

Mandates of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions; the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism; and the Special Rapporteur on the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment.

Ref.: AL USA 43/2025
(Please use this reference in your reply)

26 December 2025

Excellency,

We have the honour to address you in our capacities as Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions; Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism; and Special Rapporteur on the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment., pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 53/4, 58/14 and 55/2.

In this connection, we would like to bring to the attention of your Excellency's Government information we have received concerning **two separate rounds of military strikes conducted by the United States Air Force in Yemen on 17 April and 28 April 2025. These strikes reportedly resulted, respectively, in the death of 74 and 68 individuals, in addition to the injury of 171 and 47 others.** These incidents raise serious concerns regarding the compliance of the United States Government with its fundamental legal obligations under international humanitarian law (IHL) and international human rights law (IHRL), particularly in relation to the protection of the right to life.

According to the information received:

Between 15 March and 6 May 2025, forces of the United States conducted an air and naval strike campaign in Yemen referred to as "Operation Rough Rider." On 27 April 2025, United States Central Command (USCENTCOM) stated that, since 15 March 2025, the campaign had struck more than 800 targets, including command-and-control sites, air defence systems, and advanced weapons manufacturing and storage facilities, with the stated aim of restoring freedom of navigation and deterrence.¹ By 1 May 2025, officials were cited as indicating that more than 1,000 targets had been hit since mid-March 2025. Open source reporting indicates concentrations of strikes in Sa'ada, Sana'a and Hudaydah; between 15 March and 18 April 2025, 207 attacks in Yemen were recorded, reportedly resulting in at least 209 fatalities.

Several strikes during this period have reportedly affected civilians and civilian infrastructure. In particular, the 17 April 2025 strikes on the Ras Issa Oil Terminal (Hudaydah) and the 28 April 2025 strike on the Sa'ada Remand Prison were associated with the highest reported civilian casualties.

¹ United States Central Command (USCENTCOM), "USCENTCOM Forces Continue to Target Houthi Terrorists," press release, 27 April 2025, Release No. 20250427-01, available at: <https://www.centcom.mil/MEDIA/PRESS-RELEASES/Press-Release-View/Article/4167047/uscentcom-forces-continue-to-target-houthi-terrorists/> (accessed on 12 November 2025).

Houthi de facto authorities and affiliated media alleged widespread civilian harm arising from United States strikes, including on residential buildings and civilian infrastructure, reporting 123 killed and 247 wounded between 15 March and 15 April 2025.

On 6 May 2025, Oman's Ministry of Foreign Affairs announced a ceasefire agreement between the United States and Ansar Allah facilitated by Oman's mediation, with both parties committing to refrain from targeting each other and ensuring the safety of US ships in the Red Sea and Bab al-Mandab Strait.²

The military strikes conducted by the United States of America on the Ras Issa Oil Terminal on 17 April 2025

Ras Issa Terminal is Yemen's secondlargest oil export facility, situated on Yemen's Red Sea coast near Al-Salif in the Hudaydah Governorate in Western Yemen.

Ansar Allah took control of the terminal as they captured the governorate of Hudaydah in 2015. As most of the Ma'rib Governorate remained in the control of Internationally Recognized Government, the main function of the Terminal changed from export to import of gasoline, diesel and liquefied petroleum gas import terminal and to generate a very important revenue stream. Reportedly, the Terminal provides 90 per cent of fuel imports, around 60 per cent of food imports in the areas under the control of Ansar Allah, and through which 80 per cent of humanitarian assistance passes.

On 17 April 2025, between 10.00 and 11.00pm (Yemen Standard Time), the U.S. forces launched an air campaign against Ras Issa Terminal, striking multiple fuel storage tanks, truck marshalling zones, and adjacent service areas. According to Ansar Allah affiliated media, the U.S. launched a total of 14 air strikes in two waves, targeting Ras Issa Oil Terminal. Strikes continued through the morning of 18 April 2025.

