It is with deep enthusiasm and earnestness that I introduce *UPR Info*’s 2012 Annual Report. This year has marked the beginning of the UPR’s second cycle and in this respect bore great importance for the functioning of the mechanism in the five next years. We currently encounter a decisive turning point, facing both abundant opportunities to maximize the UPR’s potential and consolidate and build upon its achievements, as well as significant challenges which, without diligent attention and concerted action, could reduce the force of the UPR to effect substantial and sustainable change on the ground.

2012 was also a turning point for *UPR Info*. We launched a new programme, the “pre-sessions” which resulted in the organisation of 35 meetings between 65 Permanent Missions and over 150 civil society organisations (CSOs) in Geneva. These “pre-sessions” aimed at improving CSOs opportunities to influence the review and the content of the recommendations made. In this way, the pre-sessions offered a platform to raise the issues of importance. They also provided States with unique insights into the status of implementation of the recommendations they had made during the first cycle in order to ensure that they better address them in their statements. During those “pre-sessions”, we also provided a number of CSOs with trainings on the UPR process and on how to undertake effective lobbying.

Another highlight of the year was the release of a study on the implementation of 3’000 recommendations by 66 States. In the framework of the follow-up programme, we published a quantitative and qualitative analysis on how States are implementing recommendations at mid-term. “On the road to implementation” was launched during a side event with the participation of the Permanent Mission of Norway and Romania.
and provided the ground for a fruitful discussion on the obstacles actors are facing to implement recommendations as well as solutions to progress forward.

The number of visits to the website increased again to reach a record figure of 131’000 visits, that is 11’000 visits per month. More than ever, our broad and substantial information on the UPR is proven to match actual needs.

Finally, we were pleased to be granted the Special Consultative status by the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).

During this fruitful year, we identified new ways to improve the UPR and strived to strengthen the previous ones; we are committed to continuing our work in order to make it a successful mechanism for every human being.

Roland Chauville
Executive Director
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Three key elements were at stake at the thirteenth UPR session in the perspective of the second cycle: the list of speakers, the number of recommendations made and the assessment of the implementation of first cycle recommendations.

An average of 68.1 statements were made per Review at the 13th session. When the same 14 States were first reviewed in 2008, the average was 46.4 statements, denoting an increase of nearly 20 statements per Review. However, a change in the modalities of the list of speakers which made it possible for a greater number of States to take the floor did not result in a significant increase of the number of recommendations made. In total, 2126 recommendations were made during the 13th session. The average number of recommendations received by those fourteen States under Review was 152, which is in line with the average number of recommendations received by States during session 12 (143). The accent put by States on the follow-up was a mixed bag. While a majority of States under Review took the opportunity both in their National Reports and during their opening statements to report on their progress accomplished to implement recommendations, few “reviewing States” mentioned the recommendations they had made at the first cycle, thus failing to bring accountability to States by building on the previous recommendations.

More broadly, the UPR is facing a major threat to its functioning: a potential breach in the 100% participation of the 193 member States is jeopardizing its universality. In May 2012, Israel suspended “its cooperation with the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Human Rights Council (the Council) and its subsequent mechanisms” and could therefore potentially not participate in its UPR scheduled for 29 January 2013. Such a precedent could open the door for other States to withdraw, thus endangering the mechanism. The Council should therefore develop modalities that will prevent other States from avoiding or postponing their UPR. It has the responsibility to define the concept of “persistent non-cooperation” as contained in article 38 of resolution A/HRC/RES5/1 and the actions to take when facing such a situation.
The three programmes of UPR Info significantly developed in 2012: UPR awareness raising and monitoring, Civil Society Organisation (CSO) capacity-building and the Follow-up programme.

1. UPR Awareness Raising and Monitoring Programme

1.1. Gathering and clustering all documents on the UPR

In order to facilitate users’ access to the documentation on the UPR process, we uploaded the various documents for the 28 countries that were reviewed at sessions 13 and 14 on our website. These documents included national reports, compilations from the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights' (OHCHR), summaries of stakeholders’ information, non-governmental organisations’ (NGOs) individual submissions, advanced questions, Working Group Reports and their Addenda, UN press releases, as well as oral and written statements from NGOs.

