

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

## Analysis and findings 52nd Regular Session of the UN Human Rights Council

*by the Centre for Civil and Political Rights  
April 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 52nd 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 52 - key facts

- The 52nd Regular Session of the HRC took place from **27 February to 4 April 2023**.
- **Two Interactive Dialogues (ID)** were held on Myanmar: one with the UN **High Commissioner for Human Rights (HC)** on his report (A/HRC/52/21)<sup>1</sup> on 6 March 2023 and the other with the **Special Rapporteur on Myanmar (SR Myanmar)** on his report (A/HRC/52/66)<sup>2</sup> on 20 March 2023.
- In total, **69 statements** were made by countries during two IDs on Myanmar at the HRC 52.
- During the **ID with HC, 33 countries** made statements (in addition to the ones made by the EU)<sup>3</sup>.
- During the **ID with SR Myanmar, 36 countries** made statements (in addition to the ones made by the EU)<sup>4</sup>.

*\*Data presented in the Sections 2 - 7 of this paper only concerns statements made by individual countries, while Section 1 includes data from statements presented by regional blocs and groups of States and Section 8 solely focuses on statements of regional blocs and groups of States.*

## Methodology update

The analysis of statements made by countries at the HRC 52 was mainly carried out based on their **texts uploaded at the HRC extranet**<sup>5</sup>. However, texts of the statements made by following countries were not available on the extranet at the time of this writing, thus, analysis of their statements were carried out based on the **English audio of the videos of the IDs archived on UN WebTV**:

ID HC: texts of statements of Canada, China, Pakistan and Russia were not available on the extranet, and wrong document was uploaded for the statement of France;

ID SR: texts of statements of Canada, China, Japan, Russia, South Africa and Ukraine were not available on the extranet.

---

<sup>1</sup> The report highlighted trends and patterns of human rights violations in Myanmar between 1 February 2021 and 31 January 2023, among others: use of airstrikes, artillery strikes, burning of villages, death in custody and extrajudicial executions, and enforced disappearance committed by Myanmar military; violence by anti-military armed groups; sexual and gender-based violence; systemic discrimination against the Rohingya and other ethnic and religious minorities; instrumentalisation of the legal framework and subvention of the judiciary; right to liberty and security of person; fundamental freedoms; economic and social rights; and accountability.

<sup>2</sup> The report raised the issues of, among others: attacks on civilians; displacement and humanitarian needs; arrest and detention; civic space and fundamental freedoms; the SAC's plans for a sham election; and international response to those fleeing violence and human rights violation in Myanmar.

<sup>3</sup> In alphabetic order: Australia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Botswana, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Egypt, France, Gambia, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Japan, Libya, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Netherlands, Norway (on behalf of Nordic Baltic States), Pakistan (on behalf of OIC), Russia, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Thailand, Türkiye, UK, USA, Venezuela, Viet Nam

<sup>4</sup> In alphabetic order: Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark (on behalf of Nordic Baltic States), France, Gambia, Germany, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Lao PDR, Liechtenstein, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Netherlands (on behalf of BENELUX countries), New Zealand, Pakistan (on behalf of OIC), Romania, Republic of Korea, Russia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, Türkiye, UK, Ukraine, USA, Venezuela

<sup>5</sup> Data on the statements made by countries since 29th Special Session (12 February 2021) and up to the 51st Regular Session of the HRC (12 September - 7 October 2022), were collected and analysed solely based on the texts of their statements uploaded at the HRC extranet.