The U.S. strikes killed at least 74 individuals, of whom 3 children, and injured 171 others, of whom 5 humanitarian aid workers, making the 17 April strikes the deadliest attack on Yemen since the commencement of the United States' extensive campaign of aerial and naval operations known as "Operation Rough Rider". Documentation by civil society organizations estimate that the number of fatalities reached a total of 84 civilians.

On the same day, 17 April 2025, the USCENTCOM claimed responsibility for the attack, noting that Ansar Allah used fuel to "sustain their military operations, as a weapon of control, and to benefit economically from embezzling the profits from the import."³ In an X post, USCENTCOM further underlined that the U.S forces had taken actions to "eliminate this fuel source," to "weaken the Houthis'

² Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Oman) [@FMofOman], "#Statement ...," **post on X (in Arabic)**, 6 May 2025, available at: <https://x.com/FMofOman/status/1919815759892459667> (accessed 13 November 2025).

³ United States Central Command (USCENTCOM), "Destruction of Houthi Controlled Ras Isa Fuel Port," **Statement**, 17 April 2025, available at: <https://www.centcom.mil/MEDIA/STATEMENTS/Statements-View/Article/4159042/destruction-of-houthi-controlled-ras-isa-fuel-port/> (accessed 13 November 2025).

economic power source, as they continue to exploit and harm their own citizens. The intent of this strike was not to harm the Yemeni people, who rightly seek to break free from the yoke of Houthi rule and live in peace.”⁴

Video footage from the impact site showed fires, smoke plumes, and visible damage to considerable areas of port infrastructure. Satellite images evidenced widespread damage to fuel storage tanks, several berths, the customs area and cargo unloading zones. The damage to the port accelerated the fuel crisis in Yemen, which escalated in late April 2025 and had an important impact on fuel prices.

The strikes and the news of high civilian casualties created mass panic in surrounding communities and Hudaydah as families searched through hospitals⁵ and morgues in desperation. The process of identification was harrowing as some bodies were severely disfigured.

The high civilian casualties are believed to have been caused by targeting the multiple fuel trucks and other vehicles congregating sites, where individuals were present in sizable numbers. According to information received, the shift workers, drivers and other workers were present at ‘packing platforms, material trailers and the checkout or collection hangars when the strikes happened. Reportedly, five paramedics, who responded to the strikes, were among the casualties of the second wave of the strikes.

The UN Secretary General issued a statement warning against actions likely to exacerbate civilian harm and called for restraint in the region. The UN Special Envoy for Yemen expressed grave concerns about the impact of strikes on civilians and civilian infrastructure and cautioned against the cycle of attacks by Ansar Allah on the Red Sea and the US airstrikes in response, calling for de-escalation.

Following the airstrike on 17 April the United States continued to target Ras Isa Terminal. On 25 April, United States’ aircraft launched a new wave of strikes targeting the Ras Isa Terminal, injuring three Russian crew members of a tanker offloading its cargo at the port. On 26 April, media reported, which was corroborated by the *de facto* authorities reported that three Russian sailors were injured when a U.S. airstrike hit Ras Isa Terminal, where their vessel was present in anchorage.⁶ The Russian Embassy in Yemen later confirmed that all three sailors were transferred to Moscow on 2 May to complete their medical treatment.⁷ Most recently, on 6 May, media reports indicated that U.S. aircrafts

⁴ United States Central Command (Arabic) [@CENTCOMArabic], “تدمير منصة الوقود في ميناء رأس عيسى الذي يسيطر عليه”، **post on X (formerly Twitter)**, 17 April 2025, available at: <https://x.com/CENTCOMArabic/status/1912942405894213764> (accessed 13 November 2025).

⁵ These hospitals are Al-Hudaydah Specialized Hospital (Private), Al-Amal Hospital (Private), Al-Anhar Hospital (Private), Al-Thawra General Hospital (Government).

