

RESEARCH BRIEF

THE UNIVERSAL PERIODIC REVIEW MID-TERM REPORTING PROCESS: LESSONS FOR THE TREATY BODIES

KEY MESSAGES

- The United Nations (UN) Treaty Body (TB) system as it stands today does not, by and large, allow for effective and functioning domestic stakeholder engagement. Main points of concern with the current setup relate to the low levels of predictability, visibility (hence accessibility) and coherence of the system. Available entry points for civil society organizations (CSOs), National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs) and Ombudsman bodies are not sufficiently clear. The means of information-sharing between the formal TB infrastructure and domestic stakeholders do not allow for sufficiently predictable plans of action related to the various stages of the work of TBs.
- The experience of the methodologies used in preparing Universal Periodic Review (UPR) mid-term reports demonstrates numerous practices that can be of value for the follow-up work of the TB Concluding Observations (COBs) as well as act as mid-term appraisals during the gaps in reviews as envisaged in the options being considered towards the ‘clustering’ of TB country reviews. One of the defining features of the UPR process has been the robust follow-up mechanisms that have emerged throughout the reporting cycles of the UPR. A number of lessons can be drawn from this practice for the work of TBs. These follow-up mechanisms and strategies, including assessing the implementation status of UPR recommendations, are well reflected in the UPR mid-term reports.
- Some of the ‘good practices’ emerging from the UPR mid-term preparation process include the creation of stakeholder and multi-stakeholder mechanisms involving governments, NHRIs, parliaments and CSOs; the development of national action plans for human rights and the development of matrices and tools to track the implementation status of UPR recommendations.
- The development of implementation strategies for the UPR has resulted in a number of matrices/tools to track progress with the UPR recommendations. These tools have been developed by governments, NHRIs and NGOs. A number of national action plans on human rights developed by governments, NHRIs and NGOs include

NOVEMBER 2019 | MILOON KOTHARI

these tools to demonstrate the extent to which the UPR recommendations have been implemented.

- The mechanisms and methodologies developed through the follow-up work of UPR recommendations has led to the reinforcement of related TB COBs. This merging of recommendations from different parts of the UN human rights system has also contributed to the content of the reports submitted by different actors at various stages of the UPR cycle.
- The sophisticated nature of the mechanisms and methodologies, inspired by the UPR, are a 'good practice' that offer valuable lessons for the TBs. It is essential, therefore, that during the discussions towards the reform of the TBs serious consideration is given to the many lessons that can be learnt from the follow-up processes spawned by the UPR.
- An overarching recommendation that follows from the lessons illustrated in this paper, based on a partial analysis of UPR mid-term reports, is that we need to move to a consolidated national monitoring and implementation process for all recommendations emanating from the UN human rights system. Some of this work is already taking place through the matrices developed to track implementation of UPR recommendations. These matrices reinforce the COBs of TBs and recommendations from the Special Procedures.
- If the foundation that has now been established by the UPR, through the creation of multi stakeholder consultative mechanisms, National Action Plans for Human Rights and monitoring tools, can be fully utilised (including enhancing where necessary for the purpose of a full treatment

being given to TB COBs and decisions) then it will not only lead to a more coherent and coordinated UN human rights system but, of critical relevance where it matters, an efficient national process will reduce significantly the reporting burden on States, NHRIs and NGOs to the international human rights system.

INTRODUCTION

The report of the Academic Platform on the 2020 Review suggests changing the modalities of the state review procedures either to a single consolidated review or clustered reviews each on an eight-year cycle.¹ The time-lapse between the reviews calls for enhanced follow-up and sustained focus on accountability and implementation. Experiences from the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) offer some illuminating insights on how such processes can be designed to benefit the work of United Nations (UN) Treaty Bodies (TBs).

