

What are countries saying about Myanmar at the UN HRC?

Analysis and findings

57th Regular Session of the UN Human Rights Council

by the Centre for Civil and Political Rights

October 2024

[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 57th 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 military coup can be found [here](#).

HRC 57 - facts

- *The 57th Regular Session of the HRC took place from 9th September to 11th October 2024.*
- **Two Interactive Dialogues (ID)** were held on Myanmar: the **ID with the Independent Investigative Mechanism for Myanmar (ID IIMM)** on 9th September and the **ID with the High Commissioner (ID HC)** on 23rd September 2024.
- *During these two IDs in total, 59 statements were made by countries and 7 by groups of countries:*
 - *During the ID IIMM, 28 countries¹ and 3 groups of countries² made statements.*
 - *During the ID HC, 31 countries³ and 4 groups of countries⁴ made statements.*

Methodology update

- *Statements were analysed using their texts uploaded on the HRC extranet. Texts uploaded in languages other than English⁵ 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 IIMM: China, the Gambia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Saudi Arabia, Türkiye*
 - *ID HC: Belarus, China, France, the Gambia, Georgia, Malaysia, Philippines, Türkiye, Venezuela*

¹ Albania, Australia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Egypt, France, Gambia, Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Kuwait, Lao PDR, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, Türkiye, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela

² European Union (EU), Nordic-Baltic Countries (NB8, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Sweden, presented by Denmark), and Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC, presented by Pakistan)

³ Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Cyprus, Czech Republic, France, Gambia, Georgia, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Kuwait, Lao PDR, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Philippines, Romania, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Spain, Thailand, Türkiye, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, Viet Nam

⁴ CANZ (Australia, Canada and New Zealand, presented by Australia), European Union (EU), Nordic-Baltic Countries (NB8, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Sweden, presented by Norway), and Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC, presented by Pakistan)

⁵ ID IIMM: Belarus, Belgium, Egypt, France, Kuwait, Luxembourg, Switzerland, Venezuela; ID HC: Kuwait, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Russian Federation, Spain

1. Key Highlights

- A number of countries addressed the issue of **sexual and gender-based violence**, including:
 - **Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Indonesia, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Malta, UK and US** during ID IIMM; and
 - **Cyprus, France, Gambia, Mauritania, Sierra Leone, UK and US** during ID HC.
- A number of countries specifically referred to the **Myanmar military as the main perpetrator** of human rights violations, abuses, atrocities, war crimes and crimes against humanity, including:
 - **Australia, Canada, France, the Gambia, Ireland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, UK and US** during ID IIMM; and
 - **France, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malawi, Romania, Spain, UK and US** during ID HC.
 - Among these countries, following ones also addressed **crimes and violence committed by other actors**, in particular by armed groups fighting against the military:
 - **Australia, the Gambia, Ireland, Liechtenstein and US** during ID IIMM; and
 - **Malawi and US** during ID HC.
- On the other hand, there were a number of **countries**, as listed below, that **failed to call out Myanmar military**, although some of them referred to “*all parties*” or “*all perpetrators*”:
 - **Albania, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Egypt, Kuwait, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malawi, Saudi Arabia and Türkiye** during ID IIMM; and
 - **Bangladesh, Belarus, China, Czechia, the Gambia, Georgia, India, Indonesia, Iran, Kuwait, Lao PDR, Maldives, Mauritania, Philippines, Russia, Sierra Leone, Thailand, Türkiye, Venezuela, and Viet Nam** during ID HC.
- The issue of **conscription** and **forced recruitment** was addressed by **Japan and UK** during ID IIMM and by **Cyprus, the Gambia, Iran, Japan and Spain** during ID HC.
- The issue of **abuses against detainees** and **prison condition**, including torture, ill-treatment, denial of healthcare, sexual violence, death in custody was addressed by the **Gambia and Switzerland** during ID IIMM, and by **Cyprus, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg and UK** during ID HC.
 - **UK** was the only country in this regard addressing **abuses against children in detention** and calling for **adherence to CAT**.
- The issue of the **lack of rule of law** in particular **dysfunctional domestic justice system** and its **instrumentalisation by the military** were addressed by, among others, **Gambia, Luxembourg, Romania and Sierra Leone** (all during ID HC).
- Following three countries expressed concerns over the **impact** of the conflict in Myanmar **beyond its border** or **regional level**:
 - **Bangladesh** stated that the conflict was affecting “*the safety and security of the people and property of Bangladesh along the border*” (ID IIMM), and that Rohingya refugees

were putting “*additional burden*” and it could not “*allow the intrusion of any more displaced person from Rakhine*” (ID HC);

