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1. Introduction

The Universal Periodic Review (UPR) is a unique mechanism of the United Nations which started in April 2008 and consists of the review of the human rights practices of all States in the world, once every four years. However, the follow-up of the UPR recommendations is the most critical and important phase of the whole UPR process. This phase is the one leading to the realization of the UPR objective that it is the “improvement of the human rights situation on the ground,” which shows progress. The success of this phase will also determine the efficiency and credibility of the mechanism and demonstrate States’ engagement in the promotion and strengthening of human rights. This is also directly linked to the next cycle of the UPR process that is commencing in 2012.

In considering 2011 strategic programming opportunities, Recommendations of the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) has re-emerged as a potential entry point for UNDP country offices across the region. UNDP Bratislava Regional Center (UNDP BRC) has been following closely the efforts aimed at implementing the Universal Periodic Review recommendations at the country level since early 2011.

The main objective of the Conference was to raise awareness among the national governments and UN agencies on the challenges and examples of implementing UPR recommendations that are agreed by national governments. Over 80 representatives of relevant government ministries/agencies, senior Management of UNDP Country Offices from the ECIS region, UNDP/UN Technical Advisers/Specialists, selected representatives of UN agencies (UNDP, OHCHR), and NHRI from 16 countries and from regional offices across the world participated in the Conference. The aims of the Conference were to:

- Strengthen the understanding and capacities of National Governments, UNDP and OHCHR technical staff and senior managers, and other critical partners (i.e., NHRI, CSOs) in the effort to support the implementation of the UPR recommendations at the country level.
- Discuss good practices and lessons learned on the implementation modalities at the national level.
- Stress the importance of ensuring broad and open participation (mainly from NHRI and civil society organizations) during the UPR follow-up phase.
- Identify the roles that each agency is meant to play during the critical phase of implementing the recommendations of the UPR.
- Provide a starting point for the study that UNDP BRC aims to conduct in 2012 on good practices, lessons learned, and models for replication to contribute to the follow-up of the UPR recommendation.

This was the first conference of its kind which comes after the completion of the first cycle of the Universal Periodic Review to which all countries in Europe and the CIS have been subjected. The previous resulting UPR recommendations lacked accompanying detailed guidelines to key stakeholders (national government agencies, national human rights institutions, civil society organizations and others) on how to implement them at national, sub-national and local levels. Consequently, there are now different national processes, levels of commitment, modalities, mechanisms, and pace of responding to recommendations. The Conference aimed to stimulate an open discussion about these issues in an attempt to better equip the institutions involved to address them, as well as try and pre-empt their re-occurrence in the subsequent UPR cycles.
2. Overview of the First Cycle of the Universal Periodic Review (UPR)

2.1. The Purpose of UPR

UPR is a mechanism of the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) monitoring the fulfilment by each State of its human rights obligations and commitments. The review must:

- Review all human rights;
- Apply to all UN members States’ human rights records;
- Be the same for all States;
- Fully involve the country under review;
- Take into account the level of development and specificities of countries;
- Be conducted in an objective, transparent, non-selective, constructive, non-confrontational and non-politicised manner;
- Fully integrate a gender perspective;
- Complement and not duplicate other international human rights mechanisms;
- Use a cooperative mechanism based on dialogue, participation, and cooperation.

2.2. First Cycle: Recommendations

All 193 UN member states have participated in the first UPR cycle (2008-11). The process has produced 21,211 recommendations, of which:

- Approximately 70% have been accepted;
- Approximately 50% concerned the signature, ratification and implementation of international instruments and the protection of the rights of special groups (other issues often raised included torture, justice, gender, and issues related to national human rights systems);
- A total of 32% required specific action, 40% general action, and 15% continuing action;
- Only 10% required considering action and as few as 3% required minimal action.

