

Compilation of written proposals for the UPR review

17th November 2010

States papers:

- ❖ Algeria
- ❖ Argentina
- ❖ Armenia¹
- ❖ Canada
- ❖ China
- ❖ Colombia
- ❖ Costa Rica
- ❖ Cuba
- ❖ European Union (EU)
- ❖ GRULAC
- ❖ India
- ❖ Indonesia
- ❖ Iran
- ❖ Israel
- ❖ Japan
- ❖ Maldives
- ❖ Mauritius
- ❖ Mexico
- ❖ Moldova
- ❖ Non Aligned Movement (NAM)
- ❖ Norway
- ❖ Pakistan
- ❖ Russian Federation
- ❖ South Africa
- ❖ Switzerland
- ❖ Turkey²
- ❖ United States (USA)

¹ Translated from French to English by UPR Info.

² Translated from French to English by UPR Info.

NGO papers:

- ❖ Académie de droit humanitaire, “Expertise in the Human Rights Council” (ADH)
- ❖ Amnesty International, “Recommendations for the UPR 15 Oct.2010” (AI)
- ❖ Civicus (CIVICUS)
- ❖ Human Rights Law Resource Centre, “Australia’s engagement with the UN HRC” (HRLRC)
- ❖ Human Rights Watch, “Curing the Selectivity Syndrome” (HRW)
- ❖ International Federation of ACAT (Action by Christians for the Abolition of Torture, “HRC Review – UPR assessment” (FIACAT)
- ❖ Joint NGO contribution to the UPR review
- ❖ Nord-Sud XXI Position Paper for IGWG on HRC Review.
- ❖ UPR Info, “Analytical assessment of the Universal Periodic Review 2008-2010” (UPR Info)

National Human Rights Institutions:

- ❖ Asian Pacific Forum (APF)
- ❖ Commission Nationale Consultative des Droits de l’Homme, “Contribution CNCDH examen des travaux du CDH, sept. 2010”, (CNCDH)³
- ❖ International Co-ordinating Committee of National Human Rights Institutions position paper (ICC)

Others:

- ❖ “Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights non-paper on the HRC review – 15 October 2010” (OHCHR)
- ❖ Commonwealth Secretariat submission to HRC Review.

Length of the cycle

- A gap of one year between the end of the first cycle and the beginning of the second cycle would be needed for countries and relevant stakeholders to prepare for the second cycle adequately, for the intergovernmental elaboration and adoption of its modalities as well as guidelines for the UPR in the subsequent cycle. (NAM)
- There should be no gap between the first and the second cycle. The second cycle should start in 2012. (EU)
- In terms of periodicity, the Council may wish to spread the second cycle over a period of five years which should start in the spring 2012. The modalities should be agreed upon at the September 2011 session to enable the reporting States to prepare themselves for the UPR process. The order of consideration of the various States should be drawn by lot at that session, with those States having been considered during the next three ones in a second lot and so on. (OHCHR)
- Five years cycle seems to be more feasible and practical for comprehensive implementation of the UPR recommendations by States. So from the second cycle and onwards the UPR periodicity can be of 5 years. (RUSSIAN FEDERATION)
- On the Order of the review, Taking into consideration paragraph 3 (c) of the Resolution 5/1 which implies that all countries should be treated equally the current order of the

³ Translated from French to English by UPR Info

review should be kept unchanged. At the same time the order within respective WGs could be reshuffled. (RUSSIAN FEDERATION)

- As far as the duration of the second cycle is concerned, the 4 years cycle should be maintained and that no pause is needed between the 2 cycles. (SWITZERLAND)
- the review cycle should be extended to 5 years (INDONESIA)
- The UPR cycle should be extended to 5 years, thus allowing the review of 13 states per UPR working group session. A gap of one year after the first UPR cycle should be taken into consideration, in order for states to discuss the modalities of the second cycle and guidelines for the preparation of documents by the OHCHR. (CHINA)
- The second/subsequent UPR cycle shall be extended to 5 years and one year break between first and second cycles shall be given to the States in order to settle procedural issues (IRAN)
- After the end of the 1st cycle the periodicity should move to a five-years cycle to promote greater professionalism in the review and reduce queuing by allowing more time for individual reviews, interactive dialogue in the UPR Working Group as well as the implementation of accepted recommendations. (ALGERIA)
- An immediate move to the second cycle is desirable. (COMMONWEALTH)

National consultations

- National consultations should be made more thorough through the engagement of OHCHR regional offices. OHCHR could follow the process of national consultations more closely and include its observations into its report to the HRC. (UPR Info)
- Consultation between the SuR and broad sector of civil society should be well-prepared and based on a clear timeframe. NHRI (with A status), national parliamentary bodies, the OHCHR and UN country programs can play a useful role in supporting such national consultations. (AI)
- Organise broad national consultations in the spirit of openness and cooperation with civil society. These consultations should take place sufficiently in advance of the drafting of the national report in order for the points of view of civil society to be included in the discussion. (FIACAT)
- Encourage NGOs at the national level to initiate a constructive dialogue with their respective governments prior to, during and after the review. (FIACAT)
- Establish guidelines for States to ensure effective consultation with civil society and other stakeholders. (CANADA)
- An independent voluntary fund should be established to enable indigenous NGOs to fully participate in consultations in the country concerned before, during and after the States UPR before the Council's Working Group. (NORD SUD XXI)
- National consultations should be well prepared, be based on a clear timeframe and held well in advance of the preparation of the State report and fully include civil society. (JOINT NGOs CONTRIBUTION)

Documents as basis of the review

- Guidelines on the preparation of the documents that constitute the basis of the subsequent UPR cycles should be elaborated intergovernmentally sufficient time prior to the beginning of the second cycle. (NAM)
- The 3 background reports as the basis for discussion should be maintained, with all reports containing information on (a) the state of implementation by the State reviewed of the commitments made by it in the first cycle and (b) an update on the general human rights situation. The compilation prepared by the OHCHR of stakeholders' information should start with a separate section for National Human Rights Institutions with 'A' status.

States should be advised to table national UPR reports in national parliaments prior to their submission to the UPR process. (EU)

- The draft national report for the UPR should be tabled by the SuR for discussion in the national Parliament prior to its submission to the OHCHR. (AI)
- Reports presented by SuR and those presented by OHCHR in accordance with the institutional building package should devote their substantive part to reporting on the state of implementation as well as on progress in the fulfillment of accepted recommendations and challenges encountered during implementation. (COLOMBIA)
- The Secretariat could prepare a report recommending aspects to be taken into account in order to update and better reflect the spirit of the general guidelines contained in Decision 6/102. (COLOMBIA)
- The OHCHR should develop a new report for a country's second UPR that assesses its response to the recommendations from the first round and the obstacles to implementation of accepted recommendations. (USA)
- Establish rules for the content of the second round UPR report to leave out information on basic constitutional structures and put in a self-assessment on how the state under review is implementing recommendations accepted at the first UPR round. Similarly stakeholder reports should include information on follow through on recommendations. (USA)
- During the second cycle, the three reports should be kept in the same format but should pay special attention to recommendations made in the previous cycle in order to contribute to the assessment of their implementation. In order not to overburden States with too many recommendations the Troika should play a more active role in clustering recommendations. (SWITZERLAND)
- Better use should be made of the documentation prepared for each examination: the national report, the UN compilation and the stakeholder summary. These should be analysed, for example by the OHCHR or independent human rights experts, and their key findings presented to the UPR WG prior to start of the examination to better inform the dialogue. (AI)
- States should submit a written national report. (FIACAT)
- Encourage civil society in countries under review to present written contributions to ensure that the documents being used as a basis for the review are sufficiently diversified to enable an objective review. (FIACAT)
- Address the concern that the UN and stakeholders' reports are not formally presented to the working group or the Human Rights Council at any stage of the review process. The Human Rights Council could allow an independent expert or a member of OHCHR to formally present to the working group the main information compiled in the UN and stakeholders' report. (FIACAT)
- The documentation for the review should remain the same as established in the IB. (CUBA)
- The Council should develop guidelines for the preparation by the OHCHR of the summary and the compilation mandated in paragraphs 12 b) and 12 c) of the IB. (CUBA)
- Providing clear guidelines for the preparation of 2nd UPR cycle reports. (MOLDOVA)
- Drafting the appropriate guidelines for conducting national consultation processes. (MOLDOVA)
- The General Guidelines for the Preparation of Information under the UPR should be updated. For that purpose, and on the basis of the existing Guidelines, the following elements are submitted for consideration:
 1. Description of the methodology and the broad consultation process followed for the preparation of information provided under the UPR.
 2. Update on developments since the last review relating to the national framework for the protection and promotion of human rights, including normative, institutional, policy and any other relevant developments.
 3. Update on developments since the last review relating to the promotion and protection of human rights on the ground; of international human rights