One of the defining features of the UPR process has been the robust follow-up mechanisms that have emerged throughout the reporting cycles of the UPR. A number of valuable lessons can be drawn from this practice for the work of TBs. These follow-up mechanisms and strategies, including assessing the implementation status of UPR recommendations, are well reflected in the UPR mid-term reports.²

- The mid-term reporting process of the UPR has already demonstrated several good practices that can be adopted by the TBs:
- Methodologies developed at the national level including multi-stakeholder's platforms
- Assessment of status of the implementation of UPR recommendations through the process of data collection, analytical work and preparation of the mid-term reports
- The development of national action plans on human rights
- Development of matrices and tools to track the implementation status of UPR recommendations and
- The reinforcement of related TBs Concluding Observations (COBs) through the development of mechanisms and methodologies to track implementation of UPR recommendations. This merging of recommendations from different parts of the UN human rights system has also contributed

1 See: 'Optimizing the UN Treaty Body System: Academic Platform Report of the 2020 Review' at: <https://www.geneva-academy.ch/joomla/tools-files/docman-files/Optimizing%20UN%20Treaty%20Bodies.pdf>

2 To date, 75 States have submitted UPR mid-term reports. 52 NGO/NHRI mid-term reports have also been submitted.

to the substantive quality of reports submitted by different stakeholders at various stages of the UPR cycle and to the TBs.

This paper seeks to summarise the lessons that are important to imbue into the TB reform process and to assist in building the rationale for the various options that are being considered as reform measures to be considered during the 2020 GA review of the TBs. The information on which the analysis in this paper is based,

including illustrative names of countries, relies on the content of UPR mid-term reports available in the data bases of the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and UPR Info.³

STAKEHOLDER AND MULTI-STAKEHOLDER MECHANISMS

The experience of the methodologies used in preparing UPR mid-term reports demonstrates numerous practices that can be of value for the follow-up work of the TB' COBs as well as act as mid-term appraisals during the gaps in reviews as envisaged in the options being considered towards the 'clustering' of TB country reviews. One of the 'good practices' emerging from the UPR mid-term preparation process is the creation of stakeholder and multi-stakeholder mechanisms.

GOVERNMENT LED MID-TERM REPORTS

Inter-ministerial committees: A number of countries have established inter-ministerial committees to oversee the preparation of UPR reports. They have played an important role in overseeing the preparation of UPR mid-term reports.⁴ An innovative practice, that has shown results, is the broad consultative process these committees have adopted.

Validation meetings: A complementary approach that is commendable is the practice of governments holding

3 See: <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/UPRImplementation.aspx>
<https://www.upr-info.org/en/search/google/mid-term%20reports> and the publication on UPR mid-term best practices available at: https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/general-document/pdf/upr_midterm_report_web_v1_high.pdf

4 Examples include the DIDH in Morocco organizing inter-governmental consultations and regional participation, as did the national UPR Committee of Thailand. The Botswana's Inter-Ministerial Drafting Committee engaged additionally into national capacity building. See: https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/morocco/session_13_-_may_2012/moroccoimplementation2ndcycle.pdf; <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/UPRImplementation.aspx>; https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/botswana/session_15_-_january_2013/botswana_mid-term_2016.pdf

validation meetings with civil society members. Such meetings lead to substantive inputs to each other's mid-term reports. Such a process increases the credibility and legitimacy of each report. Examples include **Morocco** and **Mongolia**, where the validation process included civil society and the NHRI as well as embassies. At these meetings recommendations and critical perspectives of the draft reports were shared. Such an inclusive process contributed to reports that are comprehensive in their coverage of human rights issues in the country as well as assessing the status of implementation of the UPR recommendations.⁵ Another useful example is the process followed by **Denmark's** Inter-Ministerial Human Rights Committee whose report received contributions from the Danish NHRI as well the Danish NGO UPR Committee. The process included public hearing with different actors. Feedback from these public hearings led to changes in the content of the mid-term report.⁶

A number of national efforts also contain useful lessons. In **Montenegro**, for example, consultations on the content of the mid-term report took place on a bi-annual basis and included the office of the Protector of Human Rights and Freedoms, NGOs and the UN system.⁷ Consultations with all interested subjects resulted in an objective report with clear guidelines for further action by all actors that participated in the broad consultative process.