⁶ The Maritime Executive, “TASS: Three Russian Seafarers Injured in U.S. Airstrike on Ras Isa”, 29 April 2025, available at: <https://maritime-executive.com/article/tass-three-russian-sailors-were-injured-in-u-s-airstrike> (accessed 15 December 2025).

⁷ IZ.RU (Izvestia), “Russian Embassy Announces Arrival in Moscow of Sailors Injured in Strike on Yemen”, 5 May 2025, available at: <https://en.iz.ru/en/1881585/2025-05-05/russian-embassy-announced-arrival-moscow-sailors-injured-strike-yemen> (accessed 15 December 2025).

conducted three additional airstrikes on Ras Isa Terminal.

The reported economic impact of the attack on the Ras Issa Oil Terminal includes restrictions on petroleum imports through military action or economic sanctions, severely disrupting essential services, including water, electricity, transportation and will directly affect the functioning of hospitals, educational institutions, and other vital public facilities within DFA-controlled territories. In particular, the densely populated urban centers such as Sana'a, Dhamar, Hudaydah, and Hajjah are at heightened risk of experiencing a significant paralysis of basic services, coupled with increase in transportation costs and food prices. This deterioration will inevitably deepen the daily hardships faced by residents, placing them in an increasingly precarious and challenging situation.

The military strikes conducted by the United States of America on the Sa'ada Remand Prison on 28 April 2025

The Sa'ada Remand Prison is located on the outskirts of Sa'ada City, in the Sa'ada Governorate, North-Western Yemen. The prison occupies an area of approximately 51.5 acres. As of April 2025, the center had a detainee population of approximately 115 individuals and had been used by Ansar Allah to detain undocumented migrants mostly from Ethiopia and Somalia, who were attempting to reach Saudi Arabia via Yemen. Reports indicate that the site of the prison had been used as a "Security Camp" until mid2020, and since transformed into a detention facility, which had been repeatedly visited by international humanitarian actors since 2021, including by a visit by an UN interagency team, on 28 January 2022, which confirmed that there were no 'signs indicating that this site, formerly a barracks, continues to have a military function.' The ICRC had also regularly visited the detention facility to ensure humane treatment and conditions.

On 28 April 2025, shortly before 05:00 local time, the United States Air Force conducted three airstrikes on the prison using high-precision munitions such as GBU-39 bombs. The attack resulted in the death of 68 civilian detainees and injuries to 47 others, mostly men. The immediate humanitarian response was constrained by both the security situation, as well as the humanitarian access restrictions to the site. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) announced⁸ that it assisted the Yemeni Red Crescent Society during response efforts, including by facilitating the evacuation of injured and ensuring the dignified management of the deceased. The United States government acknowledged that the strike had potentially caused the death of civilians and announced that a battle damage assessment was underway.

In the days following the attack, the United Nations, the UN Special Envoy for Yemen, the International Organization for Migration and the ICRC

⁸ International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), "Yemen: ICRC responds to deadly attack on Sa'ada Prison, urges for protection of civilians amidst worsening humanitarian crisis", News release, 28 April 2025, available at: <https://www.icrc.org/en/news-release/yemen-icrc-responds-deadly-attack-saada-prison-urges-protection-civilians-amidst> (accessed 15 December 2025).

acknowledged the strike. Several human rights organizations condemned the attack and have called for an independent and transparent investigation.

While we do not wish to prejudge the accuracy of these allegations, we express grave concern at the reported civilian harm resulting from the United States airstrikes on the **Ras Issa Oil Terminal** and the **Sa'ada Remand Prison**. The information received raises serious concerns as to the United States' compliance with its obligations under international humanitarian law (IHL), in particular the principles of distinction, proportionality and precautions in the conduct of hostilities. The reported scale of death and injury among civilians further engages the State's obligations to respect and ensure the right to life under international human rights law (IHRL), including the prohibition of arbitrary deprivation of life, as set out in article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).

