

What are countries saying about Myanmar at the UN HRC?

Analysis and findings

53rd Regular Session of the UN Human Rights Council

*by the Centre for Civil and Political Rights
August 2023*

Background

The Centre for Civil and Political Rights (CCPR Centre) has been monitoring discussions of the UN Human Rights Council (HRC) on Myanmar and analysing statements made by countries. In order to provide stakeholders with practical and useful information for their advocacy, CCPR Centre has started an extensive collection and analysis of such statements and visualisation of the findings since the 29th Special Session of the HRC immediately after the military coup in February 2021. It highlights, among others: which countries are more vocal in addressing the crisis in Myanmar in support of its people, which are not and which countries appear to be blocking effective actions from the international community; what issues are raised and actions called for; and where advocacy should be strengthened.

This summary paper presents the results and findings of the analysis of statements made by countries at the 53rd regular session of the HRC. More details about the entire project, including the visualisation products as well as the findings of the monitoring of previous HRC sessions since the illegal military coup can be found [here](#).

HRC 53 - key facts

- The 53rd Regular Session of the HRC took place from 19 June to 14 July 2023.
- Two Interactive Dialogues (ID) were held on Myanmar: one with the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (ID HC) on his written update (A/HRC/53/52) and the other with the Special Rapporteur on Myanmar (ID SR) on his oral progress report, both on 6 July 2023.
- One Panel Discussion was held on Human Rights Violations against Rohingya and other minorities in Myanmar (PD R, based on HRC res. 50/3).
- In total, 63 statements were made by countries and 10 by groups of countries at the HRC 53:
 - During the ID HC, 27 countries¹ and 2 groups of countries² made statements.
 - During the ID SR, 21 countries³ and 4 groups of countries⁴ made statements.
 - During the PD R, 15 countries⁵ and 4 groups of countries⁶ made statements.

Methodology update

- Statements were analysed using their texts uploaded on the HRC extranet. Texts uploaded in languages other than English⁷ were analysed by using an online translation tool. Furthermore, statements of following countries were analysed by transcribing their statements from the English channel of the UN Webcast as their texts were not available on the HRC extranet at the time of analysis.
 - ID HC: China, Georgia, Libya, Maldives and Türkiye (and OIC presented by Pakistan)
 - ID SR: China and Viet Nam (and OIC presented by Pakistan)
 - PD R: Türkiye
- Similarly, statements presented at previous HRC sessions (since the 29th Special Session), for which texts were not available on the HRC extranet, were also analysed and added to the database based on their transcriptions from the English channel of the UN Webcast.
- As countries started raising the issue of refugees and IDPs as well as repatriation of Rohingyas, new categories were added in the data analysis from this session.⁸

¹ Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bulgaria, China, Czech Republic, France, Gambia, Georgia, India, Indonesia, Libya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Maldives, Mauritania, Romania, Russian Federation, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, Türkiye, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela

² European Union (EU); and Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC, presented by Pakistan)

³ Australia, Bangladesh, Canada, China, France, Germany, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Lao PDR, Luxembourg, Malaysia, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, Viet Nam

⁴ EU; Group of Friends on Children and Armed Conflict (presented by Uruguay); Nordic-Baltic States (presented by Denmark); and OIC (presented by Pakistan)

⁵ Australia, Bangladesh, Costa Rica, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mauritania, Russian Federation, Senegal, South Africa, Türkiye, United Kingdom, Venezuela

⁶ Benelux (presented by Luxembourg); EU; Nordic-Baltic States (presented by Norway); and OIC (presented by Pakistan)

⁷ ID HC: Belarus, France, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Russia, Spain, Switzerland, and Venezuela; ID SR: Canada, France, Kuwait, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Saudi Arabia, and Venezuela; PD R: Costa Rica, Egypt, Kuwait, Mauritania, Russia, Senegal, and Venezuela

⁸ For details, please see our [methodology explainer](#).

