



Human Rights Council**Forty-eighth session**

13 September–1 October 2021

Agenda items 2 and 3

**Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner
for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High
Commissioner and the Secretary-General****Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil,
political, economic, social and cultural rights,
including the right to development****Summary of the intersessional panel discussion on the
fifteenth anniversary of the responsibility to protect
populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and
crimes against humanity, as enshrined in the 2005 World
Summit Outcome****Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for
Human Rights***Summary*

Pursuant to resolution 44/14, the Human Rights Council convened on 11 May 2021 an intersessional panel discussion to mark the fifteenth anniversary of the responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.

Participants pointed out the link between human rights violations and atrocity crimes, insisting on the importance of preventing violations at an early stage to avoid escalation into atrocity. In line with the 2005 World Summit Outcome, they recalled the primary responsibility of States in preventing atrocities. They mentioned the appointment of national focal points on the responsibility to protect, the adoption of national action plans for atrocity prevention, regular national risk assessments and measures to counter hate speech among possible practices to prevent atrocity crimes at the national level.

Participants also highlighted the deterrent effect of accountability measures and other guarantees of non-recurrence – from truth and reconciliation initiatives to human rights education and memorialization. They also underscored the key roles of open and vibrant civic spaces and meaningful and inclusive public and civil society participation in preventing atrocity crimes, and stressed the importance of the Human Rights Council mechanisms, as well as of national human rights institutions.

* Reissued for technical reasons on 27 August 2021.



I. Introduction

1. Pursuant to resolution 44/14, on 11 May 2021 the Human Rights Council convened an intersessional panel discussion to mark the fifteenth anniversary of the responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, as enshrined in the 2005 World Summit Outcome, in order to share best practices for strengthening national policies and strategies to implement the responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity through national mechanisms and other stakeholders. The meeting was chaired by the Permanent Representative of the Bahamas and Vice-President of the Human Rights Council.
2. As requested in the resolution, the present report summarizes the discussions held during the meeting.

I. Opening statements

3. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Special Envoy of the Foreign Minister of Qatar for counter-terrorism and mediation of conflict and national focal point for the responsibility to protect, Mutlaq bin Majed Al-Qahtani, and the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Responsibility to Protect, delivered opening statements.
4. In her speech, the High Commissioner stressed that the best form of protection was prevention. Protecting people from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity was, first and foremost, about preventing such crimes. To enable that to happen, the High Commissioner stressed that “operational prevention” to avert or de-escalate ongoing threats should be combined with deeper “structural prevention”, in order to reduce the long-term likelihood of atrocities.
5. The High Commissioner described “operational prevention” as encompassing early warning to detect risks of serious human rights violations and early action to stop them from spiralling into disaster. She emphasized the expertise of the United Nations human rights mechanisms and their recommendations as valuable contributions in this respect. She called on the Human Rights Council and its mechanisms to integrate the prevention of atrocity crimes more systematically into their work. She also stated that she trusted that the report on the contribution of the Human Rights Council to the prevention of human rights violations¹ and the subsequent adoption by the Council of resolution 45/31 would enable the Council to continue reflecting on how to improve its early warning and early action capacities.
6. The High Commissioner also pointed to the importance of “structural prevention” and the key role played by States. She recalled that the 2005 World Summit Outcome stated that States had the primary responsibility to protect. In cases where they failed or were unable to fulfil their duty to protect, the international community had the responsibility to assist them, providing that the States concerned were willing to take protective measures against atrocity crimes. The High Commissioner stressed that her Office and the United Nations human rights mechanisms had a critical role to play in this regard. Those bodies contributed to the fulfilment of the priorities identified by the Secretary-General in implementing the responsibility to protect, including by strengthening democracy, civic space, freedom of expression and protection against discrimination, as well as by promoting accountability and the rule of law through equal access to justice, effective security forces with civilian oversight and transparent and accountable governance.
7. The High Commissioner further noted that prevention remained relevant even after serious human rights violations and atrocity crimes had happened, in order to prevent their repetition in the future. She pointed out that measures fostering “guarantees of non-recurrence” included institutional interventions, through the ratification of treaties and legal, judicial, security sector and constitutional reforms, as well as societal interventions through the creation of enabling environments and interventions in the cultural and individual spheres, including in education, arts, memorialization and psychosocial support.