We remind your Excellency's Government that parties to an armed conflict, whether international or non-international, must at all times distinguish between civilians and combatants, and between civilian objects and military objectives, and may direct attacks only against military objectives. In case of doubt, an object normally dedicated to civilian purposes must be presumed not to be used for military purposes. Indiscriminate attacks, and attacks that may be expected to cause incidental civilian death or injury excessive in relation to the concrete and direct military advantage anticipated, are prohibited. Parties must also take all feasible precautions to verify targets and to choose means and methods of attack with a view to avoiding, and in any event minimizing, incidental civilian harm, and must cancel or suspend an attack if it becomes apparent that it would be unlawful.

With specific regard to the Sa'ada Remand Prison, we are deeply alarmed by the information received indicating that the facility was a known detention site, reportedly used primarily to hold African migrants, and that it was struck using precision-guided munitions, reportedly including GBU-39 bombs. In view of the apparent civilian character of persons held at the site, and the presumptively civilian status of the detention facility absent reliable information establishing its use as a military objective at the time of the strike, these allegations raise serious concerns that, if substantiated and insofar as they occurred in the context of and were associated with an armed conflict, they may amount to war crimes under international law, including intentionally directing attacks against civilians or civilian objects, or launching an indiscriminate or disproportionate attack resulting in civilian death or injury.

We are further alarmed by information received that humanitarian relief and medical personnel, and other civilian first responders, were struck while carrying out rescue and assistance activities following the incident at the Ras Issa Oil Terminal, including reportedly through "double-tap" strikes launched in rapid succession at or near the same location. Under IHL, humanitarian relief personnel and objects, as well as medical personnel, units and transports, must be respected and protected and must not be made the object of attack. In addition, the wounded and sick must likewise be respected and protected. Parties to the conflict must take all feasible precautions, including to verify that targets are military objectives and to avoid, and in any event minimize, incidental civilian harm, and must cancel or suspend an attack if it becomes apparent that the target is not a military objective or that the attack would be disproportionate. In these circumstances, intentionally directing attacks against

protected humanitarian or medical personnel or objects, or carrying out double-tap strikes in circumstances indicating a failure to take feasible precautions to spare civilian rescuers, may amount to serious violations of IHL and to war crimes under international law.

We are concerned that military strikes affecting fuel imports may severely disrupt essential services, including water, electricity, transport and hospital functioning, particularly in densely populated urban centres, and may lead to increased transport costs and food prices, thereby deepening humanitarian hardship.

Additionally, bombing civilian infrastructures of such importance could deepen famine, fuel disease outbreaks, and worsen the suffering of millions of Yemenis. These actions created a situation where residents are struggling to meet their basic needs, impacting the public health, sanitation, and mental wellbeing of the population in Yemen.

We further recall that the right to life is protected under IHRL, including the ICCPR, which provides that every human being has the inherent right to life and that no one shall be arbitrarily deprived of life. This right is non-derogable. The Human Rights Committee has emphasized that, in situations of armed conflict, IHL and IHRL are complementary: uses of lethal force that comply with IHL will in principle not be “arbitrary” for purposes of article 6 ICCPR, whereas conduct inconsistent with IHL—such as the targeting of civilians and civilian objects, indiscriminate attacks, or failure to take feasible precautions to prevent civilian death—may entail violations of article 6 of the Covenant. We further recall that the right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment is fundamental to the enjoyment of the right to life and has been explicitly recognized by the United Nations General Assembly and the Human Rights Council.

We further note the Human Rights Committee’s interpretation that a State party’s obligations under article 6 extend to all persons subject to its jurisdiction, including persons over whose enjoyment of the right to life it exercises power or effective control, and also to persons outside its territory whose right to life is affected by the State’s military or other activities in a direct and reasonably foreseeable manner. In this regard, allegations of lethal operations affecting civilians abroad may engage the State’s obligations under article 6 ICCPR, alongside the applicable rules of IHL.

