

your**HRC**.org

A window onto cooperation, dialogue, leadership
and policymaking at the UN Human Rights Council

**THE HUMAN RIGHTS
COUNCIL IN**

2018

**LEADERSHIP, RESOLVE AND COOPERATION
AT THE UN'S MAIN HUMAN RIGHTS BODY**



yourHRC.org

On October 2015, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Universal Rights Group (URG) launched yourHRC.org, an innovative online tool designed to contribute to international efforts to strengthen the visibility, relevance, credibility and impact of the UN Human Rights Council (Council).

The yourHRC.org portal aims to help shine a light on the work of members of the Council: are they cooperating with the body and its mechanisms; are they assuming leadership positions in, for example, the Bureau; what is their voting record in the Council; are they participating actively in debates, especially via joint statements; which resolutions and initiatives do they sponsor; are they engaging constructively and positively with civil society; and are they living up to their pledges and commitments made at the time of their election?

In addition to this focus on the engagement, cooperation and principal sponsorship of Council members, yourHRC.org also focuses on candidates for election to the Council, applying the same analytical framework to assess the merits of each candidature, as measured against the election criteria set down in General Assembly (GA) resolution 60/251. Before each Council election, a summary of this information is published in a dedicated 'Election Guide.'

Finally, at the end of each year, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the URG jointly publish a annual review of the work of the Council and its members, and the degree to which they have delivered on the body's crucial mandate as set down in GA resolution 60/251.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	4	GLOBAL OVERVIEW OF COOPERATION	36
A window onto the work of the UN's human rights pillar	13	AFRICAN GROUP (AG)	
		Overview of members	38
		Principal sponsorship	39
		Contribution to Council debates, panel discussions, and dialogues in 2018	40
		Voting analysis	41
		Cooperation with human rights mechanisms	42
PART I			
THE WORK, OUTPUT, AND PERFORMANCE OF THE COUNCIL AND ITS MECHANISMS	14		
THE COUNCIL'S FOCUS AND OUTPUT: RESOLUTIONS AND MECHANISMS	16	ASIA-PACIFIC GROUP (APG)	
Number of Council texts adopted over time	16	Overview of members	44
The focus of the Council texts by agenda item (2008-2018)	17	Principal sponsorship	45
Financial implications of Council resolutions (2010-2018).	18	Contribution to Council debates, panel discussions, and dialogues in 2018	46
Evolution of Council Special Sessions since 2006	19	Voting analysis	47
Donors of the Voluntary Trust Fund to support the participation of LDCs and SIDS in the Council	20	Cooperation with human rights mechanisms	48
Top themes in 2018: focus of thematic resolutions	21	EASTERN EUROPEAN GROUP (EEG)	
State participation in Interactive Dialogues of the Special Procedures in 2018	22	Overview of members	50
		Principal sponsorship	51
		Contribution to Council debates, panel discussions, and dialogues in 2018	51
		Voting analysis	52
		Cooperation with human rights mechanisms	53
		LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN GROUP (GRULAC)	
		Overview of members	54
		Principal sponsorship	55
		Contribution to Council debates, panel discussions, and dialogues in 2018	56
		Voting analysis	57
		Cooperation with human rights mechanisms	58
		WESTERN-EUROPEAN AND OTHERS GROUP (WEOG)	
		Overview of members	60
		Principal sponsorship	60
		Contribution to Council debates, panel discussions, and dialogues in 2018	61
		Voting analysis	62
		Cooperation with human rights mechanisms	63
PART II			
COUNCIL MEMBER STATES: ENGAGEMENT, PRINCIPAL SPONSORSHIP, COOPERATION	28		
MEMBERSHIP OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL IN 2018	30		
COOPERATION WITH THE UNITED NATIONS, ITS REPRESENTATIVES, AND MECHANISMS IN THE FIELD OF HUMAN RIGHTS - REPORT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL	32		

Introduction

The Human Rights Council in 2018 will probably be remembered, principally, as the year the United States left the Council, thus playing into the hands of an increasingly confident and assertive China; the year when the emphasis of the Council's on-going reform efforts began to switch from efficiency to effectiveness (designed to strengthen the body's impacts on the ground); the year when the Council began to display a new level of maturity and deliver important new results; and the year when a new High Commissioner set out a fresh approach for her Office and the wider UN human rights pillar, and called for a far stronger and deeper connection between that pillar and the UN's peace and security, and development pillars. Notwithstanding these important substantive developments, 2018 also saw the UN – again - elect countries with demonstrably poor human rights records to the Council – significantly undermining the body's authority and credibility.

Council strengthening

Ahead of the 37th session of the Council in March, the new Council President, Vojislav Šuc (Slovenia), presented modest short-term proposals to improve the efficiency of the Council's methods of work. These proposals included the development of a more sensible and structured annual programme of work (mainly via the clustering and staggering of general debates across the Council's three annual sessions), and a proposal to reduce panel debates from three to two hours. The former proposal was based on the (entirely valid) premise that it is unnecessary (and a waste of resources) to have general debates under every

agenda item at every session – indeed this was never the intention of the first Council Bureau when it negotiated the institution-building package (IBP) in 2006-2007.

Unfortunately – and somewhat surprisingly – the proposals to streamline general debates did not receive the consensual support of Council members and observers (because a number of EU States feared a 'weakening' of Council action under item 4, while the Palestinian delegation likewise opposed any reduction in focus on item 7). The failure of States to reach agreement on the President's reform proposals played a key part in the decision of the US to leave the Council during its 38th session (see below).

At the same time as presenting these short-term proposals, the President also established a longer-term process of open and informal consultations, led by three sets of co-facilitators. The three strands of those discussions covered: the Council's programme of work (hopefully resurrecting some of the ideas rejected in February); rationalisation of Council resolutions, initiatives and mechanisms; and using technology to improve the Council's work. As this report went to press, it was not clear whether this longer-term strengthening/efficiency effort would secure the support of States. What is clear is that there is a lot at stake. Without the introduction of sensible changes to the Council's programme and methods of work, the body will simply not have the time, space or resources necessary to focus on much-needed 'effectiveness reforms' (e.g. focused on implementation, prevention and the delivery of capacity-building





assistance). This ‘effectiveness’ agenda is expected to become a key focus of the Council’s work in 2019. Moreover, if the Council shows itself to be incapable (again) of reaching agreement on sensible, and relatively minor, efficiency reforms, it would undermine the body’s credibility in the eyes of the GA and the general public.

Notwithstanding the ultimate success, or otherwise, of President Vojislav Šuc’s efforts to strengthen the Council’s efficiency, 2018 did see welcome signs that four years of efficiency drives by different Council bureaus is beginning to have a positive impact on the Council’s work. For example, the 38th session saw a significant drop in the number of adopted texts compared to one year earlier - from 37 to 20 (a 46% drop); while the 39th session saw the adoption of 24 texts - compared to 34 texts one year previously (a drop of 29.4%).

