



DEMOCRACY
COALITION
PROJECT

Sixty-Fourth United Nations General Assembly Scorecard *Expansion of support for country resolutions*

The 64th UN General Assembly saw a marked reversal in the trend of waning support for country-specific resolutions on serious human rights situations. Three recurring country-specific resolutions on Iran, Myanmar, and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea saw a noticeable increase in cross-regional support from UN member states. A resolution on the Goldstone Report on the Gaza Conflict also received resounding support by the UNGA, signaling increased resolve and a more even handed approach to prevent impunity on violations in the conflict.

A resolution on “combating defamation of religion” was once again adopted at the 64th session, but with decreased support as states showed increasing concern about the negative ramifications on freedom of expression. Of particular concern at the 64th session were efforts by some states to undermine the independence of the UN’s special procedures and treaty body systems due to divergent viewpoints between member states and the UN’s independent human rights experts.¹

As part of its annual series of reports on the work of United Nations bodies, the Democracy Coalition Project (DCP) undertook the following independent analysis of positions taken by governments on key human rights resolutions voted on during the 64th UN General Assembly (GA). The analysis evaluates how member states are upholding their commitments to the promotion and protection of human rights under the framework of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

METHODOLOGY

As in past years, DCP selected a set of indicators from the decisions taken by the 64th UNGA and tracked government positions for them. They consist of procedural, thematic and country-specific resolutions identified by DCP as key indicators of a government’s commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights. DCP did not track the positions of governments on all decisions considered by the GA as the majority of resolutions were adopted by consensus and, on some resolutions, DCP did not take a position.

To establish the positions of governments on these issues, DCP consulted the public record, as well as the International Service for Human Rights (ISHR) report of the 64th General Assembly.² Based on this information, each country was evaluated against a “preferred” position, which was considered the best option for the protection and promotion of human rights. The positions taken by governments were then contrasted with previous positions taken at the 63rd session held in 2008 and

¹ The term “Special Procedures” refers to the body of UN experts appointed to study and report on thematic and country-specific human rights issues around the world.

² <http://www.ishr.ch/general-assembly>.

marked with ↑ or ↓ if the government's position changed in 2009.³ An upward arrow was given to states whose positions at the 64th session moved toward a preferred position as compared to 2008. Similarly, a downward arrow was given to countries whose positions during the 64th session moved away from the preferred position.

COUNTRY RESOLUTIONS

Despite past efforts by states such as China, Egypt, Russia and Cuba to eliminate country-specific resolutions that address serious human rights violations, the 64th session saw a marked improvement in member states' willingness to adopt such resolutions. More governments chose to support critical resolutions on Iran, Myanmar and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), as well as a resolution pertaining to the Gaza conflict. As a result, the first three recurring resolutions acquired a higher margin of adoption than in 2008. Adding to this positive outcome, both Iran and Myanmar refrained from introducing a "no-action" motion that, if passed, would essentially remove the resolution from consideration.⁴ Their decision not to pursue this strategy in the 64th session suggests recognition of the GA's refusal to ignore these matters, particularly in light of the deteriorating human rights conditions in both countries.

Despite increased support for these country resolutions, some states maintained the argument that such initiatives are politically motivated, selectively target certain countries, and run contrary to respect for the principles of "sovereignty" and "non-interference."⁵ Egypt and Malaysia argued that country-specific resolutions attempt to assert the "superiority" of certain parties, who believed that their values, cultures and social and legal systems are superior to that of others, and thus undermine efforts towards constructive dialogue. Malaysia also joined Myanmar in citing the UPR as the only appropriate and impartial mechanism to deal with country specific matters.⁶

Members of the Western European and Others Group (WEOG), as well as the Republic of Korea and the Ukraine countered that the UPR was only one of several UN mechanisms to address country-specific human rights violations, and that special procedures and treaty bodies were more effective than the UPR in addressing urgent human rights crises. UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Ms. Navanethem Pillay noted that the UPR complements rather than replaces these additional mechanisms.

During the debate, the European Union (EU), Australia, Canada, and New Zealand expressed concerns regarding particular country situations where they felt dialogue had not been successful in stemming violations and thus warranted action by the international community. Countries named included Afghanistan, Belarus, Cuba, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Fiji, Guinea, Honduras, Occupied Palestinian Territory, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Uzbekistan

³ The amendment on non-discrimination on ICESCR ↑ or ↓ denotes that a government changed its position in the GA after voting differently on the same amendment in the Third Committee. To view the Third Committee vote count visit the 64th Session's [Third Committee website](http://www.un.org/ga/third/64/votingsheets.shtml) (<http://www.un.org/ga/third/64/votingsheets.shtml>).

⁴ Attempts by Iran and Myanmar to shut down debate on their human rights records had been defeated in previous years.

⁵ Although statements were made in individual state capacities and not on behalf of the NAM grouping, reference was made to the positions expressed in the final document of the 'XV Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Movement' at Sharm El Sheikh in July 2009.

⁶ GA/SHC/3960, [UN Expert Tells Third Committee No State Free from Human Rights Violations, Accountability System Must Be Effective in as Many States as Possible](#), October 27, 2009.

and Zimbabwe. Unexpectedly, the United States refrained from mentioning particular countries during the general discussion, nor did it sponsor any resolutions at this session.⁷ In fact, no new country-specific resolutions were tabled at the Third Committee. While this new US strategy may stem from its new policy of “principled pragmatism” and “constructive dialogue,” it disappointed some members of the international human rights community which count on the United States to be a leading voice on human rights. However, the United States was commended for supporting the resolutions on the rights of the child⁸ and the right to food⁹ for the first time, thus enabling the adoption of both by consensus.

Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

For the seventh year in a row, a resolution was adopted addressing the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran.¹⁰ Sponsored by Canada, the resolution cited a wide range of grave human rights abuses including torture, increased incidences of capital punishment and the execution of juveniles, public executions by stoning, repression of women’s rights defenders, and discrimination against women and minorities. The text also paid particular attention to the civil and political rights violations that have occurred since the disputed Iranian presidential election in June 2009, including the serious restrictions placed on freedom of assembly and expression, as well as the arbitrary arrest and persecution of opposition members, human rights defenders, and dissidents.

The resolution calls upon the Government to cease the aforementioned violations and to launch an impartial and credible investigation into the allegations of post-election human rights abuses. It also urges the Government to rectify its record on non-cooperation with international human rights mechanisms, including its refusal to allow UN mandate holders access to the country for the past four years.¹¹ Although many members of the international human rights community felt the gravity of the situation necessitated the appointment of a UN special envoy on Iran, this was not included in the final text. However, the resolution invites six thematic special procedure mandate holders to investigate and report on the violations which have occurred since the June 2009 elections. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 74 in favor, 49 against and 59 abstentions, which reflects the highest margin of adoption in the last four years.¹²

The Dominican Republic, Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands all switched from abstaining in 2008 to voting in favor in 2009. Belize and Saudi Arabia changed from voting against in 2008 to voting in favor in 2009. Congo, Malawi, Morocco, South Africa and Togo, all of which previously voted against the resolution, abstained from the 2009 vote. However, Namibia and Nigeria, along with Brunei Darussalam, United Arab Emirates and Bolivia, all, moved to oppose the resolution at the 2009 session after previously abstaining from the vote in 2008. Fourteen members of NAM – four more than in 2008 – voted in favor of the resolution¹³, while fifty-three abstained. While the

⁷ The United States has not sponsored a resolution since 2007.

⁸ A/RES/64/146

⁹ A/RES/64/159

¹⁰ A/RES/64/176

¹¹ Although Iran has officially issued a standing invitation to all special procedures, it has not actually granted any requests to visit since 2005.

¹² In 2008, the resolution on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran was adopted by a vote of 69 in favor, 54 against and 57 abstentions.

¹³ Botswana, Liberia, Madagascar, Papua New Guinea, Saudi Arabia, Timor-Leste, Vanuatu, Belize, Chile, Dominican Republic, Honduras, Panama, Peru and Saint Lucia.

large majority of OIC states continued to oppose the resolution, Saudi Arabia and Albania voted in favor, while Morocco and Togo abstained after voting against the resolution in 2008. The majority of the Community of Democracies (CD)¹⁴ voted in favor of the resolution with only eleven members opposing it. These states were Bangladesh, Bolivia, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Lebanon, Malaysia, Namibia, Niger and Senegal. It is particularly notable that India is a member of the Convening Group (CG)¹⁵ of the CD.