Finally, we underscore the obligation to ensure accountability for potentially unlawful deprivation of life. Under IHRL, States have a duty to conduct prompt, effective, thorough, independent and impartial investigations into potentially unlawful deaths and, where the evidence so warrants, to prosecute those responsible. A failure to conduct effective investigations and to pursue accountability where warranted is incompatible with the duty to protect the right to life and to ensure an effective remedy. The Human Rights Committee has further stated that States must investigate alleged violations of article 6 in situations of armed conflict in accordance with relevant international standards.

Under customary IHL, war crimes must be investigated and, where appropriate, prosecuted. Responsibility may extend beyond direct perpetrators to those who ordered or otherwise bear responsibility, including through command responsibility where

commanders knew or, owing to the circumstances at the time, should have known of crimes and failed to take necessary and reasonable measures within their power to prevent them or to submit the matter to competent authorities for investigation and prosecution. Investigations into potentially unlawful deaths should therefore also examine the role of officials in the chain of command and any systemic or policy failures that may have contributed to the harm.

We further urge all parties to the conflict to immediately ensure full, safe and unhindered access for independent human rights monitors, including OHCHR, so as to facilitate accurate documentation and reporting, preserve evidence, and support remedies for victims and accountability measures consistent with international law, thereby contributing to justice and the rule of law.

In connection with the above alleged facts and concerns, please refer to the **Annex on Reference to international human rights law** attached to this letter which cites international human rights instruments and standards relevant to these allegations.

As it is our responsibility, under the mandates provided to us by the Human Rights Council, to seek to clarify all cases brought to our attention, we would be grateful for your observations on the following matters:

1. Please provide any additional information and/or comment(s) you may have on the above-mentioned allegations.
2. Please provide thorough information on measures taken by the United States military to ensure that the airstrikes targeting Ras Issa Oil Terminal and Sa'ada Remand Prison comply with the principles of distinction, proportionality, and precaution as guaranteed under international humanitarian law.
3. Kindly provide detailed information on the result of any investigations conducted on the loss of civilian life and environmental harm as a result of the aforementioned airstrikes, and to hold those responsible to account. If no investigations have been initiated, please explain why and how this would comply with the United States obligations to protect the right to life under IHRL and IHL.
4. Please provide detailed information as to how the United States is safeguarding the rights of civilians in Yemen despite its ongoing military activities, as was recommended by the United Nations Group of Eminent International and Regional Experts on Yemen, including through the review of the targeting procedures to ensure compliance with IHL principles and prevent future civilian harm.
5. Please provide information on the measures taken to ensure that the victims of these attacks, as well as their families, have access to mechanisms of reparation and compensation.

This communication and any response received from your Excellency's Government will be made public via the communications reporting [website](#) within

60 days. They will also subsequently be made available in the usual report to be presented to the Human Rights Council.

While awaiting a reply, we urge that all necessary interim measures be taken to halt the alleged violations and prevent their re-occurrence and in the event that the investigations support or suggest the allegations to be correct, to ensure the accountability of any person(s) responsible for the alleged violations.

We may publicly express our concerns in the near future as, in our view, the information upon which the press release will be based is sufficiently reliable to indicate a matter warranting immediate attention. We also believe that the wider public should be alerted to the potential implications of the above-mentioned allegations. The press release will indicate that we have been in contact with your Excellency's Government's to clarify the issue/s in question.

Please be informed that a copy of this letter has been also sent to the Government of Yemen, as well as to the de-facto authorities in Sana'a.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of our highest consideration.

Morris Tidball-Binz

Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions

Ben Saul

Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism

Astrid Puentes Riaño

Special Rapporteur on the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment

Annex

Reference to international human rights law

In connection with above alleged facts and concerns, we recall the relevant obligations of your Excellency's Government under international human rights law (IHRL) and international humanitarian law (IHL), as well as authoritative guidance on their interpretation.

International human rights law

The Right to Life

We would like to refer to article 3 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which provides that every individual has the right to life, liberty and security of the person. The right to life constitutes a jus cogens, peremptory norm from which no derogation is permitted. In its general comment 36, paragraph 2, the Human Rights Committee notes that article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), ratified by your Excellency's Government on 8 September 1992, recognizes and protects the right to life of all human beings without derogation even in situations of armed conflict.