¹ A/HRC/43/37.

8. The High Commissioner concluded by emphasizing that from discrimination to poverty, to lack of access to basic services, human rights gaps threatened social cohesion and were root causes of unrest and conflict. She stated that the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic had exacerbated these gaps and derailed progress in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. In that respect, she recalled that advancing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development was essential, not only to recover better from the COVID-19 crisis, but also to prevent atrocity crimes in the long term.

9. The Special Envoy of the Foreign Minister of Qatar for counter-terrorism and mediation of conflict and national focal point for the responsibility to protect, Mutlaq bin Majed Al-Qahtani, began by stating that all Member States were bound by the obligation to protect their populations from atrocity crimes. He pointed out that this commitment had been reinforced in 2005 when world leaders unanimously recognized the responsibility to protect. He noted that the failure to fulfil this responsibility had collective consequences as it undermined world peace and security. He therefore called on Member States to integrate the responsibility to protect in domestic and foreign policies and set out a number of initiatives taken by Qatar in this area.

10. Mr. Al-Qahtani stated that Qatar had been the first country in the Middle East to appoint a senior official as national focal point for the responsibility to protect, in order to raise awareness of this matter at the domestic, regional and international levels. In that respect, Qatar had supported initiatives to assist vulnerable communities and countries in fulfilling their commitments and used good offices, mediation and other forms of preventative diplomacy to address the root causes of violence within certain countries and communities, including racism, which could lead to atrocity crimes and terrorist acts.

11. Mr. Al-Qahtani also acknowledged that the prevention of atrocity crimes required the active participation of civil society. In that regard, Qatar worked in partnership with national civil society organizations with a focus on economic empowerment and education. In particular, it worked with the “Education Above All” Foundation, set up in 2012 at the initiative of Her Highness Sheikha Moza bint Nasser, aimed at contributing to human, social and economic development through the provision of quality education, with a particular focus on those affected by poverty, conflict and disaster. To date, the programmes developed by the Foundation had been implemented in 51 countries and had enrolled more than 9.2 million children in school. Mr. Al-Qahtani also noted that Qatar supported over 300 partner organizations to address youth unemployment, which constituted a driver of conflicts.

12. The Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Responsibility to Protect recalled that the unanimous adoption of the responsibility to protect by Heads of State and Government during the 2005 World Summit marked a milestone in international efforts to ensure that past failures of collective action, such as in Rwanda and Bosnia-Herzegovina, would never be repeated. However, she noted that, sadly, atrocity crimes continued to be committed in many parts of the world. She stressed that experience had shown that such crimes did not happen overnight. Rather, the risk of their being committed increased when triggers fell on fertile ground constituted by long-standing human rights violations, notably widespread impunity, hate speech, social exclusion and discrimination. The Special Adviser noted that the Secretary-General had pointed to the link between human rights violations and atrocity crimes in his reports on the responsibility to protect. In his “call to action for human rights” the Secretary-General had recognized the connection between the protection of human rights and the prevention of violations of human rights and of atrocity crimes. For the Special Adviser, the call to action provided a framework for putting human rights at the centre of the actions of the United Nations in areas that were central to upholding the responsibility to protect.

13. The Special Adviser further noted that the Secretary-General had made prevention of atrocity crimes his highest priority. She stressed that preventing atrocity crimes started with understanding the causes and risk factors. She observed that the framework of analysis for atrocity crimes developed by the United Nations Office on Genocide Prevention and the

Responsibility to Protect set out a clear path for identifying and understanding such risks, as well as options to mitigate them.²

14. The Special Adviser also emphasized that the Human Rights Council was a privileged forum for discussion of the responsibility to protect. She stressed that, pursuant to its mandate to promote and protect human rights for all, in many instances the Council had played an early warning role, notably through the monitoring activities of the special procedures and the work of fact-finding missions and independent investigative mechanisms. The Special Adviser recommended that investigative mechanisms applied an atrocity prevention lens more systematically. She mentioned the Commission of Inquiry on Burundi and the independent international fact-finding mission on Myanmar that had both utilized the framework of analysis for atrocity crimes in their work. She noted that the universal periodic review offered further opportunities to use the framework to assess elements of risk in countries under review.