1.2. Monitoring the process

From January to December 2012, we published 80 news articles on topics such as the UPR modalities, the highlights of States’ reviews, and UPR Info’s activities. In addition, during that same period, we distributed 8 newsletters summarizing the news published during these months. The number of subscribers increased from 1’300 to 1’500 subscribers. Each newsletter contained a video on the UPR process, which generally consisted in the interview of a pre-eminent actor. The interviewees in 2012 were: Mr. Yervand Shirinyan, Program Director of the Human Rights and Governance Grants Program, Open Society Foundations; Ms. Corlett Letlojane, Executive Director, Human Rights Institute of South Africa; Mr. Christophe Peschoux, Chief of the UPR section at the OHCHR; Mr. Bob Last, Senior Human Rights Adviser.
at the Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom to the United Nations in Geneva; Mr. Patrick Mutzenberg, Director of the Centre for Civil and Political Rights; and Ms. Alice Mogwe, Executive Director of Ditswhanelo.

We covered sessions 13 and 14 live by reporting on the issues raised and the recommendations made through Facebook and Twitter; in this way, it is now possible for everyone to follow every UPR review live through our two social media channels. The live monitoring drastically increased our visibility in social media. Our "Facebook Likes" and "Twitter followers" doubled in 2012 to reach respectively 1000 and 900 people.

1.3. Offer detailed explanations on the process

The different pages containing explanations on the process and the role of States and CSOs were redrafted to take into account the revised modalities of the second cycle and more up-to-date practices. We also updated the “timeline” for CSOs, States under Review and Recommending States. The three videos on the UPR process, the role of States under Review and of CSOs have been updated as well. These are currently available in English, French, and Spanish.

1.3.1. Developing fact sheets

In partnership with the "NGO Group for the CRC", we developed fact sheets on the UPR process. Practical and action-oriented, these fact sheets aim at providing general information as well as technical details about the mechanism in order to enhance civil society’s understanding of its modalities and how they can engage. Each fact sheet has two versions: one with specific references to the rights of the child which is targeted at non-governmental organisations (NGOs) working on this issue, and one with a broader content, aimed at all NGOs. In 2012 two fact sheets were published on the UPR mechanism and on NGO submission to the UPR in English, French and Spanish.
1.3.2. Survey on advocacy opportunities

In order to ensure that CSOs possess the necessary information in order to lobby States at the appropriate time, UPR Info teamed up with "Mandat International" to conduct a survey seeking out the process through which States draft their interventions for the UPR working group. The aim of this survey was to improve CSOs' knowledge on these processes, with a view to facilitate their interaction and advocacy efforts with States. For the latter, the survey was designed as an opportunity to inform NGOs about States’ preferences regarding how and when NGOs should contact them, with a view to saving time and making the process more efficient for both. The survey was conducted between January and March 2012 and involved the participation of 31 states. The results have been sent to all Geneva-based Permanent Missions, and were published on our website for CSO access in early June.

1.4. Statements at the Human Rights Council

Now in Special Consultative Status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), UPR Info made two oral statements at the Human Rights Council, during the general debate under item 6.

In June 2012, we expressed our concern that session 13 did not look into the implementation of recommendations from the first cycle in a satisfactory manner. We explained that only 16% out of 2008 recommendations were followed up by similar or additional recommendations at the 13th session, which would imply that 84% of the 2008 recommendations were fully implemented. This seemed rather unlikely considering that the average percentage of recommendations fully implemented at mid-term is normally around 10%. We therefore called on recommending States to look more closely into the recommendations they made at
the first cycle and inquire into their implementation. A consistent follow-up was essential to secure that the UPR has a real impact. A lack of follow-up would result in a lack of accountability and would risk transforming the UPR into a rhetoric exercise where States come to Geneva every five years simply to discuss human rights and receive only new recommendations without any reference to previous reviews.

