a vote, his delegation would vote against it and recommended that all members of the Council should do the same.

21. **Mr. Verdún Bitar** (Paraguay) said that the proposed amendment would not add value to the draft resolution, the sixth preambular paragraph of which already contained an expression of concern about the human rights situation of migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers, while the ninth preambular paragraph contained a reference to the efforts of host countries to promote and protect the rights of migrants. In his delegation's view, the main sponsors had duly captured those concerns while also calling attention to the human rights violations that had caused millions of Venezuelans to leave their country. The main sponsors of the proposed amendment had not raised their concerns during the transparent and constructive informal consultation process. His delegation rejected the proposed amendment and called on all members of the Council to do the same.

22. *At the request of the representative of Argentina, a recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

China, Cuba, Eritrea, South Africa, Sudan.

Against:

Albania, Argentina, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Japan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Montenegro, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Paraguay, Romania, Somalia, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Qatar, United Arab Emirates.

23. *The proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/57/L.40](#) was rejected by 21 votes to 5, with 20 abstentions.*

24. **The President** invited the Council to take action on the proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/57/L.41](#).

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

25. **Ms. Fuentes Julio** (Chile) said that Chile had always taken the position that unilateral coercive measures were not in the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations or the principles governing peaceful relations among States. Such measures could have a negative impact on the enjoyment of human rights and on free trade and international cooperation between States. Indeed, the delegation of Chile had voted in favour of Council resolution 55/7 on the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on the enjoyment of human rights. Her delegation acknowledged the comments made by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights regarding the role of sectoral sanctions in exacerbating pre-existing human rights challenges in Venezuela. Accordingly, the main sponsors of the draft resolution had

made an oral revision to the text introducing a new preambular paragraph referring to measures that exacerbated challenges and negatively affected the enjoyment of human rights; unfortunately, that had not been sufficient to trigger the withdrawal of the proposed amendment under consideration. Nevertheless, the new paragraph had been retained in an effort to demonstrate transparency and openness and to fully reflect the challenges that the country was facing.

26. The Council should resist efforts to oversimplify the issue. The crisis in Venezuela was complex and multifaceted, and democracy and the rule of law had progressively been eroded. Mechanisms for repression were embedded in the functioning of the State, and human rights violations had caused more than 7 million people to flee their country. No sanction on the Venezuelan Government or any of its leaders could justify acts of torture and sexual violence or the detention of political opponents. Sanctions had no bearing on deaths that occurred in the context of protests. The atmosphere of fear, repression and persecution that pervaded Venezuelan society, particularly since the recent elections, could not be justified on the basis of sanctions. The proposed amendment was unrelated to the lack of electoral transparency and the refusal to recognize the election results and heed the will of the people, as expressed at the polls. It was unacceptable for any State to use the existence of unilateral coercive measures against it as an excuse for human rights violations. Her delegation rejected all attempts to politicize the concept of unilateral coercive measures. It would vote against the proposed amendment and called upon all members of the Council to do the same.

27. **The President** announced that China had withdrawn its sponsorship of the proposed amendment.

28. **Ms. Li Xiaomei** (China) said that unilateral coercive measures constituted a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law, hindered the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and infringed the right of the affected countries' people to fully enjoy their human rights. Following a visit to Venezuela in 2021, the Special Rapporteur on the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on the enjoyment of human rights had stated that the measures imposed had caused an economic, humanitarian and development crisis in the country, with devastating effects on the entire population, in particular women, children, persons with disabilities and other vulnerable groups. The lack of food, medicine, machinery and fuel posed a serious obstacle to the enjoyment of the rights to life, health and food, among other rights. Her delegation would vote in favour of the proposed amendment, which used consensual language to draw attention to unilateral coercive measures, and requested all members of the Council to do the same.

29. **The President** announced that Eritrea had withdrawn its sponsorship of the proposed amendment.

30. **Ms. Micael** (Eritrea) said that during the consultations her delegation had requested the inclusion in the draft resolution of language on unilateral coercive measures, the impact of which on the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela had been acknowledged by the High Commissioner himself, who had called for them to be lifted. However, the main sponsors had chosen not to reflect those concerns in the draft resolution; instead, they had proceeded to cherry-pick extracts from reports. Such measures, which were imposed in pursuit of geopolitical aims, had far-reaching consequences that deeply impacted the daily lives of millions of Venezuelans. The imposition of unilateral coercive measures was not neutral. In Venezuela, as in other countries subjected to such measures, their use was not simply an obstacle to recovery but also a deliberate act designed to destabilize the country for political purposes. Their impact extended far beyond economic damage and contributed to a deepening humanitarian crisis, social unrest and political destabilization. It was vital to recognize the toll that such measures took on the sovereignty of Venezuela and on the basic rights and dignity of its citizens.

31. The oral revision proposed by the main sponsors of the draft resolution was insufficient and stemmed from an unwillingness, on the part of the countries imposing unilateral coercive measures, to include language on such measures. Her delegation would therefore vote in favour of the proposed amendment and called on all other members of the Council to do the same.

32. **Ms. Schroderus-Fox** (Finland) said that the main sponsors of the draft resolution had, in good faith, sought a compromise with the proponents of all the amendments and, to that end, had included language on the avoidance of obstacles inconsistent with international law; the proposed amendment under consideration was therefore unnecessary.

33. The High Commissioner and the independent international fact-finding mission had documented serious and widespread human rights violations that were completely unrelated to the targeted sanctions that had been imposed on the country. Her delegation was mindful of the High Commissioner's comments regarding sectoral sanctions; however, it was important to note that sanctions aimed at supporting and consolidating peace, democracy, the rule of law and human rights were always targeted, carefully calibrated and imposed in accordance with international law. The sanctions on Venezuela included exceptions for humanitarian activities and did not target food, medicines or emergency supplies. Furthermore, it was important to avoid suggesting that sanctions could explain or justify human rights violations that could amount to crimes against humanity; such violations had begun before the imposition of sanctions and needed to be highlighted and addressed. In the light of the deterioration of the situation in the country, such violations should remain the focus of the draft resolution. Her delegation would therefore vote against the proposed amendment and called on all members of the Council to do the same.