2.3. Upside of the First UPR Cycle

Encouraging aspects of the first cycle of the UPR review include:

- Active participation of civil society actors throughout the process;
- The cooperative spirit of the UPR, which has created new opportunities for dialogue and collaboration at all levels;
- Raised awareness about the importance attached to human rights;
- Strengthened belief of the universality of human rights;
- In most cases UNRCS/UNCTs were engaged;
- HRAs and consultants have been deployed with strong UNDP support;
- Regional knowledge platform strengthened;
- Helped UNRCS/UNCTs to open new opportunities and entry points.
2.4. Challenges of the First UPR Cycle

There were several observations and recommendations:

- Some States received over 200 recommendations with the average receiving between 60-80 recommendations.
- Recommendations are often vague and difficult to implement.
- States sometimes are vague about their position concerning certain recommendations.
- Rejected recommendations often reflect serious human rights issues.
- Reprisals against people participating in the UPR process—against UPR spirit.
- Resource implications to implement recommendations, during a period of international financial crisis.

The success of the UPR mechanism depends crucially on replicating the encouraging aspects and dealing with the challenges, as well as a solid follow-up. Ways in which this can be, and have been done, are explored in sections 3 through 6 of the report.
3. Normative Framework of the UPR Implementation: Overview, Challenges, and Opportunities

When consolidating the UPR Recommendations for the region, the realization has been that a number of recommendations are already captured in the UN Country Specific Planning Process. Others are not captured by this process, but could potentially be, through CPAP’s specific work plan or through the UNDAF (United Nations Development Assistance Framework). Some countries, such as Moldova, already have a draft of the UNDAF as well as fresh UPR Recommendations. The challenge is to integrate the recommendations within the existing framework in such a way that the benefit of the recommendations for any country is maximized without having to resort to the implementation of a separate framework for the UPR.

The conference focused on two particular avenues for integrating the UPR recommendations into countries’ existing frameworks and action plans: CCA-UNDAF and Treaty Bodies and Special Procedures.

3.1. CCA-UNDAF and UPR Recommendations

For each of these points below, there is potential for inserting the UPR recommendations into the process. UNDAF\(^1\) is guided by five main principles:

**Normative**

1) Human Rights Based Approach  
2) Gender Equality  
3) Environmental Sustainability

**Enabling**

4) Results-based Management  
5) Capacity Development

The working groups have identified the following opportunities and challenges associated with the UPR integration with UNDAF:

**Opportunities**

- Content-wise, the UPR recommendations can be output, outcomes, indicators; they can inform the CCA’s as well as expose existing gaps in the promotion of human rights on the ground.
- Sometimes UN priorities are different from government’s priorities, therefore the UPR Recommendations which are state commitments can serve as an argument at the negotiation table on what the UNDAF should look like at the end of the day.

---

\(^1\) UNDAF (United Nations Development Assistance Framework) is a document representing a consensus plan between governments and UN agencies, linked to national plans but also articulating the priorities of the UN system. The development of a UNDAF document takes at least a year and occurs after the pre-emptive stage of Common Country Assessments (CCA) has ended. It is then broken down into country programmes for UN agencies such as UNICEF, UNDP and UNFPA. These country programmes are accompanied by a Country Programme Action Plan, which describes the outputs expected out of each programme document. Each output will have a project document, annual work plan, and joint programmes – jointly managed with civil agencies.
For countries which have developed UNDAFs, an existing review process, which happens bi-annually or every three months, could allow for inclusion of the UPR recommendations.

Different stakeholders of the UPR have different visions on how the recommendations should be implemented and thus the process is an opportunity for dialogue between them, which informs UNDAF on how different stakeholders see the recommendations to be implemented.

Challenges

- There are often substantial regional and inter-country differences in ideas about how UPR should be integrated within UNDAF. Unlike European countries for example, Central Asian countries have no watchdog such as the EU and thus it may be difficult to deliver the UPR message to governments.
- There is often a lack of capacities within regional offices as well as government reporting capacities to implement the UPR recommendations.
- UN agencies are not working closely together and as a result time and money are frequently wasted on duplication.
- UNDAF is often de facto about poverty reduction and economic development, and does not necessarily have a distinct human rights approach.
- UNDAF has three indicators per outcome, which sometimes is not enough to assess whether the outcome is achieved.