15. The Special Adviser noted that the human rights treaty bodies had also provided analysis and key recommendations on how to address the structural risks of atrocity crimes. She therefore called on Member States to cooperate with all United Nations human rights mechanisms and comply with their recommendations to design and implement national policies and strategies aimed at protecting populations from atrocity crimes.

16. The Special Adviser concluded by acknowledging the instrumental role of civil society actors in ensuring that the voices of affected communities and of victims of violations informed the discussions and decisions of the Human Rights Council.

II. Panel discussion

17. The panel discussion was moderated by the Deputy Executive Director of the Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, Savita Pawnday, with the participation of the Chair of the National Human Rights Council of Morocco, Amina Bouayach, the Rapporteur of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and former Special Rapporteur on minority issues, Rita Izsák-Ndiaye, and Director of the Coordinadora Regional de Investigaciones Económicas y Sociales, Andrei Serbin Pont.

18. The moderator and panellists all commended resolution 44/14 as the first thematic resolution on the responsibility to protect adopted by the Human Rights Council. They also emphasized that no society was immune to atrocity crimes and therefore insisted that the responsibility to protect should be made a priority at the national level.

19. Ms. Bouayach highlighted the role of national human rights institutions in detecting early signs of atrocities through monitoring activities, reporting and follow-up of cases of violations with national authorities. She also detailed how the Human Rights Council of Morocco focused its activities on preventing hate speeches, which were in many cases the precursors of atrocities. She further explained how the Council had worked with the Moroccan Equity and Reconciliation Commission with a view to preserving the memory of past victims of violations and ensuring, through the development of school curricula, that these violations were not repeated.

20. Ms. Bouayach also underlined the role played by special procedures in detecting early signs of atrocities, including the early stages of discrimination and hatred, as well as political and socioeconomic environments conducive to serious human rights violations. She encouraged the Human Rights Council to continue discussing its contribution to the prevention of human rights violations and atrocities, while highlighting the need to strengthen its cooperation with New York-based mechanisms. In addition, Ms. Bouayach pointed out the key work done by United Nations bodies, such as that of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) in preventing and combating the exploitation of children and that of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women in protecting women from large-scale violations.

² Available from www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/documents/about-us/Doc_3_Framework%20of%20Analysis%20for%20Atrocity%20Crimes_EN.pdf.

21. Ms. Izsák-Ndiaye noted how human rights mechanisms, through assessment, recommendations and guidance to Governments, contributed to mitigating the risk of atrocities. In that respect, the universal periodic review provided regular overviews of the situation of human rights in countries, as well as of the national legislative and institutional frameworks in place to implement the responsibility to protect. Ms. Izsák-Ndiaye emphasized the importance of the Voluntary Fund for Financial and Technical Assistance in the Implementation of the Universal Periodic Review in supporting Member States to implement the recommendations made during universal periodic reviews. She also noted that in many cases, the special procedures were the first mechanisms to shed light on serious human rights violations through their statements and country visits. Among treaty bodies, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination provided an early warning and urgent action procedure that could be more systematically utilized to implement the responsibility to protect. Ms. Izsák-Ndiaye emphasized that it was crucial that civil society organizations and human rights defenders were better informed about the procedure.

22. Ms. Izsák-Ndiaye further stressed the deterrent effect of the United Nations human rights mechanisms, whether by releasing public statements or conducting quieter diplomacy through letters of allegation or urgent appeals sent to Governments in case of serious violations. The United Nations human rights mechanisms also had convening power. She also noted that during her country visits as Special Rapporteur on minority issues, in many cases she had brought together actors that had not met before and therefore yielded cooperation and synergies between them. In particular, that had enabled civil society actors to conduct joint advocacy activities.