NGO/NHRI LED MID-TERM REPORTS

The initiatives taken by States to engage different stakeholders in the preparation of their mid-term reports is laudable. This practice has allowed for different perspectives on human rights in a given country to be reflected in the government reports. Such a practice has, however, not restricted the submission of UPR mid-term reports by NGOs and NHRIs either individually or collectively. The submission of NGO/NHRI reports has brought necessary independent perspectives into the mid-term reporting process. Some pertinent examples include the preparation of joint reports by NGOs/by NGOs and NHRs and independent reports prepared by NGOs and NHRIs:

⁵ See: https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/mongolia/session_22_-_may_2015/upr_Mid-term_report_human_rights_forum_mongolia.pdf

⁶ UPR mid-term report submitted in June 2018. See: https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/denmark/session_24_-_january_2016/denmark_mid-termreport2018.pdf

⁷ Report submitted in June 2015. See: https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/montenegro/session_15_-_january_2013/montenegro2ndcycle.pdf

Also see Annex to the report at: https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/montenegro/session_15_-_january_2013/covermontenegro2ndcycle.pdf

- In **Denmark**, the UPR Committee of the Danish Human Rights Council, consisting of 20 collaborating CSOs, prepared a joint report in consultation with the Danish Institute of Human Rights.⁸ Other examples include a joint report⁹ of CSOs from **Singapore**, the media, and the national coalition of human rights defenders that was presented for the 2nd cycle. Also noteworthy is the mid-term report¹⁰ developed by The **Kenya** Stakeholders' Coalition on the UPR. A good practice followed in the preparation of this report is that the Steering Committee called for and received technical support from the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (KNCHR); OHCHR; and UPR Info Africa.

NHRIs from across the world¹¹ are beginning to submit mid-term reports. They bring a particular experience to the content of these reports. As with the CSOs, the NHRIs are collaborating with governments and NGOs in the preparation of multi-stakeholder reports. They, however, continue to submit their own reports:

- The Danish Institute of Human Rights has submitted a mid-term report¹² in its capacity as the national human rights institution of **Denmark**. Additionally, as noted above, the Institute has provided secretarial assistance to Danish civil society's UPR committee in its drafting of the separate NGO mid-term report. The Institute's report mentions appreciation that the Danish Government, in its UPR mid-term report, has addressed some of the concerns expressed by civil society and the Institute during the public hearing of the draft report earlier in the process. A

⁸ Report submitted in June 2018. See: https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/denmark/session_24_-_january_2016/jointngosubmissiondenmark.pdf. The Danish Government in drew from this report for its own mid-term report.

⁹ Report submitted in August 2018. See: https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/singapore/session_24_-_january_2016/upr_mid-term_report.pdf A very useful practice followed in this report is the comprehensive thematic focus covering CP and ESC rights (e.g. detention, death penalty, rule of law, elections, freedom of expression and assembly, censorship, wage inequality, education, LGBTQ rights, women, children, migrant workers and persons with disabilities). The Coalition brings together over 60 NGOs that work on different aspects of human rights in Kenya and is led by a Steering Committee

¹⁰ Report submitted in October 2018. See: https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/kenya/session_21_-_january_2015/kenya_cso_upr_mid-term_report_final_revised.pdf. Led by a Steering Committee, the Coalition brings together over 60 NGOs that work on different aspects of human rights in Kenya.

¹¹ Denmark; Georgia; Ireland; Portugal; Poland; Kenya

¹² Report submitted in June 2018. See: https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/denmark/session_24_-_january_2016/thedanishinstituteofhumanrights.pdf

very thoughtful mid-term report¹³, that critically assessed the status of implementation of **Georgia's** second cycle UPR recommendations, was submitted by The Public Defender's Office in Georgia.

THE ROLE OF PARLIAMENTS

It has been estimated that around 60–70 percent of UPR recommendations need parliamentary approval for implementation.¹⁴ National parliaments are becoming involved in the UPR process. Lessons can be drawn for the follow-up work of TB COBs from the involvement of parliaments in the UPR process:

- In the aftermath of **Togo's** second UPR, members of the Togolese Parliament participated in the Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue on UPR. Co-organised by UPR Info in Togo, parliamentarians resolved to remain active on the UPR and to establish a Network of parliamentarians for the UPR. They contributed to the CSO coalition mid-term report.¹⁵
- In the case of **Mongolia**, Human Rights NGO Forum in its mid-term report¹⁶ has detailed the active role played by the Mongolian Parliament in different stages of the monitoring and implementation, including enacting of laws and approving budgetary steps. A good practice has also been the initiatives taken by the Mongolian Human Rights NGO Forum to hold meetings with the Head of the Human Rights Subcommittee of the Parliament of Mongolia,



¹³ See the report of the Public Defender's Office of Georgia at: <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/UPR-NGOs-Mid-term-reports.aspx>. The comments, in this NHRI report, are presented in a tabular format with detailed commentary on each recommendation that Georgia received.