## 1. Key Highlights

- When calling for actions, several countries have been using **vague terms**, such as “Myanmar”, “the authorities in Myanmar” or “Myanmar authority”, which made their calls less effective, and in some cases gave the impression, intentionally or unintentionally, that they are recognising the authority of the junta.
- **Costa Rica** made **intervention for the first time** on Myanmar since the coup in 2021, specifically calling out the Myanmar military for their systemic violations of human rights and international humanitarian law. Particular attention was given to the human rights of the Rohingyas.
- **Botswana, Malta and South Africa** made their **interventions for the second time** since their first ones at the 29th Special Session. In comparison with its [previous statement](#), Botswana’s [intervention](#) at the HRC 52 included a strong and specific call for actions:

*“We call for the cessation of politically motivated prosecutions, including those targeting members of the democratically elected Government, members of political parties, civil society representatives, human rights defenders and all other persons expressing opposition to military rule.”*

- Botswana, ID HC

- **BENELUX** countries<sup>6</sup> made their **intervention for the second time as a group** of States following their 1st intervention as a group at the HRC 51.
- **Venezuela** is the **only country from Latin America** that has issued statements in this session.
- **Luxembourg** was the only one country that made a reference to the **recognition of the National Unity Government of Myanmar (NUG)** during ID HC, asking the High Commissioner whether he would recommend that the international community recognises NUG as the legitimate representative of Myanmar.
- As a new issue that was not previously raised, **New Zealand, Romania** and the **United States** addressed the junta’s plans to conduct **elections**.

*“We fully concur with the Special Rapporteur’s views that holding genuine elections under current conditions – with opposition leaders imprisoned, in hiding or exiled and journalistic work criminalized – is indeed impossible.”* - Romania, ID SR

- Despite the situation of Rohingyas being one of the main issues raised by both HC and SR in their reports, among the countries participating in both IDs, **20 countries (Austria, Belarus, Botswana, China, Croatia, The Czech Republic, France, Ireland, Lao PDR, Malta, Netherlands, Romania, Republic of Korea, Russia, Sierra Leone, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, Venezuela and Viet Nam)** and **Nordic-Baltic States**<sup>7</sup> have **NOT addressed it at all** in their statements.

<sup>6</sup> Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg

<sup>7</sup> Statement presented by Norway for ID HC and by Denmark for ID SR

- On the other hand, **Mauritania** and **Saudi Arabia** are the two countries that only **addressed the issue of the Rohingyas but nothing else** at the HRC 52.
- While participating in relevant discussions at the HRC several times but being silent on Rohingyas, **Bulgaria, Japan, Liechtenstein, Thailand**, and the **US** for the **first time** explicitly addressed the issue of **Rohingyas** at the HRC 52. The **US** has also announced its **commitment** for additional contributions of USD 26 million for humanitarian assistance for the Rohingyas.
- However, the following countries are **still silent on or not explicitly addressing the issues of the Rohingyas** despite their repeated participation in HRC discussions: **Austria**<sup>8</sup>, **Belarus**<sup>9</sup>, **Cambodia**<sup>10</sup>, **China**<sup>11</sup>, **Croatia**<sup>12</sup>, **India**<sup>13</sup>, **Lao PDR**<sup>14</sup>, **Netherlands**<sup>15</sup>, **Romania**<sup>16</sup>, **Russia**<sup>17</sup>, **Singapore**<sup>18</sup>, and **Viet Nam**<sup>19</sup>.
- While several countries continued their support to ASEAN and called for implementation of ASEAN's Five Point Consensus (5PC), **Bangladesh** was the only country that indicated the **need for alternatives to ASEAN 5PC** given the lack of implementation.

*"Given serious lack of implementation of the ASEAN five-point consensus, the imperative for exploring other approaches on Myanmar is now too glaring to ignore." - Bangladesh, ID SR*

- Countries receiving **refugees** in the region, such as **India, Thailand, Malaysia**, and **Indonesia** all expressed **discontentment** in their statements with regard to the **Special Rapporteur's report**, which explicitly named these countries and their failure in providing adequate support to refugees from Myanmar.