34. *At the request of the representative of Argentina, a recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Algeria, Brazil, Burundi, China, Cuba, Eritrea, Honduras, Indonesia, Malaysia, South Africa, Sudan.

Against:

Albania, Argentina, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Japan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Paraguay, Romania, Somalia, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Bangladesh, Benin, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, India, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Malawi, Maldives, Qatar, United Arab Emirates.

35. *The proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/57/L.41](#) was rejected by 22 votes to 11, with 13 abstentions.*

36. **The President** invited the Council to take action on the proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/57/L.42](#).

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

37. **Mr. Bonnafont** (France) said that, according to the Inter-Agency Coordination Platform for Refugees and Migrants from Venezuela, in September 2023 there had been more than 7.7 million Venezuelan refugees and migrants around the world. That figure signalled a profound crisis, which had not been created by the imposition of sanctions. The factors that had driven Venezuelans to leave their country were well known. No credence should be given to alternative facts such as those that had given rise to the proposal of a number of amendments.

38. The overwhelming majority of Venezuelan refugees – 6.5 million of them – were located in Latin America and the Caribbean. France stood with the countries that hosted them and recognized those countries' exemplary solidarity towards Venezuelan citizens. It was the Council's duty to ensure that, in the face of such a large-scale humanitarian crisis, which had forced almost a quarter of the Venezuelan population to leave their country, the United Nations worked to uphold the human rights of all Venezuelans.

39. France, which had a presence in the Amazon, was committed to peace and security in the region and wished to see the continuation of joint efforts by OHCHR, UNHCR and IOM to protect the rights of Venezuelan migrants and refugees. The root causes of the crisis were to be found in Venezuela, and a long-term solution could be found only through a peaceful political process that respected the will of the people as expressed at the polls, accompanied

by inclusive dialogue. His delegation would vote against the proposed amendment and invited all members of the Council to do the same.

40. **Mr. Verdún Bitar** (Paraguay) said that the proposed amendment brought no added value to the draft resolution. OHCHR played an important role in protecting the rights of refugees that complemented the specific mandate of UNHCR. It was a widely accepted standard practice for OHCHR to work with other relevant international organizations and agencies, as called for in a number of other Council resolutions. In adopting the draft resolution, the Council would encourage special procedure mandate holders to remain abreast of the situation in Venezuela, thereby ensuring a flexible and inclusive approach. It was unnecessary to narrow the focus to a single mandate, given that there were several that were relevant to the situation. The importance of respecting the independence of mandate holders in the exercise of their functions must not be forgotten. His delegation would vote against the proposed amendment and urged all members of the Council to do the same.

41. **Ms. Taylor** (United States of America) said that her delegation could not support the proposed amendment, which would undermine the work of OHCHR in Venezuela in three ways. First, the proposed deletion of the word “refugees” was inconsistent with other paragraphs of the draft resolution that contained the word. To delete it would be to ignore the important role played by OHCHR in advancing the protection of the rights of refugees, which complemented the work of UNHCR. Second, the deletion of references to collaboration with other relevant international organizations was inconsistent with standard practice. Third, mandating collaboration with only one special procedure mandate holder was unnecessarily limiting and undermined the goal of ensuring a broader, more flexible and inclusive approach to the critical work of the fact-finding mission. It would also call into question the independence of mandate holders. Her delegation opposed the proposed amendment and urged all members of the Council to vote against it.

42. *At the request of the representative of Argentina, a recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Algeria, China, Cuba, Eritrea, South Africa, Sudan.

Against:

Albania, Argentina, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Honduras, Japan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Paraguay, Romania, Somalia, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Côte d’Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Gambia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Maldives, Qatar, United Arab Emirates.

43. *The proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/57/L.42](#) was rejected by 22 votes to 6, with 18 abstentions.*

44. **The President** invited the Council to take action on the proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/57/L.43](#).

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

45. **Mr. Foradori** (Argentina) said that since September 2022, when the mandates of OHCHR and of the independent international fact-finding mission had last been renewed, both mechanisms had proven to be extremely valuable and effective in bringing to the world’s attention the serious and ongoing human rights violations in Venezuela. The mandates were complementary and mutually reinforcing; OHCHR was focused on monitoring and reporting on the human rights situation on the ground, while the work of the fact-finding mission was centred on ensuring accountability, with a view to preventing future violations. Against that backdrop, and due to the volatility of the situation, the High Commissioner’s oral updates, which the proposed amendment would eliminate, were a crucial tool for keeping the Council and the international community abreast of the situation, with clear, up-to-date, first-hand information on the most recent developments in the country. In recent months, the situation had deteriorated rapidly, making regular updates all the more important. The main sponsors

of the draft resolution were aware of the implications of all the activities called for in the text and had carefully assessed the value of each of them. They regretted that some delegations sought, through the proposal of amendments, to downplay the importance of the topic in the context of the Council.

46. The delegation of the country concerned had just stated that it did not recognize mandates that were imposed on it. He wished to recall that, during the Council's forty-second session, the delegation of Venezuela had affirmed that OHCHR would be granted unlimited access to all regions and detention centres, with the full cooperation of the State, and had expressed support for Council resolution 42/4 on strengthening cooperation and technical assistance in the field of human rights in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. At the same session, the Council had adopted resolution 42/25, which had established the mandate of the independent international fact-finding mission that the draft resolution at hand would extend, following the expulsion, by the Government of Venezuela, of the members of the fact-finding mission on the basis of arguments that were not credible. In conclusion, he said that his delegation would vote against the proposed amendment and invited all members of the Council to do the same.

47. **Ms. Taylor** (United States of America) said that the main sponsors of the draft resolution were mindful of the financial situation of the United Nations and shared concerns about the effects thereof on the implementation of activities mandated by the Council. For that reason, they had been careful to maintain requests addressed to OHCHR and the fact-finding mission at the same level as in the previous resolution on the same subject, notwithstanding the deterioration of the human rights situation in Venezuela in the intervening period. No increase in resources had been requested, and the main sponsors had preserved only one interactive dialogue on the situation at each of the Council's regular sessions, in addition to one in December 2024, which was intended to provide the Council with an update on the repression that was expected to further intensify in the lead-up to the presidential transition in January. Her delegation therefore opposed the proposed amendment and urged the members of the Council to vote against it.