¹⁴ Based on data from UPR Info and the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU)

¹⁵ Report submitted in 2018. See: https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/togo/session_26_-_november_2016/rapport-mi-parcours_epu_togo_cdfdh_1.pdf

¹⁶ Report submitted in May, 2018. See: https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/mongolia/session_22_-_may_2015/upr_Mid-term_report_human_rights_forum_mongolia.pdf

the Heads of the Political Parties and several other Members of Parliament to inform them on how they can contribute to the implementation of UPR recommendations.

THE UPR AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL ACTION PLANS ON HUMAN RIGHTS

A positive contribution of the UPR process has been the role played by UPR recommendations in encouraging countries to develop National Action Plans on Human Rights (NAPHRs). The content and methodologies contained in the NAPHRs, demonstrate their practical value in ensuring impactful follow-up, not only for the UPR, but also the TB COBs.

CONTENT

Several NAPHRs set out the ways in which the government fulfils its responsibility to protect and promote human rights, the specific objectives and priorities it defines in this regard, and the role of other bodies and individuals in ensuring respect for human rights in the respected country.¹⁷

Some of the NAPHRs focus on the importance of building national capacity to ensure implementation of international human rights commitments.¹⁸ NAPHRs also stress a comprehensive approach, both thematically and geographically, in gathering the content of action plans. **Thailand**, for example, placed emphasis on the participation of all parties concerned across the country, a process through which members of the public collectively learned, reflected and deliberated upon, participated in, and prepared a human rights plan at the local (provincial) level that was subsequently developed in to a national plan.¹⁹

METHODOLOGIES

In the preparation of NAPHRs, stakeholders follow different methodologies that can be examples for the follow-up work on TB COBs. Some of the NAPHRs were developed through intensive interministerial talks and consultations with NGOs. In the **Netherlands**, for example, in addition to interministerial discussions, separate consultations were held with the Netherlands Institute for Human Rights,

¹⁷ See e.g. NAPHR of the Netherlands <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/UPRImplementation.aspx>

¹⁸ See: https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/mongolia/session_22_-_may_2015/upr_Mid-term_report_human_rights_forum_mongolia.pdf

¹⁹ The third NAPHR for Thailand utilised these strategies. See: http://www.rlpd.go.th/rlpdnew/images/rlpd_1/2556/thaigov_Plan3/10plan3.pdf

the National Ombudsman, the Children's Ombudsman, Amnesty International Nederland and the Netherlands Institute for Social Research. These talks showed that there is strong support for periodic NAPHRs prepared by the government.²⁰

A similar methodology was employed by **Mongolia** including through the coordinating work of an ex officio council to oversee the preparation and submission of a mid-term report on the status of implementation of their UPR recommendations. The process also required the submission of an implementation report, by all stakeholders to the ex officio council every January and to the Government every February. This two-step process was key in reinforcing the importance of implementation of the UPR recommendations.²¹

The methodology followed by **Thailand** included extensive regional consultations with NGO partners. The National UPR Committee of Thailand meets regularly to take stock of the status of implementation of the NAPHR. A special emphasis has been placed, in the development of the third NAPHR, on local (provincial) level involvement, including through public hearings. This has led to not only the building of local capacity through human rights education but has the involvement of local actors in the drafting process towards the NAPHR.²² Another notable feature of the methodology used by Thailand, as reflected in its mid-term report²³ is the identification of implementation challenges (for example, concerted inter-agency effort on human rights issues, institutions with sufficient resources and training to enforce legal reforms, data collection and so forth). These challenges have been incorporated into the drafting of the NAPHR.

20 See, op. cit. 17 for more details on the methodology followed by the Netherlands

21 See the report submitted in May, 2018: https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/mongolia/session_22_-_may_2015/upr_mid-term_report_human_rights_forum_mongolia.pdf Further support for the implementation of Mongolia's NAPHR has now been initiated with the support of the OHCHR Voluntary Fund for Financial and Technical Assistance in the implementation of the Universal Periodic Review,

22 See op.cit. 19 for more details.

23 Submitted in March, 2019. See: <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/UPRIImplementation.aspx>

TRACKING IMPLEMENTATION: LESSONS FROM THE UPR PROCESS

The development of implementation strategies for the UPR has resulted in a number of matrices/tools to track progress of the recommendations emanating from with the UPR. These tools have been developed by governments, NHRIs and NGOs. A number of national action plans on human rights developed by governments, NHRIs and NGOs include these tools to demonstrate the extent to which the UPR recommendations have been implemented. Some of the tools include references to complementary TB COBs thereby reinforcing the work of TBs. Some salient features of matrices/tools are presented below. A consolidated matrix, for consideration in the TB review process, follows.