US departs, China rises

During the first week of the Council’s 38th session (June), the US announced its decision to withdraw from the Council. While some believed this was inevitable considering the Republican Party’s long-standing antipathy towards the body, others argued that it was the result of the failure, over the twelve months since Ambassador Nikki Haley’s visit to the Council in June 2017, to secure reforms of the Council’s agenda/programme of work, and of its elections/membership.

The US decision to disengage was seen by many experts as a defining moment in the Council’s short history. Would the Council revert to the highly politicised and generally ineffective body seen during the period 2006-2009 (when the US was similarly disengaged under the Presidency of George W. Bush)? Or would other countries step up their

engagement to compensate for America’s absence, and would the UN’s wider membership move to work more cooperatively and cross-regionally? Thus far (based on the evidence of the 38th and 39th sessions), the Council appears to be following the second – more positive – path.

Moreover, there are signs as 2018 draws to a close that the US may already be inching back towards closer engagement with the Council. For example, in November the US unexpectedly decided to participate in the 31st session of the UPR working group (the UPR being a mechanism of the Council), while during an interactive dialogue with the President of the Council on 2 November, the US delegation to the GA’s Third Committee welcomed Council action on the situation in Venezuela, expressed its on-going support for reform of the Council (including in the context of preparations for the 2021 review), and noted that these developments ‘reinforce our willingness to one day re-engage with a reformed, improved and strengthened Human Rights Council.’

One clear consequence of the US’ decision to leave the Council, was that it left an important leadership vacuum. As noted above, to some extent this vacuum was filled by new leadership on the part of European and Latin American States. However, US departure has also served to cede the international human rights stage to its great geopolitical rival, China. China has not been slow to seize this opportunity, and 2018 saw further signs (building on 2017) of increasing Chinese engagement with the Council, and of its determination to help shape the international human rights agenda.

For example, during the 37th session, China presented a new resolution on ‘Promoting the international human rights cause through win-win cooperation’ (the name

was later changed to ‘Promoting mutually-beneficial cooperation in the field of human rights.’) Despite the resolution’s rather benign nature, and the constructive manner in which the Chinese delegation approached negotiations on the draft, the symbolism associated with China coming forward, for the first time in the history of the UN, with such texts (it also tabled a resolution on ‘The contribution of development to the enjoyment of human rights’ in June 2017), served to engender considerable Western concern and opposition (though in the end the only country to vote against was the US).

A new maturity?

Despite the US departure, and on-going controversy over the human rights records of countries being elected to the Council (especially from the African Group), many long-term observers believe the body enjoyed its best ever year in 2018 (in terms of atmosphere, cooperation and results).

For example, in the thematic area, 2018 saw: a welcome agreement between Mexico and Egypt to merge their respective resolutions on terrorism and human rights (one of which had underscored the importance of respecting human rights while countering terrorism, and the other which had highlighted the negative impacts of terrorism on human rights); important resolutions on the relationship between human rights and the SDGs, aiming to demonstrate the positive contribution that the UN’s human rights pillar can – and should – make towards the realisation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development ‘leaving no one behind;’ and an important resolution seeking to operationalize the Council’s mandate to prevent human rights violations and respond promptly to emerging crises.

Likewise, 2018 saw the Council take historically significant steps to address situations of serious human rights violations. For example, the 39th session saw important action on the situations in: Myanmar, Yemen, Venezuela, and Burundi.

The resolutions on Myanmar and Venezuela were particularly significant, for a number of reasons.

In the case of the former, the final resolution was tabled by the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) and the EU working in concert (setting a powerful precedent for future cooperation between regional/political groups), and established a powerful new type of Council mechanism: an international, impartial and independent mechanism (IIIM) on Myanmar. This new mechanism was mandated by the Council to: ‘collect, consolidate, preserve and analyse evidence of the most serious international crimes and violations of international law committed in Myanmar since 2011, and to prepare files in order to facilitate and expedite fair and independent criminal proceedings [...] in national, regional or international courts or tribunals that have or may in the future have jurisdiction over these crimes.’

Regarding Venezuela, the Council’s resolution was notable not so much for what was in it, but rather for which States tabled it: namely countries of Venezuela’s own regional group (GRULAC) including Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Mexico, Paraguay and Peru, (later supported by Canada and other WEOG States). This is one of the first times this has happened since the establishment of the Council and, together with the EU-OIC resolution on Myanmar, represents an important break from the notion that (with a few exceptions, such as African leadership on





the situation in Eritrea) only Western States can bring situations of serious violations to the Council's attention.

New High Commissioner, new approach?

The 39th session of the Council, the last regular session of 2018, saw the inaugural speech of the new High Commissioner for Human Rights, Michelle Bachelet. The speech appeared to signal a new departure for the High Commissioner and her Office. While committing to continue her predecessor's important work in 'calling-out' serious human rights violations, Ms Bachelet promised to also engage States in a spirit of constructive dialogue and cooperation. She expressed her firm belief that by working with States, the primary duty-bearers in the international human rights system, and by securing consensus and identifying common ground, it would be possible to drive real domestic change, and secure improvements in the on-the-ground enjoyment of human rights.

The High Commissioner's speech, together with a number of other statements she subsequently delivered

in New York, also provides important indications as to the likely focus of her work in the coming years.

In this regard, she underscored her strong belief in the importance of strengthening the position of the human rights pillar in a reformed UN: 'Human rights express the core purpose of the UN, we can only attain peace, security and sustainable development for all societies when we advance the dignity and equality of all human beings [...] The new reforms underway at the UN present an opportunity to advocate, as powerfully as we can, that a human rights approach be at the centre of the work of our UN partners.'

In particular, in order to strengthen the effectiveness of the Council, and the interconnectedness of the three pillars of the UN, the new High Commissioner used her speeches to urge progress in three interconnected areas: national implementation of international human rights obligations and commitments; the contribution of human rights to the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs; and the UN's prevention agenda.



A window onto the work of the UN's human rights pillar...

Members of the Human Rights Council (Council) hold the main responsibility for pursuing and fulfilling the body's mandate, namely to promote 'universal respect for the protection of all human rights and fundamental freedoms for all,' (GA resolution 60/251).

When establishing the Council, the GA decided that the body would consist of 47 members, elected by a majority of UN member States. In making their choice, voting States would take into account the contribution of candidates to the promotion and protection of human rights, as well as their voluntary pledges and commitments.