*"We therefore, regret the imbalanced illustration of the situation in the SR's report, with little consideration of States' duty to protect its national security, sovereignty and territorial integrity. We also regret that Malaysia's efforts in meeting the needs of refugees and asylum seekers were not fairly reflected in the SR's report. We sincerely hope that moving forward, the SR maintains the focus of his report in addressing the crisis and human rights situation in Myanmar, in accordance with his mandate." - Malaysia, ID SR*

<sup>8</sup> Participation in 29 Special Session, HRC 46 (ID SR), 47 (ID SR), 48 (ID IIMM), 51 (ID SR), 52 (ID SR)

<sup>9</sup> Participation in 29 Special Session, HRC 50 (ID SR), 51 (ID OHCHR report), 52 (ID HC)

<sup>10</sup> Participation in HRC 46 (ID SR), 47 (ID SR), 49 (ID HC), 50 (ID HC)

<sup>11</sup> Participation in HRC 49 (ID HC), 49 (ID SR), 50 (ID HC), 52 (ID HC), 52 (ID SR)

<sup>12</sup> Participation in 29 Special Session, HRC 46 (ID SR), 51 (ID SR), 52 (ID SR)

<sup>13</sup> Participation in 29 Special Session, HRC 46 (ID SR), 47 (ID HC), 48 (ID SR), 51 (ID SR), 52 (ID SR)

<sup>14</sup> Participation in 29 Special Session, HRC 46 (ID SR), 47 (ID HC), 48 (ID SER), 49 (ID HC), 52 (ID SR)

<sup>15</sup> Participation in 29 Special Session, HRC 46 (ID SR), 47 (ID HC), 48 (ID IIMM), 49 (ID HC), 51 (ID IIMM), 52 (ID HC), \*the statement of BENELUX countries presented by the Netherlands during HRC 52 ID SR addressed Rohingyas

<sup>16</sup> Participation in 29 Special Session, HRC 46 (ID SR), 47 (ID HC), 48 (ID HC), 49 (ID HC), 51 (ID IIMM), 52 (ID SR)

<sup>17</sup> Participation in 29 Special Session, 46 (ID SR), 48 (ID HC), 52 (ID HC), 52 (ID SR)

<sup>18</sup> Participation in 29 Special Session, 46 (ID SR), 47 (ID SR), 51 (ID OHCHR report)

<sup>19</sup> Participation in 29 Special Session, HRC 47 (ID SR), 48 (ID HC), 49 (ID HC), 52 (ID HC)

## 2. Condemnations and Concerns

- Among all the country interventions during the session, only 17 (or less than 30% of the total interventions) specifically outlined their concerns and condemnations. 13 interventions included specific condemnations coming from Austria, Canada, Croatia, Czechia, France, Italy, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Ukraine and the United States. There were 4 interventions with specific concerns in total, each delivered by Australia, Costa Rica, South Africa and Türkiye.
- Belarus, Venezuela, Russian Federation and China continued their attempts to legitimise the junta's authority and actions.

*“Real concerns for human rights should contribute to the speedy normalisation of the situation in Myanmar, support for an inclusive and a democratic electoral process under the auspices of the current authorities, in promoting regional cooperation, which is welcomed by the people and authorities of Myanmar” - Belarus, ID HC*

*“Given the current exceptional situation, the plans by the authorities to hold parliamentary elections will bring stability and political predictability to the country.”  
- Russian Federation, ID HC*

- Countries such as India, Thailand and Malaysia were either vague or completely absent in expressing condemnations and concerns towards the human rights and political situation in Myanmar. In contrast, the concerns were expressed towards the report of the Special Rapporteur.

*“We are, however, concerned about some unwarranted references to India in the report. These go beyond the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar. Such remarks do not contribute to improving the situation in Myanmar and undermines India's efforts towards peace and stability in Myanmar” - India, ID SR*

## 3. Issues Raised

### **Overview of the issues raised and their frequency:**

Violence and extrajudicial killing - 35; Humanitarian situation - 32; Rights of the Rohingyas - 29;  
Women, children and other vulnerable groups - 21; Arbitrary arrests and detentions - 19;  
Military coup - 16; Impunity and accountability - 15; ASEAN - 14;  
Freedom of expression and assembly - 10; Elections - 3; State of Emergency - 2

- Issues related to violence and extrajudicial killings were addressed through 35 country interventions, making it the most frequently addressed thematic issue during the HRC 52. Come second is the humanitarian situation addressed through 32 country interventions. Closing the list

of top three issues raised during the HRC 52 are the rights of the Rohingyas which were addressed through 29 country interventions.