Iran							
Regional Groups	Members	Yes	No	Abstained	Absent	#↑	#↓
Africa	53	3	16	30	4	7	3
Asia	54	15	24	11	4	7	4
Eastern Europe	23	17	4	1	1	1	0
Latin America	33	11	5	17	0	2	2
Western Europe and Others	29	28	0	0	1	0	0
Totals	192	74	49	59	10	17	9

Cross-Regional Groups	Members	Yes	No	Abstained	Absent	#↑	#↓
Organization of the Islamic Conference	56	2	31	16	7	7	4
Non-Aligned Movement	117	14	42	53	8	14	8
European Union	27	27	0	0	0	0	0
Community of Democracies	124	69	11	39	5	8	5

The ↑ or ↓ represents the number of governments whose position on the Iran resolution was either more or less favorable in 2009 as compared to its previous positions taken at the 63rd session held in 2008.

Situation of human rights in Myanmar

The GA adopted a resolution condemning the situation of human rights in Myanmar for the nineteenth year in a row.¹⁶ The 2009 resolution, sponsored by Sweden (on behalf of the EU), was especially critical given the progression of human rights violations in Myanmar throughout the year. In August 2009, the military junta extended the house arrest of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, a Burmese pro-democracy politician and Nobel Laureate, for a further eighteen months on fabricated charges. The extension of her sentence effectively renders it impossible for her to participate in the 2010 elections.¹⁷ Moreover, the majority of Myanmar's 2,000 political prisoners had yet to be released in the last year despite the 2008 GA resolution calling upon the Government to do so.

¹⁴ Established in 2000, the Community of Democracies (CD) is an association of democratic states committed to upholding and strengthening democratic principles internationally. The association is currently made up of 124 governments which were invited to participate in the Lisbon Ministerial in 2009. Governments are invited to participate in biennial meetings on the basis of their respect for democratic standards and principles established by the CD.

¹⁵ The Convening Group is a committee of 17 countries which govern the affairs of the CD: Cape Verde, Chile, the Czech Republic, El Salvador, India, Italy, Lithuania, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Mongolia, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, South Africa, and the United States.

¹⁶ A/RES/64/238

¹⁷ Mr. Tomás Ojea Quintana, the Special Rapporteur on Myanmar, expressed doubts about whether a legitimate election could be held after informing the Third Committee that the Government of Myanmar had neither enacted any electoral laws nor set a date for the elections.

A streamlined version of the resolution once again strongly condemns the systematic human rights violations of the people of Myanmar, including the practice of arbitrary detentions, enforced disappearances, sexual violence, use of child soldiers, targeting and discrimination of ethnic minorities and torture. It also urges the Government to release all prisoners of conscience, to ensure the necessary steps toward free and fair elections, and to lift restrictions on freedom of assembly and association. The text expresses particular concern over the conviction of Suu Kyi and calls for her immediate release. Furthermore, it calls upon the Government to cooperate fully with the good offices mission of the Secretary-General in the fulfillment of its responsibilities, including facilitating the visits of the Special Advisor. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 86 in favor, 23 against and 39 abstentions.¹⁸

Myanmar							
Regional Groups	Members	Yes	No	Abstained	Absent	#↑	#↓
Africa	53	12	5	14	22	7	1
Asia	54	16	12	15	11	4	1
Eastern Europe	23	19	3	0	1	0	0
Latin America	33	12	3	9	9	4	4
Western Europe and Others	29	27	0	1	1	1	2
Totals	192	86	23	39	44	16	8

Cross-Regional Groups	Members	Yes	No	Abstained	Absent	#↑	#↓
Organization of the Islamic Conference	56	11	10	20	15	4	0
Non-Aligned Movement	117	26	20	35	36	13	3
European Union	27	27	0	0	0	0	0
Community of Democracies	124	77	3	19	25	11	7

The ↑ or ↓ represents the number of governments whose position on the Myanmar resolution was either more or less favorable in 2009 as compared to its previous positions taken at the 63rd session held in 2008.

As was observed with all of the country specific resolutions, many African and Latin American member states changed their positions from last year's vote. Ghana, Liberia, Malawi, Namibia, South Africa and Tanzania, all of which had abstained on the 2008 resolution, voted in favor at the 64th session. While the majority of African states took a neutral position, only Algeria, Egypt, Libya, and Zimbabwe voted against the resolution. Although the votes among the Asian and Latin American groups remained mixed, states such as the Solomon Islands, Antigua and Barbuda, and Jamaica helped the groups receive a higher margin of favorable votes this session after changing their votes from an abstention in 2008 to voting in favor in 2009. While a large portion of OIC and NAM member states continued to abstain on the resolution both groups saw more members voting in favor at the 2009 session. In fact, thirteen NAM member states took a more favorable position at the 64th session than at the 63rd session. The majority of the CD maintained its support for the resolution; only Bangladesh, India and Malaysia, all which opposed the resolution on Iran, voted against the resolution on Myanmar as well.

¹⁸ While the resolution on the situation in Myanmar began in 1991 it had been adopted without a vote until 2006. In 2006 it was adopted by a vote of 77 in favor, 64 against and 30 abstentions. In 2007, it was adopted by a vote of 85 in favor, 22 against, and 47 abstentions, while in 2008 it was adopted by a vote of 80 in favor, 25 against, and 45 abstentions.

Situation of human rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea

A recurring resolution on the human rights situation in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) was adopted by the GA for the fifth year in a row.¹⁹ The resolution, introduced by Sweden (on behalf of the EU) and Japan, once more expresses its serious concerns regarding the widespread and grave violations of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights in the DPRK. It urges the Government to immediately cease such violations, address the issue of impunity for human rights violators, and to implement recommendations set out for the DPRK by UN special procedures and treaty bodies. It also strongly urges the Government to reverse its tradition of complete disengagement with OHCHR, as well as with the Special Rapporteur on the DPRK.²⁰ The resolution was adopted by a vote of 99 in favor, 20 against and 63 abstentions.²¹

Democratic People’s Republic of Korea							
Regional Groups	Members	Yes	No	Abstained	Absent	#↑	#↓
Africa	53	13	7	28	5	3	3
Asia	54	26	9	16	3	7	1
Eastern Europe	23	18	2	1	2	0	0
Latin America	33	13	2	18	0	1	1
Western Europe and Others	29	29	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	192	99	20	63	10	11	5

Cross-Regional Groups	Members	Yes	No	Abstained	Absent	#↑	#↓
Organization of the Islamic Conference	56	16	9	27	4	6	2
Non-Aligned Movement	117	32	18	59	8	8	5
European Union	27	27	0	0	0	0	0
Community of Democracies	124	84	3	33	4	3	3

The ↑ or ↓ represents the number of governments whose position on the DPRK resolution was either more or less favorable in 2009 as compared to its previous positions taken at the 63rd session held in 2008.

As was the case in previous sessions of the GA, the resolution addressing the situation in the DPRK drew support from a broad cross-regional group of states. WEOG and Eastern Europe maintained the largest ratio of favorable votes within their groups. Five more states within the Asian group, including Jordan, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and the United Arab Emirates, chose to vote in favor of the 2009 resolution. Within the African group, Somalia voted in favor of the resolution despite having opposed it in 2008. Comoros, Bangladesh and the Bahamas withdrew their previous support for the resolution by abstaining in 2009, while Namibia voted against the resolution after having abstained in 2008. The CD remained largely supportive of the resolution at the 2009 session with only Namibia, Indonesia and Malaysia voting against the resolution.

Goldstone Report on the Gaza Conflict

¹⁹ A/RES/64/175

²⁰ The Government of the DPRK has refused to cooperate with Special Rapporteur on the DPRK, Mr. Vitit Muntarbhorn, throughout his six-year term.

²¹ In 2008, the resolution on the human rights situation in the DPRK was adopted by a vote of 94 in favor, 22 against, and 63 abstentions.

At the September 2009 session of the HRC, Justice Richard Goldstone presented a report on behalf of the UN Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict,²² which cited evidence of serious violations of human rights and humanitarian law committed by both Israeli forces and Hamas during the early 2009 conflict. The Fact Finding Mission concluded in its report that impartial and thorough investigations of the conduct of the armed forces of both parties to the war were needed to prevent impunity. It also recommended that there be a means to monitor the progress of these investigations to ensure that they are conducted in conformity with international standards. At the October 2009 HRC Special Session on the Human Rights Situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory including East Jerusalem, the HRC passed a resolution²³ that endorsed the Goldstone Report and recommended that the GA discuss the report at its upcoming session.

