

### State-by-State Positions on the Responsibility to Protect

Country / Group	Embraces the Responsibility to Protect	Clarifications in Endorsement	Rejects R2P	Other Issue Links	Group (if noted)
Albania					EU
Algeria	No comment on R2P				NAM AG
Andorra					
Argentina	Yes -Also acknowledges and challenges reasons for dissent.				
Armenia					
Australia	Yes	Endorsement includes: “unable or unwilling;” “including Chapter VI and VIII;” and reference to regional organizations.			
Bangladesh					NAM
Barbados					G-77
Belarus					
Brazil	Unclear	Supports R2P definition in Draft Outcome Document as a “basis for further improvement.” “Collective action... must be agreed by and implemented through the Security Council.”			
Bulgaria					EU
Cameroon					NAM G-77 AG
Canada	Yes	Endorsement includes: “sovereignty entails responsibility;” “unwilling or unable;” “including Chapter VI, VII, VIII” language.			
Chile	Yes	Supports the R2P paragraph of the draft outcome document (72). Embraces R2P as a continuum of responses. Strong Language.			
China	No		Advocates for the status-quo by hedging on the international community’s responsibilities, requesting further discussion and deferring to the Security Council.		

Country / Group	Embraces R2P	Clarifications in Endorsement	Rejects R2P	Other Issue Links	Group (if noted)
Colombia	Yes	Supports R2P draft outcome document language. Feels that "participation of regional organizations is essential" Looks to para. 72 to "create legal framework in implementation of R2P"			
Costa Rica					EU
Cote D'Ivoire					NAM AG
Croatia	Yes	-Notes interconnectivity of human rights, security and development -Acknowledges the importance of the R2P.		Human security	EU
Cuba	No		-Rejects the attempt to impose the acceptance of R2P -"will only facilitate interference, pressure and intervention in the domestic affairs of our States by the superpowers and their allies"		NAM
Denmark					EU
Dominica					
Egypt	No		-There is no shared responsibility outside of the responsibility of the state to protect its own citizens and the responsibility of the Security Council to address matters of international peace and security. -Referred to a responsibility to prevent in the section on peace and security.		NAM G-77
El Salvador					
Fiji	No comment on R2P (Para on peacekeeping includes R2P-like language)				
France	Yes	-Embraces language of R2P -It should highlight the international community's duty to step in through the Security Council.			EU
Germany	No comment on R2P				EU

Country / Group	Embraces R2P	Clarifications in Endorsement	Rejects R2P	Other Issue Links	Group (if noted)
Guatemala					G-77 NAM
Guinea-Bissau					
Guyana					
Holy See	Unclear	Addresses R2P and 'use of force' in the same paragraph, with no elaboration on their position with respect to R2P. Suggests that the 'criteria for the use of force' from the SG report be reinserted into these paragraphs.			
Iceland	Yes	-Supports R2P -Concept of urgency should be added to text -Agrees with Canada's statement			
India	No comment on R2P				NAM G-77
Indonesia					G-77 NAM
Iran	No		R2P is too vague		NAM G-77 & China
Israel	Yes				EU
Italy	No comment on R2P				
Jamaica	Spoke on behalf of G-77 and China (see below)				
Japan	Yes	-Supports R2P -Text should go further to represent R2P as a continuum- "prevention, response, development, assistance, and capacity-building, and only as a last resort, to the use of force."			
Jordan	Yes				
Kazakhstan	No comment on R2P				
Kenya	No comment on R2P				G77, China, AG
Korea	Yes – urges members to come to an agreement on R2P	"We should establish concrete mechanisms and modalities for carrying out this responsibility, which must be properly defined and delimited in order to alleviate concerns over encroachment of sovereignty."			
Kuwait					
Kyrgyzstan					