The Human Rights Committee has further clarified that, in situations of armed conflict, IHL and IHRL are complementary. In particular, practices inconsistent with IHL that entail a risk to the lives of civilians and other protected persons—such as directing attacks against civilians or civilian objects, indiscriminate attacks, or failure to apply precaution and proportionality—may also amount to a violation of article 6 of the ICCPR. The Committee has also indicated that States should, in general, disclose the criteria for attacking individuals or objects with lethal force where deprivation of life is expected, including the legal basis for attacks, the process of target identification, the means and methods used, and whether less harmful alternatives were considered, and must investigate alleged or suspected violations of article 6 in armed conflict in accordance with relevant international standards.

Extraterritorial application: The Human Rights Committee has interpreted States parties' obligations under article 6 as extending to all persons subject to their jurisdiction, including persons over whose enjoyment of the right to life a State exercises power or effective control, and also to persons outside the State's territory whose right to life is affected by the State's military or other activities in a direct and reasonably foreseeable manner. In this regard, allegations of lethal operations affecting civilians abroad may engage the State's obligations under article 6 ICCPR, alongside the applicable rules of IHL.

Positive obligations to protect life, including in relation to essential services: The Human Rights Committee has further emphasized that the duty to protect life under article 6 also entails positive obligations to address general conditions in society that may give rise to direct threats to life or prevent individuals from enjoying their right to life with dignity, including where relevant through ensuring access, without delay, to essential goods and services.

In addition, we recall relevant international standards on economic and social rights closely linked to survival and human dignity, including the rights to adequate food and to the highest attainable standard of health under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), and the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights' authoritative interpretation of these rights. Where a State has signed but not ratified a treaty, the obligation to refrain from acts that would defeat its object and purpose is reflected in article 18 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Duty to investigate, prosecute, and provide an effective remedy: We underline that IHRL requires effective remedies for violations, including through prompt, thorough, independent and impartial investigations into potentially unlawful deaths, and, where the evidence so warrants, the prosecution of those responsible. The Human Rights Committee has affirmed that investigations into alleged violations of article 6 must be independent, impartial, prompt, thorough, effective, credible, transparent, allow victims' participation, and should be guided by relevant international standards, including the Minnesota Protocol on the Investigation of Potentially Unlawful Death.

In his report to the 50th session of the Human Rights Council (A/HRC/50/34, para. 80), the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions has similarly underscored that the duty to investigate the cause and manner of potentially unlawful deaths promptly, thoroughly, effectively, independently, impartially and transparently is integral to the right to life, and applies without distinction of any kind.

Rights to food, health and water in relation to the right to life

We also recall that the Human Rights Committee has affirmed that the right to life should not be interpreted narrowly and entails positive obligations where necessary to ensure access without delay to essential goods and services required to sustain life, including food and health-related services.

With respect to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), we note that the United States signed the Covenant on 5 October 1977. We recall that articles 11 and 12 of the ICESCR address the rights to an adequate standard of living (including adequate food) and to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, which are particularly implicated where disruption of fuel supplies foreseeably affects water, sanitation, food supply chains and the functioning of hospitals and other essential services.

Right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment

We recall that environmental harm can affect the enjoyment of human rights, including the right to life. The Human Rights Committee has recognized that environmental degradation may give rise to direct threats to life or prevent individuals from enjoying the right to life with dignity. We further recall Human Rights Council resolution 48/13 and General Assembly resolution 76/300 recognizing the right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment, as well as the Framework Principles on

Human Rights and the Environment presented by the Special Rapporteur in A/HRC/37/59.

We recall that customary IHL further requires that the natural environment be considered within the applicable conduct-of-hostilities rules, including distinction, proportionality and precautions, and prohibits attacks against military objectives which may be expected to cause incidental environmental damage excessive in relation to the concrete and direct military advantage anticipated.