While a large cross-regional majority supported the report and its recommendations, Australia, Canada, Israel, Netherlands and the United States voted against the HRC resolution after expressing concerns over the validity of the report. The GA resolution introduced by Egypt (on behalf of NAM and the Arab League)²⁴ called for both the Government of Israel and the Palestinian side to undertake credible and independent investigations into the violations within a three-month period. It also requested that the Secretary-General report to the GA on the implementation of the investigations within three months at which time it will consider if further action by the Security Council is necessary.²⁵ The resolution was adopted by a vote of 114 in favor, 18 against and 44 abstentions.²⁶

Goldstone Report on the Gaza Conflict					
Regional Groups	Members	Yes	No	Abstained	Absent
Africa	53	37	0	8	8
Asia	54	38	4	6	6
Eastern Europe	23	7	6	10	0
Latin America	33	27	1	3	2
Western Europe and Others	29	5	7	17	0
Totals	192	114	18	44	16

Cross-Regional Groups	Members	Yes	No	Abstained	Absent
Organization of the Islamic Conference	56	49	0	3	4
Non-Aligned Movement	117	93	1	10	13
European Union	27	5	7	15	0
Community of Democracies	124	62	18	35	9

The EU vote, which had split between states that opposed the HRC resolution²⁷ and those that abstained, divided three ways at the UNGA. Slovenia, which had abstained on the HRC resolution, joined Cyprus, Ireland, Malta and Portugal, along with Switzerland, to vote in favor of the GA

²² In response to the Israeli military siege on Gaza in late December 2009, the HRC convened its Ninth special session in January 2009 which dispatched an urgent international fact-finding mission to investigate human rights and humanitarian law violations. Justice Richard Goldstone was later appointed to head the mission.

²³ A/HRC/RES/S-12/1

²⁴ A/RES/64/10

²⁵ In February 2010, the UNGA adopted resolution A/RES/64/254, which extended the time period by five months in which both sides should report back on the progress of their investigations.

²⁶ A/RES/64/10

²⁷ A/HRC/S-12/L.1 entitled "The human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem."

resolution. The largest regional support emanated from Latin America, Africa and Asia with only Panama, the Marshall Islands, Micronesia and Nauru voting against the resolution.²⁸ The OIC gave the greatest cross-regional endorsement with only Burkina Faso, Cameroon and Uganda abstaining and none voting against. Exactly half of the CD's membership voted in favor of the resolution, the lowest margin of support from the CD for a country-related resolution at the 2009 session. Of the eighteen CD states that voted against the resolution, the Czech Republic, Italy, Poland and the United States are notable as being CG members. The United States opposed the resolution arguing that it was "deeply flawed," "unbalanced," and that it would interfere with the parties' ability to conduct their own investigative processes. Significantly, Russia abstained on the GA resolution after having supported the HRC resolution. Russia also joined the United States in declaring its opposition to referring the report to the Security Council.²⁹

THEMATIC RESOLUTIONS

Combating 'defamation of religions'

A resolution on "combating defamation of religion" was once again adopted by the GA despite continued opposition from states and human rights experts that oppose the controversial concept of on grounds that it endangers freedom of expression.³⁰ Despite recent progress on reaching compromise language related to this initiative, the 2009 resolution contained much of the same problematic language seen in previous iterations.³¹ Tabled by Malaysia (on behalf of the OIC), Belarus and Venezuela, the resolution expresses deep concern at the 'negative stereotyping of religion' with particular emphasis on the stereotyping of Islam.³² It also emphasizes that freedom of expression carries with it special duties and responsibilities, and might therefore be subject to limitations as provided by law. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 80 in favor, 61 against and 42 abstentions.

Opposition to the resolution came largely from members of WEOG and the Eastern European Group while support came from members of the African Group and OIC. Several delegations cited its focus on one religion while others emphasized that discrimination based on religion should be addressed in such a way that was not detrimental to the right to freedom of expression.³³ Several states from NAM, Latin America and the Asia group shifted their support away from the resolution at the 2009 session. Chile, Mexico, Panama, Saint Lucia, Uruguay, Papua New Guinea, Timor-Leste, Tonga and Vanuatu all voted against the resolution after abstaining in 2008. About half of the CD voted against the resolution; ten more CD members opposed the 2009 resolution after abstaining or being absent

²⁸ Although Mexico had abstained on a resolution welcoming the Goldstone Report at the HRC, it stated that it overcame its reservations over "endorsing" the report to vote in favor of the GA resolution.

²⁹ The Netherlands and India also opposed the Goldstone Report being referred to the Security Council.

³⁰ On November 10, 2009 over one hundred religiously diverse NGOs from over 20 countries released a joint Common Civil Society Statement protesting the concept of 'defamation of religion.' The statement asserts that such a concept is incompatible with the freedoms of individuals to freely express their thoughts, ideas, and beliefs.

³¹ During the Twelfth session of the HRC the US worked with Egypt to secure a resolution that acknowledged the need to combat discrimination and incitement of hatred and violence but also omitted the vague concept of "defamation of religion."

³² A/RES/64/156

³³ India and Albania also expressed concern that the resolution attempted to link "defamation of religions" with racism in its request that the Secretary-General report on their correlation at the GA's 2010 session.

from the vote the previous year.³⁴ However, three CD members, namely Belize, Cape Verde and Liberia, chose to abstain this year after opposing the resolution in 2008. In total, eight more states voted against the resolution in 2009, indicating mounting recognition that the resolution endangers human rights standards.

Combating defamation of religions							
Regional Groups	Members	Yes	No	Abstained	Absent	#↑	#↓
Africa	53	30	0	16	7	5	5
Asia	54	35	11	6	2	6	0
Eastern Europe	23	3	17	3	0	0	0
Latin America	33	11	5	17	0	9	2
Western Europe and Others	29	1	28	0	0	1	0
Totals	192	80	61	42	9	21	7

Cross-Regional Groups	Members	Yes	No	Abstained	Absent	#↑	#↓
Organization of the Islamic Conference	56	50	0	4	2	2	1
Non-Aligned Movement	117	72	6	32	7	15	6
European Union	27	0	27	0	0	0	0
Community of Democracies	124	27	60	34	3	16	4

The ↑ or ↓ represents the number of governments whose position on the defamation of religions resolution was either more or less favorable in 2009 as compared to its previous positions taken at the 63rd session held in 2008.

Strengthening the role of the UN in elections

The United States once again presented its biennial resolution on “Strengthening the role of the United Nations in enhancing periodic and genuine elections and the promotion of democratization.”³⁵ The resolution reaffirms the responsibility of member states to ensure a free and fair electoral process. It also stresses that UN electoral assistance is only provided at the behest of the state concerned. A new paragraph was also added to the 2009 resolution expressing appreciation for the guidelines contained within the *Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the Code of Conduct for International Observers*.³⁶ Over the past several years, this resolution has received almost total support from the GA.³⁷ However, Russia objected to the 2009 resolution’s reference to the guidelines, arguing that it was a civil society initiative which had not been a part of intergovernmental negotiations and was therefore illegitimate.³⁸ Despite the fact that the guidelines had been endorsed by the African Union, Organization of American States, and the Council of Europe, Russia still called a vote on the paragraph. The Russian proposal to delete the paragraph was met with resounding defeat in a vote of 121 in favor of retaining the reference, 19 against, and 28

³⁴ Chile, Mexico, Nauru, New Zealand, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Saint Lucia, Timor-Leste, Uruguay and Vanuatu.

³⁵ A/RES/64/155

³⁶ The 12-page Declaration of Principles and its accompanying Code of Conduct was developed by over 20 inter-governmental and international NGOs to build consensus on best practices for election observation.

³⁷ The 2007 resolution was adopted by a vote of 182 in favor, none against and 2 abstentions. The DPRK and Swaziland abstained on the resolution.

³⁸ Notably, Russia stated that it objected to the reference to the Declaration, but it did not object to its contents.

abstentions. The resolution was later adopted by consensus with Iran disassociating itself from the paragraph that had been put to a vote and Cuba disassociating itself from the resolution as a whole.

Strengthening the role of the UN in elections					
Regional Groups	Members	Yes	No	Abstained	Absent
Africa	53	24	3	15	11
Asia	54	23	9	11	11
Eastern Europe	23	20	2	0	1
Latin America	33	25	5	2	1
Western Europe and Others	29	29	0	0	0
Totals	192	121	19	28	24

Cross-Regional Groups	Members	Yes	No	Abstained	Absent
Organization of the Islamic Conference	56	22	6	19	9
Non-Aligned Movement	117	56	17	28	16
European Union	27	27	0	0	0
Community of Democracies	124	103	3	11	7

The vote on the reference to the Declaration displayed a significant bias from select member states against cooperation by the UN and other intergovernmental organizations with members of civil society. Seventeen states from the Asian, African and Latin American group voted against the inclusion of the reference.³⁹ After having supported the resolution as a whole in 2007, fourteen members of NAM and five members from the OIC, including Brunei Darussalam, Egypt, Iran, Malaysia and Sudan, voted in favor of Russia’s amendment at the 2009 session. Conversely, member states of WEOG and the Eastern Europe group largely supported the reference, with the exception of Belarus and Russia who voted against its inclusion. The majority of the CD also extended its support for the original text; notably Bolivia, Ecuador and Malaysia opposed the reference to the Declaration.