1. Key Highlights

- As it was the topic of the panel discussion, a number of statements were addressing issues related to the rights and situation of **Rohingyas**, such as systematic discrimination and grave violations of their human rights including crimes against humanity and war crimes. Among those, **repatriation** was a topic, on which positions of countries were rather divided:
 - On the one hand, a number of countries⁹ stressed on the need and importance of ensuring **safe, voluntary, dignified and sustainable return** and that the situation in Myanmar i.e. Rakhine State was **not yet conducive** to it;
 - There were also countries that only touched upon one or some of the elements of such return¹⁰, whereby **Mauritania** appeared to be also emphasising on **“immediate”** return¹¹;
 - On the other hand, **Bangladesh** was focusing on the **pilot project** carried out between Bangladesh and “Myanmar” i.e. the junta¹², which were also welcomed by Russia¹³ (and OIC¹⁴).
- Majority of countries welcomed, thanked or appreciated the report and/or work of the High Commissioner and the Special Rapporteur during the two IDs¹⁵, while Bangladesh (ID HC and ID SR), India (ID HC) and Viet Nam (ID SR) took note¹⁶ of them.
- **Belarus, China, Russia** and **Venezuela** continued expressing their disapproval or **opposition against international actions** including by UN HC and SR by claiming e.g. **“politicisation”** of issues and mandates, **“bias”** or **“lack of verified information”**, and at some point **attempting to legitimise acts of the Myanmar military** by typically claiming that the issue is **“internal affairs”** and **“sovereignty”** of **“Myanmar”**.
- **Accountability** is one of the priority issues raised by many stakeholders, including the Centre and especially the civil society from the ground. It was also raised by the HC in his report submitted to the HRC 53 and also raised by many countries in their statements including the call for compliance with the provisional measures issued by the ICJ. However, **several countries failed** (or intentionally omitted) **to specify the perpetrator to be held accountable in particular the Myanmar military**, significantly weakening their calls for accountability:

⁹ E.g. Australia (PD R), Indonesia (PD R), Kuwait (PD R); Malaysia (PDR), Mauritania (PD R), Senegal (PD R), UK (PD R), Venezuela (PD R), Bulgaria (ID HC), Mauritania (ID HC), US (ID HC), Canada (ID SR), Italy (ID SR), Luxembourg (ID SR), Republic of Korea (ID SR)

¹⁰ E.g. Bangladesh (PD R, voluntary), Libya (ID HC, safe and dignified of all displaced persons), Türkiye (ID HC, safe, voluntary and dignified), Viet Nam (ID SR, voluntary, safe and dignified), Saudi Arabia (ID SR, safe and dignified)

¹¹ Apart from Mauritania, statements of OIC (presented by Pakistan during PD R and ID HC) were the only ones calling for immediate return. See chapter 7 For details about statements of regional bodies and groups of States.

¹² In all three statements during PD R, ID HC and ID SR.

¹³ Statement during PD R

¹⁴ Statements presented by Pakistan during PD R and ID HC.

¹⁵ E.g. ID HC: Austria, Bulgaria, Czechia, France, Gambia, Georgia, Indonesia, Libya, Maldives, Malta, Romania, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, Türkiye, UK, US, (and EU); ID SR:

¹⁶ During ID HC, OIC (presented by Pakistan) also only took note of HC’s report. During ID SR, Kuwait and Malaysia (and OIC) both thanked and took note of the SR’s update.