23. Mr. Serbin Pont underlined the importance of the two first pillars of the responsibility to protect to prevent atrocities at the national level. While insisting on the importance of a tailored approach adapted to each national context, he noted the need to consult and include a variety of actors in the development and conduct of policies aimed at implementing the responsibility to protect. It was crucial that national authorities engaged with civil society organizations working on human rights and conflict prevention, as well as with academia and the private sector. The latter was particularly critical for building peaceful communities and incentivizing local initiatives.

24. Mr. Serbin Pont elaborated on how, as a civil society representative, he engaged with national authorities on the responsibility to protect. He highlighted the role of policy briefs as advocacy tools to convey recommendations and the importance of including government representatives in training and awareness-raising activities. He also encouraged civil society organizations to utilize media strategically, not only to denounce some situations, but also to engage positively with Governments and with public opinion.

25. Ms. Bouayach concluded the discussion by mentioning the importance of national human rights institutions consulting regularly with civil society organizations to create monitoring platforms and share information, and of building networks with a view to advocating for atrocity crimes to be prosecuted and perpetrators brought to justice.

26. For her part, Ms. Izsák-Ndiaye emphasized the need for a consistent approach to atrocity prevention in order to avoid criticisms of inconsistent approach. She also questioned the way the United Nations mechanisms communicated on how they were implementing the responsibility to protect. She encouraged reflection on ways to better reach out to the public at large, and youth in particular, to enhance understanding of the added value of those mechanisms and their potential to improve situations on the ground.

III. Interactive dialogue

27. There were 112 participants at the panel discussion. Among them, representatives of 23 States and one regional organization took the floor, including the Netherlands on behalf of the Group of Friends of the Responsibility to Protect,³ Denmark on behalf of the steering group of the Global Network of the Responsibility to Protect Focal Points,⁴ followed by

³ The Group of Friends consists of 53 Member States from across all regions plus the European Union.

⁴ Austria, Denmark, Ghana, Lithuania, Luxembourg and Slovenia.

Argentina, Australia, Cameroon, China, Cuba, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Indonesia, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Peru, Slovenia, Switzerland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Ukraine, the United States of America and Uruguay, as well as the European Union. The delegations of Belgium, Croatia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Luxembourg, Poland, the Russian Federation and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), as well as a representative of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women, were also inscribed on the list of speakers, but were not able to deliver statements owing to time constraints. Their views however are reflected in the present report.

28. Delegates of the following non-governmental organizations (NGOs) also took the floor: All-Win Network, Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies on behalf of two other NGOs, CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, International Service for Human Rights and Public Organization “Public Advocacy”.

29. Some delegations, including Cameroon, China, Cuba, Iran (Islamic Republic of), the Russian Federation, the Syrian Arab Republic and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), questioned the consideration of the responsibility to protect by the Human Rights Council, a subsidiary body of the General Assembly. According to them, this topic should be examined by the General Assembly, in line with resolution 63/308. They further maintained that the responsibility to protect remained a concept that was insufficiently detailed, owing to a lack of consensus about its definition. In their view, this had led to it being used by some States to interfere in the domestic affairs of other States, causing, in some instances, violence and conflict. The Cairo Institute for Human Rights also highlighted selectivity in the use that had been made of the responsibility to protect, leading to an absence of intervention for political motives in cases of serious human rights violations.

30. The majority of speakers welcomed resolution 44/14 as an opportunity for the Human Rights Council to examine the responsibility to protect and share good practices on the implementation of its two first pillars. Some delegations noted that the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic had highlighted the need to protect populations, especially the most vulnerable and marginalized ones. In their view, this made a renewed commitment to the responsibility to protect even more important. To facilitate lessons learned and the exchange of good practices, some speakers encouraged more Governments to appoint national focal points on the responsibility to protect and to join the Global Network of Responsibility to Protect Focal Points, launched in September 2010 with, to date, the participation of 61 States and two regional organizations (the European Union and the Organization of American States). The representative of Peru reported that a report on national good practices in the implementation of the responsibility to protect had been transmitted to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). Switzerland, for its part, was finalizing a manual on atrocity prevention and its representative reported that in November 2021 the fourth global meeting of the Global Action Against Mass Atrocity Crimes would take place in the Netherlands.