48. **Ms. Stasch** (Germany) said that the proposed amendment was an attempt to reduce scrutiny on Venezuela in what were crucial and trying times for the country. In general, her delegation did not appreciate the proposal of amendments to texts about which delegations had been given extensive opportunities to raise concerns at the negotiation stage. As tensions in Venezuela grew and the suppression of dissent increased, it was all the more important to maintain international engagement. It was therefore vital that the Council should receive timely updates from OHCHR. Her delegation would vote against the proposed amendment and called on other members of the Council to do the same.

49. *At the request of the representative of Argentina, a recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Algeria, China, Cuba, Eritrea, Honduras, Indonesia, Sudan, Viet Nam.

Against:

Albania, Argentina, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Japan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Montenegro, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Paraguay, Romania, Somalia, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, India, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Qatar, South Africa, United Arab Emirates.

50. *The proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/57/L.43](#) was rejected by 21 votes to 8, with 18 abstentions.*

51. **The President** invited the Council to take action on the amendment proposed orally by the delegation of Cuba.

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

52. **Mr. Foradori** (Argentina) said that the five reports produced by the fact-finding mission since 2020, in addition to numerous oral updates and other documentation, had highlighted the hundreds of cases of extrajudicial killing, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention and torture that had occurred in Venezuela over the previous decade. They had also served to document how the justice system had been used by the Government as a tool for political repression and had concluded that such serious human rights violations could amount to crimes against humanity.

53. The fact-finding mission had been all the more crucial before, during and after the presidential elections of July 2024, which had been held against a backdrop of worsening human rights violations and an unprecedented increase in restrictions of civic and democratic space, including the disproportionate use of force by security officers and armed individuals, acts of intimidation, attacks, harassment, reprisals and public defamation of opposition leaders, peaceful protesters, journalists, human rights defenders and Indigenous Peoples. There had also been incidents of closure of media outlets, surveillance, blocking and shutdown of websites and digital platforms.

54. As he had stated previously, the mandates of the fact-finding mission and of OHCHR were complementary and mutually reinforcing. The amendment proposed orally by the Cuban delegation sought, at a stroke, to eliminate the mission, which was centrally important for delivering accountability for the victims of human rights violations in Venezuela. Many countries, usually those with the worst human rights records, constantly made reference to the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States. If the Council were to apply that principle in the most restrictive sense, it might as well close down, since the implication would be that it was indifferent to human rights violations worldwide. It was the Council's duty not to ignore suffering and to maintain its firm commitment to defending human rights in Venezuela, in line with the principle of "non-indifference" towards States.

55. One delegation had signalled its concern about budgetary costs. His own delegation was also concerned about costs, specifically the human cost of rights violations against the people of Venezuela. His delegation would vote against the oral amendment and urged all members of the Council to do the same.

56. **Mr. Payot** (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Union that were members of the Council, said it was regrettable that, in addition to a written amendment, the Cuban delegation had proposed an oral amendment to the draft resolution. To take delegations by surprise and deprive them of the possibility of seeking instructions or engaging in further consultations was not a constructive course of action and led to unnecessary polarization, which had a pernicious effect on the Council's integrity and credibility. The Council should not reward aggressive behaviour of that kind.

57. The oral amendment was particularly unconstructive in that it would delete the operative paragraph relating to the fact-finding mission. The European Union took the position that both mandates, that of the mission and that of OHCHR, were necessary and were eminently compatible and complementary, despite the Venezuelan Government's refusal to work with them. The delegations of the States members of the European Union that were members of the Council would vote against the oral amendment and called upon other members of the Council to do the same.

58. **Mr. Jgenti** (Georgia) said that the crucial importance of the fact-finding mission should not be underestimated. Since its establishment, it had played a key role in documenting human rights violations in Venezuela and providing important recommendations for improving the situation on the ground. The mission's reports were one of the few instruments available for pursuing justice and facilitating national dialogue between all stakeholders in the country. Given the recent deterioration of the human rights situation in Venezuela, it was critical for the fact-finding mission to continue its vital work. His delegation supported the renewal of the mission's mandate and would vote against the oral amendment. It urged other members of the Council to do the same.

59. **Mr. Tummers** (Kingdom of the Netherlands) said that his delegation's concerns about the oral amendment were substantive as well as procedural, given that it would strip

the draft resolution of its *raison d'être*. The fact-finding mission had, since its creation, played a pivotal role in documenting human rights violations in Venezuela and made important recommendations to the authorities and the international community on how to address them. Its reports had contributed to advancing accountability and justice for victims and it had been instrumental in facilitating national dialogue between all stakeholders in the country.

60. By providing impartial and independently verified information on the human rights situation in Venezuela, the mission had enabled the Council to fulfil its mandate pursuant to General Assembly resolution 60/251, namely to address situations of violations of human rights, including gross and systematic violations, and make recommendations thereon. More than ever before, the Council needed to address the human rights situation in Venezuela; it was therefore critical that the mission's mandate should be extended so that it could continue its vital work. His delegation would vote against the oral amendment and called upon all members of the Council to do the same.

61. *At the request of the representative of Argentina, a recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Algeria, China, Cuba, Eritrea, Sudan, Viet Nam.

Against:

Albania, Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Japan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Paraguay, Romania, Somalia, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Bangladesh, Benin, Burundi, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Maldives, Qatar, South Africa, United Arab Emirates.

62. *The amendment proposed orally by the delegation of Cuba was rejected by 23 votes to 6, with 18 abstentions.*

63. **The President** invited the Council to take action on draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.8](#), as orally revised.

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

64. **The President** announced that Germany had withdrawn its sponsorship of the draft resolution.