- Issues related to vulnerable groups such as women, children and refugees were addressed 21 times, while more specific issues such as arbitrary arrest and detentions were mentioned 19 times. The military coup is still more frequently addressed (16) than other issues such as impunity and accountability (15) followed by ASEAN (14). Freedom of expression and assembly was mentioned only 10 times.
- The State of Emergency was almost untouched with a total of 2 mentions throughout the session. Meanwhile, the emerging issue related to elections envisaged by the junta was addressed 3 times in total.

#### 4. Call for Actions

- In total, 156 calls for concrete actions were made by countries at the HRC 52<sup>20</sup>.
- The highest number of calls for action came from Australia, which made 12 calls, followed by Italy (8), Japan (8), Canada (7), Türkiye (7) and the United States (7).
- Among African States<sup>21</sup>, all 8 countries that participated in the two IDs made calls for actions, in order of the total number of calls: Malawi (6), Sierra Leone (6), Gambia (4), South Africa (4), Botswana (1), Egypt (1), Libya (1) and Mauritania (1).
- Among 14 countries from Asia-Pacific States that participated in IDs, most calls were made by Japan (8) and Türkiye (7), followed by Indonesia (5), Malaysia (4), Republic of Korea (4), Thailand (4), Bangladesh (3), Viet Nam (3), Iran (2), Lao PDR (2), Maldives (1) and Saudi Arabia (1). There were no calls for action from China and India in this regard.
- Neither of the two countries from Latin American and Caribbean States that participated in the IDs, Costa Rica and Venezuela, made any call for actions in their statements.
- Among the Western European and other States, 16 countries participated in the two IDs, of which 14 countries made calls for action. Most calls were made by Australia (12), Italy (8), Canada (7), and the United States (7), followed by Germany (6), New Zealand (5), Austria (4), France (4), Spain (4), UK (4), Ireland (3), Switzerland (3), Luxembourg (1) and Malta (1). Liechtenstein and the Netherlands did not make any call for action.

---

<sup>20</sup> 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 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.

<sup>21</sup> See the UN regional groups of member states here; same for other groups used in this paper

- Among Eastern European States, seven countries participated in the two IDs, and five of them made calls for action: Croatia (6), Bulgaria (5), Czechia (4), Romania (1) and Ukraine (1). No call was made by Belarus and Russia in this regard.
- Russia, China, Belarus, and Venezuela have continued their rhetoric to legitimise the junta’s authority and actions and to oppose effective actions from the international community, e.g. by claiming that the issue is an internal affairs, calling for participation of “country concerned”, arguing that the HRC’s discussion is politicised by “West” or “Global North”, or demeaning the work of the OHCHR or the Special Rapporteur.

*“We condemn the insistent calls by the Special Rapporteur for the imposition of more unilateral coercive measures against Myanmar, which cause hunger, death and untold suffering to its people, flagrantly violating their human rights, which he claims to protect. The extreme politicisation of his mandate is alarming, reflected in the lack of objectivity of the reports that he has presented, selective, biased, with unverified information and from sources that are impossible to corroborate.”*

- Venezuela, ID SR

*“The SR misuse his UN expert status, went beyond his mandate, unwarrantedly vilified normal arms trade between sovereign states in an attempt to interfere in the work of UN bodies, serving the political agenda of certain countries, seriously contradicting the code of conduct of special procedures and gravely undermine their credibility which would further complicate the situation”*