During the 20th HRC session in September 2012, we denounced the practice of States negotiating the wording of recommendations made during the UPR in a joint statement with Conectas Direitos Humanos and the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies. We criticised both States under Review and Recommending States for engaging in a trade-off concerning the wording of recommendations after they have been made during the review. This practice, though used since the Working Group reports of Afghanistan and Yemen in 2009, is still lacking transparency and accountability. Moreover, it undermines the stakeholder’s participation in the UPR process by erasing their effort to ensure that specific recommendations are made. We called on all states to stop this practice. Other issues of concern raised in the statement were the possibility for States under Review to draft the summary section of their own statement within the report of the UPR Working Group, and the requirement that when factual mistakes and mistranslation of language occur within that report, only the delegation which made the statement may request that corrections be made to that text. We argued that this practise is unnecessary and could potentially increase the chance of inaccuracies being included in the final outcome document.

2. CSO Capacity-Building Programme

2.1. Offering technical assistance

The change of modalities from the first to the second cycle, notably the new online list of speakers for statements at the UPR adoptions online and the word limits for CSO reports, has increased CSOs’ need for information on how to engage in the process. Through emails, phone calls and meetings, we have reached over 250
actors (including NGOs, NHRIs, Government officials and academics) from Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Colombia, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Morocco, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Togo, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates and Zimbabwe.

We also started offering a new service to CSOs. We sent a reminder by email to CSOs working on countries to be reviewed at session 14, 15, 16, and 17 and which had submitted a contribution on those States during the first cycle. These reminders, sent out a year before the UPR, contained the date of review of the specific country, the deadline for the submission of information, links to explanations of the new modalities, links to the recommendations received by the Government at the previous cycle and information about our “pre-sessions”.

**2.2. Participating in trainings and conferences**

In 2012 *UPR Info* delivered 25 presentations to CSOs on the second cycle, advising them on lobbying strategies around the UPR. More than two hundred representatives from the following countries were reached: Algeria, Azerbaijan, Burma, China, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ecuador, Eritrea, France, Georgia, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Macedonia, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Republic of Congo, Romania, Russian Federation, Spain, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Uzbekistan, Yemen and Zambia.
The organisations we worked with included: Amnesty International – Ireland, the Australian National University, the Commonwealth Secretariat, the Centre for Civil and Political Rights, Freedom House, the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, the Geneva Academy for humanitarian law and human rights, the GMedia Center, the Human Rights House Foundation, the Inter-Parliamentary Union, the Minority Rights Group, the Niger Delta UPR coalition, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Open Society Foundations, and the University of Essex.

In December 2012, UPR Info’s Executive Director was invited to Canberra, Australia, to a workshop organised by the Australian National University. The seminar was organised within the framework of a study launched by Professor Hilary Charlesworth on “Rights, Rituals and Ritualisms”. The workshop gathered scholars and practitioners, including former Special procedures mandate holders and current Treaty body members, CSOs and OHCHR staff to discuss to what extent the UPR functions as a “regulatory mechanism”. UPR Info presented a paper on the successes and weaknesses of the first cycle of the UPR. The contributions by the participants will be gathered into a book to be published in 2014.

2.3. Updating the database and developing Statistics tools

[Your database] is very user friendly and clear and thus an extremely useful tool for anyone working to promote human rights through the UPR mechanisms.

Danish Human Rights Institute

We added the recommendations made at session 12 of the UPR Working Group and the voluntary pledges from sessions 1 to 12, thus completing the entire first cycle. The database contains 21,353 recommendations and 603 voluntary pledges. It remains the most sought-after feature of our website. It is continuously used by all actors for such purposes as lobbying work by NGOs, training activities by international organisations, and academic research. We regularly receive requests for new features, and strive to respond positively to these. Last but not least, by
adding this unique information on voluntary pledges, we increase the monitoring opportunities on the UPR.

