West and Central Africa Regional Meeting on the Universal Periodic Review (UPR)

Introduction

The West and Central Africa Regional Meeting on the Universal Periodic Review, from 6-8 July 2010 in Dakar, Senegal, was jointly organized by the UNDP Regional Centre in Dakar and the Regional Office for West Africa of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). The meeting brought together a total of 75 participants - Government officials, UNCT human rights focal points and coordination specialists, representatives of civil society organizations and national human rights institutions - from 18 countries from the sub-region that underwent the UPR process and countries that are preparing for their UPR scheduled for the second half of 2010 or 2011.¹

The objectives of the regional meeting were:

- To capacitate partners with the necessary tools and knowledge to prepare for the UPR process and to follow up at the national level:
- To share UPR experiences and demonstrate how UPR can be used as a practical and tangible tool by Governments and other actors in the sub-region to assess and analyze the human rights situation in their countries;
- To clarify the important role of the totality of the human rights machinery for the UPR process.
- To better equip UNCTs with tools and knowledge required to meaningfully assist Member States in the implementation of their UPR commitments before, during or after the session in Geneva.

The meeting was divided into three main parts: 1) preparation of the UPR, including the role of the different stakeholders and the UNCT during this preparatory phase; 2) conduct of the review in the Working Group and the Human Rights Council Plenary session in Geneva; 3) methods, experiences and practices for follow-up to the UPR recommendations.

Several high-level officials participated in the meeting, including the Minister of Human Rights, Democracy and Civic Training of the Republic of Togo, Ms. Leonardina Rita Doris Wilson-de Souza, the Ambassador of the Republic of The Gambia to the United Nations in Geneva, Ms. Marie Saine Firdaus, the Director of

¹ Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cape Verde, Gabon, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo, Eritrea. See annex 1 for a list of participants.
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Legal and Consular Affairs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Senegal, Ambassador, Mr. Cheikh Tidiane Thiam; the UN Resident Coordinator in The Gambia, Ms. Chinwe Dike as well as the Director of the Human Rights Council and Special Procedures Division of OHCHR, Mr. Bacre Ndiaye.

The meeting was opened by a video message from the current President of the Human Rights Council in Geneva, Ambassador of Thailand, Mr. Sihasak Phuangketkeow. The opening session was presided over by Minister of State, Minister for Gender and relations with African and foreign women’s organizations, Ms. Awa Ndiaye, Mr. Bacre Ndiaye, and Mr. Michel Balima, Deputy Director a.i. of the UNDP Regional Centre Dakar, all of whom underlined the importance of this unique mechanism which for the first time allows for the review of the overall human rights situation in all UN member states, shedding light on the respect and protection of all human rights - civil and political rights as well as economic, social and cultural rights – as laid down in international human rights law.

Session 1

Session 1: A) What is the UPR?

In the introductory session, Bacre Ndiaye and Myriam Tebourbi (OHCHR Human Rights Council and Special Procedures Division) outlined the main features of the Universal Periodic Review, established by the UN General Assembly on 15 March 2006 through Resolution 60/251, which also established the Human Rights Council. The UPR reviews the human rights records of all 192 UN Member States once every four years, providing an opportunity for States to demonstrate what actions they have taken to improve the human rights situation in their own countries. The UPR is one of the key elements of the Council, and aims at improving the human rights situation in all countries, identifying human rights violations wherever they occur, and supporting States to rectify them.

The review is conducted through interactive dialogues between a country under review and the Working Group composed of the 47 members of the Council. The Working Group is an intergovernmental meeting, which any UN entity and stakeholder (National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs), NGOs and civil society, experts etc.) can attend but not intervene in.

The review is based on:

1) A national report, which is prepared by the State under review.
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2) A **compilation of information** which summarizes information from reports of treaty bodies, special procedures, including observations and comments on the State concerned, and other relevant official UN documents.

3) A **summary of stakeholders’ information** which summarizes ‘credible and reliable information’ submitted by other relevant stakeholders including non-governmental organizations and National Human Rights Institutions.