3.2. Treaty Bodies, Special Procedures and UPR Recommendations

The Human Rights Treaty Bodies are committees of independent experts that monitor the implementation of the core international human rights treaties. When a country ratifies one of these treaties it assumes a legal obligation to implement the rights recognized in that treaty. The country incurs an additional obligation to submit regular reports to the monitoring committee set up under that treaty on how the rights are being implemented. To meet their reporting obligation, States must submit an initial report usually one year after joining and then periodically in accordance with the provisions of the treaty (usually every four or five years). In addition to the government report, the treaty bodies may receive information on a country’s human rights situation from other sources, including NGOs, UN agencies, other intergovernmental organizations, academic institutions and the press. In light of all the information available, the treaty bodies i.e., Committees examine the report together with government representatives. Based on this dialogue, the Committee publishes its concerns and recommendations, referred to as “concluding observations.”

Various activities are undertaken by special procedures, including responding to individual complaints, conducting studies, providing advice on technical cooperation at the country level, and engaging in general promotional activities.

---

3 Special procedures’ mandates usually call on mandate holders to examine, monitor, advise, and publicly report on human rights situations in specific countries or territories or on major phenomena of human rights violations worldwide.
Conference participants have identified the following opportunities, challenges and innovative solutions for the UPR recommendations’ integration with the aforementioned human rights review practices.

Opportunities

- UPR mobilizes stakeholders and donors, and is a very powerful tool to improve human rights protections.
- European instruments, Treaty Body recommendations and Special Procedures could be used to facilitate the UPR implementation and vice versa.
- UPR could enhance the work of Parliaments via Special Procedures and Treaty Bodies.
- UPR recommendations should address Treaty Body recommendations – something to take into account for the next cycle.

Challenges

- There is often no baseline information, as in the case of the Roma situation. As a result, very important issues are ignored by all human rights review mechanisms.
- It is a great logistical and resource-related burden for governments to follow-up and report on all these different recommendations as well as special procedures and treaty bodies.
- Though few, rejected recommendations exist, and there is not much that can be done for their advancement within the existing UPR framework.

Innovative Solutions

- UPR recommendations could be combined with Treaty Body and Special Procedures for a joint follow-up database.
- Rejected recommendations should be addressed by Treaty Body experts and Special Procedures.
- Grouping human rights issues into regional focal areas, thus ensuring better coordination between country authorities.
- Issues which have trans-border and international dimensions, such as human trafficking, could be coordinated using the UPR recommendations in conjunction with Treaty Bodies and Special Procedures.
- Creating inter-agency expert groups and steering committees in UN country offices would provide a mainstreaming of human rights activities and lead to better coordination.
- UPR recommendations could be included in existing human rights action plans.
4. ‘Working as One’ with ‘Inclusive Approach’ (Government NHRIs, CSOs and UN Agencies, other actors): Overview and Challenges

According to the HRC Resolution 16/21, 12.04.2011, while the outcome of the UPR, as a cooperative mechanism, should be implemented primarily by the State concerned, States are encouraged to conduct broad consultations with all relevant stakeholders in this regard. It is important therefore, and it is the aim of the Inclusive Approach that mechanisms be established to permit the consultation between the Governments and other national and international human rights partners to take place. Besides the more direct and evident interventions of the NHRIs and other national and international agencies, the criticism and high expectations of the civil society is considered crucial in pushing governments forward. In developing countries, the UN is positioned to take a leading role as a facilitating liaison between the Government and other human rights empowering actors.