Outcome of the Durban Review Conference

Sudan (on behalf of the G-77 and China), Russia and Norway sponsored a decision, “Outcome Document of the Durban Review Conference,”⁴⁰ which endorsed the Outcome of the second Durban Review Conference⁴¹ held in April 2009 and decided to implement the document as part of the wider implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. The Durban Review Conference Outcome emphasizes the need to address with greater resolve all forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance in all parts of the world. As a result of intensive negotiations among states, the final document excluded references to ‘defamation of religions’, as well as references to Israel and the conflict in the Middle East. It also reaffirmed the positive role of freedom of expression in the fight against racism, while deploring derogatory stereotyping and negative stigmatization of people based on religion and belief.

³⁹ Belarus, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, China, Democratic Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Singapore, Sudan, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

⁴⁰ A/64/437.

⁴¹ The Durban Review Conference is the official name of the April 2009 United Nations World Conference against Racism (WCAR). The conference’s mandate was to review the implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action from the 2001 World Conference, which took place in Durban, South Africa. The Durban Review Outcome Document can be viewed here:

http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Press/Durban_Review_Conference_outcome_document.pdf

Outcome of the Durban Review Conference					
Regional Groups	Members	Yes	No	Abstained	Absent
Africa	53	48	0	0	5
Asia	54	46	2	2	4
Eastern Europe	23	19	0	4	0
Latin America	33	33	0	0	0
Western Europe and Others	29	20	5	3	1
Totals	192	166	7	9	10

Cross-Regional Groups	Members	Yes	No	Abstained	Absent
Organization of the Islamic Conference	56	53	0	0	3
Non-Aligned Movement	117	110	0	1	6
European Union	27	21	1	5	0
Community of Democracies	124	103	7	8	6

Israel called for a vote on the resolution, resulting in its adoption by a large majority of 166 in favor, seven against and nine abstentions. While nearly every member of the OIC and NAM supported the resolution,⁴² the EU vote split three ways. Significantly, the Netherlands was the only EU state to oppose the resolution. Of the ten states that boycotted the Durban Review Conference,⁴³ the United States, Canada, Australia, Netherlands and Israel all voted against the resolution, while Italy, Germany, New Zealand, Poland and the Czech Republic abstained.⁴⁴ Only two members of the Asian group, Marshall Islands and Palau, chose to vote against the resolution. Nevertheless, the majority of the CD voted in favor of the resolution, thereby supporting the High Commissioner’s conclusion that the document was a “meaningful outcome enshrining a common aspiration: to defy racism in all its manifestations and work to stamp it out wherever it may occur.”⁴⁵

Support for Treaty Body System

Only one year after the landmark “UN declaration on sexual orientation and gender identity”⁴⁶ was presented at the 63rd session of the GA, the issue of gender identity came under intense fire at the 2009 session after UN Special Rapporteur on counter-terrorism, Mr. Martin Scheinin, presented his report on counter-terrorism in which he interpreted ‘gender identity’ to include lesbians, gays, bisexuals, transgender and intersex persons (LGBTI). Sharp opposition to this interpretation by members of the African and Arab Groups resulted in the resolution on “International Human Rights Covenants” to go to a vote for the first time since its first introduction in 1966.⁴⁷

⁴² Vanuatu abstained while Chad, Gambia, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Somalia, and Myanmar were absent from the vote.

⁴³ These states boycotted Durban II because of objections to the “anti-Israeli” rhetoric observed throughout the Durban I conference, even though the final outcome document of this conference did not contain such language.

⁴⁴ Notably, the Czech Republic, Italy, Poland and the United States are all members of the CD Convening Group.

⁴⁵ “Anti-racism Durban Review Conference concludes with successful outcome,” OHCHR media release, April 2009.

⁴⁶ The statement, initiated by France and supported by 66 additional member states, includes condemnation of violence, harassment, discrimination, exclusion, stigmatization, and prejudice based on sexual orientation and gender identity.

⁴⁷ A/C.3/64/L.22

Sponsored by Finland, the biennial procedural resolution commits parties to respect their obligations under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), as well as the Optional Protocols applicable to them. The initial draft of the resolution took note of three General Comments adopted by the Human Rights Committee and the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights relating to the obligations of State parties under the Optional Protocol, the right to social security, and the right to non-discrimination in economic, social and cultural rights, including on the basis of sexual orientation.⁴⁸

Amendment on Reporting Obligations to ICCPR (Third Committee)					
Regional Groups	Members	Yes	No	Abstained	Absent
Africa	53	48	0	0	5
Asia	54	19	6	11	18
Eastern Europe	23	2	21	0	0
Latin America	33	1	14	14	4
Western Europe and Others	29	0	28	0	1
Totals	192	70	69	25	28

Cross-Regional Groups	Members	Yes	No	Abstained	Absent
Organization of the Islamic Conference	56	40	3	5	8
Non-Aligned Movement	117	67	11	21	18
European Union	27	0	27	0	0
Community of Democracies	124	25	67	20	12

Zambia (on behalf of the African Group) presented amendments to remove two paragraphs taking note of the General Comments, citing the “lack of clarity” of the General Comment on state party obligations and the “controversial” nature of the comment on non-discrimination regarding sexual orientation and gender identity.⁴⁹ The vote to remove the comment on obligations of states parties was successful; however the vote to remove the paragraph containing the comments on social security and non-discrimination was initially defeated in the Third Committee. Both votes were won or lost by a margin of only one vote.⁵⁰ The resolution as a whole was then adopted by a vote of 111 in favor, none against and 66 abstentions.

Later at the General Assembly, Iraq (on behalf of the Arab Group) undertook a second attempt to remove references to the comments on social security and non-discrimination; to which it succeeded by a vote of 76 in favor, 72 against and 26 abstentions. The vote drew the most support from the African and Asian Groups with only nine Asian and no African member states voting against the

⁴⁸ Operative paragraph 9 and 10 of the original resolution references the obligations of States parties under the Optional Protocol (General Comment No. 33), the right to social security (General Comment No. 19) and to non-discrimination in economic, social and cultural rights (General Comment No. 20). General Comment No. 20 affirms that state parties should ensure that a person’s sexual orientation is not a barrier to realizing Covenant rights and that gender identity is recognized as prohibited grounds of discrimination.

⁴⁹ Notably, the African Group stated that it had no problem with General Comment No. 19, but believed referencing the Committee’s report, which included that comment, was sufficient.

⁵⁰ The amendment to OP 9 was adopted by a vote of 70 in favor, 69 against and 5 abstentions. The amendment to OP 10 was opposed by a vote of 71 in favor, 72 against and 23 abstentions.

amendment.⁵¹ The OIC also had a large favorable majority with only Albania and Turkey voting against the amendment. Members of WEOG and the Eastern European Group, with the exception of Belarus and Russia, were largely opposed to the deletion of the paragraph. The majority of Latin American states voted against or abstained on the vote. These states expressed concern that the GA was sending a negative message to the treaty bodies with regard to confidence in their expertise or respect for their independence.⁵²

Amendment on Non-Discrimination on ICESCR (GA)							
Regional Groups	Members	Yes	No	Abstained	Absent	#↑	#↓
Africa	53	41	0	6	6	8	2
Asia	54	26	9	9	10	5	7
Eastern Europe	23	2	20	1	0	0	2
Latin America	33	7	14	10	2	1	7
Western Europe and Others	29	0	29	0	0	0	0
Totals	192	76	72	26	18	14	18

Cross-Regional Groups	Members	Yes	No	Abstained	Absent	#↑	#↓
Organization of the Islamic Conference	56	47	2	3	4	3	9
Non-Aligned Movement	117	71	11	22	13	10	13
European Union	27	0	27	0	0	0	0
Community of Democracies	124	29	71	18	6	8	5

The ↑ or ↓ represents the number of governments whose position on the non-discrimination amendment was either more or less favorable in the 64th GA Plenary as compared to its previous positions taken at the 64th session's Third Committee.

The reverse outcome in the GA was in part achieved after several Asian and Latin American states, notably Afghanistan, Tajikistan, Russia, Dominica, Guyana, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, switched from abstaining on the amendment at the Third Committee to supporting it at the GA. Nicaragua also voted in favor of the paragraph's removal after voting against it in the previous vote. Although the majority of the CD voted against the paragraph's removal, twenty-nine voted in favor. Among the CD states which voted yes were Bahrain, Bangladesh, Jordan, Kenya, Malaysia and Zambia.