Following the review, a report consisting of 1) a factual summary of the discussions held during the interactive dialogue and 2) a list of recommendations made to the State under review is prepared. The report clearly indicates which of the recommendations have been accepted by the State under review and which have been rejected.

Following the working group session, the Human Rights Council meets in a plenary session to study and adopt the final document of the UPR. The final document contains a summary of the procedures, conclusions and recommendations, as well as the voluntary commitments made by the States under review. The States have the primary responsibility to implement the recommendations contained in the final outcome.

Both speakers underlined the following main characteristics of the UPR:

**Universal:**
The UPR is the first human rights mechanism which reviews the human rights situation in all UN member states. All countries are examined on an equal footing in order to ensure that the same rules apply to every State in the same way, irrespective of the status of ratification of international human rights instruments and the political, development and human rights situations in the countries.

Furthermore, the UPR examines the respect, protection and realization of all rights laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international human rights treaties – civil and political rights as well as economic, social and cultural rights. Recommendations from the UPR process are therefore different than those from the treaty monitoring bodies as they refer to all obligations under international human rights law.

**Periodic:**
The UPR is not a single event, but rather a periodic process, which begins with the **preparation of the national report** by all relevant Government actors following national consultations with relevant stakeholders. After the **review in the Working Group of the Human Rights Council**, the respective Government can **examine the pending recommendations** and prepare for the plenary session of the Human Rights Council which usually takes place some months after the review in the

Dakar 6-8 July 2010
working group. In the plenary session of the human rights council the final document is adopted. This is followed by the period of follow-up and the implementation of the recommendations. 4 years later the Government will be reporting to the Human Rights Council on actions taken and on progress made in the implementation of the recommendations. In this light, the establishment of permanent national coordination mechanisms was recommended.
Peer Review:
One of the most innovative features of the UPR is that it is States that are reviewed by their peers, i.e. other States. The review is conducted through interactive dialogues between the State under review and the Working Group composed of 47 members of the Council. Each State review process is assisted by a group of three States, known as the “troika”, that serve as rapporteurs. This means that although there is no obligation to present a report, States generally do so. Governments are free to accept or reject the recommendations made by their peers; experience shows that many recommendations are accepted, however, and some States make additional voluntary commitments as a result of the review.

Accessible and inclusive:
The speakers further stressed the goal of the UPR to be a participative and accessible process. States are recommended to involve all relevant stakeholders in the process and to undertake national consultations with relevant stakeholders and the population when preparing the national report. Furthermore, all stakeholders (not only international NGOs, but also labor unions, religious associations etc.) can submit their own contributions on their view of the current human rights situation in their country to the OHCHR in Geneva. This information is then compiled in a third report, the so-called stakeholder support. The report together with the State report and the OHCHR compilation serves as a basis of the examination in the Working Group. It was underlined that the UPR has to be seen as a process which allows a dialogue on the human rights situations in a given country. It is a dialogue among the peers, but also a dialogue between a Government and the United Nations System and the civil society and its people. Anybody who has internet access can follow this dialogue in Geneva over the webcast.
The speakers concluded, by mentioning that the UPR process invites to reflect on/to rethink the relations in a given country, the international relations as well as the human rights situation in a given country.

The role of the United Nations System:
The United Nations System in a country, the United Nations Country Team, can raise the awareness of the UPR process and support the Government and stakeholders in the preparation of the UPR. Furthermore, the UPR gives the UNCT an opportunity to contribute to a third report, the UN compilation, which presents progress made and discusses concerns, as seen by the UNCT. Most importantly, the UNCT can play an important role in supporting Governments when it comes to implementation of UPR recommendations.
Session 1: B) How to prepare for the Review?