- obligations; and of voluntary commitments and pledges; and cooperation with human rights mechanisms.
4. Status of implementation of UPR recommendations that enjoyed the support of the SuR.
 5. Identification of achievements, good practices, challenges and constraints.
 6. Key national priorities, initiatives and commitments that the SuR concerned intends to undertake to overcome those challenges and constraints and improve the situation on the ground.
 7. International cooperation needs of the SuR, including capacity building and technical assistance, in support of its national efforts for the protection and promotion of human rights. Assessment of the international cooperation provided so far to the SuR and requests, if any, for international cooperation.
 8. Any other information relevant to the follow-up to the previous review. (MEXICO)
- To develop guidelines for the preparation by the OHCHR of the UPR documents in order to ensure transparency, objectivity, fairness and that the relevant work by the OHCHR strictly abides by the purposes and principles of the UN Charter and fully respect the sovereignty of States under Review. (CHINA)
 - The Council should develop drafting guidelines for the two documents, prepared by the OHCHR through establishing an inter-governmental body. (IRAN)
 - For the two UPR document prepared by the OHCHR, the SUR should be also consulted with. (IRAN)
 - Guidelines on the preparation of the documentation that will constitute the basis of the second UPR cycle should be elaborated through an intergovernmental process. Such guidelines would not be restricted to the information prepared by the State under review but would also apply to compilations prepared by OHCHR. These should devote comparable space to collation of all sources of information. (ALGERIA)
 - Request the High Commissioner for Human Rights to present the UN compilation and stakeholder summary reports at the beginning of each country's review. (CANADA)
 - Opportunities should be given during the interactive dialogue for the OHCHR compilation of UN information and summary of stakeholder submissions to be introduced to the UPR Working Group. (JOINT NGOs CONTRIBUTION)

Troika

- States could be encouraged to appoint experts as their representatives on Troikas. A special roster of experts for this purpose could be established and maintained. States need not choose experts only from their own countries. A list of experts available to assist the UPR could be compiled for the consideration of States appointing to Troikas. (ADH)
- A stronger role should be played by the troika in focusing the interactive dialogue and compiling recommendations and the outcomes document to ensure that the "principal human rights issues are identified, prioritised and addressed. (HRLRC)
- Nominate a human rights law expert into the Troika. (UPR Info)
- While States must retain the discretionary ability to say whether or not they wish to accept a recommendation and/or to undertake voluntary commitments, the members of Troika, with the technical assistance of the Secretariat, should have the capacity to give an opinion, based on the international instruments of which the SuR is party, in the case that a question or recommendation is not in conformity with the spirit of the exercise. (COLOMBIA)
- To adopt the report, the Troikas, with the full participation of the State concerned and the technical assistance of the OHCHR, should highlight at the end of the document the best practices, achievements and advances to be noted, the specific areas in which the State concerned needs to get or improve technical cooperation, and the issues and challenges that remain outstanding. (COLOMBIA)

- It is important to develop guidelines for both the Troika and the OHCHR, especially concerning the grouping and filtering of recommendations. The idea of these guidelines is for the Troika to have a clearly defined role under the concept of facilitator, without losing its condition as political actor (as it is composed of Member States of United Nations) in the UPR. (COSTA RICA)
- The primacy of the inter-governmental nature of the UPR mechanism, and the role of the Troika as envisaged at present, should be maintained. (INDIA)
- The Troika mandated with the preparation of the report (§ 8-9, PRST 8/1) should not only consider recommendations stemming from oral statements made during the interactive dialogue, but also consider also written recommendations transmitted to the Troika or the Secretariat during the session. (SWITZERLAND)
- The functions of troikas should remain purely technical. We would advise against entrusting it with additional functions, e. g. screening questions or recommendations to the SuR against the basis of the UPR, is counterproductive. (RUSSIAN FEDERATION)
- Bearing in mind the large number of recommendations often made to SuRs on a diverse range of issues, UPR troikas are invited to further assist in the preparation of the report of the working group, by clustering the recommendations thematically to facilitate their analysis and follow up. (MEXICO)
- In facilitating the review, the troikas and the OHCHR shall assist the SuR by ensuring that the report of the working group is consistent with the principles and objectives of the UPR, the international obligations of the SuR and international human rights standards. (MEXICO)
- The Troika, with the full consent of the SuR and the assistance of the Secretariat, should play a bigger role in the formulation of the clustered recommendations. (INDONESIA)
- Troikas should be required to nominate a rapporteur who would lead their work. The rapporteur should present to the Working Group the main findings of the three reports. (EU)
- The current role of Troika should be maintained. (PAKISTAN)
- the current role and composition of the troika should be maintained. However the Troika could cluster recommendations according to the subject matter so as to limit number of recommendations to a manageable total, in full consultation with States authors of these recommendations and the State under review. That would be more pragmatic than capping the number of recommendations across the board. (ALGERIA)

Composition of the delegation

- States could include in their delegations to the UPR Working Group experts in human rights law and on the human rights situations in States under review. (ADH)
- States should follow the practice of choosing qualified individuals to represent them. (FIACAT)
- States should bear gender issues in mind when putting together the delegation that will represent them during their review. (FIACAT)
- Member and Observer States should be strongly encouraged to bring an element of additional expertise to the review process by associating national human rights experts as part of their delegations. This, in turn, would facilitate the work of troikas and enable them to play a more proactive role in the UPR process. (OHCHR)

SuR's time in the Working Group review

- An NHRI of a State under review could be enabled to contribute its expertise to the interactive dialogue in the UPR Working Group either by the State itself allocating part of

its time to the NHRI or by the allocation of a specific period to the NHRI through supplementing the institution building texts. (ADH)

- Time allocated to the SuR could be extended to 1,5 hours. 15 minutes would be devoted to the presentation of the national report, 30 minutes to respond to advance questions and 45 minutes to respond to questions during the interactive dialogue. (UPR Info)
- States should use their introductory speeches in the working group to respond to questions that have been raised in writing beforehand and outline the latest developments as to human rights in their countries as well as the problems they are facing concerning their implementation. (FIACAT)
- States should make a brief introductory statement so as to allow sufficient time for meaningful dialogue. (FIACAT)