- **Bangladesh** (PD R, ID HC, ID SR), **Egypt** (PD R), **Indonesia** (PD R), **Iran** (PD R), **Kuwait** (PD R), **Malaysia** (PD R), **Mauritania** (PD R, ID HC), **Senegal** (PD R), **Türkiye** (PD R), **Venezuela** (PD R), **Saudi Arabia** (ID SR) (and OIC, PD R and ID HC), among others, were particular about the human rights violations against Rohingya, but have not mentioned Myanmar military at all in their statements;
 - Similarly, **Georgia** (ID HC), **India** (ID HC), **Indonesia** (ID HC, ID SR), **Libya** (ID HC), **Maldives** (ID HC), **Bulgaria** (IC HC), **Malaysia** (ID HC, ID SR), **Malta** (ID HC), **Thailand** (ID HC), **Singapore** (ID SR), among others, raised various issues including accountability but have not mentioned Myanmar military in their statements;
 - **Kuwait** (ID SR), **Lao PDR** (ID SR), **Russia** (PD R), **Viet Nam** (ID SR) were less vocal in raising issues and have not mentioned Myanmar military at all in their statements;
 - **China** (ID HC, ID SR), **Belarus** (ID HC), **Russia** (ID HC) and **Venezuela** (ID HC) have not addressed any human rights issues or mentioned Myanmar military at all in their statements.
- While a number of countries clearly addressed Myanmar military as the target of their calls and specified their accountability, some countries were using **vague or problematic terms**¹⁷ such as “Myanmar”, “Myanmar authorities” or “authorities in Myanmar”, “Myanmar government”, “military authority”, when referring to national actors in Myanmar, especially Myanmar military, thereby failing to spell out their accountability, blurring the target of their calls for actions, or giving the impression that they were even giving some legitimacy to the military
 - **Kuwait** (PD R and ID SR) presented its **first and second statements** on Myanmar since the coup in 2021.
 - **Georgia** (ID HC) presented a statement on Myanmar for the **first time** since the coup in 2021.
 - **Costa Rica** (PD R) and **Senegal** (PD R) presented a statement on Myanmar for the **second time** since the coup in 2021, following their first statement at the HRC 52 and 50 respectively.
 - **Costa Rica** was the **only country among the Caribbean** and **Venezuela** the **only one among the Latin American** States that presented statements on Myanmar at HRC 53.
 - **Group of Friends on Children and Armed Conflict**¹⁸ presented a statement during ID SR for the **first time** since the coup in 2021.

***Did you know?** After the HRC 53, 42 African States (out of 54), 29 Asia-Pacific States (out of 54), 7 Eastern European States (out of 23), 27 Latin American and Caribbean States (out of 33), 4 Western European and Other States (out of 28) still remain silent on Myanmar.¹⁹*

¹⁷ For more details, please see chapter 6.

¹⁸ Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Guatemala, Hungary, Italy, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, France, United Kingdom, Uruguay.

¹⁹ Some of the countries were part of joint statements presented by regional body or groups of countries, but never presented individual statements. For more details, please see [here](#).

2. Condemnations and Concerns

- The 53rd Regular Session of the Human Rights Council recorded the lowest number of specific condemnations and concerns expressed by countries through their statements on the situation in Myanmar since the 29th Special Session in 2021.
- 51% of country statements (32 out of 63) expressed condemnations and concerns towards the human rights violations, illegitimate coup and actions of the military junta.
- Specific condemnations were expressed by 8 countries²⁰ while specific concerns were expressed by only 6 countries²¹.
- Australia was the only country to express both specific concerns and condemnations.

“Australia condemns the regime’s ongoing violence against the Myanmar people, including the horrific airstrike on 11 April, which killed large numbers of civilians, among them women and children.”
- Australia, ID SR

- Belarus, China, Russia and Venezuela delivered multiple statements in their continuous attempts to oppose international actions, defend or legitimise the military junta’s authority and actions.

“This Council should not continue to support these unnecessary and ineffective mandates against the countries of the South that violate the right to self-determination of peoples and the universal principles of respect for sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of States.”
- Venezuela, ID SR

3. Issues Raised

Overview of the issues raised and their frequency (from most to less frequent):

Humanitarian situation (36); Violence and extrajudicial killing (33); Rights of the Rohingyas (30); Women, children and other vulnerable groups (18); Military coup (18); ASEAN (17); Impunity and accountability (14); Repatriation (12); Arbitrary arrests and detentions (5); Freedom of expression and assembly (0); Elections (0); State of Emergency (0)

- ‘Humanitarian situation’ was the most frequently raised issue (36) during the session, particularly regarding the situation of the Rohingyas including the impact of Cyclone Mocha.