65. **Ms. Stasch** (Germany) said that, with the recent increase in the suppression of dissent in Venezuela and the arrest of individuals, including children, for simply exercising their right to freedom of speech, the draft resolution was an important response to calls from Venezuelan civil society for support from the international community. The practice of proposing amendments to undermine support for the draft resolution was thus deeply regrettable. The independent investigations and assessments conducted by the fact-finding mission were of paramount importance for ensuring that violations and abuses were documented. Her delegation called on Venezuela to cooperate fully with the fact-finding mission and OHCHR. She urged other members of the Council to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

66. **Ms. Li Xiaomei** (China) said that the Chinese Government welcomed the progress made by the Venezuelan Government in promoting and protecting human rights and opposed interference by external forces in that country's internal affairs. All parties should respect the right of the Venezuelan people to independently choose their own development path and should be impartial and objective in their assessment of the human rights situation, while trusting the Government and the people to manage their own internal affairs. Differences in the field of human rights should be addressed through constructive dialogue and cooperation, and any politicization of human rights or their use as a pretext for interference in the internal affairs of States should be avoided. Experience showed that country-specific mechanisms imposed without the consent of the State concerned did not help to protect and promote human rights. The draft resolution provided for duplicate mechanisms and included requests

for the Council to hold frequent dialogues, all of which took up significant resources, with the budget for the fact-finding mission alone amounting to \$6 million. For those reasons, and because of its position of principle on country-specific mechanisms, her delegation called on other members of the Council to vote against the draft resolution.

67. **Mr. Quintanilla Román** (Cuba) said that draft resolutions such as the one under consideration were shameful examples of interference in the internal affairs of States. The partial, selective, politicized text completely lacked any balance and was an affront to the Venezuelan people's sovereignty, dignity and right to self-determination. It included irresponsible accusations devoid of any legal or technical justification that resulted only from hatred and harassment of a country that would never bow down to imperialism or the geopolitical aims of imperialist countries. It was a clear example of the double standards that prevailed in the Council, as the same countries that had supported the rationalization of the Council's work now sought to mandate the drafting of 10 reports and the holding of 8 interactive dialogues in just two years. The so-called fact-finding mission, with its fallacious statements, lack of impact, complicity with lies and scandalous attempt to assume the powers of an international tribunal, was another glaring example.

68. The oral amendment proposed by his delegation had previously been put forward during the informal consultations on the draft resolution but had been ignored. The text made no mention of the impact of unilateral coercive measures on the social and economic situation of Venezuela and on the realization of the rights of its people. The evidence documented by the Government of Venezuela and the relevant statements made by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, special procedure mandate holders, treaty bodies and specialized agencies must not be ignored. The silence in the face of hate speech and disinformation and the resurgence of fascist rhetoric by far-right political activists responsible for criminal acts and inciting violence and destabilization were deeply troubling. It was unfortunate that the States of the Latin American region had not understood the importance of unity and solidarity in the face of national challenges to which no country was immune. Some of the sponsors of the draft resolution should concern themselves more with the rights of their own citizens, who were seeing social welfare systems that had been built over many years being dismantled and millions of vulnerable people left without help. Reiterating its firm support for Venezuela, its people and the democratically elected Government of President Nicolás Maduro, his delegation requested a vote on the draft resolution and would vote against it.

69. **Mr. Ghirmai** (Eritrea) said that his delegation firmly rejected all country-specific mandates. Venezuela, like any sovereign State, had the right to manage its internal affairs free from unwarranted foreign intrusion. The fact-finding mission had repeatedly demonstrated clear bias, selectively presenting information to fit preconceived narratives and disregarding the fundamental principles of fairness and non-interference; his delegation therefore rejected any renewal of its mandate. Rather than foreign intervention, the people of Venezuela needed respect for their independence and for the democratic processes at the foundation of their nation. His delegation welcomed the considerable efforts made by the Government to promote and protect the human rights of its citizens. It joined the Cuban delegation in calling for a vote on the draft resolution and urged all other members of the Council to stand firm in their commitment to fairness and respect for national sovereignty by voting against it.

70. **Ms. Arias Moncada** (Honduras) said that her delegation had repeatedly expressed concern about the selectivity that endangered the Council's legitimacy and credibility; the impact and efficacy of its work in establishing human rights mechanisms and procedures must be subject to critical assessment. The work of the fact-finding mission to date did not fully ensure the objectivity and impartiality of the mandate, nor had it taken into account the negative impact of disinformation and its effects in polarizing society. Her Government expressed its solidarity with the people and Government of Venezuela in respect of the unilateral coercive measures imposed against the country, which were incompatible with international human rights law and had a clear negative impact on the people's right to food, development, education and health. In the light of the calls for rationalization of the Council's activities, including the merging of similar activities regarding country situations, attention should have been paid to the resources allocated solely to discussing the situation in

Venezuela. In the light of those considerations, her delegation would abstain from voting on the draft resolution.

71. **Mr. Da Silva Nunes** (Brazil) said that his delegation supported the renewal of the mandates of OHCHR and the fact-finding mission in Venezuela, as their work could contribute to the improvement of the human rights situation in the country through constructive dialogue and cooperation. His Government had repeatedly encouraged the Venezuelan Government to engage with those mandates. Although some of his delegation's suggestions had been integrated into the draft resolution, the text nevertheless remained biased and unbalanced; his delegation would therefore abstain from voting on it.

72. As had been clearly seen in the case of other resolutions adopted under agenda item 4 where the principles guiding the Council's work had been disregarded, excessively condemnatory and prescriptive wording would not improve conditions on the ground or foster dialogue with the relevant parties. The negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on Venezuela, particularly in respect of access to food, medicines and medical equipment, which affected the realization of human rights, especially for the most vulnerable segments of the population, must also be taken into account. The draft resolution did not adequately address the challenges stemming from those measures, which the High Commissioner had recognized in the past. The only way to overcome the political, economic and social challenges faced by the country was through efforts to foster dialogue among Venezuelan political forces. His delegation urged the Venezuelan authorities to promptly address the alleged human rights violations in order to promote the protection of and respect for all fundamental rights and freedoms.

73. *At the request of the representatives of Cuba and Eritrea, a recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Albania, Argentina, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Japan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Paraguay, Romania, Somalia, United States of America.

Against:

Algeria, China, Cuba, Eritrea, Sudan, Viet Nam.

Abstaining:

Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Maldives, Qatar, South Africa, United Arab Emirates.

74. *Draft resolution A/HRC/57/L.8, as orally revised, was adopted by 23 votes to 6, with 18 abstentions.**

75. **The President** invited delegations to make statements in explanation of vote or general statements on any of the draft resolutions considered under agenda item 4.