- **India** was gravely concerned over “*increased influx of people from Myanmar*” and “*transnational crimes such as drug and human trafficking*”;
- **Indonesia** was “*alarmed by the rise of cross-border crimes in the region ..., including online scams as well as drug and people smuggling.*”
- **UK** was the only country explicitly addressing the **obstruction of humanitarian aid by the Myanmar military** (ID HC), while **US** raised it indirectly when referring to the local governance structures providing humanitarian support to those “*who were otherwise receiving little humanitarian support due to military restrictions and interference*” (ID HC).
- **Malaysia** was the only country calling for **resettlement of Rohingyas in third countries**.
- **India** was the only country referring to **federalism** by expressing its support to “*to Myanmar’s transition towards inclusive federal democracy*” (ID HC).
- **China** was the only country pushing for **early repatriation** of Rohingyas from Bangladesh claiming that it was the way to solve the Rohingya issue in Rakhine.
- **Russian Federation** was the only country that made reference to the National Unity Government (**NUG**), however by stating that the NUG “*seems extremely dangerous.*”
- Some countries used following **vague terms** when calling on actors in Myanmar for action (see chapter 6 for more detail), such as:
 - “**Myanmar**”: Bangladesh (ID IIMM), Czechia (ID HC), Kuwait (ID HC), Malta (ID IIMM) and UK (ID IIMM and ID HC)
 - “**Myanmar authorities**” / “**de facto authorities in Myanmar**”: Belarus (ID IIMM), the Gambia (ID IIMM), Indonesia (ID HC), Luxembourg (ID IIMM), Maldives (ID HC), Mauritania (ID HC) and Russian Federation (ID HC)
 - “**Myanmar officials**”: Iran (ID HC); or
 - “**Myanmar Government**”: Belarus (ID HC), Egypt (ID IIMM) and Russian Federation (ID HC)
- During ID IIMM, **majority** of countries **welcomed, commended, thanked** or **appreciated** the **report of the IIMM**, while:
 - **UK** made mere **factual reference**;
 - **Saudi Arabia** **took good note**;
 - **China, Egypt** and **Indonesia** **took note**;
 - **Belarus** and **Venezuela** made **no reference** to the IIMM or its report.
- During ID HC, **majority** of countries **thanked, commended** or **welcomed** the **report of the HC**, while:
 - **Indonesia** and **Türkiye** made mere **factual reference**;
 - **India** and **Viet Nam** **took note**;
 - **Belarus, China, Lao PDR, Mauritania, Philippines, Russian Federation, Thailand** and **Venezuela** made **no reference** to HC or the report.

- **Belarus, China, Russian Federation, Venezuela and Viet Nam**, as they have been doing in previous HRC sessions, appeared to **undermine** or **oppose** international efforts to address the situation in Myanmar, or even to defend acts of Myanmar military:
 - **Belarus** repeated its assertion that the HRC mandate was politicised, the situation in Myanmar was mis-interpreted, and distorted information was used to discredit the authorities (ID IIMM), and noted that “*efforts*” were made “*by the Myanmar government*” but its voice was not fairly heard by the HRC (ID HC).
 - **China** alleged that HRC’s discussion on Myanmar did not have any positive result for human rights and, stressing on the principle of non-interference in internal affairs, that “*interference or infiltration by external forces*” undermined stability and development of Myanmar (ID HC).
 - **Russian Federation** noted “*efforts of the Myanmar authorities*” to normalise situation and alleged that the “*reason for the degradation of the situation in Myanmar*” was “*political, diplomatic and financial support of the anti-Government forces by the collective West*”, which was using the HRC to politicise the issue to pressure State’s authorities (ID HC).
 - **Venezuela**, calling for respect for sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of States, repeated its opposition to the application of unilateral coercive measures (ID IIMM and ID HC).
 - **Viet Nam** stressed that the solution should respect “the principles of non-interference, sovereignty, and territorial integrity.”