The GA furthermore decided that elected members should uphold the highest standards in the promotion and protection of human rights and fully cooperate with the Council and its mechanisms. Moreover, it was agreed that the Council's methods of work would be transparent, fair, and impartial, enable genuine dialogue, be results-oriented, allow for subsequent follow-up discussions to recommendations and their implementation, and allow for substantive interaction with Special Procedures and other mechanisms.

yourHRC.org has been created to promote transparency around the degree to which the Council and its members are delivering on this crucial mandate, passed to them by the GA and, ultimately, entrusted to them by 'the Peoples of the United Nations' described in the UN Charter.



PART I


2018

THE WORK, OUTPUT AND
PERFORMANCE OF THE COUNCIL
AND ITS MECHANISMS

THE COUNCIL'S FOCUS AND OUTPUT: RESOLUTIONS AND MECHANISMS

The focus of the Council's texts by agenda item (2008-2018)


Number of Council texts adopted over time



Data source: Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights ('OHCHR') HRC extranet / URG Resolutions Portal.

- Consistent with Bureau-led efforts to improve the Council's efficiency, 2018 saw a significant drop in the number of adopted resolutions and other texts.
- 2018 also saw the highest-ever proportion of voted resolutions (36%), suggesting significant differences between States on key human rights issues and situations.


Percentage of texts adopted under each of the Council's agenda items between 2008 - 2018




Data Source: Council's texts (resolutions, decisions or presidential statements) adopted between 2008-2018, available on the OHCHR extranet and via the URG Resolutions Portal.

- As has been the case each year since 2006, in 2018 most resolutions were adopted under agenda item 3 (the 'promotion and protection of all human rights').
- 2018 saw significant drops in the number of item 10 resolutions (on technical assistance and capacity-building), and item 5 resolutions (human rights mechanisms).
- Despite the departure of the US, the number of item 4 resolutions addressing situations of human rights violations remained steady year-on-year.


Financial implications of Council resolutions (2011-2018)



Evolution of Council Special Sessions since 2006




Donors of the Voluntary Trust Fund to support the participation of LDCs and SIDS in the Council 2018



DONORS
(As of 25 september 2018)




Top themes in 2018: focus of thematic resolutions



Note: The size of each bubble, and word/phrase within the bubble, relates to the number of resolutions adopted with that focus/theme in 2018. Data source: Council resolutions available on the OHCHR extranet and via the URG Resolutions Portal.

- In 2018, there was an almost exact balance between resolutions focused on civil and political rights (16); economic, social and cultural rights (15); and cross-cutting human rights concerns (16).
- For CPRs resolutions, States focused particularly on participation, good governance, and the role of local governments in the realisation of human rights.
- For ESCRs resolutions, the Council focused mainly on the realisation of ESCRs and the right to development, although some texts also focused on climate change and the environment.
- Overall, there was a balance in the texts related with groups in focus, although slightly more attention was given to the rights of women.
- For cross-cutting matters, there was a strong focus on technical cooperation and capacity building.


State participation in Interactive Dialogues of the Special Procedures in 2018



Data source: OHCHR extranet.

Note: For comprehensive information on data sources, timeframes, and methodology please see endnote.

Evolution of amendments to Council resolutions





Data source: OHCHR extranet.

Note: For comprehensive information on data sources, timeframes, and methodology please see endnote.


GEOGRAPHIC FOCUS OF THE COUNCIL

GEOGRAPHIC FOCUS OF COUNCIL TEXTS, SPECIAL SESSIONS,
AND PANELS (2006-2018).



*Includes resolutions on 'Human Rights in the occupied Syrian Golan' and 'Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan'

Global coverage of the UN human rights system in 2018



OHCHR FIELD PRESENCE	UPR	THEMATIC SPECIAL PROCEDURES	COUNTRY-SPECIFIC SPECIAL PROCEDURES	INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATIONS		
OHCHR field presence during 2018	UPR review completed 2018	Country visits completed 2018	Country Independent Expert	Commission of Inquiry (COI)	Fact-finding mission	Other
			Country Special Rapporteur			

Note: For comprehensive information on data sources, timeframes, and methodology please see endnote.



PART II

2018

**COUNCIL MEMBER STATES:
ENGAGEMENT, PRINCIPAL
SPONSORSHIP AND
COOPERATION**

MEMBERSHIP OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL IN 2018



Data source: OHCHR website. Note: For comprehensive information on data sources, timeframes, and methodology please see endnote.

COOPERATION WITH THE UN, ITS REPRESENTATIVES, AND MECHANISMS IN THE FIELD OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Secretary-General's report

In September 2018, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights, Mr Andrew Gilmour, presented the Secretary-General annual report (pursuant to resolution 12/2) to the 39th session of the Council on: 'Cooperation with the United Nations, its representatives, and mechanisms in the field of human rights.'

With resolution 12/2, the Council 'expressed concern over continued reports of intimidation and reprisals against individuals and groups seeking to cooperate or having cooperated with the United Nations'¹ and condemned all acts of intimidation and reprisal against individuals and groups who seek to cooperate, are cooperating, or have cooperated with the UN, its representatives

and mechanisms in the field of human rights, committed by State and non-State actors. The 2018 report is the ninth report based on resolution 12/2; in this document, the UN Secretary-General highlights the initiatives and efforts by the UN system and other stakeholders to raise awareness, prevent, respond to, and address such acts.

In the report, the Secretary-General recalls that when addressing the Council in February 2018, he 'affirmed that we should all be deeply shocked and angered by the extent to which civil society actors suffer reprisals, intimidation and attack because of their work, including when they engage with the United Nations system'. He also stresses that acts of intimidation and reprisal not only affect those directly impacted but also other actors and individuals wishing to engage

with the UN to express their views freely. 'It is also observable from cases that have been reported to the United Nations that women and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons are exposed to gender- or sexual orientation-specific barriers, threats and violence.'

Acts of intimidation and reprisals included in the report are those occurred in relation to cooperation with the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, the Human Rights Council and the Security Council, as well as 'within the United Nations system, including in the Secretariat and its field offices and peace missions, at the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the United Nations Conference of States Parties to the Convention Against

Corruption, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund'.

The Secretary-General recalls that acts of intimidation and reprisals occur, not only on the ground, but in the UN facilities and headquarters too. To this end, the report draws attention to the fact that 'the Assistant Secretary-General has addressed concerns about the use of accreditation and security procedures to hinder people from speaking out in a number of United Nations forums at Headquarters. There have been attempts by some diplomats to block the participation of certain civil society representatives in United Nations events, meetings or conferences, including attempts to thwart the accreditation of NGOs, especially those doing human rights work, through various manoeuvres'.

¹ Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General. Cooperation with the United Nations, its representatives and mechanisms in the field of human rights. 13 August 2018, UN Symbol: A/HRC/39/41.