76. **Mr. Da Silva Nunes** (Brazil) said that the increasing numbers of resolutions submitted each year under agenda item 4, rather than fostering solutions to help address human rights violations, only served to further isolate countries and undermine the Council's vital work. Country-specific resolutions should be considered only as a last resort, after an inclusive and transparent process involving all relevant stakeholders and a thorough assessment of the need for such measures had been undertaken. If their effectiveness was not assessed, the repeated adoption of such resolutions under agenda items 2 and 4 risked eroding the Council's fundamental principles of universality, impartiality, objectivity and non-selectivity. The current approach increased polarization, hampered dialogue and reduced the potential for international cooperation, which was crucial for addressing global challenges. Additionally, the ongoing budgetary crisis affecting OHCHR underscored the need for careful consideration before the establishment or renewal of special procedure mandates that could not deliver tangible results on the ground. His delegation believed that

* The delegation of Burundi subsequently informed the Council that it had intended to vote against the draft resolution.

the Human Rights Council and OHCHR should put greater effort into fostering international cooperation and promoting technical assistance; it also supported the universal periodic review process as a constructive mechanism and remained convinced that cooperation and dialogue were the only way forward.

Agenda item 10: Technical assistance and capacity-building (*continued*)
(A/HRC/57/L.32)

Draft resolution A/HRC/57/L.32: Technical assistance and capacity-building for Yemen in the field of human rights

77. **Mr. Al Musharakh** (United Arab Emirates), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of Arab States, said that it embodied some of the most important values for which the Council had been established: to work with States and empower them in the promotion and protection of human rights through constructive dialogue and cooperation and to deliver technical assistance and capacity-building. The reasons behind the call for greater support and assistance to Yemen at the current critical time included the facts that it was one of the least developed countries and was undergoing difficulties and challenges that had impacted the capabilities of the Government; it urgently needed continued developmental, humanitarian and technical support from the international community to be able to fulfil its human rights obligations. The dramatic events after the coup d'état in the country, the destruction of civilian infrastructure and the negative repercussions for the Yemeni population's enjoyment of human rights made it vital to achieve peace in order to bring an end to the violations and open a pathway for transitional justice. The Yemeni Government was committed to investigating allegations of human rights violations and cooperating with the Council and various mechanisms. The National Commission of Inquiry was leading those efforts and, despite the challenges it faced, was determined to improve its performance and the quality of its reports.

78. Many delegations had participated in the consultations on the draft resolution and had made suggestions to enrich the text. He wished to thank the High Commissioner for the technical assistance provided by OHCHR to the Yemeni Government, despite the ongoing liquidity crisis in the regular budget of the United Nations Secretariat.

79. In the draft resolution, OHCHR was requested to continue to provide the necessary support to help the Government of Yemen to implement its human rights obligations and meet the development and humanitarian needs of the Yemeni people. The draft resolution was also aimed at strengthening the capacity of the independent National Commission of Inquiry to enable it to continue investigating allegations of violations of human rights and international humanitarian law in order to ensure accountability, justice and redress. It further expressed strong support for the international efforts to reach a comprehensive ceasefire, end the conflict in the country and renew meaningful political dialogue for peace and included a call for the removal of obstacles to the provision of humanitarian aid. It also included a call on the Houthis, who had detained scores of United Nations personnel, humanitarian workers and staff working for international and national non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and diplomatic missions, to expedite the unconditional release of those detainees. He urged the members of the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

General statements made before the decision

80. **Ms. Al-Muftah** (Qatar), speaking on behalf of the States members of the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf, said that the delegations concerned welcomed the call in the draft resolution for increased technical assistance and capacity-building from OHCHR for the National Commission of Inquiry in Yemen to help it address human rights violations. Those States appreciated the work of the Commission in investigating allegations on the basis of international standards and considered it vital to ensuring justice in the country. They were concerned that the challenges currently affecting the United Nations Secretariat might affect the ability of OHCHR to provide the necessary support to Yemen to enable the Commission to achieve the desired goals. Her delegation called on members of the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

81. **Mr. Yebio** (Eritrea) said that his delegation opposed any proposal that sought to alter the essence of the draft resolution and firmly rejected the persistent calls for the imposition of new mandates that did not have the support of the State concerned. Yemen was not asking for more scrutiny or external dialogues, but for assistance on the ground and institutional capacity development. His delegation urged the Council to continue to heed that call at future sessions and to respond to the explicit needs of the country concerned. The notion of consent must not be taken lightly. Yemen had clearly expressed its opposition to the inclusion of an interactive dialogue in the mandate but certain States nevertheless continued to push for it. His delegation struggled to comprehend the fixation on dialogues: despite the argument that they were cooperative in nature and allowed solutions to be reached, they had not led to any positive achievements. Any lasting solution for Yemen must be led by the State itself, with technical assistance and on the basis of utmost respect for the country's sovereignty.

82. **Mr. Alimbayev** (Kazakhstan) said that his delegation strongly believed that the primary responsibility for the promotion and protection of human rights lay with States. The Council should provide greater technical assistance and capacity-building to supplement national efforts, in consultation with and with the consent of the States concerned. Agenda item 10 offered a valuable opportunity for the Council to support Yemen in fulfilling its human rights obligations, creating a supportive environment to allow it to effectively implement its human rights agenda for peace and sustainable development. His delegation urged other members of the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

83. **Mr. Rudjimin** (Indonesia) said that his delegation staunchly supported the Council's resolutions on technical assistance and capacity-building, believing that constructive cooperation and genuine dialogue should serve as the foundation for the promotion and protection of human rights, on the basis of consultations and the consent of the country concerned. The Government of Yemen was to be commended for its ongoing efforts to maintain stability and advance human rights, despite persistent security challenges and the difficult humanitarian situation, which had been further exacerbated by major flooding in several regions of the country. Human rights were foundational for sustaining peace and their promotion and protection were essential for preventing conflict. His delegation therefore welcomed the country's continued engagement with OHCHR in addressing the need for technical assistance and capacity-building to strengthen its national mechanisms and encouraged OHCHR to maintain its constructive dialogue and cooperation with Yemen in providing comprehensive technical assistance. His delegation urged other members of the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

84. **The President** invited the State concerned by the draft resolution to make a statement.