Did you know? At the HRC 57, Cyprus participated in the discussion on Myanmar (ID HC) for the 3rd time since the HRC 55. There were no new countries joining the discussion and 41 African States (out of 54), 28 Asia-Pacific States (out of 54⁶), 7 Eastern European States (out of 23), 27 Latin American and Caribbean States (out of 33), 4 Western European and Other States (out of 28⁷) remain silent on Myanmar at HRC.⁸

2. Condemnations and Concerns

- The average degree of condemnations and concerns expressed at the HRC 57 was - 0.07 with significant decrease from the HRC 56, which recorded 0.2. It recorded a minus figure for the second time, while the lowest ever recorded average was - 0.23 at HRC 54, and the highest being 1.34 recorded at the SS 29.
- At HRC 57, **specific condemnation** over the acts of the junta was expressed only by **Japan** (ID HC) and **specific concern** over the violation of international human rights and humanitarian law

⁶ Excluding Myanmar

⁷ Türkiye is included in the group of Asia-Pacific States

⁸ See UN regional groups of member states [here](#). Some of the countries were part of joint statements presented by regional bodies or groups of countries, but never presented individual statements. For details, please see [here](#).

committed by the junta were expressed by only **Australia** and **Malta** (both during ID IIMM).

“We remain deeply concerned by the persistent use of force by the military junta, leading to widespread atrocities, including extrajudicial killings, sexual violence, arbitrary detentions, and forced displacements.”

- Malta, ID IIMM

- About half of the statements made at the HRC 57 by countries (29)⁹ expressed **general concerns** over different issues without specifying perpetrators or their accountability.¹⁰

“We are deeply concerned by the findings of the report showing widespread and systemic violations of human rights and international humanitarian law across Myanmar.”

- Romania, ID HC

- 19 statements that did not express any concern or condemnation¹¹.

3. Issues Raised

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

Violence and extrajudicial killing (34); Impunity and accountability (19); Humanitarian situation (17); Women, children and other vulnerable groups (15); Rights of Rohingyas (15); Arbitrary arrests and detentions (12); Repatriation (4); Freedom of expression and assembly (1); State of Emergency (0); ASEAN (0); Military coup (0); Elections (0)

- **‘Violence and extrajudicial killings’** was the **most frequently** addressed issue at HRC 57, with an **increase** from HRC 56 (34 from 29).
- **‘Impunity and accountability’** was the **second most frequently** raised issue at HRC 57, with an increase from HRC 56 (19 from 11).
- **‘Humanitarian situation’** was the **third most frequently** raised issue at HRC 57 but the number has significantly decreased from HRC 56 (17 from 26).
- Situation of **‘Women, children and other vulnerable groups’** including sexual and gender-based violence and **‘Rights of Rohingyas’** were **fourth most frequently** raised issue at HRC 57, both 15 times. The number of statements addressing the former has increased from HRC 56 (15 from 11), while the latter saw a significant decrease (15 from 26).

⁹ ID IIMM: Albania, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Egypt, France, Gambia, Japan, Kuwait, Malawi, Malaysia, Türkiye and US; ID HC: Bangladesh, Georgia, India, Indonesia, Iran, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Malawi, Malaysia, Philippines, Romania, Sierra Leone, Spain, Thailand and US

¹⁰ ID HC: Bangladesh, Georgia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Kuwait, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Sierra Leone, Thailand, Türkiye, US; ID SR: Bangladesh, Bulgaria, France, Gambia, Indonesia, Japan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Malaysia, Mauritania, Republic of Korea, South Africa, Türkiye

¹¹ ID IIMM: Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Lao PDR, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, UK; ID HC: Cyprus, Czechia, France, Gambia, Lao PDR, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mauritania, Türkiye and UK

- Statements addressing ‘**Arbitrary arrests and detentions**’ saw an increase as compared to HRC 56 (12 from 5).
- The issues of ‘**Repatriation**’ of Rohingyas (4) and ‘**Freedom of expression and assembly**’ (1) were less frequently addressed at HRC 57, while their numbers remained the same as HRC 56.

Did you know? No country raised the issues related to ‘State of emergency’ or ‘ASEAN’ at HRC 57, while both were raised one time each at HRC 56. Same as HRC 56, there was no statement raising the issues related to ‘Coup’ or ‘Election’ at HRC 57.