Moreover, the Secretary-General presents information on alleged acts of intimidation and reprisal based on data gathered from 1 June 2017 to 31 May 2018, including follow-up information on cases discussed in previous reports. 'The information received has been verified and corroborated by primary and other sources to the

extent possible... Responses provided by Governments by 31 July 2018 to actions taken by various United Nations actors on cases are also included. Efforts have also been made to follow up on cases included in previous reports when there were new developments in the reporting period.'

The 2018 report summarises and provides comprehensive information on alleged cases of intimidation and reprisals in the following countries:


- | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Bahrain | Maldives |
| Cameroon | Mali |
| China | Morocco |
| Colombia | Myanmar |
| Cuba | Philippines |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | Russian Federation |
| Djibouti | Rwanda |
| Egypt | Saudi Arabia |
| Guatemala | South Sudan |
| Guyana | Thailand |
| Honduras | Trinidad and Tobago |
| Hungary | Turkey |
| India | Turkmenistan |
| Israel | Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) |
| Kyrgyzstan | |

The report further summarises follow-up information on cases included in previous reports, concerning the following countries:


- | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Algeria | Morocco |
| Bahrain | Myanmar |
| Burundi | Pakistan |
| China | Rwanda |
| Egypt | Saudi Arabia |
| India | Thailand |
| Iran (Islamic Republic of) | United Arab Emirates |
| Iraq | Uzbekistan |
| Japan | Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) |
| Mexico | |

GLOBAL OVERVIEW OF COOPERATION


Latin America and Caribbean Group




Western Europe and Others Group




Eastern European Group



African Group



Asia Pacific Group



*The WEOG has 7 seats on the Council. The United States resigned its membership in the Council on June 19. Iceland was elected to fill the vacancy on July 13.

- ✓ Standing invitation issued
- ✓ UPR midterm report submitted

African Group (AG)

Overview of Members

	Voluntary contribution to OHCHR (2017)	Voluntary contribution to OHCHR (Oct 2018)	NHRI accreditation status	Membership terms to date
Angola	X	X	-	3
Burundi	X	X	B	1
Côte d'Ivoire	X	X	B	2
Democratic Republic of the Congo	X	X	A	1
Egypt	X	X	A	2
Ethiopia	X	X	B	2
Kenya	X	X	A	2
Nigeria	X	X	A	3
Rwanda	X	X	A	1
Senegal	X	X	B	3
South Africa	✓	X	A	4
Togo	X	X	A	1
Tunisia	X	X	B	2

Principal sponsorship

During the course of 2018, African members of the Council led (as main sponsors/part of a core group) on a number of important resolutions, covering both thematic and country-specific issues.

At a thematic level, in 2018 African members led, *inter alia*, on the following issues:

Egypt - Local government and human rights, right to work, and terrorism and human rights.

Ethiopia - Cultural rights and the protection of cultural heritage.

Kenya - Promoting human rights and Sustainable Development Goals through transparent, accountable and efficient public services delivery.

Nigeria - The promotion, protection and enjoyment of human rights on the Internet.

Rwanda - Promotion and protection of human rights and the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

South Africa - United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas, the role of good governance in the promotion and protection of human rights, and the need for an integrated approach to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable


Development for the full realisation of human rights, focusing holistically on the means of implementation.

Tunisia - The safety of journalists, technical assistance and capacity-building for Yemen in the field of human rights, the promotion, protection and enjoyment of human rights on the Internet, and civil society space: engagement with international and regional organizations.

Notwithstanding such individual leadership, it is important to note that African States often work through their regional group. In 2018, the African Group led on, *inter alia*, the following resolutions: Elimination of female genital mutilation, mandate of the Independent Expert on the enjoyment of human rights by persons with albinism, high-level intersessional discussion celebrating the centenary of Nelson Mandela, and technical assistance and capacity building in the field of human rights.

The African Group also led on Council initiatives aiming to deliver technical assistance to strengthen the enjoyment of human rights in certain States, including the following resolutions: Technical assistance and capacity building in the field of human rights in the Central African Republic, technical assistance and capacity-building in the field of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in the Sudan, technical assistance to the Democratic Republic of the Congo and accountability concerning the events in the Kasai regions, and technical assistance and capacity-building to improve human rights in Libya.

Contribution to Council debates, panel discussions, and dialogues in 2018



Note: This bar chart shows the number of joint statements each State joined during the Council's general discussions, panel debates, and interactive dialogues with the Special Procedures. The empty chair symbol indicates whether, overall, the country, as a Council member, participated (individual statements) in more than 10% of panel discussions, general debates, and interactive dialogues. For comprehensive information on data sources, timeframes, and methodology please see endnote.

Voting analysis

With regard to texts on country-specific situations (item 4 texts - situations that require the Council's attention), African States joined consensus on the Council's item 4 resolutions on the human rights situations in Eritrea, Democratic People's Republic of Korea ('DPRK') and South Sudan. When a vote was called, most African members abstained or voted against. The exceptions to these were: Côte d'Ivoire voted in favour of all resolutions, except on the text on the human rights situation in Burundi - during which it abstained; Nigeria voted in favour of the text on the situation in Myanmar; Togo voted in favour of all resolutions but abstained during the voting on the texts on Belarus, Iran, and Burundi; and Tunisia voted in favour of the resolutions on Myanmar and the Syrian Arab Republic.

Regarding item 7 resolutions (Occupied Palestinian Territories), African States generally voted in favour. The exceptions to this were Burundi and Côte d'Ivoire's abstentions during the voting on the resolution on the Human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem; Nigeria's votes against all resolutions, except for the text on the 'Right of the Palestinian people to self-determination' - it voted in favour; and Egypt's abstention during the voting on all item 7 resolutions, except on the 'Right of the Palestinian people to self-determination' - it voted in favour.


For item 10 resolutions (capacity-building), African members joined consensus or voted in favour of all texts in 2018, except for the resolution on Georgia (Angola and Burundi voted against; Rwanda voted in favour; and all other African members abstained).

For thematic resolutions dealing with civil and political rights, or 'groups in focus', where a vote was called in 2018, African members usually voted in favour. Notable exceptions include:

- The resolution on the world drug problem, most AG members either abstained (e.g., Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, Senegal South Africa, Togo and Tunisia) or voted against (e.g., Burundi, Côte d'Ivoire and Egypt).
- During the voting on the text on the integrity of the judicial system, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Senegal, and Togo abstained.

For thematic resolutions dealing with economic, social, and cultural rights, African States either joined consensus on, or voted in favour of, nearly all adopted texts. The only exceptions were Tunisia's 'no vote' and Rwanda's abstention during the voting on the resolution on enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights.

