



General Assembly

Distr.: General
25 August 2026

English only

Human Rights Council

Sixty-third session

7 September–9 October 2026

Agenda item 2

**Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner
for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the
High Commissioner and the Secretary-General**

Written statement submitted by Coordination des Associations et des Particuliers pour la Liberté de Conscience, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status*

The Secretary-General has received the following written statement, which is circulated in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31.

[5 August 2026]

* Issued as received, in the language of submission only.



Alleged SAF Chemical Weapons, Human Shields in El Obeid, and Support from Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Türkiye

The continued conflict in the Sudan has generated grave and systematic violations of international human rights law and international humanitarian law, with devastating consequences for civilians across the country. Of particular concern are credible allegations implicating the Sudanese Armed Forces (SAF) in the use of prohibited chemical agents, the unlawful confinement and endangerment of civilians in El Obeid, and violations facilitated by external military and political support.

This declaration urges the Human Rights Council to address fifth interrelated issues: first, allegations of SAF use of chemical weapons and related abuses; second, violations against civilians in El Obeid, including obstruction of civilian movement and possible use of civilians as human shields; third, the role of external support networks linked to Saudi Arabia; fourth, the role of Egypt in supporting SAF operations and the resulting risk of civilian harm; and fifth the role of Türkiye, in particular due to its supply of drones to the SAF.

The United States of America announced in May 2025 that it would impose sanctions (1) on the Sudan after determining that the Sudanese government used chemical weapons in 2024 during the conflict, and called on the Sudan to comply with its obligations under the Chemical Weapons Convention. The determination by a State Party and the resulting sanctions raise an exceptionally serious concern that merits urgent and independent international scrutiny.

Additional public reporting has strengthened concern around these allegations. A France 24 investigation (2) later traced at least part of the chlorine supply chain used in suspected attacks to shipments originating in India, transiting through Saudi Arabia, and then reaching Port Sudan via a Sudanese company linked by investigators to SAF supply structures. Human Rights Watch stated that the France 24 findings provided the first public elements corroborating earlier the United States of America allegations and noted that use of chlorine as a weapon would violate the Chemical Weapons Convention and amount to a war crime.

The Human Rights Council should therefore call for an independent, international investigation into all allegations of chemical weapons use in the Sudan, including chain-of-custody preservation, forensic examination, witness protection, and scrutiny of procurement and transport networks that may have enabled diversion of dual-use chemicals into unlawful military use. Any individuals, military units, state entities, or corporate intermediaries found to have facilitated the acquisition, transfer, diversion, or deployment of prohibited agents should be identified and held accountable in accordance with international law.

The situation in El Obeid demands urgent and specific attention. There are escalating risks to civilians in El Obeid and surrounding areas, including attacks affecting populated areas, restricted movement, displacement, and severe constraints on humanitarian access. Amnesty International's July 2026 statement urged states to act with urgency to protect civilians in El Obeid, underscoring the seriousness of the current protection emergency before the Human Rights Council.

There are also deeply troubling reports that civilians have not been allowed to leave the city safely, with the SAF refusing to establish safe corridors for civilians to leave El Obeid and was using residents as "human shields" to generate international sympathy; these allegations are alarming and merit further investigation. Separate reporting has stated that preventing civilians from fleeing a besieged city may amount to the war crime of using civilians as human shields and may also constitute unlawful confinement and forced displacement, depending on the facts established.

The Council should demand immediate guarantees for safe civilian exit routes from El Obeid, unimpeded humanitarian access, and public commitments by all parties that civilians and civilian infrastructure will not be used, directly or indirectly, for military advantage. It should also request enhanced monitoring and reporting on violations in and around El Obeid, including interference with civilian evacuation.

External support to the SAF must also be examined where it may contribute to violations. Reuters reported that Egypt and Saudi Arabia have shown support for the Sudanese military. Saudi Arabia in particular presents itself as a mediator and humanitarian actor. This dual posture makes rigorous due diligence essential: mediation efforts cannot shield any state from scrutiny where its

relationships, logistical channels, or financial backing may contribute to serious abuses, covert support for one or other actor in the conflict, or its effective prolongation.

With respect to Saudi-linked channels, the France 24 investigation is especially relevant because it reported that chlorine canisters later tied to suspected chemical weapons incidents were shipped from India to Saudi Arabia and then onward to Port Sudan. This creates a clear basis for demanding transparency regarding transit, end-use controls, customs oversight, and any public or private entities that may have enabled diversion. The Council might request assurances from the Saudi leadership, including the Saudi leadership, to ensure that no Saudi territory, infrastructure, or political backing is used in ways that facilitate atrocity crimes or prohibited weapons use.

Egypt's role likewise requires careful investigation. Reuters has reported that Egypt supports the Sudanese military. There are allegations that Egyptian territory has been used to facilitate SAF military operations into the Sudan, and even that Egypt has directly participated in operations causing civilian harm. Given the scale of civilian suffering and recurrent allegations of cross-border military support, the Council should request fact-finding into whether Egyptian military assistance, facilities, airspace, training, or logistics have contributed to attacks violating international law.

Türkiye's role also warrants close scrutiny in light of emerging reporting regarding the transfer of military equipment, including unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), to SAF-aligned forces. Open-source intelligence and investigative reporting have indicated the presence of Turkish-manufactured drones in SAF operations, raising concerns about their potential use in strikes affecting civilian areas and critical infrastructure. Given the well-documented impact of armed drones in urban and semi-urban conflict environments, including risks of indiscriminate or disproportionate harm, any such transfers must be examined in the context of Türkiye's obligations under international humanitarian law and arms transfer norms, including the duty to assess the risk that exported systems could be used to commit or facilitate serious violations.

The Human Rights Council should therefore request clarification from the Turkish authorities regarding any direct or indirect provision of drones, components, training, or operational support to the SAF or affiliated entities. This should include transparency on export licensing decisions, end-use assurances, and monitoring mechanisms designed to prevent misuse. Where there is a clear risk that such systems have been or may be used in violation of international law, the Council should call for the suspension of relevant transfers and encourage full cooperation with international investigations. Ensuring accountability in this domain is essential not only for addressing alleged violations in the Sudan, but also for reinforcing broader international standards governing the responsible transfer and use of emerging military technologies.

In light of the above, this declaration calls on the Human Rights Council to: establish or strengthen an independent investigative mechanism covering chemical weapons allegations and related supply chains; demand immediate civilian protection measures in El Obeid, including safe passage and humanitarian access; call on all third states to suspend any military, logistical, or financial support that could contribute to violations in the Sudan; and press all states with influence over the SAF, including Saudi Arabia and Egypt, to cooperate fully with international inquiries and to disclose relevant information on arms transfers, transit routes, dual-use materials, and operational support.

The people of the Sudan should not be left trapped between battlefield violence and siege conditions. The Human Rights Council should act with urgency to ensure accountability, civilian protection, and meaningful scrutiny of domestic and external actors implicated in grave violations. Nor should their democratic aspirations, as expressed by their actions in removing the Bashir rule in 2019, be sacrificed to the security demands of the Sudan's immediate neighbours—as evidenced by the material and military support rendered by Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Türkiye to the Sudanese Armed Forces.

(1) <https://www.reuters.com/world/africa/us-imposes-sanctions-sudan-over-chemical-weapons-use-2025-05-22/>

(2) <https://c4ads.org/news/france-24-sudan-chlorine/>