- China, ID SR

## 5. Which Actions?

### **Overview of actions called for and their frequency:**

General calls for human rights, rule of law, and dialogues - 33; Stop violence - 23;  
 Stop persecution - 19; Reinstatement of civilian government - 17; Protect rights of the Rohingyas - 17;  
 Realise accountability - 15; Unblock humanitarian assistance - 12; Implement ASEAN initiatives - 7;  
 Impose arms embargo - 4; Stop death penalty/ execution - 3; Provide humanitarian assistance - 2;  
 End state of emergency - 1; impose other economic measures - 1; Impose sanctions - 0;  
 Ensure access to information - 0; Recognise NUG - 0

- Austria and Croatia called on the military junta to stop using anti-personnel landmines, the first time any country has mentioned such a call. These calls are recorded under the category of ‘stop violence’.
- There was no call for recognising NUG, imposing sanctions, or ensuring access to information. Up to the HRC 52, there were 2 calls in total each for the NUG recognition and imposing sanctions, and 30 calls for the access to information.

- The higher number of calls for the junta to unblock humanitarian assistance (12) as compared to calls on member states to provide humanitarian assistance (2), reflects the urgent and persistent challenge in delivering humanitarian aid for the people of Myanmar.
- Under the category ‘reinstate civilian government’, most interventions stayed vague in calling for ‘return to democracy path/civilian rule’ or ‘restoration of democratically elected institutions’. Since the 29th Special Session, there has been a gradual shift where countries became more vague in specifically calling the junta to respect the results of the 2020 elections.

## 6. Action by whom?

- Calls for action become less effective if they were made without specifying “who” should take actions. Only 62 calls for actions (40% out of the total 156 calls) were addressed to specified actors.

*“We reiterate our earlier calls for the necessary steps to be taken for swift return to democracy and the rule of law as well as for the release of all arbitrarily imprisoned elected leaders, politicians and civilians.” - Türkiye, ID HC*

*“We call on all stakeholders to create a conducive environment for an inclusive national dialogue by ceasing violence and ensuring the timely and unhindered delivery of humanitarian assistance, as well as facilitating the voluntary return of displaced persons in a safe, secure, and dignified manner.”  
- Viet Nam, ID HC*

- Moreover, when calling for actions, several countries have been using **vague terms**, as shown by the examples below, which made their calls less effective, and in some cases gave the impression, intentionally or unintentionally, that they are recognising the authority of the junta:

**“Myanmar”**: several countries called on or urged “Myanmar” to take actions.<sup>22</sup> However, given the unresolved issue concerning the representation of the country, it is not clear which actor they were exactly referring to, thus making the call less effective. Depending on the context and wording, some calls on “Myanmar” became rather problematic as they were blurring the accountability of the junta, and in some cases could even be seen as referring to the junta as “Myanmar”.

*“We will continue urging the Myanmar side to allow safe and unhindered humanitarian access.”  
- Japan, ID HC*

*“We urge Myanmar to give the UN Human Rights Office access to monitor the situation independently and impartially.”*

<sup>22</sup> E.g. Australia “called on Myanmar” (ID HC); Bangladesh “Rohingya crisis has been created by Myanmar ... Myanmar must create a conducive environment” (ID HC); Japan “urging the Myanmar side to...” (ID HC); Malaysia “call on Myanmar” (ID HC); Norway on behalf of Nordic Baltic States “urge Myanmar” (ID HC); Pakistan “OIC urges Myanmar” (ID HC); Thailand “enable relevant States, including Myanmar, to work together” (ID HC); Bangladesh “to mount pressure on Myanmar” (ID SR); Lao PDF “assisting Myanmar’s effort ... support and cooperate constructively with Myanmar” (ID SR); Pakistan “OIC urges Myanmar” (ID SR); Republic of Korea “urge Myanmar” (ID SR)



- Norway (on behalf of Nordic Baltic countries), ID HC

**“Authority”**: some countries used “the authorities”, “the authorities in Myanmar” or “Myanmar authorities”.<sup>23</sup> Similar to the use of “Myanmar” above, their calls became less effective, or even more problematic if they were intentionally or unintentionally referring to the junta as they appear to be recognising the junta as the authorities.