85. **Mr. Omar** (Observer for Yemen) said that the Yemeni Government required specialized technical support to effectively address the many challenges before it. In its efforts to improve the human rights situation, it was faced with a lack of human and financial resources. Its priorities were to develop national capacity for promoting human rights and to improve the legislative framework and institutional infrastructure; there was also a clear need to strengthen national capacities for monitoring, documentation, investigation and accountability. Advanced, secure documentation systems and data analysis tools were needed to prepare accurate and reliable reports and formulate recommendations. Support was needed to develop digital platforms for communicating with the public, including receiving and correctly managing complaints of violations. The Government was thus counting on the support of the international community to help it overcome the structural challenges faced by its national institutions, improve the implementation of its national and international obligations and provide better conditions for the observance and protection of human rights. His delegation hoped that the Council would adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

86. **Mr. Payot** (Belgium), speaking in explanation of position before the decision on behalf of the States members of the European Union that were members of the Council, said that those States were disappointed with the draft resolution. The suffering of the people of Yemen deserved the Council's full attention, independent monitoring of ongoing human rights violations and abuses, and full accountability, for the sake of victims and survivors.

87. During the negotiations on the draft resolution, States members of the European Union had made constructive proposals, which had been consistent with the spirit of the text and

had enjoyed wide cross-regional support. The proposals had represented a bare minimum of an appropriate response from the Council to the situation in Yemen and had not been unreasonable, in that they would merely have restored wording previously included in the relevant resolutions adopted between 2011 and 2018 and brought the text into line with other resolutions adopted under agenda item 10. However, the main sponsors had rejected them without providing convincing explanations. As it stood, the text fell below the standard of resolutions adopted under item 10 and created a damaging precedent.

88. The States members of the European Union strongly condemned the latest arbitrary detentions by the Houthis of staff working for the United Nations, diplomatic missions and NGOs in Yemen and welcomed the call in the draft resolution for their unconditional and immediate release. Another matter of particular concern was that, in areas under Houthi control, women could not travel without a male guardian and humanitarian workers were systematically hampered in their work in support of the Yemeni people. Despite all the efforts at constructive engagement made by the States members of the European Union, they were left with the impression that some other delegations seemed to be more interested in preventing the Council from discussing the human rights situation in Yemen than in addressing and improving it.

89. **Ms. Taylor** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position before the decision, said that her delegation was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution and thanked the main sponsors for advancing discussions on that important human rights priority. Nonetheless, it joined other States in strongly supporting OHCHR reporting on the human rights situation in Yemen and called for future resolutions to provide for such reporting. It also called for a dedicated discussion on Yemen to be scheduled for a future session of the Council. The Houthis were exacerbating the already dire human rights situation in the country and must release all detained United Nations personnel and staff of NGOs and diplomatic missions, whose detention had a direct effect on the ability of the United Nations to conduct its work. The United States called on all parties to the conflict to facilitate access for the investigation of human rights abuses and violations. It urged States to provide safe, unhindered humanitarian access to populations in need, but noted that international human rights law did not necessarily require States to permit external humanitarian assistance.

90. *Draft resolution A/HRC/57/L.32 was adopted.*

Agenda item 1: Organizational and procedural matters (*continued*) ([A/HRC/57/2](#) and [A/HRC/57/83](#))

Election of members of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee

91. **The President** drew attention to a note by the Secretary-General on the election of members of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee ([A/HRC/57/83](#)). Since the number of candidates from African States, Asia-Pacific States, Latin American and Caribbean States and Western European and other States was equal to the number of vacancies to be filled from each of those groups, he took it that the Council wished to elect the candidates by acclamation.

92. *It was so decided.*

93. *Ms. Alomair (Saudi Arabia), Ms. Devulsky (Brazil), Mr. Tzevelekos (Greece) and Mr. Viljoen (South Africa) were elected members of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee.*

Appointment of special procedure mandate holders

94. **The President** said that, on the basis of the recommendations of the Consultative Group and following broad consultations, he wished to propose the appointment of the candidates whose names were indicated in the letters circulated to delegations on 22 August and 27 September 2024. He took it that the Council wished to endorse those candidates and appoint them as special procedure mandate holders.

95. *It was so decided.*

96. **The President**, noting that an unforeseen vacancy for the mandate of Special Rapporteur on the rights of Indigenous Peoples had arisen following the previous mandate holder's resignation, said that time constraints had prevented the Consultative Group from recommending candidates for appointment at the current session. The appointment was expected to be made at the organizational session of the Council scheduled for 9 December 2024.

Report on the fifty-seventh session

97. **Mr. Staniulis** (Lithuania), Vice-President and Rapporteur, said that an advance unedited version of the draft report of the Human Rights Council on its fifty-seventh session (A/HRC/57/2) had been circulated. The structure of the report reflected the 10 items on the Council's agenda. The secretariat would finalize the report after the session and circulate it for comments and corrections. During the session, the Council had held 9 general debates and 42 interactive dialogues, including 9 with the participation of the High Commissioner or Deputy High Commissioner and 1 with the participation of the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights. It had also held 21 interactive dialogues with special procedure mandate holders and expert mechanisms, 5 interactive dialogues with other investigative mechanisms and 1 dialogue with the Advisory Committee. The Council had also discussed a wide range of topics during six panel discussions and had held a closed meeting on the complaint procedure. The Council had witnessed a historic moment during the session when the participation of observer groups had been expanded and enriched to include observers for Indigenous Peoples. Those observers had successfully participated in two debates and had made valuable contributions by bringing the voice of Indigenous Peoples to the work of the Council. The Council had adopted 37 resolutions, 1 statement by the President and 14 outcome documents under the universal periodic review process.

98. **The President** said he took it that the Council wished to adopt the report ad referendum, on the understanding that it would be finalized with the assistance of the secretariat.

99. *It was so decided.*

Statements by observer delegations on the resolutions and decisions considered at the session

100. **Ms. McCullagh** (Observer for Canada) said that her delegation had supported numerous resolutions considered at the current session. It thanked the main sponsors of draft resolution A/HRC/57/L.35/Rev.1 on the elimination of domestic violence for advancing the rights of all women and girls and for their constructive approach to accommodating suggestions. However, it would have preferred for the caveat concerning intimate partner violence to have been excluded from the seventh preambular paragraph and for the text to have noted the importance of recognizing intimate partner violence as a specific form of violence. It was regrettable that some delegations continued to question agreed language. Her delegation would continue its efforts to keep sexual and gender-based violence high on the Council's agenda and to clearly and unequivocally condemn intimate partner violence.