31. Many delegations pointed out that, in addition to instruments relating to the prevention of atrocity crimes (notably the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court), the ratification and implementation of international human rights instruments underpinned the responsibility to protect. They also recalled that national Governments had the primary responsibility to protect their populations from human rights violations that, if they escalated, could develop into atrocity crimes. They insisted that Governments adopt national human rights action plans and domestic atrocity prevention strategies, which, among others, should include measures to tackle hate speech. More specifically, some speakers underscored the need to adopt laws to counter hate speech and xenophobia online and offline. In that respect, the representative of Germany mentioned a new law that had been enacted in Germany in April 2021, which allowed for better prosecution of hate speech and made anti-Semitism an aggravating circumstance. The representative of Liechtenstein emphasized that national media played a crucial role in preventing the spread of hate speech. The representative explained how the Violence Protection Commission in Liechtenstein had initiated an open dialogue with national media and organized workshops aimed at supporting journalists in identifying and

adequately responding to hate speech. Some delegations also called on States to explore how the recommendations contained in the United Nations Strategy and Plan of Action on Hate Speech could be reflected in domestic laws and policies.

32. Many speakers emphasized that national strategies to prevent atrocity crimes should also include measures to guarantee equal access to justice, including for sexual and gender-based violence, and should tackle discrimination against and marginalization of minorities and groups in vulnerable situations. Many also insisted on the importance of both accountability and ending impunity for preventing the recurrence of atrocity crimes. In that regard, some delegations mentioned the critical and complementary role of the International Criminal Court if a State was unable or unwilling to carry out genuine investigations into or prosecutions of atrocity crimes.

33. For many delegations, ensuring the non-recurrence of past atrocities required truth and reconciliation policies. It also involved efforts in building community resilience and action in the fields of education through the inclusion of human rights in school curricula and in memorialization through, among others, archiving measures, the building of memorials and the adoption of remembrance days. For example, the representative of Argentina explained how, since the recovery of democracy, the country had removed legal obstacles to trying and punishing those responsible for crimes against humanity; established national archives to preserve testimonies and documents on those crimes; made sanctuaries of emblematic sites of past repression; adopted reparatory laws; established a national holiday to collectively reflect in schools and institutions on its recent tragic history; and incorporated human rights as a compulsory subject at all educational levels, including in diplomatic and military academies. In regard to education, the representative of Italy mentioned the national programme “R2P in schools”, which consisted of a role-playing game to raise the awareness of younger generations of the importance of a widespread commitment to strengthening tools for the prevention of atrocity crimes.

34. A number of speakers stressed the role of national human rights institutions in supporting States in meeting their obligations regarding the responsibility to protect. In particular, by performing their core functions, as set out in the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights and in line with their independent mandates, national human rights institutions assisted States to adopt effective frameworks to promote and protect human rights. They also built the capacity of States to prevent and reduce discrimination and violence, including through effective national legislation, policies and programmes. In that regard, some delegations welcomed efforts to strengthen the United Nations system-wide coordination in support of national human rights institutions, including through the tripartite partnership between the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions, the United Nations Development Programme and OHCHR.

35. A number of speakers emphasized that open civil society and free media contributed to the promotion of transparency and accountability, which were key to protecting populations against atrocity crimes. They therefore advocated for civic space to be used, notably by the Human Rights Council, as an indicator to assess the risk of atrocity crimes. Some delegations underscored the need to take measures to protect civil society organizations against reprisals. They also called for greater support for civil society initiatives that contributed to the prevention of atrocity crimes, including through the implementation of the Plan of Action for Religious Leaders and Actors to Prevent Incitement to Violence that Could Lead to Atrocity Crimes.

36. In regard to the second pillar of the responsibility to protect, many delegations emphasized the role of technical assistance and capacity-building, notably that provided by OHCHR, to prevent and address atrocity crimes. They insisted that such assistance be provided at the earliest stage possible to avoid the likelihood of such crimes being committed in the long term. Some speakers noted, however, that while there existed a broad understanding of how to utilize capacity-building assistance to help prevent human rights violations, it did not necessarily extend to the prevention of atrocities. They called for greater synergy between OHCHR and the United Nations Office on Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect in order to design capacity-building programmes and assistance that focused on the structural prevention of atrocity crimes at the domestic level.