“The Myanmar military’s actions since the coup continue to worsen the human rights conditions and humanitarian crisis facing the Myanmar people. Credible reports that the military continues to block and delay the delivery of critically needed humanitarian assistance, including for communities devastated by Cyclone Mocha.”
- United States, ID HC

²⁰ Australia (ID SR), Austria (ID HC), Czech Republic (ID HC), France (ID SR), Japan (ID SR), New Zealand (ID SR), Spain (ID HC), Switzerland (ID HC)

²¹ Australia (PD R), Gambia (ID HC), Republic of Korea (ID SR), Turkiye (ID HC and PD R), United Kingdom (ID HC and PD R), United States (ID SR)

- ‘Violence and extrajudicial killing’ was addressed by 33 country statements followed by the ‘rights of the Rohingyas’ with 33.
- Thematic issues related to ‘military coup’ and ‘women, children and other vulnerable groups’ were addressed 18 times each.
- Issues related to ASEAN were addressed in 17 statements mainly focusing on the support to ASEAN’s leadership in finding peaceful solutions to the situation in Myanmar and pushing for effective implementation of the Five Point Consensus.
- Issues related to ‘impunity and accountability’ were addressed in 14 statements..
- While Bangladesh was rather promoting (immediate) repatriation of the Rohingya through the pilot project with the Myanmar junta, 12 country statements addressed the importance of ensuring voluntary, safe, dignified and sustainable return of the Rohingyas.

“We are outraged that under the current conditions safe, voluntary, sustainable, and dignified return of internally displaced persons, the Rohingya and other refugees remains impossible.”
 - Bulgaria, ID HC

- Only 5 country statements addressed issues related to ‘arbitrary arrests and detentions’.

Did you know? Freedom of expression and assembly, elections and issue of state of emergency was not mentioned at all by any country at the HRC 53.

4. Call for Actions

Overview of number of calls for action by countries

African States:

Gambia (4), Senegal (4), Libya (3), Egypt (3), South Africa (3), Mauritania (1)

Asia-Pacific States:

Malaysia (11), Türkiye (6), Viet Nam (5), Japan (5), India (4), Thailand (4), Lao PDR (3), Bangladesh (3), Republic of Korea (3), Kuwait (2), Saudi Arabia (2), China (1), Indonesia (1), Iran (1), Maldives (1), Singapore (0)

Latin American and Caribbean States:

Venezuela (2), Costa Rica (0)

Eastern European States:

Bulgaria (7), Romania (3), Georgia (2), Czech Republic (1), Russian Federation (0), Belarus (0)

Western European and other States:

Australia (10), United Kingdom (8), Austria (5), France (5), Italy (5), Malta (5), Spain (4), Canada (3), Germany (3), New Zealand (3), Switzerland (3), Luxembourg (2), United States (2)

- In total, 143 calls for concrete actions were made by countries at the HRC 53²².

²² A phrase in statements that clearly calls for a concrete action is recorded as one “call”. As such, one statement may include several calls for action, and vice versa, some statements might not include any. “Calls” that appear to

- The highest number of calls for action came from Malaysia, which made 11 calls, followed by Australia (10), United Kingdom (8), Bulgaria (7) and Türkiye (6).
- Belarus, China, Russia and Venezuela were repeating their narratives attempting to legitimise the junta's authority and actions and to oppose any actions from the international community.
- During the PD R, Venezuela exceptionally addressed safe, dignified and sustainable return of the Rohingyas, although without mentioning 'voluntary' as a condition.

"In this regard, the root causes of the situation in Rakhine State and the need to create an enabling environment with the necessary conditions for the repatriation and safe, dignified and sustainable return of Rohingya refugees and displaced persons, must be addressed within the framework of concerted efforts and the facilitation of dialogue with Myanmar and the populations directly concerned, such as the Rohingya Muslims."

- Venezuela, PD R

Did you know? Singapore and Costa Rica did not make any concrete call for actions in their statements (apart from Belarus and Russia that only made controversial calls).

5. Which Actions?

Overview of actions called for and their frequency (from most to less frequent):

General calls for human rights, rule of law, and dialogues (27); Unblock humanitarian assistance (24); Stop violence (18); Protect rights of the Rohingyas (17); Realise accountability (16); Implement ASEAN initiatives (10); Stop persecution (9); Provide humanitarian assistance (8); Reinstatement of civilian government (6); Impose arms embargo (4); Protect the Rights of Internally Displaced Persons and Refugees (2); End state of emergency (1); Stop death penalty/ execution (1); Impose other economic measures (0); Impose sanctions (0); Ensure access to information (0); Recognise NUG (0)

- About 20% of the calls for actions (27 out of 143) addressed human rights, rule of law, and dialogues in a quite general manner.