4.1. NHRIs

4.1.1. Roles within UPR

- Unique role owing to unique status and functions under the Paris Principles, and very complementary with the actions of the other human rights enforcement actors. Reporting on national situations, ensuring broad national consultation processes, raising awareness and empowering local stakeholders, advise and assist the state.
- Recognized role by GA and HRC resolutions and HRC review.
- NHRIs’ expectations should be confronted against country specific realities such as economic factors, resources, and existing capacities. It is therefore crucial that the UPR implementation process be inclusive and participatory in order to maximize use of available country-specific resources.
- Raise awareness about the UPR outcomes and engage all stakeholders.
- Organize regular post UPR consultations with Government and civil society.
- Synchronize NHRI’s work plans and reporting with the UPR recommendations.
- Monitor and disseminate information on the status of implementation to all stakeholders.

4.1.2. Country Specific Best Practices Examples

*Australia HR Commission:* Engaging with Parliament to table UN human rights recommendations in Parliament, conduct parliamentary briefings, annual reports, achieve parliamentary awareness and presence in public debate.

*Kenya HR Commission:* Cooperation with civil society, between NHRIs and 90 NGOs. Commission established Kenya UPR Outcomes Charter with key expectations, indicators, actions, and actors. Established country specific Objectives: 1) record understandings; 2) propose a road-map; 3) identify indicator-driven actions; 4) establish monitoring framework; 5) a Joint Progress Report.

*Malaysia HR Commission:* Reporting on the UPR implementation, established mid-term follow-up report; UPR recommendations clustered in eight broad areas, including vulnerable groups and post UPR consultation processes; recorded developments and highlighted challenges, priorities
and recommendations; discussed with State and NGOs; Treaty Bodies and Special Procedures; and Human Rights Council.

4.3. Civil Society Involvement

4.3.1. Role of CSOs

- Consultations and dialogue by government organizations and the UNDP with Civil Society Organizations (CSOs).
- Human Rights Coordinators in Ministries as first contact point for Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs).
- List of responsibilities for each recommendation.
- Use of existing Working Groups for UPR Follow-up.
- Strong impact of UPR recommendations (internet obligation).

4.3.2. Challenges for CSOs

- Lack of follow-up action plan with milestones and timeframe.
- Lack of clustering and prioritisation of recommendations.
- No indicators of success.
- Absence of working groups in charge of monitoring.
- Lack of interest/resources of CSOs for monitoring.
- Lack of financing for long-term follow-up.

4.3.3. Austrian Country-Specific Best Practices

- Established Steering Committee, a practice that can be easily implemented and followed by other countries;
- NGO Coalition “Human Rights. Now” of more than 300 Austrian NGOs built in spring 2010 for joint activities in the UPR and academia;
- Coordinated by the Austrian League for Human Rights (coordination team of three experts)
  - Originally aimed at submitting a joint UPR report and doing awareness raising; continued for certain common follow-up activities and media work;
  - Financed by small contributions of member NGOs and working with pro bono consultants.
5. Implementing the UPR Recommendations at the Country level: Successes, Challenges, and Constraints

5.1. Kyrgyzstan

The UPR review in Kyrgyzstan took place on the 23rd of May 2010, with the participation of more than 120 UN member states’ government officials. There were 168 recommendations for improving the human rights situation in this country. At the meeting for confirming the final UPR review recommendations, Kyrgyzstan has committed to accepting 172 recommendations. The main areas in which these recommendations were made are:

- women’s and children’s rights;
- religious freedom;
- free trial and more broad judicial reform;
- minority rights;
- freedom of speech (mainly with respect to the media);
- freedom of association;
- freedom from torture.

Following up on the UPR review recommendations, the Ministry of Justice has prepared the Project for the National Action Plan regarding the Implementation of the UPR recommendations: “Development, Safety, Rule of Law, and Human Rights.” Throughout the development of this project, the report of the UN High Commissioner on Human Rights has also been taken into account. The governmental project has been discussed with the participation of government officials, as well as NGOs and international organizations.