4. Call for Actions

Overview of number of calls for action by region and countries¹²

African States (10 calls by 5 countries):

Gambia (3), Egypt (2), Mauritania (2), Sierra Leone (2), Malawi (1)

Asia-Pacific States (62 calls by 16 countries):

Japan (9), Malaysia (9), Indonesia (7), Lao PDR (7), Türkiye (6), Bangladesh (5), Kuwait (3),
Maldives (3), Philippines (3), Thailand (3), Viet Nam (3), Iran (2), Saudi Arabia (2),
China (0), Cyprus (0), India (0)

Latin American and Caribbean States (0 call by 1 country):

Venezuela (0)

Eastern European States (5 calls by 7 countries):

Belarus (2), Czechia (2), Romania (1), Albania (0), Bulgaria (0), Georgia (0), Russia (0)

Western European and other States (41 calls by 13 countries):

France (9), Malta (7), UK (5), Luxembourg (3), Spain (3), Switzerland (3), Belgium (2), Canada (2),
Ireland (2), Liechtenstein (2), Australia (1), Germany (1), US (1)

- In **total, 118 calls** for actions were made by 42 countries at the HRC 57¹³, presenting a slight **decrease** from HRC 56, which recorded 119 calls by 36 countries.
- The **average number of calls per country** (excluding countries that have not participated in discussion) has **decreased** at HRC 57 (2.8) from HRC 56 (3.3).
- The **highest number of calls** for action came from **France, Japan and Malaysia** (9), followed by **Indonesia, Lao PDR and Malta** (7 each), and **Türkiye** (6).
- In terms of regions, most calls came from **Asia-Pacific** (62), followed by **WEOG** (41).
- As compared to HRC 56, calls from Asia-PacAfrica have significantly increased (62 from 39), while those from Africa saw a significant decrease (10 from 29).

¹² See UN regional groups of member states [here](#).

¹³ 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.

- The average number of calls per country per region (excluding countries that have not participated in discussion) were, from the highest to the lowest: Asia-Pacific (3.88), WEOG (3.15), Africa (2), Eastern European (0.71) and Latin American and Caribbean (0).

Did you know? Although they participated in the ID IIMM and/or ID HC, Albania, Bulgaria, China, Cyprus, Georgia, India, Russian Federation and Venezuela did not make any concrete call for actions at HRC 57.

5. Which Actions?

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

Stop violence (28); General call for peace, democracy, rule of law, and human rights (27); Unhinder humanitarian assistance (15); Realise accountability (14); Protect rights of the Rohingyas (11); Stop persecution (8); Implement ASEAN initiatives (7); Provide humanitarian assistance (4); Reinstatement of civilian government (3); IDPs and Refugees (1); Arms embargo (0); Other economic measures (0); Sanctions (0); End state of emergency (0); Stop death penalty/ execution (0); Recognise NUG (0); Access to information (0)

- As compared to the numbers at HRC 56, calls for following actions have **increased**:
 - **'Stop violence'** (28 from 24)
 - **'General call for peace, democracy, rule of law, and human rights'** (27 from 18)
 - **'Realise accountability'** (14 from 13)
 - **'Stop persecution'** (8 from 5)
 - **'Implement ASEAN initiatives'** (7 from 4)
 - **'Reinstatement of civilian government'** (3 from 2)
- As compared to the numbers at HRC 56, calls for following actions have **decreased**:
 - **'Unhinder humanitarian assistance'** (15 from 21)
 - **'Protect rights of the Rohingyas'** (11 from 14)
 - **'IDPs and Refugees'** (1 from 7)
 - **'Arms embargo'** (0 from 5)
 - **'Other economic measures'** (0 from 2)
- There were the **same number** of calls for **'Provide humanitarian assistance'** (4) at HRC 57 as compared to HRC 56.

Did you know? As was the case at the HRC 56, there were no calls for 'Sanctions', 'End state of emergency', 'Stop death penalty / execution', 'Recognise NUG' and 'Access to information'..

6. Terms used to address “Myanmar”

- Some countries were using **vague or problematic terms** when seemingly addressing Myanmar military, thereby failing to spell out the accountability of the junta, blurring the target of their calls for actions, or appearing to give some recognition or legitimacy to the junta. Some countries also appeared to intentionally avoid mentioning Myanmar military in their statement or use vague terms.¹⁴
- **“Myanmar”**: **Bangladesh** (ID IIMM), **Czechia** (ID HC), **Kuwait** (ID HC), **Malta** (ID IIMM) and **UK** (ID IIMM and ID HC) called on “Myanmar” to take actions, while Malta and UK also called on Myanmar military in other parts of their statement. It was not clear who exactly was regarded as “Myanmar” by these countries..

“We urge Myanmar to cooperate with the Mechanism.”