37. In line with the annual reports of the Secretary General on the responsibility to protect,⁵ many delegations also called for a greater use of human rights mechanisms, including the treaty bodies, the special procedures of the Human Rights Council and the universal periodic review, to highlight the risks of atrocity crimes and assist States to respond to those risks. While regretting the recurrent funding constraints faced by human rights mechanisms, affecting their ability to carry out their work, they encouraged Member States to utilize those mechanisms to strengthen domestic risk assessments and national prevention efforts. They also noted that recommendations in the universal periodic review related to atrocity prevention could be of particular importance in highlighting challenges and opportunities for domestic policies. Some speakers called for national focal points on the responsibility to protect to be further involved in the drafting of their own country reports and of recommendations to other countries. A number of delegations also mentioned commissions of inquiry, fact-finding missions and preventive deployments as instrumental in deterring the likelihood of atrocity crimes being committed or avoiding their recurrence.

38. Many speakers encouraged the Human Rights Council to exchange views more regularly with the United Nations Office on Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect and for its mechanisms to use the framework of analysis for atrocity crimes to help identify the risks and drivers of such crimes. More generally, they called for greater links between Geneva-based human rights mechanisms and New York-based United Nations bodies, as well as between the various United Nations agendas, from human rights and the responsibility to protect to the protection of civilians, women, peace and security, and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Several delegations insisted that a gender perspective be mainstreamed into all those areas, as women and girls were disproportionately affected by conflicts and crises and more likely to be victims of atrocity crimes in such contexts. In particular, they advocated for the participation of women in efforts to prevent atrocity crimes.

39. Many delegations praised existing efforts to make the prevention mandate of the Human Rights Council more operational. In that regard, they welcomed the adoption of resolution 45/31 on the contribution of the Council to the prevention of human rights violations. They particularly called for the High Commissioner to further implement it by strengthening the early warning capacity of the various human rights mechanisms and informing the Council when available data pointed to a heightened risk of human rights violations.

40. In addition, a number of delegations called for the inclusion of the responsibility to protect as a standing item on the annual agenda of the General Assembly and encouraged all Member States to support the draft resolution on the responsibility to protect, which would be submitted for consideration by the General Assembly on 17 May 2021.⁶ Some delegations also expressed their support for the initiative by the Governments of France and Mexico to restrain the use of the veto at the Security Council in situations where a mass atrocity had been ascertained. They also advocated for the Security Council to be more regularly informed and briefed on early signs of atrocity crimes by the High Commissioner for Human Rights and the mechanisms of the Human Rights Council, in particular by the special procedures and investigative mechanisms.

IV. Concluding remarks

41. In her concluding remarks, the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Responsibility to Protect considered that the panel discussion had been a valuable opportunity to share experiences and best practices on how to better link the prevention of atrocity crimes with the human rights work being done at the national level and by the United Nations human rights mechanisms. She expressed the hope that the Human Rights Council would remain seized of the responsibility to protect in the future.

⁵ Available from www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/key-documents.shtml.

⁶ Adopted by the General Assembly as resolution 75/277.

42. The Special Adviser further emphasized the importance of building resilience and addressing human rights violations before they escalated into atrocity crimes. She called for the allocation of dedicated capacities and resources to the protection of human rights and the prevention of atrocities, including through the appointment of national focal points and the adoption of national action plans for atrocity prevention. She encouraged States to conduct periodic national assessments of risks and resilience, using the framework of analysis for atrocity crimes and the expertise and recommendations of the United Nations human rights mechanisms. Such assessments should identify vulnerable populations and be conducted in consultation with civil society actors, prioritizing the voices of women and young people.

43. The Special Adviser called again for the inclusion, where relevant, of an atrocity prevention dimension in Human Rights Council mandates, as well as the inclusion of such a dimension in national reports produced under the universal periodic review. She also encouraged the Human Rights Council to take advantage of her expertise on and inputs to situations or issues relevant to both her mandate and that of the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide.