OTHER ISSUES

Attacks on special procedures

The 64th session witnessed increased attacks on the UN's special procedures mandate holders, as well as misuse of the *Code of Conduct for Special Procedures Mandate Holders*⁵³ (Code of Conduct) by some states which disagreed with the opinions of special rapporteurs. Tanzania (on behalf of the African Group), Malaysia (on behalf of the OIC), Sudan (on behalf of the Arab Group), India and St. Lucia, all accused Martin Scheinin, the Special Rapporteur on counter-terrorism, of over-stepping his

⁵¹ Cyprus, Japan, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Republic of Korea and Vanuatu.

⁵² Finland, Canada, Chile, Mexico, New Zealand, Switzerland and the United Kingdom

⁵³ A/HRC/5/21

mandate by reinterpreting the internationally agreed definition of gender to include LGBTI persons.⁵⁴ Intense opposition to this section of Scheinin’s report caused Mexico, the sponsor of the annual resolution on the “Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism,”⁵⁵ to reluctantly remove a reference to the report. Although the report’s omission allowed the resolution to achieve consensus, it set an unfortunate precedent in dealing with sensitive human rights issues. In addition, amendments to include a reference to the Code of Conduct and for the Special Rapporteur to only make recommendations “within the context of his mandate” were added to the resolution.⁵⁶

The Code of Conduct was repeatedly used as a basis for harassing mandate holders for “re-interpreting” their mandates. Many states that led similar attacks on Special Procedures at the HRC - notably China, Russia, Pakistan, Malaysia, Cuba and Egypt – joined Tanzania, Sudan, India and Saint Lucia in coordinating their harassment of the Rapporteurs at the GA. China and Nigeria accused the Special Rapporteur on torture, Mr. Manfred Nowak, of taking a biased approach to his mandate for including critical remarks in his country report and thus, violating the Code of Conduct. The Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial executions, Mr. Philip Alston, was also censured by Kenya for allegedly interfering in Kenya’s internal political structure after Alston criticized the country’s police death squads. Many members of WEOG,⁵⁷ along with Chile and Uruguay, defended the independence of Special Rapporteurs to interpret their mandates in accordance with their expert opinions. They argued that Special Rapporteurs must be able to speak freely on controversial topics in order to effectively implement their mandates.

Several states from Latin America and WEOG⁵⁸ also opposed efforts to include references to the Code of Conduct in many of the session’s contentious resolutions,⁵⁹ including the resolution on human rights defenders. The biennial resolution, sponsored by Norway, expresses concern over the increased targeting by states of members of civil society monitoring human rights violations. Despite the fact that the Special Rapporteur on human rights defenders, Ms. Margaret Sekaggya, broke from established practice and refrained from citing specific countries in her report, China, Egypt, Pakistan, Russia and Syria fought, nonetheless, to include a reference to the Code of Conduct in the resolution. These efforts were defeated, but only after problematic compromises were made, including the inclusion of references to national NGO registration requirements and the ‘rights and responsibilities’ of human rights defenders.

OHCHR-NY Upgrade to ASG Level

One major achievement undertaken by the 64th GA included the upgrade of the New York Office of the OHCHR to the level of Assistant Secretary-General (ASG). The initiative began after High Commissioner Pillay advocated for greater incorporation of a human rights perspective into the work of the UN Secretariat. Despite some opposition from states, the necessary funds totaling only

⁵⁴ HRC Resolution 6/28, “Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism,” requires that the Special Rapporteur ‘integrate a gender perspective throughout the work of his/her mandate.’

⁵⁵ A/RES/64/168

⁵⁶ The amendments were adopted by a vote of 81 in favor, 73 against and 20 abstentions.

⁵⁷ Australia, Canada, Finland, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and the United States.

⁵⁸ Argentina, Chile, Canada, Colombia, Sweden (on behalf of the EU), Guatemala, Mexico and Switzerland.

⁵⁹ Some delegations sought to include this reference in the resolutions dealing with counter-terrorism, torture, human rights defenders and freedom of religion and belief; however they only succeeded in the resolution on counter-terrorism.

\$40,000, were ultimately secured in the UN's Fifth Committee, which deals with the budget of the UN. The post's upgrade boosts the status of OHCHR, allowing it to participate in high-level policy meetings and decision-making bodies, and exhibits a deeper commitment to mainstreaming human rights throughout the United Nations.

CONCLUSION

The 64th UN General Assembly concluded with mixed results. Marked progress was made in strengthening the international community's stance against the grave human rights situations in Myanmar, Iran, DPRK and the Occupied Palestinian Territory. While some states continued to question the effectiveness of such resolutions in improving human rights on the ground, none offered better alternatives to address critical country situations where constructive dialogue with the concerned country had failed. Ultimately, the UNGA reaffirmed its duty to react to human rights crises and maintained that UN member states could not stay silent in the face of serious violations. Although more states chose to uphold the principle of freedom of expression by withdrawing their support for the resolution on "combating defamation of religions," special procedure mandate holders, civil society and human rights defenders were subject to increased attacks for speaking out on human rights violations and lending their expertise to UN instruments. While states failed to reach agreement on issues such as 'gender identity' and the value of country resolutions, significant achievements in the areas of the rights of the child and the right to food signaled that consensus can be attained across regional divides.

The divide between cross-regional groups with regards to country resolutions remained apparent at the 2009 session. The European Union and the Community of Democracies continued to pull far more support for the recurring country resolutions on Iran, Myanmar, and DPRK with the EU averaging 100 percent in favor across all three resolutions and the CD averaging roughly 62 percent. Conversely, the OIC averaged only 17 percent in support of the recurring resolutions, while the Non-Aligned Movement averaged 20 percent support. However, both the OIC and NAM experienced positive changes from 2008. The OIC saw a three percent average increase in favorable positions, while NAM saw a four percent average increase, thereby affecting the higher margins of adoption seen across all three resolutions. The recurring resolutions on Iran, DPRK, and Myanmar saw 66 percent, 9 percent, and 15 percent higher margins of victory, respectively, compared to 2008.

In stark reversal of this pattern, far more support for the resolution pertaining to the Gaza conflict was extended by NAM and the OIC than was seen from the EU and CD. Over 85 percent of the members of the OIC and 79 percent of NAM voted in favor of the resolution. On the other hand, the EU and the CD, with 19 percent and 50 percent, respectively, gave their lowest support for a country resolution. This reversal in support across regions and groupings suggests that political considerations, rather than professed ideologies or human rights considerations, continue to play a larger role than states would avow when voting on a resolution.

Many members of the CD deviated from the preferred position favorable to the promotion of human rights adopted by the majority. While most democratic states supported the three recurring country resolutions, and half supported the resolution on Gaza, several CD states stood out in opposition to censuring human rights violations in these territories. Eleven CD states voted against the resolution on Iran,⁶⁰ and among them, three voted against the resolution on DPRK and Myanmar. India and

⁶⁰ Bangladesh, Bolivia, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Lebanon, Malaysia, Namibia, Niger, and Senegal.

Bangladesh voted against the resolutions on Iran and Myanmar, while Indonesia and Namibia voted against the resolutions on Iran and the DPRK. Malaysia, disappointingly, voted against all three resolutions. Notably, Bangladesh, Iraq, and Malaysia were among the small group of CD members that received negative recommendations by the International Advisory Committee (IAC),⁶¹ an independent committee of expert advisors to the CD, which found that these states had failed to uphold democratic principles. Interestingly, all of the aforementioned states voted in favor of the resolution on the Gaza Conflict and joined the majority of the CD in voting in favor of the Outcome of the Durban Review Conference. Conversely, Australia, Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Netherlands, Palau and the United States all voted against the resolutions on the Gaza Conflict and the Durban Review.⁶² On the resolution on strengthening the role of the UN in elections, Malaysia, Bolivia, and Ecuador were the only members of the CD to vote in favor of removing the reference to the *Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation*.

It is important to note that not all states consistently voted with their respective regional and cross-regional groups. Albania, Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Chile, Cyprus, Ireland, Malta, Mexico, Peru, Portugal, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Switzerland and Timor-Leste all chose to take a principled stance to vote in favor of all country resolutions. Overall, Chile, Cyprus, Ireland, Malta, Mexico, Portugal, Slovenia and Switzerland maintained the best human rights performance across all of the issues covered in DCP's 64th UNGA assessment.

⁶¹ The IAC was established to strengthen the CD invitation process by issuing recommendations on which governments merit invitation to the group based on international norms of democracy and human rights. IAC recommendations can be found at: <http://www.demcoalition.org/site09-2008/pdf/Complete%20IAC%20Report.pdf>.

⁶² Other CD members who voted against the Gaza Conflict resolution included the Czech Republic, Italy, Germany, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Hungary, Micronesia, Nauru, Panama, Poland, Slovakia and the Ukraine.