The second session of the regional meeting focused on the preparation of the review. Presentations were given by Myriam Tebourbi, (OHCHR HQ), Ambassador Cheikh Tidiane Thiam (Director of Legal and Consular Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Senegal), Isabelle Tschan (UNDP Regional Centre Dakar), Komi Gnondoli, (UNCt Niger) as well as Alioune Ndiaye (President, Senegalese Committee for Human Rights). The plenary session was followed by discussions in 3 Working Groups.

Myriam Tebourbi began by stating that there is no single, prescribed methodology for preparing national reports. However, Human Rights Council Decision 6 / 102 provides some general guidelines regarding the structure of the national report, which includes:

- The process of consultation (i.e. description of methodology and procedure of national consultation process)
- Overview of the institutional situation and the country’s legal framework
- General description of the situation on the promotion and protection of human rights
- Identification of achievements, best practices, challenges and constraints
- National priorities, initiatives and commitments/pledges of the State
- Expectations regarding technical assistance and support for implementation of recommendations

OHCHR has also produced a compilation of good methodologies for the preparation of the national report (which is limited to 20 pages and 10,700 words). The key elements are as follows:

- Determination of which department/entity will coordinate the preparation of the report.
- Determination of a timeline for the preparation of the report. Experience suggests that a reasonable time-frame for preparation of the report is 6 months.
- Identification of an entity holding the primary responsibility for drafting the report;
- Definition of a methodology, including a process of consultation and a timeline;
- Collection of basic information to feed into the report and the creation of a data base;
- Based on the guidelines mentioned above, it is important to set priorities regarding topics and rights to be covered in the national report. The selection can be conducted on the basis of the priorities of the State or challenges that the State has identified with respect to the realization of certain rights
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- Establish exactly which resources are needed for the preparation of report, including resources dedicated to national consultation processes (internet communications, questionnaires, public hearings, various forms of meetings, etc).

Ambassador Cheikh Tidiane Thiam (Director of Judicial and Consular Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Senegal) gave an overview of the preparation process in Senegal. He identified important elements for the preparation of the report, and highlighted several challenges faced throughout this process:

Coordination: The Ministry of Foreign Affairs was in charge of the coordination between several Government entities during all phases of the process. To that effect, a specific communication was made at the level of the Council of Ministers in order to inform all Ministries of the impending review and to request their collaboration. The Minister of Justice was designated as the head of the Senegalese UPR-delegation to the Human Rights Council in Geneva.

Communication: A good communication strategy was necessary during the whole preparation process in order to keep all Government entities as well as other stakeholders informed and involved. The draft national report was first approved internally by Government entities and secondly by other national stakeholders, such as the Senegalese Committee for Human Rights and the High Commissioner for Human Rights and Peace Promotion of Senegal, representatives of Universities as well as CSOs.

Challenges/lessons learned: The fact that Government of Senegal had not submitted several outstanding reports to the treaty monitoring bodies in recent years posed a challenge, as this meant that the internal review process had to be initiated without readily available data concerning a number of key human rights issues. Furthermore, Ambassador Thiam underlined that issues related to time management and resources rendered a participatory approach more complicated.

Isabelle Tschan and Komi Gnondoli presented the role and support by United Nations Country Teams (UNCT) to the preparation of the UPR.

They began by recalling that the primary responsibility for the preparation of the UPR lies with Governments. UNCTs can, however, play an active supporting role by ensuring that States have the required capacities to draft a substantive national report, provided that States express a desire for such support. Possible support for the preparation of the review can be categorized in three phases.

First phase: Awareness-raising

- Information session on UPR for colleagues from UNCT/UN agencies
- Dissemination of information on the UPR among relevant stakeholders (Government, NHRI and CSOs) throughout the country
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- Engage in a dialogue with the Government and the relevant stakeholders regarding preparations for the review

**Second phase: Preparation of reports**

- Capacity development of Government officials and relevant stakeholders to produce a solid and representative report
- Gather and prepare information for
  1) Compilation of UN information → Joint UPR specific submission
  2) Information/statistics for the National Report → make information available for State Report
  3) Facilitate contribution by stakeholders to the National Report and to the “summary of stakeholder information” → support process of national consultations

**Third phase: Preparation of review**

- Share information with all stakeholders on the modalities of the review
- Encourage and support attendance of relevant actors as well as UN system representatives to the review process at the Human Rights Council in Geneva
- Facilitate local access to the review meetings, webcasted by the UN, by convening targeted or public screenings

The panelists gave several examples of countries supported by UNCTs in preparation of the review.