The following measures have been taken by the government in responding to the UPR recommendations:

1). Women’s Rights

*August 2011*: The Kyrgyzstan government has approved the project of the Memorandum for Mutual Understanding and Cooperation between the Ministry of Labour and Migration, the Ministry for Social Protection, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the sub-cluster for the prevention of gender violence in Kyrgyzstan. The parties have agreed to develop and enlarge cooperation in identifying victims, obtaining information, monitoring and improving the existing mechanism in the area of gender violence prevention, in accordance with Kyrgyz law and international agreements.

*October 2011*: The first meeting of the working group detailing the projects of the National strategy for achieving gender equality until 2020 and that of the National strategy for achieving gender equality in 2012-2014. The meeting has resulted in a schedule of implementation and a coordination group for the formation of both projects.
2). Human Trafficking

*September 2011*: The first draft of the National action plan on the prevention of human trafficking for 2012-2015 has been presented. The development of the plan is supported by the International Organization for Migration, the UN Direction for Drugs and Crime in Kyrgyzstan, the OSCE Centre in Bishkek, and the Rule of law Programme of the American Jurists’ Association. The plan seeks to reform the normative framework in view of the ratification of international agreements and, conducting extensive and permanent information campaigns. It is expected the final version of the plan will be signed by the Kyrgyzstan Prime Minister.

3). Media Freedom

The section providing for the investigation of journalists for defamatory talk has been removed from the Penal Code.

4). Torture Prevention

The draft law for the creation of a national centre for torture and other inhuman practices’ prevention has been reviewed by the Kyrgyzstan Parliament in September 2011. The draft law stipulates the creation of an independent coordination council which would monitor institutions and other potential areas in which these practices may unfold. This council will be closely connected with civil society in its many areas.

5). Judicial Reform

Since January 2011, the law guaranteeing judicial help has been adopted. This law stipulates guaranteed judicial help to citizens who lack the means for protecting their rights and lawful interests.

6). General

At the initiative of the Kyrgyz Ombudsman, a forum on human rights was conducted between the 27th and the 29th of October 2011. The forum tackled topics such as toleration in inter-ethnic relationships as a foundation for stability and development in a multi-ethnic state, the plan of action in the creation of the independent organ for torture prevention, heightening the role of national human rights protection institutes in defending migrant rights, free mobility issues, and free and transparent elections.

### 5.2. Armenia

Armenia’s UPR hearing took place on 6 May 2010, in Geneva, based on national and shadow reports. During the hearing and after, all recommendations were accepted, except for two, meaning that 98% of recommendations were addressed. Armenia launched the development of the National Human Rights Strategy and the National Human Rights Education Action Plan for School System. The draft Law on Gender Equality is now with the parliament. Armenia hosted three visits of the Special Rapporteurs (on HR Defenders, on Arbitrary Detention, and on Internally Displaced Persons) whose recommendations are also to be addressed.

---

4 The forum was held in Issyk-Kul on the topic of human rights being one and inseparable.
On a technical level, in a follow-up UPR in July 2010, the Armenian Foreign Affairs Ministry, with the support of the UNDP, organised a meeting with the participation of the representatives of state bodies and civil society. The objective of this meeting was to walk through the UPR process, introduce them to the UPR and the logic of the steps to be taken. After some critical feedback from civil society was received, steps were outlined for the interim report.

In summer 2011 the Prime Minister established an inter-agency Working Group, consisting of Ministry of Foreign Affairs as coordinator, the Ministry of Justice, the General Prosecutor’s office, the Police, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Science and Education, the Ministry of Labour and Social Issues, the State Migration Agency and other agencies involved in the UPR process. International organisations, namely UN, OSCE, and EU were invited as observers. To date, the Working Group has only had one introductory meeting. Two substantive meetings will take place in November-December 2011, with the support of the UNDP and OHCHR to discuss the recommendations as to their substance and the measures to be taken for the implementation of these recommendations.