Scorecard: How U.N. Member States Voted On Select Human Rights Resolutions In The 64th General Assembly, 2009¹

	CD ²	Iran (GA)	Myanmar (GA)	Democratic People's Republic of Korea (GA)	Goldstone Report on Gaza Conflict (GA)	Combating Defamation of Religions (GA)	Amendment to the Role of the UN in Elections (Third Committee)	Outcome of the Durban Review Conference (GA)	Support for Treaty Body System	
									Amendment on Reporting Obligations to ICCPR (Third Committee)	Amendment on Non-Discrimination on ICESCR (GA)
<i>Vote Count</i>		Yes: 74 No: 49 Abstain: 59 Absent: 10	Yes: 86 No: 23 Abstain: 39 Absent: 44	Yes: 99 No: 20 Abstain: 63 Absent: 10	Yes: 114 No: 18 Abstain: 44 Absent: 16	Yes: 80 No: 61 Abstain: 42 Absent: 9	Yes: 121 No: 19 Abstain: 28 Absent: 24	Yes: 166 No: 7 Abstain: 9 Absent: 10	Yes: 70 No: 69 Abstain: 25 Absent: 28	Yes: 76 No: 72 Abstain: 26 Absent: 18
<i>Preferred Vote</i>		<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
Africa										
Algeria	O	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes
Angola	P	Abstain	Absent	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain ↑
Benin	P	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Botswana	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Burkina Faso	O	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Absent	Yes	Yes	Absent ↑
Burundi	O	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain	Absent	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cameroon		Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cape Verde	P	Abstain	Absent	Abstain	Absent	Abstain ↓	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Central African Republic		Abstain	Absent	Abstain	Yes	Absent	Absent	Yes	Absent	Absent

¹ Movement from a preferred position of “no” to “absent”, “abstain”, or “yes” or movement from a preferred position of “yes” to “abstain”, “absent”, or “no” is marked with a i. Movement from a position of “abstain” or “absent” toward a preferred position of “yes” or “no” was marked with a h. Movement from a position of “abstain” or “absent” away from a preferred position of “yes” or “no” was marked with a i. Movement generally represents a change in a position in 2009 from a previous position taken at the 63rd session held in 2008 with the exception of the amendment on non-discrimination on ICESCR which denotes that a government changed its position in the GA after voting differently on the same amendment in the Third Committee.

² Community of Democracies (CD) participants marked with a P, observers with an O. Only participants are considered members of the CD.

Sixty-Fourth United Nations General Assembly Scorecard

	CD ²	Iran (GA)	Myanmar (GA)	Democratic People's Republic of Korea (GA)	Goldstone Report on Gaza Conflict (GA)	Combating Defamation of Religions (GA)	Amendment to the Role of the UN in Elections (Third Committee)	Outcome of the Durban Review Conference (GA)	Support for Treaty Body System	
									Amendment on Reporting Obligations to ICCPR (Third Committee)	Amendment on Non-Discrimination on ICESCR (GA)
<i>Vote Count</i>		Yes: 74 No: 49 Abstain: 59 Absent: 10	Yes: 86 No: 23 Abstain: 39 Absent: 44	Yes: 99 No: 20 Abstain: 63 Absent: 10	Yes: 114 No: 18 Abstain: 44 Absent: 16	Yes: 80 No: 61 Abstain: 42 Absent: 9	Yes: 121 No: 19 Abstain: 28 Absent: 24	Yes: 166 No: 7 Abstain: 9 Absent: 10	Yes: 70 No: 69 Abstain: 25 Absent: 28	Yes: 76 No: 72 Abstain: 26 Absent: 18
<i>Preferred Vote</i>		<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
Chad		Abstain	Absent	Abstain	Yes	Yes ↓	Absent	Absent	Absent	Yes ↓
Comoros		No	Absent	Abstain ↓	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Congo		Abstain ↑	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes ↓	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Côte d'Ivoire		Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Absent	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Democratic Republic of the Congo	O	Abstain	Absent	Abstain	Yes	Yes ↓	Absent	Yes	Yes	Yes
Djibouti	O	Absent	Absent	Absent	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes
Egypt	O	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Equatorial Guinea		No ↓	Absent	No ↓	Absent	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Absent	Abstain
Eritrea		No	Absent ↓	Yes	Yes	Yes	Absent	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ethiopia		Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain ↑
Gabon		Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Absent	Yes	Absent	Yes ↓
The Gambia		Absent ↑	Absent	Absent	Yes	Absent ↑	Abstain	Absent	Yes	Absent ↑
Ghana	P	Abstain	Yes ↑	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes
Guinea		No	Absent	Abstain ↑	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Guinea-Bissau	O	Abstain	Absent	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain ↑
Kenya	P	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lesotho	P	Abstain	Absent	Abstain	Yes	Abstain ↑	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Sixty-Fourth United Nations General Assembly Scorecard

	CD ²	Iran (GA)	Myanmar (GA)	Democratic People's Republic of Korea (GA)	Goldstone Report on Gaza Conflict (GA)	Combating Defamation of Religions (GA)	Amendment to the Role of the UN in Elections (Third Committee)	Outcome of the Durban Review Conference (GA)	Support for Treaty Body System	
									Amendment on Reporting Obligations to ICCPR (Third Committee)	Amendment on Non-Discrimination on ICESCR (GA)
<i>Vote Count</i>		Yes: 74 No: 49 Abstain: 59 Absent: 10	Yes: 86 No: 23 Abstain: 39 Absent: 44	Yes: 99 No: 20 Abstain: 63 Absent: 10	Yes: 114 No: 18 Abstain: 44 Absent: 16	Yes: 80 No: 61 Abstain: 42 Absent: 9	Yes: 121 No: 19 Abstain: 28 Absent: 24	Yes: 166 No: 7 Abstain: 9 Absent: 10	Yes: 70 No: 69 Abstain: 25 Absent: 28	Yes: 76 No: 72 Abstain: 26 Absent: 18
<i>Preferred Vote</i>		<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
Liberia	P	Yes	Yes ↑	Yes	Abstain	Abstain ↓	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain ↑
Libya		No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes
Madagascar		Yes ↑	Abstain	Yes	Absent	Absent	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Malawi	P	Abstain ↑	Yes ↑	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mali	P	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mauritania		No	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mauritius	P	Abstain	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Abstain	Absent	Yes	Yes	Abstain ↑
Morocco	P	Abstain ↑	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mozambique	P	Abstain	Absent	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes
Namibia	P	No ↓	Yes ↑	No ↓	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Niger	P	No	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Nigeria	O	No ↓	Yes ↑	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rwanda	O	Abstain	Absent	Abstain	Absent	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Absent ↑
Sao Tome and Principe	P	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent ↑	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
Senegal	P	No	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes
Seychelles	P	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Yes	Absent	Yes	Absent
Sierra Leone	O	Abstain	Absent	Yes ↑	Yes	Absent ↑	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Somalia		No	Absent	Yes ↑	Yes	Yes	Absent	Absent	Yes	Yes
South Africa	P	Abstain ↑	Yes ↑	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes

Sixty-Fourth United Nations General Assembly Scorecard

	CD ²	Iran (GA)	Myanmar (GA)	Democratic People's Republic of Korea (GA)	Goldstone Report on Gaza Conflict (GA)	Combating Defamation of Religions (GA)	Amendment to the Role of the UN in Elections (Third Committee)	Outcome of the Durban Review Conference (GA)	Support for Treaty Body System	
									Amendment on Reporting Obligations to ICCPR (Third Committee)	Amendment on Non-Discrimination on ICESCR (GA)
<i>Vote Count</i>		Yes: 74 No: 49 Abstain: 59 Absent: 10	Yes: 86 No: 23 Abstain: 39 Absent: 44	Yes: 99 No: 20 Abstain: 63 Absent: 10	Yes: 114 No: 18 Abstain: 44 Absent: 16	Yes: 80 No: 61 Abstain: 42 Absent: 9	Yes: 121 No: 19 Abstain: 28 Absent: 24	Yes: 166 No: 7 Abstain: 9 Absent: 10	Yes: 70 No: 69 Abstain: 25 Absent: 28	Yes: 76 No: 72 Abstain: 26 Absent: 18
<i>Preferred Vote</i>		<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
Sudan		No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Swaziland		Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tanzania	P	Abstain	Yes ↑	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Togo		Abstain ↑	Yes	Yes	Absent	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tunisia		No	Absent	Absent	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes
Uganda	O	Abstain	Absent	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Zambia	P	Abstain	Absent	Abstain	Yes	Abstain	Absent	Yes	Yes	Yes
Zimbabwe		No	No	No	Yes	Absent ↑	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Asia										
Afghanistan	O	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes ↓
Bahrain	P	Absent ↑	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Absent	Yes
Bangladesh	P	No	No	Abstain ↓	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes
Bhutan	P	Abstain	Absent	Yes	Absent	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain
Brunei Darussalam		No ↓	No	Abstain	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cambodia	O	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Absent	Yes	Absent	Absent
China		No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cyprus	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No