In *Niger*, which was to undergo the UPR in February 2011, the UNCT developed a work plan (including budget) for 2010 to support the Government in preparing the review. The support provided and activities undertaken can be summarized as follows:

- **Internal UNCT coordination:** 1) Training and awareness-raising session on the UPR for members of the UNCT Thematic Group on Gender and Human Rights and for other UNCT staff. 2) Division of responsibilities between agencies for collection of information for UN compilation and the national report. 3) The compilation of information kits on the UPR to serve with documentary material to be distributed to Government entities, CSOs as well as internally to UN agencies.
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- **Support to the Government:** 1) Assisting the Minister for Justice and Human Rights in coordinating the UPR preparations, notably in the establishment of an inter-ministerial committee in charge drafting the national report for the UPR as well as periodic reports to treaty bodies. 2) Support to the inter-ministerial committee regarding resource mobilization and plan of action for the preparation of the UPR.

Alioune Ndiaye presented the role of the Senegalese Committee for Human Rights, the country’s NHRI, in the preparation of the UPR. The role of the National Institution for Human Rights in Senegal (NHRI) was twofold, as on one hand, the Committee provided credible and reliable information on the human rights situation in Senegal directly to the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and on the other hand, the Committee contributed to the national report of the State of Senegal.

After the Committee experienced initial difficulties in participating in the elaboration of the national report, the Senegalese Government’s Human Rights Coordination Office shared the draft national report with the Committee. Following a review of the first draft, the Committee observed that the draft report did not follow the guidelines set out by OHCHR, and requested additional information from the Government on the elaboration of the report. Following that request, the Government reviewed the draft report with help of experts. In addition, the coordinating Ministry invited CSOs and the NHRI to a validation meeting of the draft report. All recommendations from civil society made at the meeting were taken into account in the final national report.

Gnanou Karfa from the Burkinabe Movement for Human and Peoples’ Rights (MBDHP) spoke of the role of CSOs in the preparation of the review in Burkina Faso; In Burkina Faso, civil society contributed significantly to this first major phase of the process by including MBDHP and its partners. Before presenting the experience of the MBDHP in Burkina Faso, where CSOs have contributed significantly to the first phase of the UPR process, Gnanou Karfa repeated the options available to civil society for participation in the review.
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In Burkina Faso, the MBDHP participated in the validation workshop of the national report and the Movement also provided a report on the state of human rights in Burkina Faso to OHCHR. Further members of the MBDHP engaged in training with other CSOs on the UPR and they participated in the session of the Working Group on the UPR as well as in the plenary session of the Human Rights Council.

This session of the conference was followed by a session in three working groups, which aimed at sharing the experiences and lessons learned of different stakeholders in the preparation phase of the UPR.
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**Data collection and dissemination of information on UPR process**

- Oral communication on the UPR at the Council of Ministers. This oral communication was intended to inform all the ministers on the process and thus facilitate the involvement of all departments and all the institutions of the Republic.
- Meetings with government departments and institutions to identify areas that may interest them and give them time to provide relevant information to the Department of Promotion of Human Rights for inclusion in the national report.
- Consultation with civil society organizations working in the field of human rights identified by the ministry in charge of promoting human rights and distribution of questionnaires for their provision of relevant information.
- Organization of radio programs in French and in certain national languages, television programs, development of guides on the UPR.
- Study trips to Geneva to attend sessions of the Working Group on the UPR.