List of speakers - Length of the review

- All governments must participate on an equal footing in the UPR and be allowed to speak in a review if they so wish. Time arrangements should be flexible to meet the needs of all governments who need to participate in the review of a given country. (HRW)
- The time for discussion of each member state should therefore be lengthened to ensure the equal participation of all states. (HRLRC)
- Extend the review session from 3 to 4 hours or even more. (UPR Info)
- The UPR cycle shall be extended to 5 years, thus allowing the examination of 13 States per UPR WG session instead of 16. This would give SuR more time to implement the accepted recommendations, and to prepare for the next review, and would also increase the duration of the review, and resolve the problem of list of speakers. (NAM)
- The current order and the foreseen periodicity of 4 years should be maintained. This will ensure equal treatment of all States, 4 years allow the Council to strike a balance between the need for both a regular and effective review process, bearing in mind the practical and financial consequences of reviewing the human rights record of 192 States. The fact that HRC members will not be reviewed during their membership (as requested in OP9 UNGA 60/251) is not seen as a major obstacle. (EU)
- The UPR WG sessions shall be extended with sufficient time to allow for four hours allocated to interactive dialogue with each state under review. The state under review will continue to have one hour to its disposal. The remaining three hours will be equally divided among the states inscribed on the speakers list. (NORWAY)
- The order of speakers list will be decided by the drawing of lots according to the proposal presented in the non-paper on list of speakers UPR REV 1 of February 2010. (NORWAY)
- Allow more time for the exercise to be carried out, the ideal being to allow one day per country. However, given the limitations, to set the minimum time in the work group to 4 hours is an alternative that could be considered. It is however important to ensure that the SuR is given enough time to answer the questions and comments raised. (COLOMBIA)
- Speakers must be chosen by draw so as to rule out any trace of discrimination and favoritism which are very bad for the current image of the UPR. (ARGENTINA)
- The UPR exercise should last no less than a whole working day, i.e. two three-hour sessions. Indeed, in the case of peer reviews carried out in other inter-governmental forums, debates take in general at least one day. (ARGENTINA)
- The current frequency of four years per cycle should be cut down to three years. Prior to the beginning of the third UPR cycle, we should analyze whether such three years term has proved adequate or if it is necessary to shorten it even more. (ARGENTINA)
- The Council may consider streamlining its programme of work by meeting in two sessions for a total of eight weeks every year. The remaining two weeks out of the existing programme of ten weeks may be added to the existing programme for UPR. This could enhance the duration of UPR for each SuR and resolve the problem of speakers' list. (INDIA)

- The Maldives supported an earlier proposed by the President of the Council under which delegations should be able to sign-up to Council General Debates and UPR Speaking Lists via either email or a secure website be placed in alphabetic order, and then a computer programme would randomly choose a letter which would signify the start of the speaking list (e.g. if a “c” were chosen, the speaking list would start with Canada, and then proceed alphabetically through the States listed). The Maldives also supports increasing the UPR Working Group review time by on hour where necessary (i.e. starting at 9am instead of 10am). (MALDIVES)
- The three sessions of the Council convened per year seem to be timed-well. However, the duration of the sessions should be extended in order to accommodate all states that would like to speak on a particular SuR. At this point in time, the IB package allots three hours of review per SuR. Extending the three hours to four hours would resolve the political nature surrounding the queue process, as well as address the demand to be on the speaker's list. (ISRAEL)
- The issue of the order of the queue should also be resolved by drawing the list of speakers by alphabetical lot. (ISRAEL)
- Allow all governments who want to speak at a UPR to do so and allot them adequate time. This will require an advanced speaker sign up list to allow for appropriate scheduling. The length of a country's UPR will vary, commensurate with the number of states who have asked to speak. (USA)
- It is essential to ensure that all States are able to take the floor and make recommendations to the SuR. The current 3-hours-limitation of duration of the review for each country (art. 22 Res. 5/1) could be extended. (SWITZERLAND)
- The three hours set aside for the examination of each state should remain the same, including in the interest of universality of treatment of SuR and to avoid perceptions of selectivity; however, better use should be made of the time available in the WG, including through better preparation and facilitation of the dialogue. There should be greater reliance on written exchanges prior to and following the dialogue in the WG. (AI)
- The difficulties with the list of speakers should be immediately addressed by leaving the possibility for all States which are willing to do so to intervene in the process. This would require more time. Since there is redundancy in the current UPR phases with no real clarity as to the role of the plenary, it is suggested to revisit the current arrangements by providing more time to the WG consideration (which may be considered now as plenary meetings) and less to the plenary discussion. (OHCHR)
- Extending the time for the review of the States under UPR mechanism in order to ensure more substantial interactive debate. (MOLDOVA)
- The idea of drawing lots combined with alphabetical approach could be further explored. (INDONESIA).
- There is a need to plan the session of the Working Group in advance (may be one month in advance), when interested States would be invited to inscribe in the list of speakers for all the States to be reviewed during that very session. Then on the basis of this information, a tentative programme according flexible time-slots can be drafted. (PAKISTAN)
- Extend time for each review to 4.5 hours: reduce the number of States reviewed at each session to 12, and add one additional UPR session per year; consider possible time efficiencies: start each session promptly; cut microphone on speakers automatically at time limit; continue through lunch period (+2 hours per day); Consolidate WG adoption of draft reports into one meeting at the end of each session (+ 1 hour per day). (CANADA)
- Divide time available by number of speakers in cases where insufficient time for all to speak. (CANADA)

Interactive dialogue

- In undertaking the roles allocated to them by the Council's institution building texts, Troikas could be more active in clustering issues and questions so that the interactive dialogue is more focused and preparing the reports in a more structured format that enables the principal issues to be identified, prioritised and addressed. (ADH)
- Specialised agencies and programmes could be enabled and encouraged to play an active role in the UPR review of States in which they work or in relation to which they have expertise. (ADH)
- The role of NGOs in the UPR could be enhanced, for example, by the Troika holding informal briefings with NGOs before the interactive dialogue in the Working Group. (ADH)
- The interactive dialogue should be further developed as a genuine dialogue. It should be better organised and focused, including by identifying the key issues to be addressed, and by clustering issues, e.g. on basis of analysis of the three background documents and any questions submitted in advance. The report of the review should also be organized around this clustering of key human rights issues. (AI)
- Enable the NHRI of a state under review to participate in the interactive dialogue (HRLRC)
- Provide for "informal briefing sessions" by NGOs before the dialogue (HRLRC)
- The Troika to read out loud the written questions submitted in advance during the review. (UPR Info)
- The Troika could present the main issues contained in the three documents the review is based on at the beginning of the interactive dialogue and at the adoption of the review. (UPR Info)
- It should be formalized that a State under review should reply after 10-15 interventions. (EU)
- Speakers should do more than just praising the country which has been reviewed. Thus, the Council's President should be vested with authority to stop any speaker who will not touch fundamental issues or who does not intend to ask questions to the delegation of the country under review. Above all, such procedural of formal changes must be regarded as a token of respect towards the victims of human rights violations. (ARGENTINA)
- NGOs, which are the main players in the HRC together with the States and international organizations, should, starting on the second UPR cycle, be allowed not just to send documents with allegations, but also to be involved in the review by taking the floor, without just limiting themselves to their current role of only making comments after the debate, i.e., at the time when the final recommendations on the review are adopted. (ARGENTINA)
- Congratulatory statements from governments should be disfavored. (USA)
- The speaking time for member States and observer States alike could be limited to 2 minutes. (SWITZERLAND)
- The dialogue in the WG should remain a dialogue between States, including to foster bilateral collaboration and sharing of good practices. (AI)
- States should develop a sense of self-criticism, cooperation and openness during the interactive dialogue. (FIACAT)
- Member States and Observer States should prevent politics from interfering with the obligation to carry out the UPR "*in an objective, transparent, non-selective, constructive, non-confrontational and non-politicised manner*". (FIACAT)
- Take part in working group sessions and arrive on time. Time constraints are one of the major challenges facing the Council since the UPR's creation. (FIACAT)
- Basic modalities of review, including the timeframe of the interactive dialogue in the WG and in the HRC should remain unchanged. (RUSSIAN FEDERATION)
- The UPR dialogue should enable the questions and answers segment to be done on one day and the recommendations 48 hours later. (OHCHR)
- Extend to 4 hours the length of the review. (ARMENIA)