Sixty-Fourth United Nations General Assembly Scorecard

	CD ²	Iran (GA)	Myanmar (GA)	Democratic People's Republic of Korea (GA)	Goldstone Report on Gaza Conflict (GA)	Combating Defamation of Religions (GA)	Amendment to the Role of the UN in Elections (Third Committee)	Outcome of the Durban Review Conference (GA)	Support for Treaty Body System	
									Amendment on Reporting Obligations to ICCPR (Third Committee)	Amendment on Non-Discrimination on ICESCR (GA)
<i>Vote Count</i>		Yes: 74 No: 49 Abstain: 59 Absent: 10	Yes: 86 No: 23 Abstain: 39 Absent: 44	Yes: 99 No: 20 Abstain: 63 Absent: 10	Yes: 114 No: 18 Abstain: 44 Absent: 16	Yes: 80 No: 61 Abstain: 42 Absent: 9	Yes: 121 No: 19 Abstain: 28 Absent: 24	Yes: 166 No: 7 Abstain: 9 Absent: 10	Yes: 70 No: 69 Abstain: 25 Absent: 28	Yes: 76 No: 72 Abstain: 26 Absent: 18
<i>Preferred Vote</i>		<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Fiji		Yes	Absent	Yes	Abstain	Abstain ↑	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain
India	P	No	No	Abstain	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain
Indonesia	P	No	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Iran		No	Absent ↑	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Iraq	P	No ↓	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Japan	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	No	No
Jordan	P	Abstain	Abstain	Yes ↑	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes
Kazakhstan		No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Absent	Yes ↓
Kiribati *	P	Yes	Absent	Yes	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
Kuwait	O	No	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes
Kyrgyzstan		No	Abstain	Abstain	Absent	Yes	Absent	Yes	Absent	Absent
Lao People's Democratic Republic		Abstain	No	Absent	Yes	Yes	Absent	Yes	Absent	Absent
Lebanon	P	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes
Malaysia	P	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maldives	O	Absent	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Absent	Absent

Sixty-Fourth United Nations General Assembly Scorecard

	CD ²	Iran (GA)	Myanmar (GA)	Democratic People's Republic of Korea (GA)	Goldstone Report on Gaza Conflict (GA)	Combating Defamation of Religions (GA)	Amendment to the Role of the UN in Elections (Third Committee)	Outcome of the Durban Review Conference (GA)	Support for Treaty Body System	
									Amendment on Reporting Obligations to ICCPR (Third Committee)	Amendment on Non-Discrimination on ICESCR (GA)
<i>Vote Count</i>		Yes: 74 No: 49 Abstain: 59 Absent: 10	Yes: 86 No: 23 Abstain: 39 Absent: 44	Yes: 99 No: 20 Abstain: 63 Absent: 10	Yes: 114 No: 18 Abstain: 44 Absent: 16	Yes: 80 No: 61 Abstain: 42 Absent: 9	Yes: 121 No: 19 Abstain: 28 Absent: 24	Yes: 166 No: 7 Abstain: 9 Absent: 10	Yes: 70 No: 69 Abstain: 25 Absent: 28	Yes: 76 No: 72 Abstain: 26 Absent: 18
<i>Preferred Vote</i>		<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
Marshall Islands	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Absent	No ↑
Micronesia	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Absent	Absent	No ↑
Mongolia	P	Abstain	Yes	Absent	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Absent	Absent
Myanmar		No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Absent	Absent	Yes ↓
Nauru	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No ↑	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
Nepal	O	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain
Oman	O	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes
Pakistan	O	No	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes
Palau	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Absent	No ↑
Papua New Guinea	P	Yes ↑	Absent	Yes	Abstain	No ↑	Yes	Yes	No	No
Philippines	P	Abstain	Absent	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Qatar	O	No	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes
Republic of Korea	P	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Samoa	P	Yes	Absent ↓	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain
Saudi Arabia		Yes ↑	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes
Singapore		Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Abstain	Abstain
Solomon Islands		Yes ↑	Yes ↑	Yes ↑	Yes	Absent	Absent	Yes	Yes	Absent ↑

Sixty-Fourth United Nations General Assembly Scorecard

	CD ²	Iran (GA)	Myanmar (GA)	Democratic People's Republic of Korea (GA)	Goldstone Report on Gaza Conflict (GA)	Combating Defamation of Religions (GA)	Amendment to the Role of the UN in Elections (Third Committee)	Outcome of the Durban Review Conference (GA)	Support for Treaty Body System	
									Amendment on Reporting Obligations to ICCPR (Third Committee)	Amendment on Non-Discrimination on ICESCR (GA)
<i>Vote Count</i>		Yes: 74 No: 49 Abstain: 59 Absent: 10	Yes: 86 No: 23 Abstain: 39 Absent: 44	Yes: 99 No: 20 Abstain: 63 Absent: 10	Yes: 114 No: 18 Abstain: 44 Absent: 16	Yes: 80 No: 61 Abstain: 42 Absent: 9	Yes: 121 No: 19 Abstain: 28 Absent: 24	Yes: 166 No: 7 Abstain: 9 Absent: 10	Yes: 70 No: 69 Abstain: 25 Absent: 28	Yes: 76 No: 72 Abstain: 26 Absent: 18
<i>Preferred Vote</i>		<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
Sri Lanka		No	No	Abstain ↑	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain
Syria		No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tajikistan		No	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Absent	Yes	Abstain	Yes ↓
Thailand	P	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain
Timor-Leste	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No ↑	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain ↑
Tonga	O	Yes ↑	Yes ↑	Yes ↑	Abstain	No ↑	Absent	Abstain	Absent	Absent
Turkmenistan		No	Absent	Abstain	Absent	Yes	Absent	Yes	Absent	Yes ↓
Tuvalu	P	Abstain ↓	Absent	Yes ↑	Absent	Abstain	Absent	Yes	Absent	Yes ↓
United Arab Emirates		No ↓	Abstain	Yes ↑	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes
Uzbekistan		Absent ↑	Absent ↑	Absent ↑	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Absent	Yes ↓
Vanuatu	P	Yes	Absent	Yes	Absent	No ↑	Yes	Abstain	No	No
Viet Nam		No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Absent	Absent
Yemen	O	Absent ↑	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Absent	Yes	Yes	Yes
Eastern Europe										
Albania	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	No	No
Armenia	O	No	Yes	Absent	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	No	No
Azerbaijan	O	No	No	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Absent	Yes	No	Abstain ↓

Sixty-Fourth United Nations General Assembly Scorecard

	CD ²	Iran (GA)	Myanmar (GA)	Democratic People's Republic of Korea (GA)	Goldstone Report on Gaza Conflict (GA)	Combating Defamation of Religions (GA)	Amendment to the Role of the UN in Elections (Third Committee)	Outcome of the Durban Review Conference (GA)	Support for Treaty Body System	
									Amendment on Reporting Obligations to ICCPR (Third Committee)	Amendment on Non-Discrimination on ICESCR (GA)
<i>Vote Count</i>		Yes: 74 No: 49 Abstain: 59 Absent: 10	Yes: 86 No: 23 Abstain: 39 Absent: 44	Yes: 99 No: 20 Abstain: 63 Absent: 10	Yes: 114 No: 18 Abstain: 44 Absent: 16	Yes: 80 No: 61 Abstain: 42 Absent: 9	Yes: 121 No: 19 Abstain: 28 Absent: 24	Yes: 166 No: 7 Abstain: 9 Absent: 10	Yes: 70 No: 69 Abstain: 25 Absent: 28	Yes: 76 No: 72 Abstain: 26 Absent: 18
<i>Preferred Vote</i>		<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
Belarus		No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bosnia and Herzegovina	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	No	No
Bulgaria	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Croatia	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Czech Republic	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Abstain	No	No
Estonia	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Georgia	P	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Abstain	No	No
Hungary	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Latvia	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Lithuania	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Moldova	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Montenegro	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Poland	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Abstain	No	No
Romania	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Abstain	No	No
Russian	O	No	No	No	Abstain	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes ↓