**In Burkina Faso**

(Marc Somda, Conseiller Technique, Ministère de la Promotion des Droits Humains, Burkina Faso)

How CSOs and the NHRI were involved in drafting the national UPR

In Burkina Faso, the UPR was prepared in the spirit of the pledges made in the context of the APRM (African Peer Review Mechanism) as well as the pledges made by the Government when Burkina Faso was elected a member of the Human Rights Council. The process was divided into the following three main stages each marked by particular activities:

- Oral communication on the UPR at the Council of Ministers. This oral communication was intended to inform all the ministers on the process and thus facilitate the involvement of all departments and all the institutions of the Republic.
- Meetings with government departments and institutions to identify areas that may interest them and give them time to provide relevant information to the Department of Promotion of Human Rights for inclusion in the national report.
- Consultation with civil society organizations working in the field of human rights identified by the ministry in charge of promoting human rights and distribution of questionnaires for their provision of relevant information.
- Organization of radio programs in French and in certain national languages, television programs, development of guides on the UPR.
- Study trips to Geneva to attend sessions of the Working Group on the UPR.

**Faso**

m) as well as the pledges made by the
expert from the OIF. A draft report was prepared and submitted for validation to all parties who have provided information. A one-day validation workshop then brought together government departments, working in the field of human rights. The report was approved subject to the amendments made by participants at the workshop. The comments and amendments suggested during the validation workshop were included in the final version of the report, which was reviewed by the Ministry for the Promotion of Human Rights. The report was then sent for comments to the Inter-ministerial Commission for Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law, composed of the directors of all departments, which has to be heard on issues concerning reports to treaty bodies and other related reports. Finally, it was adopted by the Council of Ministers.

The main challenges experienced throughout the process were related to the time management, the ownership by members of the government of the process; involvement of CSOs as well as the concern to produce quality report in national languages. This challenge will be followed by the translation of the report or recommendations in these languages; the report of Burkina Faso did not receive external funding - the whole process was funded by the state budget. For the contribution/involvement of CSOs it was important to develop a questionnaire and to invite CSOs to the validation workshop. This allowed the actors, including the government and CSOs, to interact on the report and improve the document, which also resulted in improved relations between the different actors. The diplomatic representation in Geneva played an important role providing advice and contacts with OHCHR.
Case study 2: Switzerland - The preparation of the National Report with a special emphasis on the national consultation process (Esther Keimer, Human Rights Section, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Switzerland)

1) Coordination of the preparation and elaboration of the report
   - Establishment of Working Group: Department of Foreign Affairs in cooperation with other departments (7 departments: Justice, Interior, Social Affairs, Defense, Economy, Education);
   - Creation of Database: various reports submitted by the State in the framework of similar processes, other sources of information as recommended by the directive of the UPR, permanent reference to the framework of the UDHR;

2) Role of different departments
   - Consultation framework - establishment of permanent working group with different state departments and in a second step including CSOs (the various departments are members of that group thus ensuring some continuity; possibility to ensure accountability of those departments in monitoring and implementation of recommendations as well as shared ownership)

3) Consultation process with other stakeholders
   - Government’s initiative to apply a participatory and inclusive approach; guidelines for the UPR
     - Method and scope of consultation: Led by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, extensive consultation with governmental entities at cantonal level, CSOs, labor and trade unions, religious leaders etc.
     - Use of existing consultation mechanisms;
   - Inclusion of results of consultations in national report: concerns raised by CSOs were included in the report and result of discussions were early reflected (“Government and CSOs agreed to disagree”); a summary of concerns raised by CSOs was included in annex of the report;

4) After the review
   - One year after the review, several follow-up meetings were held with the involvement of CSOs; establishment of a follow-up mechanism for evaluation of the implementation of UPR recommendations.
The discussion in this working group focused on the role UNCTs can play in the preparation of the UPR report, taking the political context in a given country into account. In Eritrea, the tense political situation in the region was not favorable to a formal dialogue with the Government on the UPR by providing information on the process. This formal dialogue has been proven to be the entry point for substantive support by the UNCT throughout the UPR process resulting in an improved relationship. However, it was underlined that the UNCT always needs to stress that the responsibility to draft a national report lies fully with the Government, and that the role of the UNCT is to provide the necessary technical support.