- The issue of unbalanced participation should be resolved, since States under Review don't enjoy equal attention. (CHINA)
- To better distribute and rationalize the time allocated for the exercise of the UPR both in the Working Group and at the Human Rights Council (HRC). (GRULAC)
- Imperative need to strengthen dialogue and increase the time allocation for the interactive dialogue with the State under Review. (SOUTH AFRICA)

Recommendations

- Strengthen the role that is played by independent expert mechanisms of the UN, such as the treaty bodies, Special Procedures and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, to ensure that UPR recommendations are consistent with international human rights standards and reflect the human rights issues and priorities on the ground (HRLRC)
- Recommendations contained in the final UPR report could be clustered in order to ensure that they are not duplicated and that the recommendations are consistent. (HRLRC)
- Recommendations should be specific and more action oriented. Being action oriented means that a recommendation must contain a measure to be implemented and not only an aim to achieve. The recommendation should be explicit on how to achieve its goal. (UPR Info)
- Recommendations made by States should be consistent with basis of the review as stipulated in par. 1 of the IB text. (NAM)
- The Review should agree an optimum limit to the number of new recommendations made by States in the second cycle. (EU)
- Any streamlining of recommendations by the Troika/HRC Secretariat should be carried out with the consent of the State making the recommendation and the State under review. (EU)
- In cases where a recommendations or a State's response to a recommendation may not be compilation with international human rights law, OHCHR should provide a footnote in the Working Group report to this effect. (EU)
- In situations where time does not allow all interested delegations to speak, up to three recommendations from these states shall also be included in the report from the UPR WG. (NORWAY)
- Encourage the submission of questions and recommendations, with a focus on practical suggestions. At the same time, it is worth to consider the possibility of limiting the number of questions and recommendations that a delegation can make to a reasonable maximum number of three questions and three recommendations. It is unreasonable for the time allocated to speakers to be used as a competition of who can put the major number of questions and recommendations in the shortest possible time. (COLOMBIA)
- Member States of the HRC should not be entitled to reject recommendations which may prove embarrassing to them or which they may regard as inappropriate. On the contrary, to improve the operation of the UPR, countries should spontaneously make presentations about the application of all recommendations without having to wait for the new cycle to communicate any progress made. (ARGENTINA)
- A formula that organizes recommendations into two sub-categories can be established in accordance with resolution 5/1, that is: "positive developments and challenges". In practical terms, the Troika in each case under review, with the advice of the Office of the High Commissioner and in consultation with the State under Review, should automatically classify the recommendations. Under the first sub-category of "positive developments" the following recommendations should be included: a) those whose implementation is been completed, (b) the ones that are part of actions that already the State implements, and (c) statements which commend or acknowledge the SuR. For such effects, the Troika has to work on the grounds of the opinion of the SuR and the technical advice of OHCHR, and also on the basis of the relevant documentation that must be considered for the review, in

conformity with Resolution 5/1. The recommendations strictu sensu must be incorporated under the sub-category of “challenges”. In both sub-categories, recommendations must be subject to a synthesis in a way that they appear just once in a catalogue that, once accepted by the State, reflects its real progress and challenges in the field of Human Rights. This faculty must be bestowed to the Troika, without this implying that it takes decisions before consulting with interested States. (INDIA)

- Recommendations to a concerned State during the UPR Working Group should be streamlined and clustered, during the Troika discussions with the concerned State, into a more manageable, transparent and implementable series of actions. (MALDIVES)
- The recommendations made by TB and SP to a SuR should be systematically included in the final report on the SuR, clearly distinguishing them from the recommendations made by States during the review. Only the latter should be subject to “acceptation” or “rejection” by the SuR. These recommendations – and the correlated commitments – should regard only the modalities of realization of the State’s obligations. (CNCDH)
- Recommendations to the SuR to address human rights violations and strengthen human rights protection should be fewer in number, more precise and lend themselves to evaluation of implementation. (AI)
- Member States and Observer States should be active ask their questions quickly and make recommendations clear and assessable. (FIACAT)
- Member States and Observer States should see that the recommendations made are realistic and have real added value, while refraining from both condemnation and praise. (FIACAT)
- Member States and Observer States should avoid all recommendations that undermine human rights and see that they conform to international tenets on the promotion and protection of human rights. (FIACAT)
- The recommendations made during the interactive dialogue should be clustered and steps should be taken to ensure that recommendations made in the UPR working group are streamlined, rationalized, pertinent, meaningful, effectively relate to human rights and aim at improving the situation on the ground. They should also be consistent with those formulated by other human rights bodies and mechanisms. The latter role could be played by strengthened troikas. (OHCHR)
- Ensuring the effectiveness of the UPR process by elaboration of the necessary guidelines for future State’s action-oriented recommendations, providing that the latter are consistent with international standards and with the situation on the ground (concerned country). (MOLDOVA)
- Structuring properly thematic recommendations. (MOLDOVA)
- In order to ensure consistence of the recommendations with universally recognized international human rights standards an additional principle of working methods/culture should be introduced. (RUSSIAN FEDERATION)
- The increasing number of recommendations during the UPR makes their implementation more difficult. To avoid this situation the recommendations can be clustered and classified by issues. (TURKEY)
- OHCHR should compile and systematize all recommendations made to SuRs, together with the comments made by the SuRs to the recommendations and their voluntary commitments and pledges, and make this information available to Members and observers of the Council in sufficient advance to the next review of the respective SuRs. (MEXICO)
- The SuR is expected to follow up on recommendations that enjoy its support as well as on voluntary commitments and pledges. The SuR may also address other recommendations if it so wishes, particularly on the basis of developments at the national level. Other Member and Observer states of the Council may refer to all recommendations. (MEXICO)
- Any recommendation made to States within the framework of the UPR process should be realistic and implementable. Therefore, States are encouraged to thoroughly consider the

political and social structures of the States under Review in order to formulate practical and useful recommendations. (INDONESIA)

- The formulation and clustering of recommendations should be further streamlined so as to ensure they can be accepted and implemented effectively by the States under Review (SuR). (INDONESIA)
- The Working Group report should reflect the recommendations and the declarations made in a balanced and non-selective manner and exclude a privileged treatment for certain States. (ARMENIA)
- Recommendations made by the States should be consistent with those human rights, which are recognised in the UN human rights system. (PAKISTAN)
- Only recommendations made during the interactive dialogue should be reflected in the final document. (PAKISTAN)
- State recommendations to be consistent with the basis of the review as stipulated in paragraph 1 of the IB text. (IRAN)
- To make efforts to organize and cluster the recommendations in the Report of the UPR Working Group according to Point 3 of the Framework of the Programme of Work of the Council included in Resolution 5/1. (GRULAC)
- The formal commitment of States to international human rights standards, for example through ratification, provides a set of legal obligations that might be made explicit when they form the basis of recommendations. (COMMONWEALTH)
- We encourage recommendations to be constructive, specific and measurable. (COMMONWEALTH)
- [Recommendations] might be clustered by theme before the adoption of the report whether done with the assistance of Troika or the OHCHR or both. Any editorial changes need to be agreed by the receiving and the recommending states. (COMMONWEALTH)
- Specific encouragement should be given by the Council in the UPR procedures to recommendations directed not only to the States under Review, but also to intergovernmental organizations and to other States. These States and IGOs might also be given the opportunity to adopt these outcomes by committing to fulfilling them. (NORD SUD XXI)
- Recommendations should be focused, action-oriented and clustered thematically in the outcome report. Particular attention should be given to recommendations which are based on recommendations from other human rights mechanisms. (JOINT NGOs CONTRIBUTION)