International humanitarian law

We recall that IHL applicable in armed conflict, including customary IHL, binds all parties and regulates the conduct of hostilities, including through the principles of distinction, proportionality, and precautions in attack, as well as rules on warnings, and special protections for medical and humanitarian personnel.

Principle of distinction

We underline that parties to an armed conflict must at all times distinguish between civilians and combatants, and between civilian objects and military objectives, and may direct attacks only against military objectives. Civilian objects may not be attacked unless and for such time as they become military objectives; in case of doubt, an object normally dedicated to civilian purposes must be presumed not to be used for military purposes.

We further recall that a “military objective” is limited to objects which, by their nature, location, purpose or use, make an effective contribution to military action and whose total or partial destruction, capture or neutralization offers a definite military advantage in the circumstances ruling at the time. Accordingly, the fact that an object generates revenue or broad economic benefit does not, by itself, render it a military objective absent the requisite nexus and definite military advantage at the time of attack.

We also note that the UN Mission to Support the Hudaydah Agreement (UNMHA) has been mandated by the Security Council to support the Hudaydah Agreement, including with respect to Hudaydah city and the ports of Hudaydah, Ras Issa and Salif, including in relation to the presence of military personnel and material.

As regards places of detention, we reiterate that detention facilities are presumptively civilian objects, and persons deprived of liberty are protected persons under IHL. Such facilities may only be lawfully attacked if, and for such time as, they meet the criteria of a military objective; in case of doubt, the presumption of civilian status applies. Detainees and staff who are not directly participating in hostilities must not be made the object of attack.

Principle of proportionality

We recall that attacks expected to cause incidental loss of civilian life, injury to civilians, or damage to civilian objects that would be excessive in relation to the concrete and direct military advantage anticipated are prohibited. We further recall that proportionality assessments must take into account reasonably foreseeable incidental

harm, including foreseeable reverberating effects on civilians where relevant, and that this obligation operates together with the duty to take all feasible precautions to avoid, and in any event minimize, incidental civilian harm.

Principle of precaution

We underline that parties are required to take all feasible precautions to verify that targets are military objectives; to choose means and methods of attack with a view to avoiding, and in any event minimizing, incidental civilian harm; and to cancel or suspend an attack if it becomes apparent that the target is not a military objective or that the attack would be disproportionate. Parties must also give effective advance warning of attacks which may affect the civilian population, unless circumstances do not permit.

Protection of the wounded and sick; medical and humanitarian personnel

We further refer to the obligation to respect and protect the wounded and sick and those caring for them, and protections afforded to medical units and humanitarian personnel, which must not be attacked or impeded in the performance of their humanitarian functions.

Accountability and investigations under international law

We recall that serious violations of IHL may, depending on the circumstances, constitute war crimes under international law and give rise to individual criminal responsibility. We further recall that responsibility may extend beyond direct perpetrators to those who ordered, authorized, or otherwise bear responsibility, including under command/superior responsibility where commanders knew or, owing to the circumstances at the time, should have known that subordinates were committing or about to commit violations and failed to take necessary and reasonable measures within their power to prevent such acts or to submit the matter for investigation and prosecution.

In this connection, we recall that the Group of Eminent International and Regional Experts on Yemen has urged parties to immediately end measures that worsen the humanitarian crisis and to conduct prompt, transparent, independent, impartial, thorough, credible, effective and gender-sensitive investigations of violations and crimes, and to ensure accountability.

Human rights and counterterrorism

Finally, we recall that numerous resolutions of the General Assembly, Security Council and Human Rights Council reaffirm that any measures taken to combat terrorism or violent extremism must comply with States' obligations under international law, in particular IHRL, IHL (as applicable) and refugee law, and must conform to the principles of legality, necessity, proportionality and non-discrimination. We further recall the UN Global Counterterrorism Strategy (A/RES/60/288), which underscores that effective counterterrorism and the protection of human rights are complementary and mutually reinforcing.