Country / Group	Embraces R2P	Clarifications in Endorsement	Rejects R2P	Other Issue Links	Group (if noted)
Lao					
Libya					NAM AG
Liechtenstein	Yes	-Supports explicit language in draft outcome document -Language should not be diluted in final draft			
Macedonia					EU
Malaysia	Y/N		Recommends further discussion on R2P by the GA. In order to reflect urgency in this matter, Malaysia recommends that there be a commitment to take this up in the 60 <sup>th</sup> session of the GA.		NAM G-77
Mali					
Marshall Islands					
Mexico	Yes – proposes additional language to strengthen R2P	“...emphasizing that the concept is a continuum and that it therefore includes prevention and international assistance, including development and capacity building.”			
Moldova					EU
Mongolia	No comment on R2P				NAM G-77
Morocco	No comment on R2P				
Netherlands					
New Zealand	Yes	-Emphasizes that protection is within the parameters of international law and provisions of UN Charter			
Nigeria	No comment on R2P				NAM AG
Norway	Yes				

Country / Group	Embraces R2P	Clarifications in Endorsement	Rejects R2P	Other Issue Links	Group (if noted)
Pakistan	No		- "...measures to promote protection of civilians should not become a basis to contravene the principles of non-interference and non-intervention or question the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of States" -Suggests that the section be retitled "Protection of Civilians"		
Palestine	No Comment on R2P				NAM G-77
Panama	Yes	Clearly supports the principles of R2P, however, does propose that there be some continued dialogue in the GA on criteria.			
Peru	Yes	-Intervention can only occur when there is no other alternative - "...regimes that violate the Geneva Convention, the Convention against Genocide and the international humanitarian law, also violate the international law and can be intervened by the United Nations"			
Portugal	No Comment on R2P – fully aligned with EU (Y)				EU
Qatar					NAM
Romania					EU
Russia	No		-There is not sufficient understanding of the concept of R2P -The UN is capable of responding to crises under current situation.		
Rwanda					
Senegal					NAM
Serbia and Montenegro					EU

Country / Group	Embraces R2P	Clarifications in Endorsement	Rejects R2P	Other Issue Links	Group (if noted)
Singapore	Yes	Supports more discussion, but expresses desire to have these discussions to discuss clear criteria urgently. Does indicate strong support for the principles of R2P.			
South Africa	Yes	The text should be linked to exceptional circumstances so as not to be misused.			NAM G77 & China
Spain	Yes				EU
Sri Lanka	Yes	Would like very clear language on the appropriate use of action.			EU
Sweden					EU
Switzerland	No comment on R2P				
Syria	Arabic Only				
Tanzania	Yes - Very strong, enumerated support. -Directly challenged the NAM position				AG G-77
Tunisia					NAM AG
Turkey	No comment on R2P – fully aligns with EU (Y)				EU
Uganda	No comment on R2P				
U.K.	Yes	-We need internationally agreed framework to protect vulnerable -Only in extreme cases would military force be used -Fulfill responsibilities to weak on case-by-case basis -This is not about the West trying to find excuses to intervene			EU
Ukraine					EU
U.S.	Yes/no	Supportive language of the principles of R2P, however, the statement never refers to 'responsibility' and uses weak language with respect to considering reaction.			
Venezuela	No		R2P will only serve the interests of powerful states.		

Country / Group	Embraces R2P	Clarifications in Endorsement	Rejects R2P	Other Issue Links	Group (if noted)
Vietnam	No		R2P is a reincarnation of humanitarian intervention.		NAM G-77
<b>GROUPS</b>					
African Group (Mauritania)	No Comment on R2P				AG G-77
CARICOM	Unclear / No		Welcomes “the opportunity to discuss concept further.” Could give support for R2P if “necessary safeguards are put in place to ensure respect for the principles set forth in Charter and international law.”		Jamaica on behalf of G77 and China
European Union (Luxembourg)	Yes -Strong, enumerated support.				EU
EU – European Parliament Resolution	Yes	- Supports R2P as presented in the HLP report. - Addressed R2P in the same paragraph as ‘use of force.’			
GUAMM (Azerbaijan)	No comment on R2P				
G-77 and China (Jamaica)	No comment on R2P. Proposes a new paragraph 2 for the Values and Principles section of the report that emphasizes strict adherence to the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity.				
IUCNNR					
Non-Aligned Movement (Malaysia)	No		R2P is a reincarnation of humanitarian intervention. No basis for ‘humanitarian intervention’ in the Charter or Law.		
Tuvalu (Alliance of Small Island States)					
Rio Group	No comment on R2P				