Response to recommendations

- The state under review should be required to state its position with respect to each UPR recommendation. (HRW)
- Governments should be requested to respond to all UPR recommendations at least two weeks ahead of the adoption of the final report of the UPR, in order to allow delegations and NGOs to make properly informed comments during the adoption of the final report (HRW)
- States should be required to provide clear responses on the position that they adopt with respect to each of the recommendations made by the Council. The states' position on whether they accept or reject each of the recommendations should be indicated well ahead of the adoption of the final report. (HRLRC)
- States have to provide clear responses to each and every recommendation they receive. These responses should be given in advance and in writing in an addendum to ensure transparency and predictability and show States' attitude and willingness to cooperate with the mechanism. (UPR Info)

- Treaty Bodies and Special Rapporteurs recommendations should be distinguished from other recommendations when made during the interactive dialogue and in Reports of the Working Group. (UPR Info)
- A detailed explanation has to be provided by the SuR in case a recommendation from a delegation is rejected. (UPR Info)
- States must give clear responses to each individual recommendation made to them. (EU)
- The state under review shall, prior to the adoption of the outcome in UPR plenary sessions, clearly state its position in writing on all recommendations received during the interactive dialogue. (NORWAY)
- States under review should be clear in stating their position with respect to each UPR recommendation presented to them. This clarity would assist NHRIs in working on follow-up to UPR outcomes at the national level. (ICC)
- The position of the SuR on all of the recommendations made to it by other States should be made clear prior to the adoption of the outcome. Where a State had taken recommendations under further consideration and Addendum setting out its position on each of these recommendations should be mandatory and available at least two weeks before the adoption of the outcome by the HRC. (AI)
- States should not adopt a stance on recommendations until they have consulted the national NGOs on how they can be implemented. (FIACAT)
- SuR should follow good practice that involves issuing their responses to the recommendations well in advance (at least 2 weeks before the adoption of the final report) and in writing, so as to ensure better comprehension and a quality debate. (FIACAT)
- States should make clear commitments and clearly state their position regarding each recommendation. (FIACAT)
- Clearly identify those recommendations they accept, give reasons for those they reject when possible and reject any recommendations that undermine human rights. (FIACAT)
- States should follow up on other recommendations not made due to lack of time and respond to them nonetheless. These recommendations should be included in the working group report, by way of an annex, and taken into consideration at the next review. (FIACAT)
- Greater rigor by SuR should be secured in terms of acceptance or rejection of recommendations. (OHCHR)
- States under review should be clear in stating their position with respect to each UPR recommendation presented to them. This clarity would assist NHRIs in working on follow-up to UPR outcomes at the national level. (APF)
- Ensuring best possible track record evidence on the acceptance-decline of the recommendations during the adoption of the final report by the Council. (MOLDOVA)
- In cases where a recommendation or a State's responses to a recommendation may not be compatible with international human rights law, OHCHR should provide a footnote in the Working Group report to this effect. (EU)
- The full list of recommendations accepted by the State and those noted should be included in an addendum, submitted to the Council no later than ten weeks prior to the adoption in plenary. This addendum would include this information on all recommendations made to the State in both cycles. (EU)
- States must clarify their position on all recommendations and give clear and objective reasons where some of the recommendations are rejected. The rejection merely for political reasons should be excluded. (ARMENIA)
- Establish templates for States to clearly indicate to the WG whether each recommendation has been accepted or rejected, and to provide a concise rationale. (CANADA)
- Encourage States to use the "Addendum1" document to record definitive responses to recommendations. In this way responses are clearly articulated and provide guidance for UPR follow up. (COMMONWEALTH)

- Responses to each recommendation should be provided in advance and in writing. All recommendations should receive a response and reasons for rejection should be provided. Recommendations should not be rejected for reasons that are inconsistent with the SuR's international human rights obligations. (JOINT NGOS CONTRIBUTION)

NGOs participation

- Allocate more time for NGOs at the Plenary adoption. (UPR Info)
- Non-ECOSOC NGOs to be allowed to take the floor at the Plenary adoption. (UPR Info)
- NGO participation should be strengthened at all stages, including through the use of video-conferencing that is disabled accessible. (EU)
- The opportunity for NGOs to contribute to the discussion of the UPR outcome in the HRC should be further developed by enabling national NGOs to participate through video-conferencing. In allocating speaking slots, priority should be given to organizations that have contributed to the stakeholder summary. (AI)
- Encourage the NGOs and other relevant stakeholders to meet to discuss common problems and present joint contributions to avoid duplication. (FIACAT)
- Strengthen the provisions of Resolution 5/1 regarding the participation of NGOs in the UPR process by allocating more time and space to all stakeholders. (FIACAT)
- Allow stakeholders to raise issues which were not addressed during the review itself. In order to show that a review was comprehensive and useful, the opportunity of making general comments before the final document is adopted in Plenary should be interpreted in a broad sense, in line with Resolution 5/1. (FIACAT)
- NGOs participation proved to be satisfactory and balanced and its modalities should be preserved. (RUSSIAN FEDERATION)
- Ensure the participation of all relevant stakeholders, including non-governmental organizations and national human rights institutions in accordance with General Assembly resolution 60/251 of 15 March 2006 and Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31 of 25 July 1996, as well as any decisions that the Council may take in this regard. (CIVICUS)
- Create dedicated speaking space during the UPR WG for NGOs. (CANADA)
- We consider the participation of a variety of stakeholders in the UPR process can be improved by allowing NGOs to make oral interventions during the consideration of a State's report and, perhaps, by including NGO representatives in the delegation of States as they are under review. Nord-Sud XXI supports an approach that would ensure a balance of representations from NGOs representing indigenous peoples, the Global South and developed countries. (NORD SUD XXI)
- Shifting the opportunities for NGO oral interventions to the Working Group's UPR of a country from its current time only after the adoption of the UPR Report. (NORD SUD XXI)
- NGOs without ECOSOC status should be able to make comments on the UPR outcome at the plenary adoption. (JOINT NGOS CONTRIBUTION)

Item 6

- The HRC's agenda item on UPR (item 6) should have a section reserved for further discussion on situations that merit more sustained engagement following the UPR, including discussion of initiatives arising from the reviews. (HRW)
- Under item 6 (General Debate) not only States, but NGOs and NHRIs could report on implementation. (UPR Info)

- There shall be a session of two weeks convened in September-October to adopt the reports of the UPR WG and for general debate under Agenda item 6. (NAM)
- Taking into account that the UPR is a work in process, Item 6, general debate, should be used to motivate States to report regularly, on a voluntary basis, about the implementation of UPR recommendations and voluntary commitments. (COLOMBIA)
- The Council should create a segment under agenda item 6 for follow-up to each UPR examination. States should be required to provide oral reports on their implementation of recommendations two years after their review. (ICC)
- State should report, during Agenda Item 6 of the ordinary session of the HRC, on the status of implementation of their UPR commitments within two years of the review. This would create a formal basis for UPR follow-up applicable to all countries. (FIACAT)
- A suggestion to allocate specific session of the Council to the adoption of the UPR outcomes could be considered. (RUSSIAN FEDERATION)
- During the adoption of the UPR outcome at the HRC session the discussion should focus in recommendations and comments by the States concerned without touching upon the situation in the State. (RUSSIAN FEDERATION)
- Israel is open to the idea of the Council convening one session per year dedicated entirely to the adoption of UPR Working Group reports. (ISRAEL)
- There shall be a separate session of two weeks to adopt the reports of the UPR Working Group as well as to hold a General Debate under Agenda Item 6. (IRAN)