The Working Group on Human Rights in **India** and the UN (WGHR) developed a detailed monitoring matrix in 2012 that proposed the following tables: Number of recommendation; Summary of recommendation; similar recommendation made by other national or international mechanisms (including TB COBs); indicators to track progress; type of measures taken by the State; type of measures taken by independent institutions and identification of responsible body for the implementation.²⁴

The monitoring matrix developed by WGHR has formed the basis for the vast majority of matrices subsequently developed by governments, NGOs and NHRIs.

The general matrix presented in the UPR mid-term reports contains columns that identify the recommendation, the name of the country proposing the recommendation and the follow-up status in the mid-term period between two UPR cycles. An example of such a sequence for the matrix is contained in **Denmark's** mid-term report.²⁵

Some of the matrices contain useful additional information that attempt to develop criteria to capture the process of assessing the level of implementation. One such criteria is the development of indicators to track implementation as reflected in the **Kenya** CSO mid-term

24 See the full report with thematic examples of matrices at: http://www.wghr.org/uploads/wghr_tracking_implementation_monitoring_tool_2013.pdf The global template is on page 6 of the document.

25 Report presented in June 2018. See: https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/denmark/session_24_-_january_2016/thedanishinstituteforhumanrights.pdf See matrix in Annex A

report²⁶, reflecting on the Kenya government's report.²⁷

The CSO report from Kenya, referred to above, also includes a column explaining complementary action by other stakeholders.

Another useful practice is to thematically cluster the recommendations as evident in the joint NGO report from **Singapore**.²⁸ This report also contains the important practise of identifying, within the thematic clustering, the most serious human rights challenges faced by the country.

A number of mid-term reports have developed a rating system to track different stages of implementation. **Mongolia**, in its report, uses the following headings: implemented; in progress and not implemented.²⁹ **Singapore** has developed a similar rating system in its report by categorising the recommendations as: very good; good; weak; overdue needs to be addressed and poor.³⁰

A number of other useful additions to the matrix offer useful lessons. In addition to explaining the status of implementation, a NGO coalition from **Tajikistan** includes a time frame by when the implementation should be completed.³¹ This report also presents a column in the matrix stating the level of implementation and the type of activities that need to be taken

to implement the recommendations. **Thailand** focuses its most recent mid-term report on key areas of notable progress and identifies key government ministries tasked with implementation of the UPR recommendations.³² Finland follows a similar model providing detailed information (measures undertaken) on the implementation measures, including the identification of Ministries tasked with the

implementation.³³

Honduras has taken the welcome step of stating, in its matrix, the budgetary allocation made to implement relevant UPR recommendations.³⁴

A CONSOLIDATED MONITORING MATRIX

Annex F presents a consolidated monitoring matrix that builds on the 2012 WGHR template and augments it with subsequent details drawn from information on tracking recommendations from the UPR mid-term reports. This consolidated matrix could be used by UN TBs to monitor the implementation of their COs.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Some of the major drawbacks of the TB system in reporting and follow-up are that '... the TB system as it stands today does not allow for effective and functioning domestic stakeholder engagement. Main points of concern with the current setup relate to the low levels of predictability, visibility (hence accessibility) and coherence of the system. CSOs, independent national human rights institutions and ministerial representatives highlighted the difficulties they face in planning TB – related activities in advance of the reviews of their concern, with Follow-Up procedures currently not open to interaction with non-State domestic stakeholders. Available entry points for CSOs, NHRIs and Ombudsman bodies are not sufficiently clear and the means of information sharing between the formal TB infrastructure (TB Members and OHCHR) and domestic stakeholders do not allow for sufficiently predictable plans of action related to the various TBs and TB-specific stages'.³⁵

It is precisely in the areas identified in the quote above that the UPR has been able to take strident steps to overcome the shortcomings of the TB follow-up work.³⁶

33 Report presented in June, 2014. See: <https://lib.ohchr.org/HRBodies/UPR/Documents/Session13/FI/FinlandImplementation2.pdf>. See: Annex E.

