

Joint Statement on the Universal Periodic Review

Item 6 General debate HRC25 – 21 March 2013

Mr President,

I have the honour to make this statement on behalf of 47 countries.

As stated in the HRC Resolution that established the Universal Periodic Review (resolution 5/1), the UPR process should not be overly burdensome and should be conducted in an 'objective, transparent, constructive, non-confrontational and non-politicized manner'. We believe that the effectiveness and credibility of this mechanism relies upon a manageable number of high quality recommendations given to the state under review, to give the receiving state the best chance to successfully implement their accepted recommendations in advance of the next review. We also consider that Mid Term Reports are an important tool to monitor and measure progress in states' implementation of their recommendations.

As we approach the half-way point of the second cycle of the UPR, we therefore make the following three voluntary commitments:

1. To exercise restraint on the number of recommendations given to other states, by adhering to a maximum of two for each state – in order to try to bring the number of recommendations to a more manageable level, and ensure that the state under review will have the best chance to successfully implement their accepted recommendations.

2. To always give high quality recommendations to other states, by ensuring that all our recommendations are precise, practical, constructive, forward looking and implementable.

3. To write and publish as appropriate a Mid Term Report two years after our reviews, which updates on progress achieved in implementation of our recommendations.

We believe that technical assistance has an important role to play in helping states to implement their accepted recommendations. We also believe that the discussion to promote technical cooperation and capacity-building in the Human Rights Council should be based on consultations with and the consent of the States concerned, and should take into account their needs and aim to make a concrete impact on the ground, while the provision of technical assistance should be provided upon the request of States concerned

We further encourage grouping recommendations that are identical or nearly identical, with the consent of the state under review and the recommending state, as long as the substance of the recommendation is preserved. This can help states to manage a high level of repeated recommendations. We also stress the importance of a clear and unequivocal written response to all recommendations, in line with Resolution 16/21.

We would also like emphasize that for the UPR to have value for a diverse range of national actors, it is important for states to facilitate access to the UPR webcast and to documents relating to the UPR process including their official national reports and the outcomes of the UPR process, as appropriate.

This statement is on behalf of the following countries:

Armenia, Bahrain, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Chad, Cote d'Ivoire, Croatia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Guinea, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, State of Palestine, St Kitts and Nevis, South Sudan, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Yemen