Follow-up – implementation of recommendations

- OHCHR could play a more substantive, expert role in providing its own independent information and analysis to the UPR (for example through a fourth initial report, starting during the second cycle of the UPR). (ADH)
- The Council should create a segment under agenda item 6 for follow up of each UPR. Governments should be required to report on the status of implementation of recommendations two years after their review was completed (HRW)
- On the completion of the review of a State under the UPR, the President of the Council, in consultation with the State under review and the Troika for that State's review, could appoint an expert to assist that State over the following four years with implementation of the UPR recommendations and conclusions. The expert could provide an annual report on implementation to the Council. (ADH)
- During the second round, States that have marked a year after the adoption of the report could be invited to present an update of actions taken to advance implementation in a five minute intervention to the Council. (COLOMBIA)
- The follow-up process could be strengthened by active participation and monitoring by the OHCHR regional offices, UN agencies, NHRIs and NGOs that could play an important role on the ground. (UPR Info)
- Organisation of yearly coordination meetings in the State between the government, the OHCHR regional office, UN agencies, the NHRI and NGOs. (UPR Info)
- Establish a concrete mechanism to evaluate the implementation of recommendations by the States. The role of OHCHR regional offices could be crucial for delivery of information to the HRC. The OHCHR conclusions could then be presented by the Troika during the second cycle. (UPR Info)
- States should provide a detailed timetable within twelve months of the adoption of the UPR outcome for the implementation of recommendations. (EU)
- States should be encouraged to hold an annual consultation on the implementation of recommendations with NGOs and other stakeholders. (EU)
- States should be encouraged to follow best practices in informing the Council of the progress of their implementation plans. (EU)

- The state under review has the primary responsibility to implement the outcome of the UPR. States are invited to inform the Council of the status regarding the implementation of the recommendations 2 years after the review. This mid-term exercise should include information on the state's efforts to engage the international community in the implementation of recommendations and the response and assistance provided by, inter alia, the UN system, development banks and bilateral donors. (NORWAY)
- The UPR should be seen as a dynamic entity and not simply a forum for exchange of information on a Member State. It is important, therefore, to establish appropriate modalities for follow up of reviews. These modalities should provide, inter alia, that Member States must make firm commitments and Member States that fail to comply with the recommendations must explain within a prescribed time frame the reasons for 'non-compliance'. (ARGENTINA)
- All States should be encouraged (but not obliged) to report annually or every two years (i.e. mid-term) on the implementation of UPR recommendations. In order to avoid this reporting becoming a burden on States, OHCHR would prepare a simple, short table containing the streamlined, clustered recommendations (see above), and States would simply update this table with important areas of progress. These progress reports would be placed on a dedicated page on the OHCHR website for stakeholder review and consideration. This would also help concerned States generate support for implementation (e.g. donor support) and would make it far easier to compile the National Report for the second cycle (as work will have been done in the meantime). (MALDIVES)
- The UPR was conceived as a peer-review process and owes to this fact a large amount of its legitimacy. To uphold this legitimacy, States which have made recommendations in the first cycle should evaluate their implementation during the second cycle of the UPR. Peer States should have the possibility to repeat previous recommendations they consider not yet or only partially implemented, reiterate recommendations which were noted during the 1st cycle and issue new ones. (SWITZERLAND)
- 'A' status accredited NHRIs, as well as other stakeholders, should be able to provide regular update information on the status of implementation of UPR outcomes, for instance under the general debate under item 6 of the Council's agenda. (ICC)
- The Review Outcome Report should be tabled in the national Parliament for a discussion of how the government intends to facilitate the implementation of recommendations at national level. A national implementation plan, with a clear time frame and key milestones, should be developed within 12 months of the adoption of the Review Outcome and submitted to the HRC (and posted on the OHCHR webpage). States should be able to request technical assistance and/or funding from the Voluntary Trust Fund for the UPR to develop an implementation plan. (AI)
- The government should establish a national mechanism with participation of relevant ministries, parliamentarians, NHRI, civil society groups and organizations to oversee the implementation of the UPR commitments (unilateral and supported recommendations). (AI)
- A mid-term report should be developed detailing the state of implementation of commitments made in the review. This report should be submitted to the HRC (and posted on the OHCHR website) and used as the basis for an update to the Council. States should be allocated time under Item 6 to present such reports. Some of the time that is currently allocated to States at the adoption of UPR outcomes in the Council Plenary could be reallocated for the presentation of an implementation plan and mid-term implementation report. (AI)
- States should identify and carry out specific steps to accelerate national implementation of recommendations, including the creation of specific bodies and national implementation plan with the participation of the civil society. (FIACAT)
- Organise nationwide and transparent consultations on the follow-up to the UPR; members of civil society should participate in order to define general policy measures which ought to be taken in order to implement the recommendations. (FIACAT)

- Encourage the civil society to ensure that UPR's recommendations are widely spread at a national level and to see to it that they are implemented. (FIACAT)
- Encourage the civil society to get involved in national initiative aiming at the implementation of the UPR's recommendations and the voluntary pledges. (FIACAT)
- Encourage civil society to provide an update, on a regular basis, on the implementation process in their country, under Item 6 of the Agenda of the Human Rights Council. (FIACAT)
- Promoting the national capabilities for the implementation of the UPR recommendations. (MOLDOVA)
- Format and modalities of possible follow-up procedures should be identical for all countries. It is the right of States to prepare an interim report, but such report should not be a part of formal process and can be presented at informal side events or otherwise. This practice should not be institutionalized. (RUSSIAN FEDERATION)
- All States should be encouraged to present mid term-review which will deal with the level of implementation of recommendations. (TURKEY)
- Each State should submit to the Secretariat, no later than two years after the adoption of its UPR outcome, a follow-up report on the state of implementation of the recommendations it has accepted. The Secretariat should be requested disseminate this document as well as to compile information on the areas (recommendations) which require further international assistance. An open-ended meeting in Geneva or a regional workshop (subject to the availability of existing resources) could be held to consider the areas where further international assistance is required and the extent of resources necessary. (JAPAN)
- The submission of mid-term reports or information should not become an obligation limiting the use of other instruments chosen by the States for the follow up. In this regard, systematically sharing best practices and experience is important. (ARMENIA)
- There is no need to formalise/institutionalise the presentation on the follow up of the recommendations in the Council. (PAKISTAN)
- States having undergone UPR could provide information on follow up as they deem appropriate and on a voluntary basis to the HRC before their next review. (ALGERIA)
- Establish templates to serve as a possible guideline for voluntary mid-term reporting by States on progress achieved. (CANADA)
- We are interested in Maldives ideas for a dedicated UN system resource person to help promote follow up on UPR where desired, and for an online chart to be maintained containing updates on progress by States on implementation of recommendations. (CANADA)
- Proper and clear follow up mechanism to be put in place in assessing the status of implementation of the recommendations of the UPR. (SOUTH AFRICA)
- Some States have chosen to report back to the HRC on progress. This seems to be a helpful way both to encourage scheduling of a State's follow up work as well as allowing the HRC to have a sense of in-country progress on UPR. Such practices could be further encouraged by the HRC. (COMMONWEALTH)
- Mechanisms and modalities for the assessment of the implementation of recommendations should be developed and the civil society should play an active role in this process. (JOINT NGOs CONTRIBUTION)

Second cycle of the UPR

- It is recommended that the second cycle concentrates on the human rights situation in the UN Member States and their implementation of recommendations received during the first UPR cycle. (UPR Info)
- SuRs should be challenged on the recommendations which they did not implement. (UPR Info)