34 Report presented in November 2017. See: <https://lib.ohchr.org/HRBodies/UPR/Documents/Session22/HN/Second%20Cycle%20Mid-Term%20Report.PDF>

35 See: <https://www.geneva-academy.ch/joomlatools-files/docman-files/Oslo%20Consultation%20-%20Final.pdf>

36 Some elements of a 'common aligned procedure' for follow-up to the TB COBs are contained in the 2018 report of the meeting of Chairs of TBs. These are, however, stated in very general terms and lacking a monitoring methodology. See: https://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=a/73/140

As demonstrated by this paper, the UPR process has produced a number of mechanisms, methodologies and monitoring tools that can be of immense use to TBs in the follow-up work of their Concluding Observations.

26 Report submitted in October, 2018. See: https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/kenya/session_21_-_january_2015/kenya_cs0_upr_mid_term_report_final_revised.pdf

For a sample of the matrix see: Annex B

27 https://lib.ohchr.org/HRBodies/UPR/Documents/Session21/KE/SecondCycleMid-term_Kenya.pdf

28 Report submitted in August 2018. See: <https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/UPR/NGOsMid-termReports/JointNGOSubmissionSingapore.pdf>

29 Report submitted in May, 2018. See: https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/mongolia/session_22_-_may_2015/upr_Mid-term_report_human_rights_forum_mongolia.pdf

30 Report submitted in August 2018. See: op.cit. 29. See Annex C

31 See: (CSOs) Bureau of Human Rights and Rule of Law: 2019 https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/UPR/NGOsMid-termReports/BHR_Tajikistan.pdf. Also see Annex D.

32 Submitted in March, 2019. See: <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/UPRIImplementation.aspx>

As demonstrated by this paper, the UPR process has produced a number of mechanisms, methodologies and monitoring tools that can be of immense use to TBs in the follow-up work of their Concluding Observations. These mechanisms and tools can serve as guides in developing mid-course assessments as we move to the reform of the work of TBs, including changes in the time period between the examination of State reports.

Some of these mechanisms and tools for the UPR, developed by governments, NHRIs and NGOs, also reinforce the TB COBs and track their implementation. The sophisticated nature of these tools are a ‘good practice’ that demonstrate the general point in this paper – that the UPR follow-up mechanisms and tools are far more robust than work produced, to date, for the TBs. It is essential, therefore, that during the discussions towards the reform of the TBs serious consideration is given to the many lessons that can be learnt from the follow-up processes spawned by the UPR.

An overarching recommendation that follows from the lessons illustrated in this paper, based on a partial analysis of UPR mid-term reports, is that we need to move to a consolidated national monitoring and implementation process for all recommendations emanating from the UN human rights system. Some of this work is already taking place through the matrices developed to track implementation of UPR recommendations. These matrices reinforce the COBs of TBs and recommendations from the Special Procedures.

If the foundation that has now been established by the UPR, through the creation of multi stakeholder consultative mechanisms, National Action Plans for Human Rights and monitoring tools, can be fully utilised (including enhancing where necessary for the purpose of a full treatment being given to TB COBs) then it will not only lead to a more coherent and coordinated UN human rights system but, most importantly, an efficient national process that will reduce significantly the reporting burden on States, NHRIs and NGOs to the international human rights system.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Miloon Kothari is an Independent Expert on human rights and social policy. He is the President of UPR Info and was the first UN Special Rapporteur on Adequate Housing (2000-2008). As a global scholar/activist/trainer he has extensive experience of the UN, in particular its human rights system. The author would like to thank Nicoletta Zapille from UPR Info for research support for this paper.

ANNEXES

ANNEX A: DENMARK¹

No.	RECOMMENDATION	COUNTRY	DK-RESPONSE	DK-FOLLOW UP STATUS 2018
121.3.	Withdraw the territorial exclusion for Greenland and the Faroe Islands to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography	Canada	Accepted	With effect from 10 October 2016 Denmark has withdrawn its territorial reservation for the Faroe Islands and Greenland to the Optional Protocol.
121.4.	Work with the Greenland authorities to withdraw the territorial reservation for Greenland to the Convention on the Rights of the Child Optional Protocol on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Accepted	Reference is made to the response to recommendation 121.3.
121.11.	Ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance and fully recognize the competence of the Committee on Enforced Disappearances, as provided for in articles 31 and 32 of the Convention	Germany and France	Accepted	The Convention is already signed and will be ratified when the necessary amendments to national legislation have been passed.