**Issues and Challenges**

- Formatting of the interim report: a Matrix, mapping activities in Human Rights sector vis-à-vis recommendations on the steps taken by each and every entity, or a mini replica of the national report.
- The coordination of the Working Group activities to prevent duplication and bureaucracy and in order to ascertain that the Working Group develops specific assignments, which are comprehensive and feasible.
- It is important to end up with a comprehensive report to ensure that all concerned bodies provide their information in the same format. Sometimes different agencies present their part of the report in quite different ways – figures and statistics or plain qualitative analysis.
- Need for a sensible and concrete reporting style: “we really want our reports to be sharp, simple and human.”
- Lack of coordination between the different actors.
- Internationals do not coordinate well among themselves and the Government is not effective in coordination of donor efforts.

**Recommendations**

- OHCHR should consider development of a draft format or some sort of guidance to share, with periodic updates for the process, in order to reduce the diversity of reports.
- The active participation of NGOs in the elaboration of the UPR should be ensured through the Working Group and through shadowing.
- Government must be in the driver’s seat, and the UPR is an excellent format to regulate this.

**5.3. Morocco**

1). Recommendations related to International Treaties:
The three specific recommendations that were addressed to Morocco during its review with relation to International Treaties are namely:

a. To ratify the Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities;

b. To sign the OP-CAT;

c. To communicate to the United Nations Secretary-General the withdrawal of its reservations to CEDAW.

2. General recommendations in terms of scope and duration but specific to certain fields:

Human rights education and training: There were two recommendations in this field. The first one requested that the Government carries on with its efforts to disseminate and consolidate the human rights culture in the country, while the second requested that the country should continue with the training of law enforcement officials. Many programmes were put in place in order to ensure the training of law enforcement officials on human rights, as well as the inclusion of human rights in the school curricula. In addition, a global strategy entitled “National Platform for Human Rights Culture” was developed by the National Human Rights Institution for the dissemination of human rights culture. Another notable contribution has been the joint Moroccan and Swiss initiative on the draft UN Declaration on human rights education and training. The final draft was adopted by the Human Rights Council last March and should be adopted by the UNGA at the occasion of the 61st anniversary of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights on the upcoming 10th of December.

The situation of the prisoners and fair trial: It was recommended that there should be a High Delegation of the prison administration reporting directly to the Prime Minister, which has a mandate, among others, to enhance the situation of prisoners.

As a follow-up to the recommendations of the “Instance Equité et Réconciliation” the Moroccan experience of transitional justice is being implemented gradually. While reparations to the families of victims and the regions affected have been almost completed, other recommendations regarding this Commission have been included in the new Constitution that Morocco adopted last July.
6. Recommendations

6.1. Normative Improvement

- Analysis of the UPR recommendations with those from other treaty bodies, special procedures and others, and drawing up of a matrix of UN human rights recommendations that may form the basis for a national plan of action.
- Recommendations could be clustered thematically to facilitate their implementation.
- Use of the Human Rights Index database (contains all recommendations from treaty bodies, special procedures and soon the UPR).
- The UN compilation report prepared for the review could be used.
- Other UPR recommendations databases could be used (UPR Info.org or UPR Watch).
- UPR recommendations combined with Treaty Body and Special Procedures for a joint follow-up database.
- Rejected recommendations should be addressed by Treaty Body experts and Special Procedures.
- Grouping human rights issues into regional focal areas, thus ensuring better coordination between country authorities.
- Issues which have trans-border and international dimensions, such as human trafficking, could be coordinated using the UPR recommendations in conjunction with Treaty Bodies and Special Procedures.
- Creating inter-agency expert groups and steering committees in UN country offices would provide a mainstreaming of human rights activities and lead to better coordination.
- UPR recommendations could be included in existing human rights action plans.
- Content-wise, the UPR recommendations can be output, outcomes, indicators; they can inform the CCA’s as well as expose existing gaps in the promotion of human rights on the ground.
- Sometimes UN priorities are different from government’s priorities, therefore the UPR Recommendations which are commitments of the states can serve as an argument at the negotiation table on what the UNDAF should look like at the end of the day.
- For countries which have developed UNDAFs, an existing review process which happens mid-term or every three months could allow for inclusion of the UPR recommendations.
- Different stakeholders of the UPR have different visions of how the recommendations should be implemented, and therefore the process is an opportunity for dialogue between them, which informs UNDAF on how different stakeholders see the recommendations to be implemented.