Cooperation with human rights mechanisms



* Ratification and Reporting is recorded for eight 'core UN human rights conventions' which include: the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT), the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (CPED), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD), and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD).

Note: for more comprehensive information on data sources, timeframes, and methodology, please see endnote.

Asia-Pacific Group (APG)

Overview of Members

		Voluntary contribution to OHCHR (2017)	Voluntary contribution to OHCHR (Oct 2018)	NHRI accreditation status	Membership terms to date
Afghanistan					
China					
Iraq					
Japan					
Kyrgyzstan					
Mongolia					
Nepal					
Pakistan					
Philippines					
Qatar					
Republic of Korea					
Saudi Arabia					
United Arab Emirates					

Principal sponsorship

During the course of 2018, Asia-Pacific members of the Council led (as main sponsors/part of a core group) on a number of important resolutions, covering both thematic and country-specific issues.

At a thematic level, in 2018 Asia-Pacific members led, *inter alia*, on the following issues:

China - Promoting human rights through sport and the Olympic ideal, and promoting mutually beneficial cooperation in the field of human rights.

Iraq - Cultural rights and the protection of cultural heritage.

Japan - Civil society space: engagement with international and regional organizations, and promoting human rights through sport and the Olympic ideal.

Pakistan - The need for an integrated approach to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development for the full realisation of human rights, focusing holistically on the means of implementation.

Philippines - World Programme for Human Rights Education, and human rights and climate change.

Qatar - Enhancement of technical cooperation and capacity-building in the field of human rights, and the safety of journalists.

Republic of Korea - Local government and human rights, the role of good governance in the promotion and protection of human rights, and promoting human rights through sport and the Olympic ideal.

At a country-specific level, in 2018 Asia-Pacific members led, *inter alia*, on the following issues:

Japan - Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Qatar - The human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic.


Saudi Arabia - The human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic.

Notwithstanding such individual leadership, it is important to note that some Asia-Pacific States regularly work through political groups, especially the Arab Group and the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC).

In 2018, the Arab Group led on a resolution on technical assistance and capacity-building for Yemen in the field of human rights.

During 2018, the OIC, at the thematic level, led on a resolution on combating intolerance, negative stereotyping and stigmatisation of, and discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against, persons based on religion or belief. At the country-specific level, the OIC led the adoption of the following resolutions: Situation of human rights of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar; human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan; right of the Palestinian people to self-determination; human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem; Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan; and ensuring accountability and justice for all violations of international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem.

Contribution to Council debates, panel discussions, and dialogues in 2018



Note: This bar chart shows the number of joint statements each State joined during the Council's general discussions, panel debates, and interactive dialogues with the Special Procedures. The empty chair symbol indicates whether, overall, the country, as a Council member, participated (individual statements) in more than 10% of panel discussions, general debates and interactive dialogues. For comprehensive information on data sources, timeframes, and methodology please see endnote.

Voting analysis

With regard to item 4 texts (situations that require the Council's attention), Asia-Pacific Members of the Council displayed markedly different voting records in 2018. In the absence of consensus, China voted against all texts; Nepal abstained in all cases; Afghanistan, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Pakistan and Philippines abstained during the vast majority of item 4 votes, the exceptions being the text on the situation in Myanmar (Afghanistan, Iraq, Kyrgyzstan, and Pakistan voted in favour and the Philippines against); the Republic of Korea voted in favour of all item 4 resolutions, and Japan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates voted, most of the time, in favour of texts under this agenda item (except for the texts on the situation in Belarus, United Arab Emirates voted against and Saudi Arabia abstained; the resolution on the situation of human rights in Burundi, Saudi Arabia voted against; and the situation in Myanmar, Japan abstained).


During voting on item 7 resolutions (Occupied Palestinian Territories), in 2018 Asia-Pacific States nearly always voted in favour. The exception was the Republic of Korea,

which usually abstained. For item 10 resolutions (capacity-building), in 2018 Asia-Pacific members joined consensus on all texts except on the resolution on cooperation with Georgia –all APG States abstained; except Philippines, which voted against, and Japan, which voted in favour.

For thematic resolutions whether related with civil and political rights, or with economic, social, and cultural rights, where a vote was called in 2018, APG members usually voted in favour. Notable exceptions include:

- Afghanistan abstained during all voting under item 3 resolutions.
- Japan and the Republic of Korea voted against or abstained in all voting under item 3 resolutions, but both voted in favour of the texts on the world drug problem and water and sanitation.
- For the resolution on the world drug problem, most APG members voted against or abstained, except Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Nepal, and the Republic of Korea, which voted in favour.

Cooperation with human rights mechanisms



* Ratification and Reporting is recorded for eight 'core UN human rights conventions' which include: the ICCPR, the ICESCR, CAT, the CPED, the CEDAW, the CRC, the CERD, and the CRPD.

Note: for more comprehensive information on data sources, timeframes, and methodology, please see endnote.

Eastern European Group (EEG)

Overview of Members

	Voluntary contribution to OHCHR (2017)	Voluntary contribution to OHCHR (Oct 2018)	NHRI accreditation status	Membership terms to date
Croatia	✗	✗	A	1
Georgia	✗	✗	A	1
Hungary	✗	✗	A	2
Slovakia	✓	✓	B	2
Slovenia	✓	✗	B	2
Ukraine	✗	✗	A	3

Note: for comprehensive information on data sources, timeframes and methodology, please see endnote.

Principal sponsorship

During the course of 2018, members of the Eastern European Group (EEG) led (as main sponsors/part of a core group) on a number of important resolutions, covering both thematic and country-specific issues.

At a thematic level, in 2018 Eastern European members led, *inter alia*, on the following issues:


Georgia - Promoting human rights and Sustainable Development Goals through transparent, accountable and efficient public services deliver.

Slovenia - World Programme for Human Rights Education, human rights and the environment, rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities.

At a country-specific level, in 2018 Eastern-European members led, *inter alia*, on the following issues:

Georgia - Cooperation with Georgia.

Contribution to Council debates, panel discussions, and dialogues in 2018



■ Regional group statements
 ■ Cross-regional group statements
 ■ Other joint statements
 ■ Political group statements
 ■ EMPTY CHAIR INDICATOR YES
 ■ NO

Note: This bar chart shows the number of joint statements each State joined during the Council's general discussions, panel debates, and interactive dialogues with the Special Procedures. The empty chair symbol indicates whether, overall, the country, as a Council member, participated (individual statements) in more than 10% of panel discussions, general debates and interactive dialogues. For comprehensive information on data sources, timeframes, and methodology please see endnote.

Voting analysis

Eastern European members tended to join consensus on or vote in favour of item 4 texts (situations that require the Council's attention) in 2018, with the exceptions of Georgia's abstention during the voting on the resolutions on Iran, Belarus, and Burundi; and Slovenia's abstention during the voting on the resolution on Burundi.