"We call upon all parties involved to create a favourable condition for such dialogue by refraining from violence, ensuring a timely and unhindered delivery of humanitarian assistance, and facilitating the voluntary return of displaced persons in a safe, secure, and dignified manner."

- Viet Nam, ID SR

- Due to continued hindrance by the junta of the delivery of humanitarian assistance, many member states called for unblocking humanitarian assistance (24), doubling the number of calls

defend, support or legitimise human rights violations including the acts of Myanmar military and that attempt to block actions to protect human rights of the people of Myanmar are not regarded as a call for action. More details about the methodology is available on our website. Categories of actions identified can be found in section 5. For the overview of countries participating in the two IDs, please see footnotes 3 and 4 above.

from the last HRC session, while 8 country statements included calls for providing humanitarian assistance.

- 18 statements called for the cessation of violence, while Austria was the only one that called for halting the use of anti-personnel landmines.
- 17 statements called for the protection of the rights of the Rohingyas, 9 during PD R, 5 during the ID SR, and 3 during the ID HC.
- 16 statements called for the realisation of accountability and justice including through impartial investigations, cooperation of the junta with accountability processes and international mechanisms such as the Independent Investigative Mechanism for Myanmar (IIMM). Out of 16 calls, 10 were made during ID HC, 5 during PD R and 1 during ID SR.
- There were 10 calls for the implementation of or support of ASEAN-led initiatives and 9 calls for the end to persecution of activists and the release of political prisoners.
- 6 statements called for restoration of democracy in general or of the civilian government elected in 2021.
- Australia (ID SR), Canada (ID SR), United Kingdom (ID SR) and the United States (ID SR) were the only countries that called for the arms embargo.

“We urge all countries to stop the transfer and sale of arms to the Myanmar regime, as Canada has done by imposing sanctions in coordination with its international partners.”

- Canada, ID SR

- Malaysia was the only country that has called for resettlement or relocation to a third country for displaced persons and refugees.

“We urge signatories of the 1951 Convention to uphold their international legal obligations and accept more refugees for resettlement or relocation.”

- Malaysia, PD R

Did you know? At the HRC 53, no call was made for imposing sanctions, imposing other economic measures, ensuring access to information, or recognising the NUG.

6. Action by whom?

- More than 70% (101 out of 143) of the calls for actions did not specify whom they were calling upon to act or only addressed vague groups such as ‘the international community’, ‘all stakeholders’, and ‘all parties’.

“My Government...calls on relevant stakeholders at the national level to maintain national dialogue and adhere to international and UN recommendations to reduce humanitarian violations.”

- Saudi Arabia, ID SR

- Among the calls that specified actors, 13 were addressed to the Myanmar military / junta, 5 fellow Member States. The other actors called upon included High Commissioner (2), Special Rapporteur (1), United Nations (1), and UN HRC (1).
- Some countries were using vague or problematic terms such as *“Myanmar”*, *“Myanmar authorities”* or *“authorities in Myanmar”*, *“Myanmar government”*, *“military authority”*, when referring to national actors in Myanmar, especially Myanmar military, thereby failing to spell out their accountability, blurring the target of their calls for actions, or giving the impression that they were recognising the military as the national authority of Myanmar.
 - *“Myanmar”*²³: considering the ongoing issue of the representation of the country, especially at the international level, it was not clear which actor exactly was addressed by countries using this term. It made the call less effective and was rather problematic as they were blurring the accountability of the Myanmar military and in some cases could even be interpreted as the junta was referred to as an actor representing Myanmar.
 - *“Myanmar authorities”*, *“authorities in Myanmar”*²⁴: similar to the calls on *“Myanmar”*, it was not clear which actor exactly was addressed with this term (and apart from the question whether there is any actor in Myanmar that can be recognised as the “authorities”), making the call less effective. However, it was more problematic as this term appeared to refer to the junta in many cases, blurring its accountability and could be interpreted as if the countries using this term were recognising it as the authorities in Myanmar.
 - *“Myanmar government”*²⁵: the junta must not be seen as the government of Myanmar. However, from the context it also appeared that this term was used referring to the NUG, making the call quite less effective. Moreover, it is problematic as the country using this term appeared to regard the junta as the “government” of Myanmar.
 - *“Military authority”*²⁶: while countries using this term were clearly addressing their calls to the Myanmar military, it was problematic as these countries appeared to see the junta as the legitimate authority in Myanmar.

