



Mr. President,

The signatories to this joint intervention appreciate preliminary conclusions of the Ambassador Mohammed Loulichki. On the basis of our common criteria for the successful establishment of the UPR mechanism¹ we would like to put forward the following proposals.

1. The review must lead to improvements in each state's fulfilment of its human rights obligations and commitments.
2. An effective review requires the **involvement of independent expertise**. Experts should analyze the available information and distil it into the basis for the review of the concerned country. Independent expertise should also have an appropriate role in the inter-active dialogue and the follow-up.
3. **The review** must be governed by the **principle of equality**. For each state, the review should be based on a common standard for review, which includes the UDHR and other international human rights obligations or specific commitments, such as election pledges. It would not include national law as a

¹ Available on the HRC Extranet at:
http://portal.ohchr.org/portal/page/portal/HRCExtranet/WG-UPR/NGOOtherContributions/FIDH_JointNGOSubmission22Nov2006_UPR_Criteria4successful.pdf

basis for the review. The review should also be **transparent** at each phase.

4. The UPR is more than just the interactive dialogue. The review *process* comprises all of the following elements:
 - the compilation and analysis of objective and reliable information and the identification of issues;
 - the interactive dialogue;
 - the conclusions, recommendations and outcome; and
 - the follow-up.
5. The analysis and interactive dialogue should have as their **principal bases** Special Procedure and Treaty Body analysis and recommendations, as well as information from the state (including its election pledges), the OHCHR and other UN bodies, national human rights institutions, and NGOs.
6. **NGOs**, including national NGOs without consultative status, must be able to participate effectively in the review process.
7. The review must *result* in a **comprehensive outcome** that will lead to result-oriented follow-up. The outcome could include a broad range of measures to encourage, assist or require the concerned state to fulfill its human rights obligations and commitments. These measures could include action proposed by the country under review, follow-up on Special Procedures and Treaty Bodies' recommendations, capacity-building and technical assistance, appointment of a country rapporteur, or recommendations to the General Assembly or to the Security Council.
8. Provisions for *follow-up* must ensure action to implement recommendations and decisions taken in the review within a **specific time-frame**.

Finally, Mr. President, the UPR can be only one means by which the Council addresses situations in particular countries. Other options include discussion and decision in regular and special sessions and the complaint procedure that results from the review of mechanisms. The various means for action by the Council in respect of the human rights situation in individual countries must complement one another.

I thank you Mr. President.

@ 510 words