

UK-Morocco-Brazil

Joint Statement on the Universal Periodic Review

Item 6 General debate HRC22 - 15 March 2013

Mr President,

I have the honour to make this statement on behalf of 89 countries.

We believe that the Universal Periodic Review, as the only peer-review mechanism in the UN human rights framework, provides a unique opportunity to improve protection of human rights worldwide. 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.

Taking the opportunity of the beginning of the second cycle of the UPR, we therefore make the following three voluntary commitments:

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

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.

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

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 hope that by making these voluntary commitments today, and holding ourselves to them throughout the second and future cycles, that others will agree to do likewise and that we might therefore work together to strengthen the UPR process and ensure that it has an even greater and more sustainable impact on the ground in the years to come.

This statement is on behalf of the following countries:

Argentina, Armenia, Bahrain, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Gabon (on behalf of the African Group), Honduras, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Maldives, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Macedonia, Republic of Moldova, Saudi Arabia, St Kitts and Nevis, Sweden, Thailand, Timor L'Este, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom and Yemen.