Sixty-Fourth United Nations General Assembly Scorecard

	CD ²	Iran (GA)	Myanmar (GA)	Democratic People's Republic of Korea (GA)	Goldstone Report on Gaza Conflict (GA)	Combating Defamation of Religions (GA)	Amendment to the Role of the UN in Elections (Third Committee)	Outcome of the Durban Review Conference (GA)	Support for Treaty Body System	
									Amendment on Reporting Obligations to ICCPR (Third Committee)	Amendment on Non-Discrimination on ICESCR (GA)
<i>Vote Count</i>		Yes: 74 No: 49 Abstain: 59 Absent: 10	Yes: 86 No: 23 Abstain: 39 Absent: 44	Yes: 99 No: 20 Abstain: 63 Absent: 10	Yes: 114 No: 18 Abstain: 44 Absent: 16	Yes: 80 No: 61 Abstain: 42 Absent: 9	Yes: 121 No: 19 Abstain: 28 Absent: 24	Yes: 166 No: 7 Abstain: 9 Absent: 10	Yes: 70 No: 69 Abstain: 25 Absent: 28	Yes: 76 No: 72 Abstain: 26 Absent: 18
<i>Preferred Vote</i>		<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
Federation										
Serbia	P	Absent ↑	Absent	Absent	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Slovakia	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Slovenia	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Ukraine	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Latin America										
Antigua and Barbuda	P	Abstain	Yes ↑	Abstain	Yes	Abstain ↑	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain
Argentina	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	No	No
Bahamas	P	Abstain ↓	Abstain	Abstain ↓	Yes	Abstain ↑	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain
Barbados	P	Abstain	Absent	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain
Belize	P	Yes ↑	Absent	Yes	Yes	Abstain ↓	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain
Bolivia	P	No ↓	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Abstain ↓
Brazil	P	Abstain	Abstain ↓	Abstain	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain
Chile	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No ↑	Yes	Yes	No	No
Colombia	P	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	No	No
Costa Rica	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	No	No
Cuba		No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes ↓

Sixty-Fourth United Nations General Assembly Scorecard

	CD ²	Iran (GA)	Myanmar (GA)	Democratic People's Republic of Korea (GA)	Goldstone Report on Gaza Conflict (GA)	Combating Defamation of Religions (GA)	Amendment to the Role of the UN in Elections (Third Committee)	Outcome of the Durban Review Conference (GA)	Support for Treaty Body System	
									Amendment on Reporting Obligations to ICCPR (Third Committee)	Amendment on Non-Discrimination on ICESCR (GA)
<i>Vote Count</i>		Yes: 74 No: 49 Abstain: 59 Absent: 10	Yes: 86 No: 23 Abstain: 39 Absent: 44	Yes: 99 No: 20 Abstain: 63 Absent: 10	Yes: 114 No: 18 Abstain: 44 Absent: 16	Yes: 80 No: 61 Abstain: 42 Absent: 9	Yes: 121 No: 19 Abstain: 28 Absent: 24	Yes: 166 No: 7 Abstain: 9 Absent: 10	Yes: 70 No: 69 Abstain: 25 Absent: 28	Yes: 76 No: 72 Abstain: 26 Absent: 18
<i>Preferred Vote</i>		<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
Dominica	P	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Absent	Yes	Abstain	Yes ↓
Dominican Republic	P	Yes ↑	Abstain ↓	Abstain	Yes	Yes ↓	Yes	Yes	No	No
Ecuador	P	No	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	No	No
El Salvador	P	Yes	Absent	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Grenada	P	Abstain	Absent	Abstain	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain
Guatemala	P	Abstain	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	No	No
Guyana	P	Abstain	Yes ↑	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes ↓
Haiti	P	Abstain	Yes ↑	Abstain	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain
Honduras	P	Yes	Absent ↓	Yes	Absent	Abstain ↑	Yes	Yes	Absent	No ↑
Jamaica	P	Abstain	Yes ↑	Yes ↑	Yes	Abstain ↑	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes
Mexico	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No ↑	Yes	Yes	No	No
Nicaragua	O	No	No	Abstain	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Absent	Yes ↓
Panama	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No ↑	Yes	Yes	No	No
Paraguay	P	Abstain	Absent ↓	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	No	No
Peru	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	No	No
Saint Kitts and Nevis	P	Abstain	Absent	Abstain	Absent	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Absent	Absent
Saint Lucia	P	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	No ↑	Abstain	Yes	Abstain	Yes

Sixty-Fourth United Nations General Assembly Scorecard

	CD ²	Iran (GA)	Myanmar (GA)	Democratic People's Republic of Korea (GA)	Goldstone Report on Gaza Conflict (GA)	Combating Defamation of Religions (GA)	Amendment to the Role of the UN in Elections (Third Committee)	Outcome of the Durban Review Conference (GA)	Support for Treaty Body System	
									Amendment on Reporting Obligations to ICCPR (Third Committee)	Amendment on Non-Discrimination on ICESCR (GA)
<i>Vote Count</i>		Yes: 74 No: 49 Abstain: 59 Absent: 10	Yes: 86 No: 23 Abstain: 39 Absent: 44	Yes: 99 No: 20 Abstain: 63 Absent: 10	Yes: 114 No: 18 Abstain: 44 Absent: 16	Yes: 80 No: 61 Abstain: 42 Absent: 9	Yes: 121 No: 19 Abstain: 28 Absent: 24	Yes: 166 No: 7 Abstain: 9 Absent: 10	Yes: 70 No: 69 Abstain: 25 Absent: 28	Yes: 76 No: 72 Abstain: 26 Absent: 18
<i>Preferred Vote</i>		<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	P	Abstain	Absent	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Abstain	Yes ↓
Suriname	P	Abstain	Absent	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain
Trinidad and Tobago	P	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Yes	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain
Uruguay	P	Abstain	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No ↑	Yes	Yes	No	No
Venezuela		No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Absent	Absent ↓
Western Europe and Others										
Andorra	P	Yes	Yes ↑	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Australia	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Austria	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Belgium	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Canada	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Denmark	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Finland	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
France	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Germany	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Abstain	No	No

Sixty-Fourth United Nations General Assembly Scorecard

	CD ²	Iran (GA)	Myanmar (GA)	Democratic People's Republic of Korea (GA)	Goldstone Report on Gaza Conflict (GA)	Combating Defamation of Religions (GA)	Amendment to the Role of the UN in Elections (Third Committee)	Outcome of the Durban Review Conference (GA)	Support for Treaty Body System	
									Amendment on Reporting Obligations to ICCPR (Third Committee)	Amendment on Non-Discrimination on ICESCR (GA)
<i>Vote Count</i>		Yes: 74 No: 49 Abstain: 59 Absent: 10	Yes: 86 No: 23 Abstain: 39 Absent: 44	Yes: 99 No: 20 Abstain: 63 Absent: 10	Yes: 114 No: 18 Abstain: 44 Absent: 16	Yes: 80 No: 61 Abstain: 42 Absent: 9	Yes: 121 No: 19 Abstain: 28 Absent: 24	Yes: 166 No: 7 Abstain: 9 Absent: 10	Yes: 70 No: 69 Abstain: 25 Absent: 28	Yes: 76 No: 72 Abstain: 26 Absent: 18
<i>Preferred Vote</i>		<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
Greece	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Iceland	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Ireland	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Israel	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Italy	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Abstain	No	No
Liechtenstein	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Luxembourg	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Malta	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Monaco	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Absent	Absent	No
Netherlands	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
New Zealand	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No ↑	Yes	Abstain	No	No
Norway	P	Yes	Abstain ↓°	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Portugal	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
San Marino	P	Yes	Absent ↓	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Spain	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Sweden	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Switzerland	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Turkey	P	Absent	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
United Kingdom	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	Yes	Yes	No	No

Sixty-Fourth United Nations General Assembly Scorecard

	CD ²	Iran (GA)	Myanmar (GA)	Democratic People's Republic of Korea (GA)	Goldstone Report on Gaza Conflict (GA)	Combating Defamation of Religions (GA)	Amendment to the Role of the UN in Elections (Third Committee)	Outcome of the Durban Review Conference (GA)	Support for Treaty Body System	
									Amendment on Reporting Obligations to ICCPR (Third Committee)	Amendment on Non-Discrimination on ICESCR (GA)
<i>Vote Count</i>		Yes: 74 No: 49 Abstain: 59 Absent: 10	Yes: 86 No: 23 Abstain: 39 Absent: 44	Yes: 99 No: 20 Abstain: 63 Absent: 10	Yes: 114 No: 18 Abstain: 44 Absent: 16	Yes: 80 No: 61 Abstain: 42 Absent: 9	Yes: 121 No: 19 Abstain: 28 Absent: 24	Yes: 166 No: 7 Abstain: 9 Absent: 10	Yes: 70 No: 69 Abstain: 25 Absent: 28	Yes: 76 No: 72 Abstain: 26 Absent: 18
<i>Preferred Vote</i>		<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
United States of America	P	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No

* Kiribati is not a member of any regional group.

° Norway stated after the vote that it had intended to vote yes.