- Bangladesh, ID IIMM

“Czechia calls on Myanmar to provide OHCHR with meaningful access to the country to facilitate independent and impartial monitoring and reporting on the human rights situation, particularly on civilian protection.”

- Czechia, ID HC

- **“Myanmar authorities”**: **Belarus** (ID IIMM), **Gambia** (ID IIMM), **Indonesia** (ID HC), **Maldives** (ID HC), **Mauritania** (ID HC) and **Russian Federation** (ID HC) called on “Myanmar authorities” to take actions, while Gambia specifically referred to Myanmar military as a perpetrator of atrocities and addressed the issue of their accountability in other parts of its statement. In addition, **Luxembourg** (ID IIMM) called on **“de facto authorities”** in Myanmar to take action. Similar to the term “Myanmar”, it was not clear in some cases who exactly was regarded as “Myanmar authorities”. But many other cases seemed to be referring to the Myanmar military, thereby giving the impression that the junta is regarded as the authorities in Myanmar.

“we deplore the lack of cooperation from the Myanmar authorities towards the Mechanism and call on them to take necessary steps to protect the civilian population.”

- Gambia, ID IIMM

“Luxembourg reiterates its call on the de facto authorities in Myanmar to immediately stop the violence against the civilian population and to release all political prisoners.”

- Luxembourg, ID IIMM

“We urge Myanmar Authorities to fully and effectively implement the 5PC”

- Indonesia, ID HC

- **“Myanmar officials”**: **Iran** used this term and from the context, it appeared to be referring to the junta officials.

¹⁴ See chapter 1 for the list of countries that failed to mention the Myanmar military in their statement.

“we call for Myanmar officials to address the fundamental causes of this conflict and restore the legitimate rights of Rohingya Muslims and take all measures to prevent acts of genocide from being committed against them.”

- Iran, ID HC

- **“Myanmar government”, “government”**: **Belarus** (ID HC), **Egypt** (ID IIMM) and **Russian Federation** (ID HC) used these terms clearly referring to the junta and appearing to regard the junta as the “government” of Myanmar. Furthermore, Belarus and Russian Federation even appeared to support or defend the junta.

“Egypt calls on the Government of Myanmar to put an end to these violations by taking measures to provide the necessary protection for the Rohingya and find a lasting solution to the crisis.”

- Egypt, ID IIMM

“The Government has repeatedly, including unilaterally, declared a ceasefire against ethnic groups.”

- Russian Federation, ID HC

7. Regional bodies and groups of States

The **EU** has been **vocal and consistent** in addressing various issues by presenting statements at every session of the HRC since the 29th Special Session. At the HRC 57, statement of the EU during ID HC expressed **specific condemnations and concerns**, although its statement during the ID IIMM lacked such remarks. The two statements of the EU addressed: escalating violence, crimes against humanity and war crimes, torture, sexual violence including those against detainees, displacement, forced recruitment and particular suffering of Rohingyas.

OIC has been **vocal** at each session of the HRC, except for the 29th Special Session, however, their statements have been **largely focused on matters related to Rohingyas**. At HRC 57, OIC presented statements at both IDs (presented by Pakistan), welcoming the reports of IIMM and HC. At HRC 57, apart from addressing the situation of Rohingyas, the degree of condemnation by OIC remained vague merely expressing **general concern** and failed to **mention anything about Myanmar military**. It regretted the non-cooperation of “Myanmar” with IIMM.

Nordic-Baltic Countries (NB8) have been **consistent** in addressing the crisis in Myanmar, presenting statements at each HRC session since the HRC 46. At the HRC 57, NB8 presented statements during both IDs (ID IIMM by Denmark and ID HC by Norway), but it expressed **general concern** during ID IIMM and no condemnation or concern during ID HC. NB8’s statements addressed escalation of conflict, including: indiscriminate attacks and killings of civilians; torture in detention including sexual violence; arbitrary detention and unfair trials; violent suppression of protests; accountability, among others. However, NB8 failed to specify the accountability of the Myanmar military during ID IIMM, while doing so during the ID HC.

CANZ (Australia, Canada and New Zealand) as a group participated in the discussion on Myanmar for the **fourth time** through a statement presented by Australia during the ID HC. CANZ's statement at HRC 57 expressed general concern over the situation in Myanmar and addressed deteriorating situation in Rakhine, death penalty imposed on political activists, sexual violence, hate speech against women and LGBTIQ+ leaders. It also raised the issue of the flow of finance, arms, and dual-use materials to the Myanmar military.