101. Her delegation supported draft resolution A/HRC/57/L.21 on the World Programme for Human Rights Education and noted with concern that, during the negotiations, some delegations had objected to the plan of action for the fifth phase of the Programme because of references to sexual orientation and gender identity. It fully supported the plan of action and continued to support the independence of OHCHR and its commitment to non-discrimination. Canada strongly supported the Human Rights Council and would continue working with members towards improved efficiency. However, her delegation was concerned about the growing number of Council resolutions that either lacked a clear objective or overlapped with existing initiatives. It encouraged delegations to consider leveraging and building upon existing work so as to reduce the potential for overlap and duplication and to recommit to further supporting efficiency efforts.

102. **Ms. Atteya** (Observer for Egypt) said that her delegation welcomed the consensual adoption of draft resolutions A/HRC/57/L.3 on terrorism, A/HRC/57/L.6 on local government and A/HRC/57/L.30 on youth and encouraged delegations to join the sponsors.

It commended the adoption of draft resolutions [A/HRC/57/L.32](#), [A/HRC/57/L.37](#) and [A/HRC/57/L.38/Rev.1](#), on technical assistance and capacity-building for Yemen, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Central African Republic, respectively, and stressed the importance of maintaining the consensual and non-politicized nature of resolutions adopted under agenda item 10. Serving as a clear testament that the Council was responding to the needs of developing countries and people in vulnerable situations, the adoption of draft resolutions [A/HRC/57/L.19](#) on the right to development, [A/HRC/57/L.25](#) on education and [A/HRC/57/L.36/Rev.1](#) on action against racism and xenophobia was also welcome.

103. Egypt reserved the right to interpret and implement the provisions of different resolutions in accordance with its national laws and its obligations under international human rights law. Her delegation was thus concerned about attempts to redefine international obligations and universally agreed language through non-legally binding or non-intergovernmentally agreed documents and regretted that the general statements made by some delegations on draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.21](#) denied the right of other delegations to express their national positions.

104. Her delegation dissociated itself from non-consensual concepts that did not have a clear definition in international human rights law, including the concept of “multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination”. It maintained its interpretation of the term “gender” and other related concepts in line with its own national and cultural context. It also dissociated itself from references to menstrual health and reproductive rights and maintained its understanding of the concept in accordance with its national legislation and the agreed language of the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development and the Beijing Declaration. Its understanding of the concept of “human rights defenders”, meanwhile, was based strictly on the Declaration on Human Rights Defenders adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 53/144.

105. It was regrettable that draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.7](#) on countering cyberbullying did not recognize the crucial role of parents as the primary caregivers and protectors of their children in online spaces. Regarding draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.34](#) on equal participation in political and public affairs, she reiterated the importance of maintaining the internationally agreed concept of youth participation and the need to take national frameworks pertaining to children’s participation into account. In relation to draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.28](#) on the promotion, protection and enjoyment of human rights on the Internet, her delegation stressed the need to adhere to the agreed language of the recently adopted Global Digital Compact.

106. **Mr. Hashim Mostafa** (Observer for Iraq) said that another year had passed and children in Palestine were still living under open skies and suffering the effects of genocidal acts as the occupying Power maintained a deafening silence while further extending the scale of its aggression, which imperilled the entire region. In solidarity with the victims of terrorism and in order to provide them with redress, his delegation supported draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.3](#). Additionally, it commended the efforts of the main sponsors of draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.21](#), particularly the openness that they had demonstrated. However, while reaffirming his country’s commitment to human rights, especially the rights of children and women, and to multiculturalism and religious diversity, his delegation wished to reiterate that the Government of Iraq reserved the right to interpret terms such as “multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination”, “menstrual health”, “reproductive rights” and “gender” in accordance with its national legislation.

107. **Ms. Méndez Escobar** (Observer for Mexico) said that her delegation had been a main sponsor of 4 draft resolutions submitted during the session and had joined the sponsors of a further 10 draft resolutions. In relation to draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.35/Rev.1](#) on the elimination of domestic violence, it appreciated the main sponsors’ efforts to address all forms of such violence, including intimate partner violence, a scourge that States should not shy away from calling by its name. Her delegation therefore rejected wording that qualified its recognition. With regard to draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.21](#) on the World Programme for Human Rights Education, her delegation supported the plan of action for the fifth phase, which had been prepared by OHCHR, and regretted that some delegations had opposed its adoption on the basis of the reference to sexual orientation as a ground for discrimination. Her delegation called on all States to respect the independence of OHCHR in carrying out its

mandate. With regard to draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.26](#) on biodiversity and human rights, her delegation supported the text overall but wished to reiterate that the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples recognized the rights of Indigenous Peoples only, and that the sixth preambular paragraph should thus not be interpreted as implying that the Declaration applied also to other groups.

108. **Mr. Barmin** (Observer for the Russian Federation) said that the Russian Federation opposed attempts to politicize the promotion and protection of human rights, which was the purpose of the resolutions concerning the human rights situation in Afghanistan, Burundi, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Syria and Venezuela. It rejected draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.4](#) on the situation of human rights in Russia, the mandate of the corresponding Special Rapporteur and draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.20](#) on cooperation with Georgia; those were politicized initiatives that ran counter to the guiding principles of the Council's work.

109. The request addressed to the President of the Council to organize the participation of Indigenous Peoples in the work of the Council, contained in draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.29/Rev.1](#), should be carried out in accordance with the Council's institution-building package. In draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.17/Rev.1](#), his delegation did not support the call for synergies to be created in the work of OHCHR and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime in order to enhance the multiple human rights dimensions of the social reintegration of persons released from detention. It did not support draft resolutions [A/HRC/57/L.26](#) and [A/HRC/57/L.31/Rev.1](#), as it opposed the saturation of the Council's agenda with climate change and nature conservation issues.

110. His Government would interpret references to human rights defenders in the adopted resolutions in accordance with the Declaration on Human Rights Defenders adopted by the General Assembly. It did not agree with the use of terms such as "human rights-based approach", "gender-responsive", "intimate partner violence", "survivors" and "menstrual health". Moreover, it understood "gender" to refer to biological sex and "gender-based violence" to refer to violations committed on the basis of sex. Lastly, it regretted that the sponsors of many resolutions had not been bold enough to address the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on the realization of human rights and especially their impact on the most vulnerable persons.