7. Regional bodies and groups of States

The following regional bodies and groups of States made statements at the HRC 53:

- During the ID HC: European Union (**EU**); and Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (**OIC**, presented by Pakistan);

²³ E.g. Bangladesh (PD R, ID HC), Bulgaria (ID HC), Indonesia (PD R), Malaysia (PD R), Viet Nam (ID SR), as well as Nordic Baltic States (PD R, presented by Norway) and OIC (PD R, ID HC, presented by Pakistan)

²⁴ E.g. Belarus (ID HC), Malaysia (PD R, ID HC, ID SR), Maldives (ID HC), Malta (ID HC), Mauritania (ID HC), Türkiye (PD R, ID HC),

²⁵ E.g. Egypt (PD R)

²⁶ E.g. Romania (ID HC), Spain (ID HC), Türkiye (ID HC)

- During the ID SR: **EU; Group of Friends on Children and Armed Conflict** (presented by Uruguay); **Nordic-Baltic States** (presented by Denmark); and **OIC** (presented by Pakistan)
- During the PD R: **Benelux** (presented by Luxembourg); **EU; Nordic-Baltic States** (presented by Norway); and **OIC** (presented by Pakistan).

The **EU** has been vocal and consistent in addressing various issues in Myanmar, presenting statements at every session of the HRC since the 29th Special Session. At the HRC 53, statements of the EU covered issues related to: coup; impunity and accountability; violence including extrajudicial killings; rights of Rohingyas; women, children and other vulnerable groups including refugees; humanitarian situation; ASEAN; and repatriation; and called for actions on: arms embargo; stopping persecution; stopping violence; provision of humanitarian assistance; ensuring access to humanitarian assistance; protection of the rights of Rohingyas; accountability; and on IDPs and refugees.

Nordic-Baltic States have also been vocal and consistent in addressing the crisis in Myanmar, presenting statements at each HRC session since the HRC 46 (it did not present any statement at the 29th Special Session). At the HRC 53, it presented statements at ID SR and PD R, covering issues similar to the ones addressed by EU except for coup and ASEAN, while making less calls for concrete actions only on stopping violence, ensuring access to humanitarian assistance and accountability. It was the only one urging *“Myanmar to endorse and implement the Safe School Declaration”*, although the impact of this call, especially concerning the responsible actor (*“Myanmar”*), is not clear.

OIC has also been vocal at each session of the HRC, except for the 29th Special Session, their statements largely focused on matters related to Rohingyas (and accountability for crimes against Rohingyas), while the degree of condemnation concerning Myanmar military’s actions has not been so strong as compared to two groups mentioned above. At the HRC 53, OIC presented three statements addressing issues related to: impunity and accountability; violence including extrajudicial killings; rights of Rohingyas; and humanitarian situation, whereby OIC’s call for action was largely focused on Rohingyas including accountability and ensuring humanitarian aid in that context. In addition, OIC was the only one welcoming the *“dialogue”* between Bangladesh and *“Myanmar”* (ID HC and PD R) and the pilot project (ID HC) apart from Bangladesh and Russia. It also called for *“immediate”* (ID HC and PD R) return of Rohingyas. Although addressing the issue of accountability, OIC has not mentioned or called out the Myanmar military in any of their statements, only calling on *“Myanmar”*.

Benelux presented a statement during PD R at the HRC 53 for the third time following HRC 51 and 52 (both during ID SR). In accordance with the topic of the panel discussion, Benelux’s statement mainly addressed issues and actions related to: rights of Rohingyas, humanitarian situation, and repatriation. Benelux was also particularly clear and strong on the need for accountability, also denouncing countries *“insisting that this is an internal affair of Myanmar and continuing their cooperation with the Tatmadaw.”*

Group of Friends on Children and Armed Conflict presented a statement for the first time at the HRC 53 during ID SR, mainly addressing issues and calling for actions related to: coup; violence including extrajudicial killings; situation of children including their education; and humanitarian situation.