During voting on item 7 resolutions (Occupied Palestinian Territories), EEG States tended to abstain, but voted in favour of the resolutions on 'Human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem' and the 'Rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination'. With the only exception of Slovenia (which abstained), all EEG members voted against the text on the 'Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan'.

For item 10 resolutions (capacity-building), EEG members joined consensus on all texts in 2018, and, when a vote was called, all of them voted in favour.

For thematic resolutions dealing with civil and political rights, and 'groups in focus,' where a vote was called in 2018, Eastern European members usually voted in favour. Notable exceptions include the following resolutions:


- UN Declaration on the rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas: EEG members abstained, except Hungary (voted against) and Ukraine (voted in favour).
- The integrity of the judicial system – most EEG members abstained, except Georgia (voted against) and Croatia (voted in favour).
- A resolution on the use of mercenaries - all EEG members voted against.

For thematic resolutions dealing with economic, social, and cultural rights, EEG States usually joined consensus. Where there was a vote, EEG members mostly voted against. Notable exceptions include the resolutions on the right to food and water and sanitation, which were supported by all EEG members.

* Ratification and Reporting is recorded for eight 'core UN human rights conventions' which include: the ICCPR, the ICESCR, CAT, the CPED, the CEDAW, the CRC, the CERD, and the CRPD.

Note: for more comprehensive information on data sources, timeframes, and methodology, please see endnote.

Cooperation with human rights mechanisms



Latin American and Caribbean Group (GRULAC)

Overview of Members

	Voluntary contribution to OHCHR (2017)	Voluntary contribution to OHCHR (Oct 2018)	NHRI accreditation status	Membership terms to date
Brazil	✗	✗	—	4
Chile	✓	✓	A	3
Cuba	✓	✓	—	4
Ecuador	✓	✗	A	3
Mexico	✓	✓	A	4
Panama	✗	✗	A	1
Peru	✓	✗	A	3
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	✗	✗	B	2

Note: for comprehensive information on data sources, timeframes and methodology, please see endnote.

Principal sponsorship

During the course of 2018, Latin America and the Caribbean Group ('GRULAC') members of the Human Rights Council led (as main sponsors/part of a core group) on a number of important resolutions, covering both thematic and country-specific issues.

At a thematic level, in 2018 GRULAC members led, *inter alia*, on the following issues:

Brazil: World Programme for Human Rights Education; enhancement of technical cooperation and capacity-building in the field of human rights; the safety of journalists; human rights in the context of HIV and AIDS; the incompatibility between democracy and racism; the right to privacy in the digital age; adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and the right to non-discrimination in this context; promoting human rights through sport and the Olympic ideal; promotion and protection of human rights and the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development; and contribution to the implementation of the joint commitment to effectively addressing and countering the world drug problem with regard to human rights.

Chile: Local government and human rights; civil society space: engagement with international and regional organizations, the role of good governance in the promotion and protection of human rights, and promotion and protection of human rights and the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Cuba: Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order; the use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination; United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas; human rights and international solidarity; the Social Forum; the right to food; the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights;

mandate of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights; and the need for an integrated approach to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development for the full realisation of human rights, focusing holistically on the means of implementation.

Ecuador: United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas; human rights and the regulation of civilian acquisition, possession and use of firearms; and promotion and protection of human rights and the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Mexico: Human rights and indigenous peoples; elimination of all forms of discrimination against women and girls, the right to privacy in the digital age; rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities; right to work; equality and non-discrimination of persons with disabilities and the right of persons with disabilities to access to justice; terrorism and human rights; and contribution to the implementation of the joint commitment to effectively addressing and countering the world drug problem with regard to human rights.

Peru: Equal participation in political and public affairs and human rights and the regulation of civilian acquisition, possession and use of firearms.

Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of): The right to development, enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights, and human rights and unilateral coercive measures.


At the country-specific level, GRULAC members led, *inter alia*, on the following resolutions:

Chile: Promotion and protection of human rights in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

Mexico: Promotion and protection of human rights in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

Peru: Promotion and protection of human rights in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

Contribution to Council debates, panel discussions, and dialogues in 2018



Note: This bar chart shows the number of joint statements each State joined during the Council's general discussions, panel debates, and interactive dialogues with the Special Procedures. The empty chair symbol indicates whether, overall, the country, as a Council member, participated (individual statements) in more than 10% of panel discussions, general debates, and interactive dialogues. For comprehensive information on data sources, timeframes, and methodology please see endnote.

Voting analysis


In terms of their voting records on item 4 (situations that require the Council's attention) texts, Latin American members of the Council can be broadly divided into three groups. When a vote was called in 2018, Cuba and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela ('Venezuela') voted against all item 4 texts, irrespective of substance or focus. On the other hand, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Panama, and Peru voted in favour of nearly all item 4 resolutions in 2018 (the only exception being Brazil's abstention during the vote on a resolution on Iran). Ecuador abstained during voting on most item 4 resolutions, except during the voting on the texts on Syrian Arab Republic and Burundi – it voted in favour.

During voting on item 7 resolutions (Occupied Palestinian Territories), Latin American States nearly always voted in favour (the exception being Mexico and Panama– both tended to abstain). For item 10 resolutions (capacity-building) Latin American and Caribbean members joined consensus but were divided on the resolution on Georgia: Venezuela and Cuba voted against; Brazil, Chile and Ecuador abstained; and Mexico, Panama and Peru voted in favour.

For thematic resolutions dealing with civil and political rights, or 'groups in focus' where a vote was called in 2018, the GRULAC member States usually joined consensus or, where a vote was called, voted in favour. The exceptions were the following abstentions: Brazil during the voting on the text on UN Declaration on the rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas, Mexico on the resolution on mercenaries, Cuba and Venezuela on the resolution on the world drug problem.

For thematic resolutions dealing with economic, social, and cultural rights and cross-cutting matters, where a vote was called in 2018, GRULAC States nearly always voted in favour. The exceptions were Mexico's abstentions during the voting on the resolutions on the effects of foreign debt, unilateral coercive measures, international solidarity, enhancement of cooperation on the field of human rights, right to development, and democratic and equitable international order; Brazil's vote against the resolution on foreign debt and abstention during the voting on resolutions on unilateral coercive measures, enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights, and democratic and equitable international order.

Cooperation with human rights mechanisms



* Ratification and Reporting is recorded for eight 'core UN human rights conventions' which include: the ICCPR, the ICESCR, CAT, the CPED, the CEDAW, the CRC, the CERD, and the CRPD.

Note: for more comprehensive information on data sources, timeframes, and methodology, please see endnote.