We also developed two new important statistic tools. It is now possible to select any of the 54 human rights issues available in our database and find out which countries have made the most recommendations on it during the UPR’s first cycle. The tool lists the countries in decreasing order and provides the user with the number of recommendations each of them made on the selected issue. This tool saves valuable time for CSOs when identifying States. In this way they quickly and easily find out which countries are interested in their issues of concerns and will therefore be able to lobby them more effectively. The second statistic tool developed is related to the specificity of action of recommendations. Based on the action category developed by Prof. McMahon from the University of Vermont, this tool enables users to identify those States that are making the most specific recommendations at the UPR and those making the less specific ones. Again, this lobbying is made easier for CSOs.
3. UPR “Pre-sessions”

[The pre-session] assisted us in advising our government where to tighten screws in the areas of human rights where we are still lagging behind, not only in preparation for the UPR, but also for the benefit of our people.

M. Charles Masole, Permanent Mission of Botswana

On 28 March 2012, UPR Info launched a new project aiming at improving the impact of CSOs’ on the Working Group review. The “pre-sessions” consist of meetings between Permanent Missions and CSOs and take place one to two months before the UPR, in order to discuss the human rights situation of the countries to be reviewed.

The purpose of these pre-sessions is to save time and resources to civil society organisations (CSOs) and to enable them to meet several delegations at once. For delegations, these meetings offer an opportunity to be briefed by CSOs about the human rights situation in the State under Review (SuR).

The pre-session for each SuR lasts one hour. The National human rights institution and CSOs are given the floor one after another to share their assessment of the human rights situation in the country since the previous review and the progress accomplished by the SuR to implement the recommendations.

All Permanent Missions, including that of the State under Review, are invited to attend.
35 “pre-sessions” meetings were organised for States to be reviewed at the 13th, 14th and 15th UPR session. The pre-sessions provided an opportunity for NGOs and State delegations to meet and discuss the human rights situations of the States that were reviewed. On average, 20 State delegations were present at each session, and 157 NGOs participated, 89 of which were national organisations and 4 of which were national institutions. With the support of the Democracy Coalition Project, the City of Geneva, the Canton of Geneva, the MFA of Switzerland, and Irish Aid, we were able to fund the participation of 23 human rights defenders (HRD) from 16 different countries. In addition further HRD participation was supported by other organisations, such as the United Nations Development Programme and the Open Society Foundations. We also provided them with trainings on the UPR process and CSO engagement. These trainings ensured that these defenders were fully equipped to continue their engagement in the process and notably in the implementation of recommendations.

Because of the many opportunities raised by the pre-sessions, we also provided trainings upon request: in this regard, we trained HRD supported by the FIACAT, CCPR Centre, Plan International, Trocaire and East and Horn of Africa Human Rights Defenders Project.

3.1. Reminding diplomats about the UPR recommendations they made

The UPR Info’s briefings […] are helpful in our preparation for the upcoming UPRs. At least for me personally, it gives me a jump start on the challenges and achievements made by the country under review in its endeavor to promote and protect human rights.

Ms. Mariska Dhanutirto, Permanent Mission of Indonesia

Aiming at improving the follow-up on recommendations as undertaken by States, UPR Info seized the opportunity to send all delegates attending the pre-sessions the recommendations they previously made to the State for which they attended the pre-session.
4. UPR Follow-up Programme

4.1. Assessment of the UPR follow-up of 65 countries

The Follow-up Project, launched in 2011, developed significantly in its second year of running. A total of 65 Mid-term Implementation Assessments (MIAs) were published. A total of 1140 CSOs from 65 countries were contacted in addition to 25 NHRIs, and 30 UN agencies. All kind of stakeholders are now engaged in the Follow-up Programme, which is continually growing and attracting attention.