Experience shared by other UNCT representatives showed that there is always a risk that the technical support provided might be interpreted as approval by the UNCT of the national report. It is therefore important that UNCT representatives especially RC clarify the role of the UNCT and specify its task to the Government and stakeholders of the process and provide technical support during the preparation phase, during the review, but also after the review. Finally, the discussions concluded by highlighting that the method for support depends on the (political) context in a country and that it was therefore also important to underline to the Government that the review is covering all human rights, civil and political rights, as well as economic, social and cultural rights.
Session 2

Session 2: A) Review in the Human Rights Council Working Group

The second session of the conference was dedicated to the review process in Geneva and its technical modalities. Myriam Tebourbi, OHCHR Geneva, began the session with a presentation on the modalities of the review in the Working Group of the Human Rights Council.

Documents review: The advantage of the interactive dialogue is that all reports are available, all will have already read them before the Working Group Session. Indeed, all three documents, the national report, the compilation of UN information as well as the summary of stakeholder’ information, are posted 10 weeks before the exam date. All the information is public, in accordance with the principle of transparency of the UPR. After submitting the national report, the Government of the state under review receives the questions for the review from the Troika 10 working days before the exam.

Delegation: At the country level, after submission of the report, authorities are prepare for the composition of the delegation for the review in the Working Group in Geneva. The composition of the delegation depends on the preparation and also the need to have persons able to decrypt messages and to understand the recommendations made by other States. Thus, the composition of the delegation is not only important for the interactive dialogue, but also for the follow-up of the review. So far the number of persons of the delegation has varied between 1 and 40. Some heads of delegations are chosen for their charisma and their ability to answer questions and/or their expertise on human rights. Other heads of delegation have a pure representative role and are assisted by technical experts.

Troika: The Troika members are selected from each regional group of the Human Rights Council by drawing. The state under review can request the replacement of one Troika member only once, but is obliged to accept the Troika composition after the replacement. The Troika is present in the room during the examination in the Working Group, does not have any special role during the examination. However, the Troika is in charge of summarizing recommendations made during the review and writing a report of the review. Furthermore, it should be noted that the Troika has no monitoring role. Once the report has been submitted and approved, the Troika has no further role to perform.
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**The review:** The interactive dialogue lasts three (03) hours: one (01) hour for the presentation by the State under review and two (02) hours for the interactive dialogue among State representatives (Other stakeholders do not take part in the working group). The working group has the same composition as the Council of Human Rights, but is presided over by another chairperson. After three (03) hours, the representatives of the country under review meet with the Troika and the Secretariat to discuss how the recommendations will be recorded in the summary. The Troika is in charge of summarizing the recommendations which will be adopted 48 hours after the presentation of the report.

**Session 2: B) Sharing experiences of the review in the HRC Working Group**

This presentation was followed by the presentation of Government representatives from Ghana, Gabon and Mali who shared their experiences of the review.

> **of Justice, Ghana**

The UPR in May 2008, entrusted to a committee to facilitate the collection of data from different departments whose mandate covers human rights issues. A focal point of the drafting committee was the establishment of the committee allowing for collecting all necessary data with a period of 48 hours to provide answers to the recommendations. Ultimately, twenty (20) minutes were allocated to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.

> **Eric Dodo Bouguendza, Director General of Human Rights, Gabon**

In the very first meeting of the Working Group, the Minister in charge of Human Rights received a Cabinet approval to set up a drafting committee for the UPR. A series of meetings was held subsequently to prepare the national report was drafted. The Attorney General went to Geneva. In addition, one member of the National Human Rights Institution also joined the delegation. The delegation arrived two days prior to the working group session and the members were able to attend sessions for the interactive dialogue. The Secretariat to discuss how the recommendations will be recorded in the summary. The Troika is in charge of summarizing the recommendations which will be adopted 48 hours after the presentation of the report.