*“We call upon the concerned State’s authorities in Myanmar to take appropriate measures in furtherance of their responsibilities.” - Iran, ID HC*

*“We would like to call on the authorities of Myanmar to fully comply with ICJ provisional measures and cooperate with all ongoing international and regional judicial and accountability mechanisms to uphold international human rights and humanitarian law in the country.”  
- Maldives, ID HC*

**“Military authorities”**: a few countries called on the “military authority”.<sup>24</sup> It was clear whom their calls were referring to, however, it is problematic as it could be interpreted that they were recognising the Myanmar military as the legitimate authority.

*“We urge the military authorities in Myanmar to implement the recommendations in the report, take effective steps to ensure a return to civilian rule, accountability and effective remedies for the human rights violations.” - Malawi, ID HC*

- The **US** was the only country that specifically echoed the SR’s call for **Telegram** and other **social media companies** to protect human rights. Including this one, only four calls have been addressed to corporations since February 2021.

*“The United States is deeply troubled by findings by independent UN experts that ‘Myanmar’s military junta and its supporters are orchestrating an online campaign of terror, and weaponizing social media platforms to crush democratic opposition’ and join their call for ‘Telegram and other social media platforms to meet their responsibilities to identify, prevent, and mitigate human rights abuses.’”  
- United States, ID SR*

<sup>23</sup> E.g. Egypt “calls on the Myanmar government” (ID HC, original text in Arabic, informal translation through online application); France “the authority has been waging a campaign of terror ...” (ID HC, quote from UN WebTV EN channel); Indonesia “for Myanmar authority to allow” (ID HC); Iran “call upon the concerned State’s authorities in Myanmar ... request the authorities in Myanmar” (ID HC); Malaysia “urge the authorities in Myanmar” (ID HC); Maldives “call on the authorities in Myanmar” (ID HC); South Africa “urge the authorities” (ID HC); Spain “call on the Myanmar authority” (ID SR, original text in Spanish, informal translation through online application)

<sup>24</sup> E.g. Botswana “to the military authorities to release” (ID HC); Malawi “urge the military authorities in Myanmar” (ID HC); Malawi “urge the military authorities in Myanmar” (ID SR); Switzerland “call on the military authorities” (ID SR, original in French, informal translation through online application)

## 7. Regional bodies and groups of States

At the HRC 52, the following regional bodies and groups of States presented statements:

- ID HC: European Union, Nordic Baltic States<sup>25</sup>, Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC)<sup>26</sup>
- ID SR: BENELUX countries, European Union, Nordic Baltic States<sup>27</sup>, Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC)<sup>28</sup>

*The European Union* has been vocal and consistent in addressing the issues in Myanmar, presenting statements at every session of the HRC since the 29th Special Session. At HRC 52, it presented statements during both IDs, strongly condemning the military for its indiscriminate airstrikes, attacks on civilians, addressing issues such as sexual and gender based violence including human rights of the Rohingyas, while also calling for actions to ensure accountability. In addition, the EU tabled the resolution on Myanmar at the HRC 52 (A/HRC/RES/52/31), which was adopted without a vote.

Similarly, *Nordic-Baltic States*<sup>29</sup> has 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 52, Nordic-Baltic States presented statements during both IDs condemning the coup and the military's indiscriminate use of force, stressing the importance of holding the military accountable for their actions and supporting the recommendation of OHCHR to sanction arms transfers as it enables further violations in Myanmar. The Nordic-Baltic States specifically called for an end to the systemic intimidation against the Myanmar people who exercise their rights and fundamental freedom, and to immediately end all forms of violence and abuses, particularly those against women and children.