These developments led to the following expected outcomes:

- The participation in the programme of both national and international NGOs is steadily increasing. From the 40% of the NGOs which took part in the first sessions, we have registered approximately 50% participation for the last sessions;
- Civil society now feels more involved in the UN process: With the help of the Follow-up Programme, NGOs know that their work is useful to the international community, and that it has an impact on the process. For example, a representative from the Norway Grimstad MPAT Institute told UPR Info that “this [was] actually the first they [heard] from the UPR since they wrote that report”. Another example was a comment from the Ahwaz Human Rights Organization: “I am glad to see that our effort to write and compile our submissions, year after year, is followed up and strengthened”;
- Despite the low participation of States in the programme, it still has an impact on them: UPR Info reminds them of their commitments within the UPR framework, and encourages them to take action. The number of reports by States at mid-term has been increasing since early 2012. For example, even though Monaco did not participate in the Follow-up Programme at first, it did provide us with a mid-term report four months later.
- Alternatively, when States did not participate, the pressure of the Programme was helpful; some Missions in Geneva used our request as a pretext to encourage the Capital to write a mid-term report. The Programme resulted in
those Missions taking direct and significant action and it provided them with a legitimate reason to make their request;

- Finally, participating States also appreciate the Programme, as the Ambassador of the Permanent Mission of Slovenia explained: “I would also like to express my country’s appreciation for the work of UPR Info in following up on the implementation of UPR recommendations. We believe the latter is a true measure of the success and value of the UPR process and we are, for our part, determined to raise it in our statements in the dialogues with countries under review”;

Additionally, due to the Follow-up Programme’s great potential to raise awareness, to involve new stakeholders, and to train them, we unexpectedly observed that:

- MIAs are now being used to assess the first UPR cycle.
- Civil society is using the MIAs as an advocacy tool. For example in the Republic of Korea and in Cyprus, NGOs that took part in the Programme referred to and used the MIA in press conferences and meetings with foreign embassies;
- NGOs formed new coalitions or re-established past ones in order to provide their comments on the recommendations (such as in Canada, Chad, China, Chile, New Zealand, Nigeria...), a development that will significantly strengthen civil society;
- Regional initiatives were started to follow up on UPR recommendations. UPR Info will closely collaborate with such initiatives, providing resources and advice;
- NGOs that had not taken part in the UPR process, discovered the UPR due to the Follow-up Programme, and new NGOs are now expected to submit a report for the second UPR cycle. For example, the Canadian Association of Sexual Assault Centres, the World Uyghur Congress are just some of those NGOs;
- The Follow-up Programme is a way for all stakeholders to prepare for the next review in advance; collected data will be used for the next UPR to submit reports. It also provides a framework for the second cycle;
• A complete section on UPR Info’s website dedicated to the Follow-up Programme was created. This section of the website aims to gather information and make it easier for visitors to access and consult it. It displays comments made on recommendations and provides the documents shared by stakeholders.

4.2. Publication of a study on the implementation of 3’000 recommendations

On 24 October 2012, UPR Info published a landmark study on the implementation of 3’000 recommendations at mid-term. The publication "On the road to implementation" presented the results of the Follow-up Programme since 2011 based on the assessment of 66 States. The results of this research, conducted over the course of one year and a half, were encouraging: 40 percent of recommendations have triggered actions from States. Similarly positive, 14 percent of the recommendations rejected have also triggered actions from States at mid-term. The study presents the Follow-up Programme’s quantitative and qualitative outcomes, and perspectives and assessments on the thirteenth UPR session as well. Data collected under the aegis of the Follow-up Programme demonstrated a very encouraging progress in the implementation of recommendations at mid-term; however, many acute challenges remain and need to be carefully envisaged by the international community as soon as possible.

This publication was launched during a side event at the 14th session of the UPR Working Group. It attracted broad interest from all actors in the UPR process. The side event was attended by 100 representatives of Permanent Missions, UN staff, academics and civil society. 300 copies of the study have been distributed so far and it has been downloaded over 2’000 times from our website.
4.3. Providing CSOs the tools for following up: the Follow-up Kit

Following their participation in the 11th and 12th UPR sessions, UPR Info sent emails to 739 recipients to remind them of the process’ next crucial steps: how to follow-up the recommendations made to the States, how to further lobby in order to get recommendations accepted, etc. To this end, a follow-up kit that was developed in 2011 and updated in 2012, was shared with those stakeholders.