After the review in 2010, a national committee in charge of drafting the periodic report within a period of twenty (20) minutes. The remaining time was devoted to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.

> **Bouguendza, Director General of Human Rights, Gabon**

After the review in 2010, a national committee in charge of drafting the periodic report was the subject of a national validation. The Gabonese delegation that intrusted to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.

After the review in 2010, a national committee in charge of drafting the periodic report was the subject of a national validation. The Gabonese delegation that intrusted to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.

> **Bouguendza, Director General of Human Rights, Gabon**

After the review in 2010, a national committee in charge of drafting the periodic report was the subject of a national validation. The Gabonese delegation that intrusted to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.

> **Bouguendza, Director General of Human Rights, Gabon**

After the review in 2010, a national committee in charge of drafting the periodic report was the subject of a national validation. The Gabonese delegation that intrusted to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.

> **Bouguendza, Director General of Human Rights, Gabon**

After the review in 2010, a national committee in charge of drafting the periodic report was the subject of a national validation. The Gabonese delegation that intrusted to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.

> **Bouguendza, Director General of Human Rights, Gabon**

After the review in 2010, a national committee in charge of drafting the periodic report was the subject of a national validation. The Gabonese delegation that intrusted to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.

> **Bouguendza, Director General of Human Rights, Gabon**

After the review in 2010, a national committee in charge of drafting the periodic report was the subject of a national validation. The Gabonese delegation that intrusted to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.

> **Bouguendza, Director General of Human Rights, Gabon**

After the review in 2010, a national committee in charge of drafting the periodic report was the subject of a national validation. The Gabonese delegation that intrusted to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.

> **Bouguendza, Director General of Human Rights, Gabon**

After the review in 2010, a national committee in charge of drafting the periodic report was the subject of a national validation. The Gabonese delegation that intrusted to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.

> **Bouguendza, Director General of Human Rights, Gabon**

After the review in 2010, a national committee in charge of drafting the periodic report was the subject of a national validation. The Gabonese delegation that intrusted to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.

> **Bouguendza, Director General of Human Rights, Gabon**

After the review in 2010, a national committee in charge of drafting the periodic report was the subject of a national validation. The Gabonese delegation that intrusted to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.

> **Bouguendza, Director General of Human Rights, Gabon**

After the review in 2010, a national committee in charge of drafting the periodic report was the subject of a national validation. The Gabonese delegation that intrusted to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.

> **Bouguendza, Director General of Human Rights, Gabon**

After the review in 2010, a national committee in charge of drafting the periodic report was the subject of a national validation. The Gabonese delegation that intrusted to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.

> **Bouguendza, Director General of Human Rights, Gabon**

After the review in 2010, a national committee in charge of drafting the periodic report was the subject of a national validation. The Gabonese delegation that intrusted to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.

> **Bouguendza, Director General of Human Rights, Gabon**

After the review in 2010, a national committee in charge of drafting the periodic report was the subject of a national validation. The Gabonese delegation that intrusted to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.

> **Bouguendza, Director General of Human Rights, Gabon**

After the review in 2010, a national committee in charge of drafting the periodic report was the subject of a national validation. The Gabonese delegation that intrusted to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.

> **Bouguendza, Director General of Human Rights, Gabon**

After the review in 2010, a national committee in charge of drafting the periodic report was the subject of a national validation. The Gabonese delegation that intrusted to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.

> **Bouguendza, Director General of Human Rights, Gabon**

After the review in 2010, a national committee in charge of drafting the periodic report was the subject of a national validation. The Gabonese delegation that intrusted to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.

> **Bouguendza, Director General of Human Rights, Gabon**

After the review in 2010, a national committee in charge of drafting the periodic report was the subject of a national validation. The Gabonese delegation that intrusted to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.