- In cases where recommendations were rejected, it is important that States are allowed to make the same recommendations again. (UPR Info)
- Actors submitting reports for review sessions could include a section in each of the three reports on the status of implementation of the UPR recommendations. (UPR Info)
- OHCHR could draft a fourth report solely on the implementation of recommendations accepted by the States. (UPR Info)
- The subsequent cycle of the UPR should focus mainly on outlining the current developments in the country concerned since the previous review, in addition to the follow up on the implementation of those recommendations made in the preceding cycle which enjoy the support of the SuR, as well as on its voluntary commitments. (NAM)
- The working group and plenary level should also be maintained for the review process, but more time should be foreseen for discussions. (EU)
- The final outcome of the UPR will be adopted by the Council in UPR plenary sessions. The UPR plenary session shall take place immediately after the sessions of the UPR Working Group and consider the outcome of the preceding session of the UPR Working Group. The state under review shall be fully involved in the outcome. (NORWAY)
- 72 hours shall pass between the end of the interactive dialogue with the state under review and the preliminary adoption of the outcome of the review by the UPR WG. (NORWAY)
- The second round of the UPR should reflect the fact that it necessarily implies a review of implementation of the outcomes of the first cycle. Accordingly, the established order of presentation by States deciding during the first round by drawing lots should be retained. (COLOMBIA)
- The System should have the capacity to identify not only problems, objectives and challenges, but also achievements, advances and good practices in order to further its development and to motivate States, and civil society organizations to continue making effective progress in improving the human rights situation on the ground. (COLOMBIA)
- The good practices gathered in the first round of the UPR could be grouped by subject in a compilation that serves as a source of information to be used by States, the Human Rights System and civil society organizations, as a tool for the effective implementation of public policies in the field of human rights. (COLOMBIA)
- In order to maintain the impetus of the work of the HRC/UPR mechanism and to enable the first group of States to be reviewed to be sufficiently prepared, the arrangements for the 2nd cycle should be agreed to by December 2011 or March 2012 at the latest. (MAURITIUS)
- The focus of the 2nd UPR cycle should be on ensuring an appropriate follow-up on the recommendations and voluntary commitments made by Member States reviewed in the first cycle. The second cycle should also address emerging human rights issues since the first cycle as well as issues of continued concern, particularly on recommendations which the reviewed State rejected. (MAURITIUS)
- The existing process and modalities of the UPR should be maintained, as specified in HRC resolution 5/1. (INDIA)
- Rather than adopting UPR reports (in effect) twice, the Maldives believes that at the end of each UPR Working Group session, the Council should convene in formal session to adopt the UPR reports considered at the previous UPR Working Group. (Instead of adopting UPR reports during regular Council sessions as is currently the case). As well as being a more efficient use of time, this would also reduce the time pressure on the OHCHR to prepare the national reports. (MALDIVES)
- Finally, the adoption of the UPR reports could be taken out of the regular HRC sessions and specific sessions could be established for that particular purpose. (SWITZERLAND)
- A costs-benefits evaluation in terms of protection and promotion of human rights should be made at the end of the second cycle of the review. (CNCDH)
- From the second cycle onwards, each examination should focus on both the state of implementation by the State reviewed of the commitments (unilateral and supported

recommendations) made in the previous UPR examination and on new and ongoing human rights challenges. The division should also be reflected in the documents prepared for each review, including the national report, the UN compilation and the stakeholder summary. (AI)

- The dialogue should focus both in the implementation of previous commitments and recommendations that received the support of the SuR and on ongoing and new human rights challenges. (AI)
- One of the focuses of the 2nd cycle will be the follow up to the recommendations made during the first cycle. It will thus be of crucial importance to envisage a specific space to UN entities; particularly UN Country Team (UNCTs) which are actively engaged in follow up. (OHCHR)
- The current reports of the WG should be organised thematically. (OHCHR)
- The second cycle of the UPR should be essentially devoted to the follow up on the implementation of those recommendations accepted by the SUR in the first cycle, on the basis of the information to that effect provided by the SUR. (CUBA)
- The strict intergovernmental nature of the UPR Working Group should be maintained, thus respecting the principle of a review among peers. (CUBA)
- Streamlining the agenda of the HRC with introducing a separate sessions for the UPR reports adoption. (MOLDOVA)
- If the Council agrees that the second/further cycles of the UPR should rather focus on the implementation of the recommendations from the first/previous rounds than on the review of the overall human rights situation in a given country at that time three reports for the second/further rounds (one national and two from the OHCHR) should be structured in accordance with the first/previous rounds recommendations. (RUSSIAN FEDERATION)
- The following cycles should focus on the implementation of the recommendations accepted by the State concerned during the first/previous round of the UPR. (RUSSIAN FEDERATION)
- Bearing in mind the provisions of the IBP and Presidential statement 8/1, the report of the UPR Working Group will consist of a summary of the interactive dialogue, which will reflect recommendations and/or conclusions made by delegations during the interactive dialogue. (MEXICO)
- Further efforts should be undertaken in order for the outcome of the review to reflect the aspects contained in the IBP. In particular, an assessment undertaken in an objective and transparent manner of the human rights situation in the country under review, including positive developments and challenges, is essential for the better follow up and implementation of the UPR outcome. (MEXICO)
- Guidelines in formulating the UPR Working Group report should also be further elaborated. (INDONESIA)
- The second UPR cycle should focus on the latest development of human rights situations in States under Review as well as the follow-up to the recommendations during the first cycle. (CHINA)
- Convert the final 2, unused days of each UPR session into HRC sessions for adoption of UPR reports from the past WG session. (CANADA)
- We welcome the suggestions made (...) by the OHCHR with regard to operationalization of UPR recommendations and the production of one single final report. (CANADA)
- A Standard Uniform Questionnaire to be addressed to all States to assess their compliance with their international human rights law and humanitarian law obligations is elaborated. (SOUTH AFRICA)
- The outcome of the review process should be more operational and implementable, to even deal with situations where the concerned State is not responsive. (SOUTH AFRICA)
- Consider ways in which to enhance opportunities for small states' engagement with the UPR. This could be done, for example, by allowing states and stakeholders to make oral interventions via video submissions or video link. (COMMONWEALTH)

- Outcomes of the UPR processes should be communicated to all relevant stakeholders in the State concerned by the Secretariat of the Council (the OHCHR).The OHCHR could consider taking more advantage of the expertise at country or regional level for determining the relevant stakeholders that should be provided the outcome document and perhaps the opportunity, where possible, to discuss it with experts from the OHCHR. (NORD SUD XXI)
- The second cycle should be devoted to both the assessment of the implementation of recommendations made in the previous review and an assessment of the current human rights situation in the State under review. (JOINT NGOs CONTRIBUTION)

Role of NHRIs

- At the time of the adoption of the UPR report, NHRI with A status should receive the floor immediately after the national delegation. (EU)
- ‘A’ status accredited NHRIs should be allocated speaking time during the review of its country at the Working Group on the UPR, following the presentation by the State under review. This would enable the NHRI to bring a national perspective and independent expert contribution to the Council’s interactive dialogue with the State. (ICC)
- NHRIs could also use item 6 as an opportunity to report on the State’s progress in implementing its UPR outcomes. (ICC)
- NHRIs should be able to submit a separate ten-page report on their State in future UPR cycles. These reports would constitute a separate fourth report upon which country reviews are based. Five pages of the report could be dedicated to reporting on the State’s performance in implementing previous UPR outcomes. The other five pages could address the human rights situation in the country. (ICC)
- NHRI with status A should have a stronger role in the preparation phase, including in being authorized to submit a fourth document to complement the basis for the review, facilitating consultation between the government and civil society groups and organizations, and participating actively in the examination in the UPR WG. (AI)
- NHRIs should be able to submit a separate ten page report on their State in future cycles of the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) mechanism. These reports would constitute a separate fourth report upon which country reviews are based. Five pages of the report could be dedicated to reporting on the State’s performance in implementing previous UPR outcomes. The other five pages could address the human rights situation in the country. (APF)
- ‘A’ status accredited NHRIs should be allocated speaking time during the review of its country at the Working Group on the UPR, following the presentation by the State under review. This would enable the NHRI to bring a national perspective and independent expert contribution to the Council’s interactive dialogue with the State. (APF)
- The role of NHRIs in the UPR could be enhanced by the Troika holding an informal briefing with the State’s NHRI before the examination of the State in the Working Group on the UPR. (APF)
- Create dedicated speaking space during the UPR WG for A-Status NHRIs (by video-link if necessary). (CANADA)
- Allow A-Status NHRIs to submit a separate 10 page reports as an additional basis for the review. (CANADA)

