

Responses to Recommendations

SESSION 9

Review in the Working Group: 1 - 12 November 2010

Adoption in the Plenary: 16 – 18 March 2011

(Last update: 03.09.2011)

State under Review	In the Report of the Working Group:	In the Addendum:	During the plenary:	Summary:
Andorra	24 REC accepted; 2 rejected; 30 pending	Out of the 30 pending, 12 are accepted, 19 rejected, 1 will be examined "in the medium term" (-> pending) , 1 no response (-> pending)	No additional information provided	Accepted: 36 Rejected: 21 No clear position: 0 Pending: 2
Bulgaria	No response, all pending	Out of the 113 pending, 94 were accepted (among which 40 were considered as already implemented or in the process of implementation), 1 was accepted in part (underlined in blue), 6 rejected, 5 noted (-> pending) and 1 not addressed (2 nd part of 80.64)	No additional information provided	Accepted: 95 Rejected: 6 No clear position: 0 Pending: 6
Croatia	94 REC accepted (among which 86 are considered implemented or in the process of implementation), and 22 pending	Out of the 22 pending, 15 are accepted, 2 partially accepted (underlined in blue), 2 rejected and 3 on which the delegation cannot make a definitive statement (-> pending)	No additional information provided	Accepted: 111 Rejected: 2 No clear position: 0 Pending: 3
Honduras	117 REC accepted (among which 112 are considered as already implemented or in the process of implementation); 12 pending	No addendum	Out of the 12 pending, the delegation stated accepting 10 and that 2 were requiring "further budgetary checking" (first part of 83.6 and 83.10) which are therefore considered as pending	Accepted: 128 Rejected: 0 No clear position: 0 Pending: 2

Jamaica	72 REC accepted (among which 35 are considered as already implemented or in the process of implementation); 26 rejected; 23 pending	Out of the 23 pending, 4 were accepted, 1 was rejected, 15 were given an unclear position, 1 was "being considered" (n° 100.5 -> pending), 1 postponed (n° 100.17 -> pending) and 1 was not addressed (n° 100.20 -> pending)	The President of the Human Rights Council asked for clarifications on REC n°100.2 -> 100.8, 100.11, 100.14, 100.15 and 100.20 -> 100.23. The delegation took note of them. For some of those REC, our understanding of the addendum was different	Accepted: 76 Rejected: 27 No clear position: 15 Pending: 3
Lebanon	69 REC accepted (among which 28 are considered as already implemented or in the process of implementation); 40 rejected; 14 pending	No addendum	The delegation stated that all the 14 pending REC were accepted but one part of a recommendation but without specifying which one. We therefore consider them all as accepted.	Accepted: 83 Rejected: 40 No clear position: 0 Pending: 0
Liberia	72 REC accepted; 41 pending	Out of the 41 pending, 1 accepted and 40 commented but which were "neither accepted nor rejected" (-> no clear response)	The delegation said that they had "made some corrections" to the addendum and stated being "not able to take a position on deferred recommendations". We keep them as "no clear position"	Accepted: 73 Rejected: 0 No clear position: 40 Pending: 0
Libya	66 REC accepted; (among which 4 are considered already implemented or in the process of implementation); 24 rejected; 30 pending	No addendum	The plenary has been postponed to the 18 th Human Rights Council session in September 2011 due the situation in the country	Accepted: 66 Rejected: 24 No clear position: 0 Pending: 30
Malawi	65 REC accepted (among which the first part of REC 102.3 is considered as already implemented); 39 rejected; 23 pending	No addendum	Out of the 23 pending, the delegation commented 20 REC without giving a clear position and rejected 3 (104.1, 104.7, 104.10). But in its concluding remarks, it stated accepting a total of 82 REC and rejecting a total of 45. However, it is not possible to know which are the 17 accepted and the 6 rejected out of the 23 pending. The written statement clearly indicates that 4 REC are accepted (104.2, 104.3, 104.4, 104.5), 3 are rejected (104.1, 104.7, 104.10), 2 have some parts accepted and some rejected (104.8 and 104.9). We therefore decided to follow the written statement	Accepted: 71 Rejected: 44 No clear position: 14 Pending: 0
Maldives	No response, all pending	Out of the 134 pending, 96 are accepted, 4 partially	No additional information provided	Accepted: 100 Rejected: 29 No clear position: 1