The “Civil Society Follow-Up Kit” saves valuable time and resources to all organisations interested in advocacy and lobbying. This feature has provided organisations that are not yet involved in the UPR mechanism with a comprehensive document compiling the outcome of the review of their respective States and providing them with an exhaustive overview of how to engage in the follow-up process and the documents needed to do so.
In 2013, UPR Info will celebrate its five-year anniversary. This fifth year will coincide with many changes for the organisation. We will increase our staff: A new Programme Manager will be hired to reinforce our small team, which then will consist of three people. We will also move into a new office as our current location is becoming too small.

For the UPR process, 2013 will be as crucial as 2012. Its credibility and functioning will be facing significant challenges, including the first potential case of non-participation by a country. This will force the Council to look into art. 38 of resolution 5/1 and define the concept of “persistent non-cooperation”. Another challenge will be the capacity of the Council to look into States’ implementation and better support the implementation both by States and by CSOs, notably through the Voluntary Fund for Financial and Technical Assistance.

UPR Info will be monitoring these developments and ensuring that the standards are created and maintained in order to protect the mechanism.
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UPR Info has elected a new Treasurer: Ms. Saida Manieva, former consultant for our organisation in the framework of the 2011 HRC Review project and currently working at the OSCE. With a long record of working with NGOs and international organisations, Ms. Manieva will be providing valuable insight into the finances and management of the organisation. She extensively followed the process of the 2011 HRC Review for UPR Info, and our publication “Analytical assessment of the UPR: 2008-2010” and therefore has an extensive knowledge of our organisation and of the UPR process. UPR Info is very pleased with this new appointment and looks forward to benefiting from her experience.

UPR Info has also been attributed the Special Consultative status by the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) during its substantive session on 23 July 2012. This new status will facilitate our engagement at the HRC and notably to take the floor during the general debate on the UPR in the HRC session.

Executive Board

- Bertrand G. Ramcharan – President
- Saida Manieva – Treasurer
- Waqas Ali Saqib – Secretary

Advisory Board

- Anita Goh (France) - NGO Group for the CRC
- Marianne Lilliebjerg (Denmark) - Amnesty International
- Professor Edward R. McMahon (United States) - University of Vermont
- Katharina Rose (Germany) - International Coordinating Committee of National Human Rights Institutions
- Micheál Tierney (Ireland) - Permanent Mission of Ireland to the United Nations in Geneva
Six interns from Greece, Guyana, Italy, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Trinidad and Tobago, the United Kingdom, and the United States worked at UPR Info during 2012. They undertook numerous tasks and did invaluable work on the website, the database, the follow-up programme, and the pre-sessions.

Secretariat

- Roland Chauville – Executive Director
- Jean-Claude Vignoli – Programmes Director
- Damaris Mabeya – Intern
- Shannon Meehan – Intern
- Onica Marie Peirera Cheong – Intern
- Morgan Robinson – Intern
- Barbara Sartore – Intern
- Karolina Schismenou – Intern
- Kira Youdina – Intern
PR Info’s activities to strengthen CSO participation in the UPR were supported by the Open Society Foundations - Budapest and the Permanent Mission of the Netherlands to the United Nations in Geneva. The Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Norway financed the follow-up programme. The pre-sessions were made possible thanks to the support of the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, the Canton of Geneva, the City of Geneva and Irish Aid.

We are very grateful for the trust they have put into our work and would like to warmly thank them for this.
**UPR Info** is a non-profit, non-governmental organisation based in Geneva, Switzerland. Its aim is to both raise awareness on the UPR process and to provide capacity-building tools to its different actors, such as UN Member States, NGOs, NHRIs, media, academics and civil society in general.

To this end, UPR Info collects information and documents on each review, provides detailed explanations and videos about the process and the role of each actor, publishes a monthly newsletter on the mechanism, conducts analyses of human rights issues raised during the process, looks into responses given to recommendations by States, publishes reports on the implementation of recommendations by countries at mid-term and manages an online database of all UPR recommendations.
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