¹ Report presented in June 2018. See: https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/denmark/session_24_-_january_2016/thedanishinstituteforhumanrights.pdf

ANNEX B: KENYA²

5.3 Recommendation: Strengthen anti-corruption efforts. Recommendation Nos. 142.94; 142.111; 142.119; ESCR rec 18

5.3.1 Specific Action by Government: Implement the recommendations of the National Task Force on Review of the Legal, Policy and Institutional Framework for Fighting Corruption in Kenya

Indicator	Status of Implementation by Government	Complementary Action by other Stakeholders
Recommendations of the taskforce fully implemented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bribery Act, 2016 and Access to information Act 2016 enacted • Whistle-blower Protection Bill has been developed and is awaiting tabling in Parliament • False Claim Bill 2017 developed • Development of Guidelines and Regulations to operationalize the Bribery Act as per Section 9 of the Act is ongoing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributed to the development of the Bribery Act, 2016 • Transparency International is part of the Committee that is currently developing the guidelines and regulations to operationalize the Bribery Act, 2016 • Originators of the Whistleblower Protection Bill, 2017 which was adopted by Government for further review • Contributed to development of the Anti-Corruption (Amendment) Bill, 2017 • Reviewed the draft False Claims Bill, 2017 • Advocated for enactment of Access to Information Law • The recommendations from the taskforce have not been fully implemented, there are State officers who are still holding public offices despite being under investigation for corruption related allegations, while other have integrity issues according to Chapter 6 of the Constitution of Kenya.

5.3.2 Specific Action by Government: Adopt a national policy and national program of action on the fight against corruption

Indicator	Status of Implementation by Government	Complementary Action by other Stakeholders
National ethics and anti-corruption policy adopted	Development of the national ethics and anti-corruption policy is ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders have contributed to development of the national ethics and anti-corruption policy • Need to fast-track development of the policy.

² Report submitted in October, 2018. See: https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/kenya/session_21_-_january_2015/kenya_cso_upr_mid_term_report_final_revised.pdf

ANNEX C: SINGAPORE³

Appendix: Recommendations

	A Safe and Secure Singapore	RATING	MUST-HAVE
Supported by Singapore	<p>166.191 Preserve its criminal justice system to reinforce rule of law;</p> <p>166.236 Intensify fighting radicalization and terrorism at its early stage to sustain the enjoyment of human rights and basic freedoms of all Singaporeans</p>	Good:	
Noted by Singapore	166.173 Ensure that nobody can be detained without trial and revise relevant laws (ISA, CLTPA, MSA, UPA) accordingly;	Weak Response by Govt.	Yes
	166.193 Adapt its legislation to ensure that all arrested and detained persons can swiftly appear before a judge and in conformity with international law;	Yes	Yes
	166.194 Replace the Internal Security Act and the Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Act with laws that mandate that an accused person has a trial in court (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;	Overdue Needs to be addressed	Yes
	166.195 Adopt legislation to ensure that all cases of arrest and detention without warrant, also those under the Internal Security Act, are subject to speedy, independent and regular judicial review;	Overdue	Yes
	166.11 Become a party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and its Optional Protocols;	Overdue Needs to be Addressed	Yes

³ Report submitted in August 2018. See: <https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/UPR/NGOsMid-termReports/JointNGOSubmissionSingapore.pdf>

ANNEX D: TAJIKISTAN⁴

Recommendations implementation/non implementation

N°	Recommendation	Activity	Timeframe	Implementing agency	Outcomes of implementation
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Accession to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and its optional protocol (115.1-115.8, 115.113, 118.1, 118.2, 118.7- 118.9)	<p>1. Become a State Party to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities</p> <p>2. Proceed towards finalizing the ratification process of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities led by the working group on accessing Tajikistan to this Convention</p>	2017 until executed	MHSPP, NHRI, other ministries and agencies Working group	<p>Implemented Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities is signed on 22 March 2018</p> <p>Being reviewed A Working Group was established to review the possibility of ratifying the Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities. The priority goal set forth in the NHRI of RT strategy for 2016–2020 is to promote the ratification of the CRPD.</p>