		accepted (underlined in blue), 29 rejected, 1 commented with no clear position and 4 taken note of (-> pending)		Pending: 4
Marshall Islands	No response, all pending	35 REC were accepted; 3 noted (-> pending).	The delegation re-stated the information provided in the addendum	Accepted: 35 Rejected: 0 No clear position: 0 Pending: 3
Mauritania	88 REC accepted (among which 24 are considered implemented or in the process of implementation); 4 rejected; 47 pending.	Out of the 47 pending, the delegation stated that they had already provided replies to 23 of them without specifying where and when. These REC are therefore considered as still pending. Out of the other 24, 14 received an unclear position and 10 did not receive any answer (92.8, 92.12, 92.15, 92.22, 92.35, 92.38, 92.39, 92.44, 92.46 and 92.47).	The delegation clustered the 47 REC into 18 and stated accepting 14 and rejecting 4. Our interpretation of which cluster corresponds to which recommendations is the following: Accepted RECs: 1 -> parts 92.7 and 92.13; part of 92.11 2 -> second parts of 92.7 and 92.13; 92.39; part of 92.40 3 -> first part of 92.20 4 -> parts of 92.7 and 92.13; last part of 92.21; 92.31; part of 92.39 5 -> part of 92.11 6 -> part of 92.40; 92.42; 92.43; 92.45 7 -> ? 8 -> 92.14 9 -> second part of 92.7; last part of 92.21; 92.34, first part of 92.39 10 -> part of 92.40; 92.41 11 -> part of 92.3 first part of 92.5 12 -> 92.47 13 -> part of 92.35; 92.36; 92.37; 92.38 14 -> second part of 92.33 Rejected RECs: 1 -> 92.23->92.29 and first part of 92.30 2 -> 92.1; part of 92.3; 92.4; part of 92.5; 92.6; 92.9 and part of 92.10 3 -> 92.8; part of 92.12 4-> 92.16->92.19 The delegate of the United Kingdom sought clarification from the delegation of Mauritania asking them to provide responses to each recommendation and not to clusters but did not receive any.	Accepted: 110 Rejected: 25 No clear position: 4 Pending: 11

Micronesia	No response, all pending.	63 REC accepted; 3 rejected and 7 commented on without giving a clear position.	No additional information provided	Accepted: 63 Rejected: 3 No clear position: 7 Pending: 0
Mongolia	118 REC accepted (among which 6 are considered implemented or in the process of implementation); 11 pending	No addendum.	Out of the 11 pending, the delegation accepted 8 and rejected 3	Accepted: 126 Rejected: 3 No clear position: 0 Pending: 0
Panama	71 REC accepted (among which 33 are considered implemented or in the process of implementation); 21 pending	Out of the 21 pending REC, 17 were accepted (among which REC n° 70.1 and 70.7 were considered as “in the process of implementation prior to the UPR”), 1 accepted in part (underlined in blue); 1 rejected and 2 pending	No additional information provided	Accepted: 89 Rejected: 1 No clear position: 0 Pending: 2
United States	No response, all pending	Out of the 240 REC pending, 110 accepted, 61 accepted in part (underlined in blue) and 71 rejected.	No additional information provided	Accepted: 171 Rejected: 71 No clear position: 0 Pending: 0

Disclaimer: This classification was made by UPR Info based on United Nations documents and webcast. For detailed explanations on each State under Review, see individual document “Responses to recommendations”. For questions and/or comments, please write to info@upr-info.org