Western European and Others Group (WEOG)

Overview of Members

	Voluntary contribution to OHCHR (2017)	Voluntary contribution to OHCHR (Oct 2018)	NHRI accreditation status	Membership terms to date
Australia	✓	✓	A	1
Belgium	✓	✓	B	2
Germany	✓	✓	A	3
Iceland	✓	✗	—	1
Spain	✓	✓	A	2
Switzerland	✓	✓	C	3
United Kingdom	✓	✓	A	4
United States of America	✓	✓	—	3

Note: For comprehensive information on data sources, timeframes, and methodology please see endnote.

Principal sponsorship

During the course of 2018, WEOG members of the Human Rights Council led (as main sponsors/part of a core group) on a number of important resolutions, covering both thematic and country-specific issues.

At a thematic level, in 2018 WEOG members led, *inter alia*, on the following issues:

Australia: National human rights institutions and the role of good governance in the promotion and protection of human rights.

Germany: The human rights to safe drinking water and sanitation; the right to privacy in the digital age; and adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and the right to non-discrimination in this context.

Spain: The human rights to safe drinking water and sanitation.

Switzerland: The promotion and protection of human rights in the context of peaceful protests, the contribution

of the Human Rights Council to the prevention of human rights violations, human rights and the environment, cultural rights and the protection of cultural heritage, and contribution to the implementation of the joint commitment to effectively addressing and countering the world drug problem with regard to human rights.

On country-specific resolutions, members of the WEOG, led on, *inter alia*, the following resolutions:

Belgium: Human rights situation in Yemen.

Germany: The human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic.


United Kingdom: Assistance to Somalia in the field of human rights; the human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic; the deteriorating situation of human rights in Eastern Ghouta, in the Syrian Arab Republic; and situation of human rights in South Sudan.

United States of America: The human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic, situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, and situation of human rights in South Sudan.

Notwithstanding such individual leadership, it is important to note that some WEOG Council members regularly work through the European Union ('EU'). In 2018, for example, at the thematic level, the EU led on resolutions dealing with, *inter alia*, freedom of religion or belief and rights of the child: protection of the rights of the child in humanitarian situations.

At the country-specific level, the EU led on: Situation of human rights of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar, situation of human rights in Burundi, situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and situation of human rights in Myanmar.

Contribution to Council debates, panel discussions, and dialogues in 2018



Note: This bar chart shows the number of joint statements each State joined during the Council's general discussions, panel debates, and interactive dialogues with the Special Procedures. The empty chair symbol indicates whether, overall, the country, as a Council member, participated (individual statements) in more than 10% of panel discussions, general debates, and interactive dialogues. For comprehensive information on data sources, timeframes, and methodology please see endnote.

Voting analysis

During 2018, members of the Western Europe and Others Group ('WEOG') either joined consensus on or voted in favour of all texts tabled under item 4 (situations that require the Council's attention). This included resolutions on the situations in the Syrian Arab Republic, Iran, Myanmar, Belarus, and Burundi.

Concerning the voting on item 7 resolutions (Occupied Palestinian Territories), all WEOG members voted against the text on 'human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan', but were divided in three groups during the voting on all the other item 7 texts: Australia and the United States always voted against; Belgium and Switzerland always voted in favour; and Germany, Spain and the United Kingdom tended to vote in favour, but during the voting on the text on 'Ensuring accountability and justice for all violations of international law in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem', Germany and Spain abstained and the United Kingdom voted against, and the United Kingdom abstained during the voting on the text on the 'Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan'.

For thematic resolutions dealing with civil and political rights or 'groups in focus', WEOG members:

- Voted against the resolutions on the use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination.

- The majority (except for Australia and the United Kingdom, which voted against, and Switzerland which voted in favour) abstained during the voting on the text on the UN Declaration on the rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas.

- Abstained during the voting on the resolution on the integrity of the judicial system.


- Voted in favour of the resolution on the world drug problem.

For thematic resolutions dealing with economic, social, and cultural rights, WEOG States either joined consensus on, or when a vote as called, voted in favour of most adopted texts, except on the resolution on the right to development – all voted against, but Iceland abstained. For texts on cross-cutting matters, all WEOG members voted against resolutions on foreign debt, unilateral coercive measures, international solidarity, enhancement of cooperation in the field of human rights, and democratic and equitable international order; the only exception was Iceland's vote in favour of the texts on international solidarity and enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights.

* Ratification and Reporting is recorded for eight 'core UN human rights conventions' which include: the ICCPR, the ICESCR, CAT, the CPED, the CEDAW, the CRC, the CERD, and the CRPD.

Note: for more comprehensive information on data sources, timeframes, and methodology, please see endnote.

Cooperation with human rights mechanisms



* The WEOG has 7 seats on the Council. The United States resigned its membership in the Council on June 19. Iceland was elected to fill the vacancy on July 13.

Methodology Notes

YourHRC.org uses independent and objective data as the basis of its summaries and analyses. The origin of that data is primarily official UN documents and information produced by other international organisations. To ensure transparency, information on the sources of all data used, together with the methodology applied and the timeframe, is presented below.

Section I

The Council's focus and output: Resolution and mechanisms

Source: OHCHR website. OHCHR extranet.

Timeframe: 2006-2018.

Data as of: 25 October 2018

Special Sessions

Source: OHCHR website.

Timeframe: 2006-2018.

Data as of: 25 October 2018

The focus of Council texts by agenda item (2008-2018)

Source: Individual resolutions, decisions, and presidential statements. OHCHR extranet.

Timeframe: 2008-2018

Data as of: 25 October 2018

Financial Implications of Council resolutions (2011-2018)

Source: Individual PBIs. OHCHR extranet.

Timeframe: 2011-2018

Data as of: 25 October 2018

Top themes in 2018: focus of thematic resolutions

Source: Individual resolutions, decisions, and presidential statements. OHCHR extranet.

Timeframe: 2018

Data as of: 25 October 2018

Geographic focus of the Council texts, special sessions, and panels (2006-2018)

Source: Council texts: Individual resolutions, decisions, and presidential statements. OHCHR extranet; Special Sessions: OHCHR website; Panels: OHCHR website.

Timeframe: 2006 - 2018

Data as of: 25 October 2018

Global coverage of the UN human rights system in 2018

Source: OHCHR website. UN Human Rights Appeal 2018.

Timeframe: 2018

Data as of: 25 October 2018

State participation on Interactive Dialogues of Special Procedures in 2018

Source: HRC Extranet

Data as of: 25 October 2018

Note: The level of participation in Interactive Dialogues with Special Procedures was calculated based on the individual statements listed on the OHCHR Extranet during the 2018 sessions (i.e. during the Council's sessions 31-33). Joint statements on behalf of a group of States that were not individually listed were not counted. Nevertheless, of course, States do also participate in this broader manner.

