

## *What are countries saying about Myanmar at the UN HRC?*

### Advocacy tips for stakeholders

Key findings of our data collection and analysis of the statements made by countries about Myanmar at the HRC are presented in [Tableau maps and infographics](#), each with different focuses and features. What each map and graph presents, and how they can be interpreted and used for advocacy are explained below.

#### Condemnation and Concern (map)

The degree of **condemnation and concern** towards the action of the Myanmar military and the situation in Myanmar expressed by countries at the HRC is presented in a map.

Advocacy tips for stakeholders: You can use this map to monitor differences among countries and regions in their expression of condemnation and concern, and identify targets of your advocacy, for example:

- Countries in darker green to continue their condemnation and concerns;
- Countries in lighter green to increase their condemnation and concerns;
- Countries in grey and black to be more active and explicit in expressing their condemnation and concerns towards Myanmar military; and
- Countries in purple to stop supporting the Myanmar military, or at least to remain silent, if not expressing condemnation or concerns.

#### Issues Raised (graph)

**10 most common issues raised by countries** when they expressed condemnation or concerns about Myanmar at the HRC are presented in two graphics here:

- **Most Frequently raised Issues by Theme and Country**

This graphic shows **which issues** are raised by **which countries** and how often they are raised.

- **Overall number of Most Frequently raised Issues**

This graphic shows the **overall numbers** of 10 most common thematic issues i.e. how often in total they were raised by countries when they expressed condemnation or concerns about Myanmar at the HRC.

Advocacy tips for stakeholders:

You can use these graphics, for example, to:

- Check whether issues of your concern are sufficiently or properly raised at the HRC in general;
- Check whether there are particular issues that HRC or individual countries should be aware of or more actively addressing;
- Identify countries you can approach to address issues of your concerns at the HRC; and
- Approach countries with more specific and targeted information about the issues that you want them to raise or continue raising at the HRC.

## **Calls for Action (map)**

**Countries calling for concrete actions** to address the situation in Myanmar are presented in a map.

Advocacy tips for stakeholders: You can use this map to monitor differences among countries and regions in their call for concrete actions, and identify target of your advocacy, for example:

- Countries in darker blue to continue their calls for concrete actions;
- Countries in lighter blue to increase their calls for concrete actions;
- Countries in white and black to be more active in calling for concrete actions to address the situation; and
- Countries you can or should approach to call for joint or global actions.

## **Which Actions? (graph)**

Types and numbers of **actions called for by countries** at the HRC to address the situation in Myanmar are presented in two graphics here:

- **Most Frequently called Actions by Theme and Country**

This graphic shows **what kind of actions** are called for **by which countries**, and **how often**.

- **Overall number of Most Frequently called Actions**

This graphic shows the **overall numbers of actions called for by countries** at the HRC to address the situation in Myanmar .

Advocacy tips for stakeholders

You can use these graphics, for example, to:

- Check whether actions discussed at the HRC are reflection the real need on the ground;
- Check whether there are particular actions that you think necessary but are not (sufficiently) discussed at the HRC or called for by individual countries;
- Identify countries you can approach to push for concrete actions you want at the HRC; and
- Approach countries with more specific and targeted information to strengthen the call for envisaged actions and eventually to make them happen.

### Actions by Whom? (bubble)

**Actors who are specifically called for**, and how often, by countries at the HRC **to take actions for Myanmar** are presented in a bubble graphic.

Advocacy tips for stakeholders

You can use this map, for example, to:

- Check which actors should be more specifically addressed to take actions;
- Approach countries to be more specific when calling for actions as to “who” should take those; and
- Clarify which concrete actions are needed from whom.

### Trends Over Time (graph)

Changes in the overall degree of condemnation and concern, issues raised and actions called for by countries at the HRC over the time at each HRC session since February 2021 are shown in three different graphs.

- **Average Score**  
This graph shows the trend of overall degree of condemnation and concern expressed over the time at each HRC session, by using the average score of all countries.
- **Issues raised**  
This graph shows how often the 10 most common issues are raised by countries, over the time at each HRC session, when they expressed condemnation or concerns about Myanmar.
- **Actions called for**  
This graph shows how often specific actions are called for by countries, over the time at each HRC session, to address the situation in Myanmar.

#### Advocacy tip for stakeholders

You can use these graphs, for example, to:

- Monitor the general trend of the focus and discussion at the HRC towards Myanmar;
- Monitor what issues and actions are discussed at which sessions of the HRC; and
- Plan the focus of your advocacy on Myanmar at the coming session(s) of the HRC.

\*In addition, our [findings papers](#) complement the above by providing additional information and findings.