While the **Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC)**<sup>30</sup> 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 in some cases accountability, while the degree of condemnation concerning Myanmar military's actions was not so strong as compared to two groups mentioned above. At the HRC 52, OIC presented statements during both IDs, consistently urging Myanmar to fully comply with the order of the International Court of Justice (ICJ), implement recommendations of the advisory commission of Rakhine state and commence repatriation of the Rohingyas with safety and dignity without further delay.

**BENELUX** countries started presenting statements on Myanmar as a group at the HRC 51. At the HRC 52, it presented a statement during the ID SR, condemning the junta's atrocities, particularly sexual and gender based violence against civilians including the Rohingyas. The bloc recognised the particular work

---

<sup>25</sup> Statement presented by Norway

<sup>26</sup> Statement presented by Pakistan

<sup>27</sup> Statement presented by Denmark

<sup>28</sup> Statement presented by Pakistan

<sup>29</sup> Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Sweden

<sup>30</sup> See [here](#) for the full list of OIC member states

of women human rights defenders and called for a full, safe, unimpeded, sustained and independent access to humanitarian assistance.

Above four are the only regional bodies i.e. groups of States presenting statements as such at the HRC on Myanmar since 29th Special Session.

## 8. [Advocacy suggestions](#)

During two IDs at the HRC 52, in total 50 countries presented statements, whereby:

Australia, Bangladesh, Canada, China, France, Gambia, Indonesia, Japan, Malawi, Malaysia, Netherlands (1 as a country, 1 on behalf of BENELUX), Pakistan (both on behalf of OIC), South Africa, Thailand, Türkiye, UK, USA and Venezuela made statements during both IDs; and

Austria, Belarus, Botswana, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark (on behalf of Nordic Baltic States), Egypt, Germany, India, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Lao PDR, Liechtenstein, Libya, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, New Zealand, Norway (on behalf of Nordic Baltic States), Republic of Korea, Romania, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine and Viet Nam made statements during one of the IDs.

In general, information provided in this paper as well as our [web tool](#) can be used by all stakeholders to monitor how the discussions at and actions of the HRC reflect the situation on the ground, issues at stake and the needs of the people of Myanmar. In addition, below are some of the points that can and should be taken into account by all relevant stakeholders carrying out advocacy for the people of Myanmar, their human rights and the resolution of crisis:

- **Silent countries**

As highlighted in this paper and on our [web tool](#), there are still a number of countries that remain completely or largely silent at the HRC concerning the situation of Myanmar. Those countries, especially in Africa, Central Asia, Latin America and the Pacific, should be strongly encouraged to speak up. Costa Rica speaking up for the first time, and Botswana and Malta for the second time at the HRC since the coup in Myanmar could be seen as a positive practice in this regard that should be followed by others.

- **Less active or “grey” countries**

Similarly, as highlighted in the [maps on our web tool](#), there are countries that participated in HRC discussions, but their condemnations and calls for actions are not strong enough. Those countries, including ASEAN countries, should be encouraged to strengthen their interventions.

- **Specification of actors**

As highlighted in sections 1 and 6, several countries were using vague terms such as “Myanmar”, “the authorities in Myanmar” or “Myanmar authority”, when calling for actions. Given the current circumstances in the country following the illegitimate military coup and the lack of decision by the UN

GA Credential Committee concerning Myanmar's representation, usage of such vague terms make the call less effective. Furthermore, if they were used to refer to the Tatmadaw, as appeared in some cases from the context of the statement, it gave the impression, intentionally or unintentionally, that they are recognising the authority or legitimacy of the junta.

Similarly, calls for actions without any specific actors is less effective in general.

All countries, especially those that have been using vague terms or not specifying actors when calling for actions in this regard, should be encouraged to spell out whom they are calling for, making it clear on who is accountable. Moreover, all countries should be cautioned to avoid using terms, when referring to the Tatmadaw or the State Administration Council (SAC), that appear to be giving certain recognition, authority or legitimacy to the military junta and/or that seem to blur or ignore its accountability.