Section II

Overview of membership, members of the Bureau, of the Consultative Group, and the Working Group on Situations

Source: OHCHR website – Human Rights Council.

Data as of: 25 October 2018

Voluntary contribution to OHCHR (2017 and 2018)

Source: OHCHR website.

Data as of: 25 October 2018.

NHRI Accreditation Status

Source: Chart of the Status of National Institutions, accredited by the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI); <http://nhri.ohchr.org/EN/Documents/Status%20Accreditation%20Chart.pdf>

Data as of: 25 October 2018

Previous Membership terms

Source: OHCHR website.

Data as of: 25 October 2018.

Contribution to Council debates, panels, and dialogues

Source: HRC Extranet.

Data as of: 25 October 2018.

Note: The participation of the members of the Council in group statements was calculated based on all joint statements listed on the HRC Extranet from March 2016 until September 2018 (i.e. during HRC sessions 31-39). Figures include statements not delivered due to lack of time.

The Empty Chair indicator was calculated based on the individual statements and joint statements other than political, regional or otherwise 'fixed' groups. A 'YES' shows that, during its current and last most recent membership terms (where applicable), the corresponding State participated in less than 10% of the total number of debates, interactive dialogues, and panel discussions.

Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

Special Procedures

Standing Invitation

Source: OHCHR website.

Data as of: 25 October 2018.

Visits Completed & longest outstanding visit

Source: OHCHR website.

Data as of: 25 October 2018.

Note: The number of visits undertaken includes only visits that have actually taken place, as listed on the OHCHR website (i.e. visits reported as completed or with report forthcoming). The dates for the most overdue visit are calculated according to the initial request date of the corresponding visit (regardless of subsequent reminders) or with the earliest request date published, when the initial request date is not available. Visits with incomplete information (i.e., dates and status), invitations, and visits postponed/cancelled have been excluded from the analysis. Visits by Special Representatives of the Secretary-General, or visits to regional institutions/organisations are not included in this analysis.

Communications response rate

Source: OHCHR – Communication report and search database.

Data as of: 25 October 2018.

Treaty Bodies

Status of Ratification and Reporting

Source: OHCHR website.

Data as of: 25 October 2018.

Note: Ratification and Reporting is recorded for eight 'core UN human rights conventions,' which include: the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT), the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (CPED), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD), and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD).

Treaty Body reporting dates relate to the State's current reporting cycle, as listed on the OHCHR website.

Explanation of Options:

• **SUBMITTED ON TIME:** The State Party Report submitted the report before or on the due date;

- **ON SCHEDULE:** The current cycle due date is in the future;
- **SUBMITTED LATE:** The State Party Report has been submitted for the current cycle, but was submitted late, i.e. after the due date;
- **OVERDUE (OUTSTANDING):** The current cycle report has not yet been submitted, and it is overdue;
- **NOT PARTY:** The State has not ratified the corresponding Treaty;
- **N/A:** No deadline has been set or data is not available.

The 'most overdue' report time is for the outstanding report with the earliest due date.

Reporting and ratification scores were calculated with the information published on the OHCHR website on the 25 October 2018.

Communications procedures accepted

Source: OHCHR website.

Data as of: 25 October 2018.

Note: This figure relates to the acceptance of individual complaints procedures under each of the abovementioned core conventions.

OP-CAT

Source: OHCHR website.

Data as of: 25 October 2018.

Note: An 'NPM' is a 'National Preventative Mechanism'.

Universal Periodic Review

Level of delegation

Source: The Head of a State's delegation (for its last UPR) was determined using the report submitted by the corresponding State during its last UPR. Where the rank of the representative was not clear, the URG followed up with the relevant missions as far as possible.

Data as of: 25 October 2018.

Mid-term reporting

Source: OHCHR website. <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPPR/Pages/UPRImplementation.aspx>

Data as of: 25 October 2018.

Note: The 'mid-term reporting' score relates to whether the State has submitted a mid-term report for the first and/or the second cycles of UPR.

Participation in other reviews

Source: UPR Info - 'Statistics of UPR Recommendations.'

Data as of: 25 October 2018.

Note: Participation in other reviews relates to the number of other States' reviews (out of 193) during which the corresponding State made (1 or more) recommendations.

Note: For updated information on all current and former Council members, visit yourHRC.org.

Photo credits:

Palais des Nations, Geneva. The flags of the 193 member states are back after the renovation of the "Allée des Drapeaux" at the Palais des Nations. 7 February 2014. UN Photo / Jean-Marc Ferré. Photo ID: 579261. 37th Session of the Human Rights Council 37th Session of the Human Rights Council, Palais des Nations. 23 March 2018. Photo by Violaine Martin. Michelle Bachelet, United Nations, High Commissioner for Human Rights at a Human Rights Council 39th regular session. 10 September 2018. UN Photo / Jean-Marc Ferré. Human Rights Council 39th regular session Delegates at the Human Rights Council (HRC) 39th regular session, 10 September 2018. UN Photo / Elma Okic.jpg. All licenses: CC BY-NC-ND 2.0, <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.0/>

About yourHRC.org

The yourHRC.org project has four component parts:

1

A universally accessible and free-to-use web portal - yourHRC.org – providing information on the performance of all 100 States that have stood for and won election to the Council. An interactive world map provides information on the Council's membership in any given year, and on the number of membership terms held by each country. Country-specific pages then provide up-to-date information on: the voting record of the State; its leadership on important Council initiatives; its level of participation in Council debates, interactive dialogues and panels; its engagement and cooperation with the Council's mechanisms (UPR and Special Procedures) and with the Treaty Bodies; and the degree to which it fulfilled the voluntary pledges and commitments made before its previous membership term.

2

An annual 'yourHRC.org Election Guide,' providing at-a-glance information (including comparative information) on candidatures for upcoming Council elections.

3

An annual 'yourHRC.org end-of-year report' (to be published each December), providing information (including comparative information) on levels of Member State engagement and cooperation over the course of that year.

4

A periodic 'yourHRC.org candidate alert' that will be sent to stakeholders informing them of candidature announcements for future Council elections, and providing information on that State's performance during previous membership terms (where applicable).

The present document is the second annual 'yourHRC.org end-of-year report,' offering an assessment of the Council's work, output, achievements and shortfalls in 2016, and analysing the contributions of Member States to the work of the Council and to the enjoyment of human rights around the world.

Universal Rights Group
Maison de la Paix
Chemin Eugene Rigot 2E

1202 Geneva
Switzerland

info@universal-rights.org
www.universal-rights.org

yourHRC.org

A window onto cooperation, dialogue, leadership
and policymaking at the UN Human Rights Council