111. **Ms. Arunatilaka** (Observer for Sri Lanka) said that her delegation welcomed the adoption of resolutions on women's rights, the right to development, the thirtieth anniversary of the Beijing Declaration, youth and human rights, and promoting accessibility for the full enjoyment of all human rights by all. However, it shared the growing concern about the proliferation of country-specific resolutions that were not supported by the country concerned. Her Government's position of principle was that any action to improve human rights in any country should be guided by the accepted principles of mutual respect and cooperation and should support national efforts in line with international obligations. In Sri Lanka, the ninth President, Anura Kumara Dissanayake, had taken office in September 2024 after a free and fair election and, in November, the people would elect a new parliament, enabling the Government to deliver on the people's expectations for a new political culture. The new Government would protect democracy and the human rights of all citizens and would address past violations. Domestic mechanisms for ensuring reconciliation, accountability and justice would be credible and independent within the constitutional framework and a truth and reconciliation process that enjoyed the trust of the people would be operationalized.

112. Since external mechanisms established without the support of the country concerned while domestic mechanisms were in operation prejudged domestic legal processes and ran counter to the founding principles of the Council, her delegation reiterated its rejection of draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.1](#) on promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka. It shared the concerns of many delegations that, under the guise of protecting human rights and serving justice, exorbitant financial resources had been allocated and had served mainly to create employment opportunities in Geneva during the United Nations liquidity crisis. Amid intense cynicism and polarization in the multilateral arena on human rights and humanitarian issues, her delegation urged the Council to adopt an inclusive, integrated and holistic approach to human rights, supporting domestic processes in line with

international obligations, in order to make the Council's work more relevant and credible in the multilateral context.

113. **Ms. Karimdoost** (Observer for the Islamic Republic of Iran), recalling that 11 October marked the International Day of the Girl Child, said that the Islamic Republic of Iran wished to reiterate its support for and solidarity with the Palestinian children facing the continuing brutality of a genocidal Israel. Regarding the resolutions adopted during the session, her delegation welcomed draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.19](#) on the right to development and hoped that future resolutions on that subject would be adopted by consensus. It dissociated itself from the controversial and non-consensual language, such as "sexual and reproductive healthcare services", used in draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.35/Rev.1](#) on the elimination of domestic violence. Her Government reserved the right to interpret and implement the resolution in accordance with national laws and development priorities, with full respect for the various religious and ethical values and cultural backgrounds of its people.

114. In respect of draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.24](#) on the situation of human rights in Afghanistan, she reiterated her Government's position of principle that selective approaches should be rejected and that any future monitoring mechanism in Afghanistan should address the atrocities and crimes perpetrated by those who had invaded the country over the past decade. In draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.30](#) on youth and human rights, it was regrettable that all mention of unilateral coercive measures had been excluded, despite the constructive approach taken by States subjected to such measures, owing to the authoritarian determination of some of the main sponsors to prevent due inclusion of such language. That attitude revealed a gulf between the words of those who purported to be human rights champions and what they were actually doing in the field.

115. **Mr. Ayala Meléndez** (Observer for Colombia) said that the internal conflict in Colombia had resulted from a history of exclusion, discrimination and violence in which the rights of campesinos, Indigenous communities, ethnic minorities, members of the LGBTIQ+ community, women and children had been ignored. The country was now working to address the consequences of that conflict. It was in view of his country's own painful experiences that his delegation wished to draw attention to the attempts of some delegations to impede the work of OHCHR, to disregard its right to refer to the rights of the LGBTIQ+ community and even to impose restrictions on the language it could use in reports and other documents. Such attempts were particularly regrettable at a time when the Secretary-General of the United Nations had only recently launched a strategy for protecting persons from violence and discrimination on grounds of their gender identity or sexual orientation and had urged all entities of the United Nations system to apply that strategy. The attempts of some members of the Council to do just the opposite had been noted. However, the Council had an obligation and a mandate to tackle the most pressing human rights issues. Accordingly, his delegation appealed to all members to move from polarization to constructive dialogue, recognizing the differences between them, as sovereign States, while keeping in mind the Council's duty to respect human dignity and combat violence and discrimination against all persons.

116. **Mr. Lauber** (Observer for Switzerland) said that, with regard to draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.11](#), his Government remained alarmed about the situation in Syria and supported the work of the Commission of Inquiry, the International, Impartial and Independent Mechanism and the Independent Institution on Missing Persons. It was essential to condemn violations of international law committed by any of the parties to the conflict. It was regrettable that draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.32](#) did not reflect the gravity of the human rights situation in Yemen. That situation should be the subject of an interactive dialogue, and an international fact-finding mechanism should be established to investigate all allegations of human rights violations and abuses. His delegation appreciated the constructive engagement of the delegation leading the negotiations on draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.37](#), on technical assistance and capacity-building in the field of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and welcomed the inclusion of references to sexual violence. However, it was regrettable that a proposal to also include a reference to the decision to lift the moratorium on the death penalty had not been taken up by the main sponsors.

117. Regarding draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.3](#) on terrorism and human rights, his delegation underscored that the approach of submitting a mere technical update of the previous resolution on the subject was not sustainable. It hoped that future iterations of the

resolution would address essential issues such as the need to prevent and provide redress for the potential adverse effects of counter-terrorism measures on human rights. His delegation welcomed the constructive approach taken by the main sponsors of draft resolution [A/HRC/57/L.35/Rev.1](#) on the elimination of domestic violence, including their efforts to find compromises that would allow progressive language to be included. However, it regretted the introduction of a qualification allowing for diverse interpretations of the concept of intimate partner violence, which should be recognized as a separate form of violence.

118. Lastly, his delegation noted that, although efficiency and rationalization measures had been discussed, the number of new draft resolutions presented in the Council continued to grow and the texts were often duplicative. All States must work together to keep the Human Rights Council strong and effective.

The discussion covered in the summary record was suspended at 5.30 p.m. and resumed at 5.50 p.m.

Closure of the session

119. After the customary exchange of courtesies, **the President** declared the fifty-seventh session of the Human Rights Council closed.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.