Expertise

- Independent expertise should be brought into the UPR process by having experts (either appointed by the HRC or from within OHCHR) observe the review process and present a summary and analysis of the UPR during the adoption of the final report. (HRW)
- The institution building texts could be supplemented by formal arrangements for the President of the Council to provide copies of the UPR reports to relevant Special Procedures mandate holders immediately after each Working Group session for their review and comment and for the President to distribute their comments before the plenary session of the Council at which the reports are to be adopted. (ADH)
- Involvement of independent experts should be a new element in the UPR which will serve to give advice to Troika members, both in preparing the review (e.g. with a list of questions) and, after the review has been completed, in preparing effective draft recommendations. (ARGENTINA)
- The UPR could be further improved by additional expertise during the adoption of the report by establishing a roster of independent experts to act as Rapporteurs at the end of each review. These experts would be invited to examine the documents of the review and to observe the review. The role of each designated expert would be to assist the Troika at the end of the review in reaching an overall picture of the unfolding of the review process, the main issues raised and the challenges faced as well as the commitments made. (MAURITIUS)
- A working group composed by 5 independent experts should be set up, appointed for the whole duration of the review cycle, according to the same modalities used for the appointment of the Rapporteurs of SP. This WG should have the following mission:
 - Ensuring the respect of the principles of complementarity, non-duplication and non prejudice of the reaction capability in case of urgent situations;
 - Making an objective assessment on the level and quality of State's commitment during the whole UPR process (from the phase of report drafting until the review in the plenary). And noting any diversion of the State trying to avoid to address allegations on human rights violations. This assessment should be integrated to the final report.
 - Verifying that recommendations made and accepted by the State are not below the standards fixed by international laws as interpreted by the competent monitoring bodies.
 - Including in the final report a section dedicated to the "objective and transparent" evaluation of the human rights situation in the country, according to the Council res. 5/1. (CNCDH)
- There should be independent expertise in the preparation of the review, e.g., in the form of a team of experts responsible for the preparation for and conduct of the UPR examination of the SuR in a particular session, including by structuring issues and discussions of these. (AI)
- Human rights expertise, including among the members of the Troika, should be brought into the WG to guide the discussion in the WG and to provide advice on issues raised and recommendations made during the examination. (AI)
- Reviewing States should include country-specific human rights expertise in their delegation to the WG to ensure a well-informed dialogue with the SuR. (AI)
- The President of the Council should provide copies of UPR examination reports to relevant Special Procedures mandate-holders and to treaty bodies immediately after each Working Group session for their review and comment. The President could distribute any comments that the Special Procedures and treaty bodies have in response in an official Council document before the plenary session of the Council at which the UPR reports are to be adopted. (APF)
- Basis, principles and objectives of the review should be preserved. Enlargement of its non-governmental component of introduction at any stage of any independent expertise

will undermine the peer review character of the review when States are supposed to be evaluated by its peers, by States. (RUSSIAN FEDERATION)

Technical assistance

- The review of any country should include an assessment of the adequacy of the assistance received from the international community to enable the implementation of the accepted recommendations. (NAM)
- There is a need to strengthen the resources of the UPR Voluntary Trust Fund to enable it to facilitate the participation of developing countries, particularly the least developed countries, in the UPR mechanism. (NAM)
- Modalities and functioning of the Voluntary Fund for Financial and Technical Assistance should be agreed by the Council as a matter of priority, preferably before the beginning of the second UPR cycle and preferably within the context of the process of the review of the Council. Through such an exercise, the Council would also give guidance on the role expected from the trustees of UPR Voluntary Trust Funds to be appointed would enable their early appointment. (NAM)
- Reports produced during the second phase of the UPR should include a paragraph reflecting the impact of cooperation and technical assistance so that State can make progress in implementing the UPR. (COLOMBIA)
- States undergoing the UPR should have the option, in their concluding remarks, to request the UN system to appoint a dedicated Resource Person to act as a permanent liaison and support point for implementation. That Resource Person would become a permanent link between the concerned State and the Human Rights Council, broader UN system and the international community throughout the four years period in-between reviews. At present, many States, especially Small Island States and other Small States that do not have a Mission in Geneva or lack the resources to follow-up on their review, do not receive any kind of advice or support on implementation. In effect, once their national report is adopted, they are cut-off from the UN human rights system. The Resource Person would avoid this by becoming a permanent conduit for advice, engagement and support for implementation. (MALDIVES)
- The Council should regularly discuss the availability of technical assistance for UPR implementation under Item 6. UN agencies and programmes involved in the delivery of human rights technical assistance should be invited to participate regularly in the discussion. (AI)
- The UPR trust fund should be extended to support NHRI attendance at the Working Group on the UPR, and to support NHRI participation in training sessions on the UPR that are organised by the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights. (APF)
- The Council should develop concrete tools with accountable financial security for the provision of technical assistance at the request of interested States for the implementation of recommendations accepted by SUR during its examine by the UPR. (CUBA)
- OHCHR should have an enhanced role in the identification of possible areas of international cooperation in support of national efforts to implement the UPR outcome, by identifying needs and sources of such cooperation, including capacity building and technical assistance activities. (MEXICO)
- Each State which has undergone a (second) UPR should be required to classify the recommendations it has accepted into one of the two following categories and to submit the information to the Secretariat for circulation:
 - (i) recommendations which the State concerned can implement on its own; and
 - (ii) recommendations for whose implementation international assistance is required.States which have placed some of the recommendations they have accepted in the second category in 1 above should request bilateral donors and relevant UN agencies, including OHCHR, for assistance. In response, those States which made the

recommendations that were placed in this category should seriously consider the possibility of extending assistance. (JAPAN)

- The Voluntary Fund for Financial and Technical Assistance for Implementation of the UPR should be expanded. OHCHR, which administers the Fund, should be requested to provide the Council with information on the Fund's balance sheet at an early date and to make periodic appeals for contributions to the Fund in accordance with the need to replenish the resources therein. (JAPAN)
- To address the issue of providing technical and financial assistance to developing countries in need, including creating conditions for the functioning of the Technical Assistance/UPR Voluntary Trust Funds in order to assist developing countries, particularly the least developed countries, to participate in the UPR and implement relevant recommendations. (CHINA)
- There is need to strengthen the resources of UPR Voluntary Trust Fund enabling the effective participation of developing countries particularly the least developed countries in different stages of the UPR process. Modalities to be finalized at the earliest to operationalize the Voluntary Fund for Financial and Technical Assistance. (IRAN)
- The OHCHR should respond as a matter of priority and effectively to technical cooperation requests expressed by States during the Universal Periodic Review. (GRULAC)
- To create mechanisms and strategies of technical assistance and capacity building for the implementation of the recommendations made in the context of the UPR exercise for which the State requires assistance. This cooperation will complement national efforts and will be given upon request of the States. (GRULAC)
- The Human Rights Council should indicate how trustees of UPR Voluntary Trust Funds set up by its resolution 6/17 are to be appointed. The HRC should also proceed to their early appointment. (ALGERIA)
- There is a need to make operational and ensure adequate resources for the UPR Voluntary Trust Fund for the Participation of Developing Countries and Voluntary Fund for Financial and Technical Assistance. (NORD SUD XXI)