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Mr. President,

I have the honour to deliver this statement on behalf of the Group of Friends of R2P.

We thank the Special Rapporteur and the Special Adviser of the Secretary-General for their substantive joint study.

Preventing genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing is the raison d’etre of R2P. The report underlines that violations and abuses of human rights can lead to atrocities and related crimes. We appreciate the unpacking in the joint study of the objectives of atrocity prevention and the place of transitional justice processes in this context.

We also appreciate the many examples of the usefulness of the Framework of Analysis for Atrocity Crimes, produced by the Joint Office for Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect.

Mr. Special Rapporteur, Mr. Special Adviser of the Secretary-General,

You note that expertise on prevention is scattered across various disciplines. You propose a framework approach in order to strengthen upstream prevention. How should the UN go about it and what role do you propose for the HRC?

You recommend a joint assessment of the vulnerability of each country to atrocities at the country level. We acknowledge that this recommendation is sensitive to the fact that each situation is context-specific. Likewise, you recommend that a comprehensive prevention framework should be developed. In practice, which entity within the UN system should have the lead, especially if this recommendation is not universally accepted by states? Is there merit in assisting States in assessing their vulnerability to atrocities?

Thank you.