⁴ (CSOs) Bureau of Human Rights and Rule of Law: 2019: https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/UPR/NGOs/Mid-termReports/BHR_Tajikistan.pdf

ANNEX E: FINLAND⁵

UNIVERSAL PERIODIC REVIEW - UPR		
A mid-term report on the implementation of the recommendations by the Government of Finland		
ACCEPTED RECOMMENDATIONS		
Recommendation	Ministry	Implementation measures
89.1. Advance its efforts to ratify CRPD (Namibia) / Actively consider ratifying CRPD (China) / Ratify and implement the CRPD, with active involvement of representatives of persons with disabilities (Slovenia) / Expedite the on-going internal proceedings and ratify the CRPD and its Optional Protocol enabling individual complaints (Portugal);	Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs and Health	<p>The working group set up to examine the possibility of ratifying the CRPD and its Optional Protocol submitted its report in January 2014. This broad-based working group consisted of representatives of the central government, the Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities, and civil society, especially disability organisations. The group formulated its report as a government proposal for legislation. The proposal is being updated and finished on the basis of received comments.</p> <p>According to the Programme of Prime Minister Jyrki Katainen's Government, the Government intends to ratify the Convention during its term of office. At the same time the Government intends to ratify the Optional Protocol.</p> <p>Of all legislative projects required for the ratification, the Government is completing the revision of the legislation on restrictions of the self-determination of persons with disabilities, and Parliament is considering the overall reform of the non-discrimination legislation.</p>

⁵ Report presented in June, 2014. See: <https://lib.ohchr.org/HRBodies/UPR/Documents/Session13/FI/FinlandImplementation2.pdf>

ANNEX F: MONITORING MATRIX FOR TREATY BODY CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Document number and paragraph of TB CoB	Recommendation summary	Was the same recommendation made by other international and national bodies	Related SDGs	Possible indicators/ data to track progress of implementation	Current status: type of measure/intervention being undertaken/to be undertaken by the State					Complementary action by stakeholders	Tracking implementation government bodies		Tracking Implementation independent bodies	
					Budgetary	Legislative	Policy	Monitoring Mechanism	Judicial Pronouncement		Time Frame	Rating	Time Frame	Rating
Indicate the text of the TB CoBs/other recommendations	Recommendations that are similar can be merged and rationalized for the purpose of this exercise, as some of them are repetitive, while others deal with more than one subject matter. This column can also be used to give more specificity to recommendations that may appear too general/vague.	These references could include: (a) Recommendations from the UPR cycles; (b) Recommendations from UN Special Procedures	Identify both the overarching SDGs and the relevant targets under each SDG	Specific indicators (statistical and qualitative) can be used to track the progress of the recommendations' implementation. This section is critical as it will be the basis on which analysis can be made on the progress of the implementation in the period between TB reviews of State parties. Indicators can also be drawn from SDG targets and priority issues identified by the TBs for their follow-up work.	Information that gives a comprehensive overview of the current status of implementation of the recommendation. Information that can give direction to concrete steps to be taken by the relevant government department for the implementation of the UPR recommendations.	This column would indicate complementary actions by NHRIs/NGOs/ other independent bodies to assist the State in implementing the TB CoBs.	This column would indicate the time frame allocated by the State to implement the TB CoBs.	This column would give, on a periodical basis, the status of implementation on such as: Completed; Partially completed (in progress); Not implemented	This column would indicate the time frame the independent body determines it would take to implement the TB CoBs.	This column would indicate assessments by Independent bodies of the progress being made by the State such as: Implemented; Weak response by the State; Overdue needs to be addressed				

THE GENEVA ACADEMY

The Geneva Academy provides post-graduate education, conducts academic legal research and policy studies, and organizes training courses and expert meetings. We concentrate on branches of international law that relate to situations of armed conflict, protracted violence, and protection of human rights.

**The Geneva Academy
of International Humanitarian Law
and Human Rights**

Villa Moynier
Rue de Lausanne 120B
CP 1063 - 1211 Geneva 1 - Switzerland
Phone: +41 (22) 908 44 83
Email: info@geneva-academy.ch
www.geneva-academy.ch

**© The Geneva Academy
of International Humanitarian Law
and Human Rights**

This work is licensed for use under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).