6.2. Broadening Cooperation

- Broad dissemination of the UPR outcome, including its translation into local languages;
- Strengthening existing and/or establishing inter-ministerial mechanisms to distribute tasks, coordinate implementation of recommendations from UPR, as well as other all UN human rights mechanisms.
- Hold consultation with broad range of stakeholders, including independent NHRI’s.
- Prepare a plan of action – with key objectives, concrete actions, allocation of responsibilities at various levels, set benchmarks and clear timetable and identify available resources and assistance and support needed.
Identify capacity needs, resources needed, and seek support.

Monitor progress in implementation of recommendations through an effective mechanism to collect/analyse data; using as a basis the defined benchmarks to measure progress.

Report on progress:
   - Mid-term progress reports (voluntary) as per the Council’s invitation.
   - Reporting periodically on progress to the Council (understanding agenda item 6).

Voluntary Fund for Financial and Technical Assistance (established by the Council in 2007 by HRC Res. 6/17): administered by OHCHR.

The Council encouraged States to seek the assistance of the United Nations at national or regional levels to help them implement their recommendations.

Bilateral and multilateral sources of assistance to support States to implement recommendations.

OHCHR may help identifying priorities, develop plans of action, assess assistance needs, mobilise support to respond to them, help coordinate this support, facilitate sharing of experiences and good practices, TA programme.
7. Specific Recommendations Stemming from Country Examples Above and as Expressed by Other Country Representatives at the Conference

7.1. Recommendation for Government Involvement and Cooperation with International Organizations (Morocco, Kyrgyzstan, Armenia)

Morocco
- The Government must continue its efforts to promote and disseminate the human rights culture in the country through education and training.
- To continue training law enforcement officials.
- Ensuring fair trials and prison conditions in line with international standards.
- To ratify the Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.
- To sign the OP-CAT.
- To communicate to the United Nations Secretary-General the withdrawal of its reservations to CEDAW.

Kyrgyzstan
- To continue improvement to the existing mechanism in the area of gender violence prevention, within the project Memorandum for Mutual Understanding and Cooperation.
- To continue with the National strategy for achieving gender equality.
- To continue with the National action plan on the prevention of human trafficking for the next three years with the support of the Kyrgyz Prime Minister.
- To continue to enforce the changes made in the Penal Code regarding the investigation of journalists for defamatory talk.
- To establish the creation of an independent coordination council connected with civil society that would monitor human rights violations.
- To enforce the recently enacted legislation that guarantees judicial help to citizens who are unable to protect their rights and lawful interests.

Armenia
- OHCHR should consider development of a draft format or other guidance to share, with periodic updates for the process in order to reduce the wide range of reports.
- The active participation of NGOs in the development of the UPR should be ensured, through the Working Group and through shadowing.
- Government must be in the driver’s seat, and the UPR is an excellent format to regulate this.
7.2. Recommendations for NHRI Involvement - Australia, Kenya, and Malaysia

Australia

- Australia’s HR Commission must continue to increase parliamentary awareness and in turn encourage public debate.

Kenya

- Kenya’s HR Commission must continue to implement their country specific objectives and maintain cooperation with civil society and NHRI. Additionally, Kenya must take into account the information gathered in the 2011 Joint Progress Report.

Malaysia

- Malaysia’s HR Commission must continue to focus on their work with vulnerable groups within their borders.

7.3. Recommendations for CSO Engagement/Partnership - Austria

Austria

- It is recommended that Austrian Civil Society continues to work with the Steering Committee and work towards exporting its practices to other countries.