> **Bouguendza, Director General of Human Rights, Gabon**

After the review in 2010, a national committee in charge of drafting the periodic report was the subject of a national validation. The Gabonese delegation that intrusted to answering questions. A delegation was given twenty-two (22) recommendations were accepted.
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Session 2: C) Human Rights Council Plenary

The second part of the second session focused on the general modalities of the plenary session of the Human Rights Council and was presented by Ms. Myriam Tebourbi.

Once the national report is prepared, approved and sent to Geneva, a state delegation goes to Geneva and offers positions in relation to recommendations that are submitted by some states in advance. Some states respond to them in their presentation while others make a general statement and respond to questions that were asked in advance at the end of the presentation. When it comes to the recommendations, the reviewed State can choose to accept, reject or request more time if further consultation is required. In a report to the working group, the reviewed State explains which recommendations it accepts, suspends or rejects including the reasons for the rejection.

While there are three UPR sessions per year - in February, in May and in November - countries that have been examined during the month of November will again appear before the Human Rights Council plenary session in March. Countries that are considered during the session of the Working Group in February will come before the Council in June and those that have been discussed in May appear again in September. This schedule shows the time a State has for consulting on the suspended recommendations. It is important that States commit to a certain schedule. They should be able to say if they will principally be able to implement the recommendations immediately or not. While it is clear that within four years not everything can be done, a process of change should start.

Between the session of the Working Group and the adoption of the report, and the renewed presentation before the Human Rights Council, the state has the opportunity to submit a paper to be an addendum of the report of the Working Group in which it can provide additional information and present recommendations on positions that have remained unresolved. Increasingly, countries are using this opportunity because it is a document which clearly expresses the State's position on a number of recommendations.

During this part of a Human Rights Council session, called the UPR segment, the 16 countries that had been discussed at the last session of the Working Group, present their feedback to the recommendations and additional information on developments since the adoption of the recommendations of the report. Each State has one hour, which is divided into thirds - one for the states under review, one for comments from UN member states and observers and one for other stakeholders such as national institutions and NGOs that have consultative status from ECOSOC. Local organisations that have submitted information to the summary, which was prepared by OHCHR can not contribute in this part of the UPR if they are not sponsored or if they do not have ECOSOC consultative status. Participation in the Human Rights Council session depends on a clearly defined procedure according to which only members of national delegations accredited by
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the country, the permanent mission, a national human rights institution, a UN agency or NGOs with ECOSOC consultative status can attend the plenary session of the Council. The 20 minutes reserved for the State under review are divided into 15 minutes of presentation and 5 minutes of conclusion.

One of the interesting aspects of this plenary session is the opportunity for NGOs and national human rights institutions to speak. Due to the short duration of the intervention of the different parties of the UPR, a meeting with the President of the Coordinating Committee of National Human Rights Institutions has already taken place, to see how to increase the participation of national institutions that often struggle to justify lengthy and costly travels for interventions that last only for a few minutes. Some institutions have already solved this by identifying a representative in Geneva who can speak in their name. However, it is only a partial solution, since these representatives often lack insight into the situation on the ground.

NGOs are faced with a similar problem. Since the twenty minutes for stakeholders are divided evenly between national institutions and NGOs, the ten minutes for NGOs have to be shared between all NGOs present that wish to speak, which makes it difficult for them to express themselves properly and creates frustration. NGO participation at this stage is important, because the NGOs can often put things in perspective by providing additional insight into country situations. They are quick to indicate progress but also to raise issues of concern.

The Human Rights Council adopts the final document which is the report of the working group. It contains a summary of the discussions, the recommendations and the position of the State on a number of recommendations. The addendum to that report is to supplement on whether or not the recommendations are accepted, which is put in the final document adopted by the Council by standard decision. The Human Rights Council finally declares that it has finished the examination of the country, the final document is adopted and finally the President symbolically strikes the table with a small hammer.
Ambassador Marie Saine of Gambia to the United Nations Office at Geneva, President of Senegal’s NHRI. In the preparatory phase, the state maintained a frank and sincere dialogue with civil society actors. The independence of these institutions was a cornerstone of the UPR process in Gambia. After the presentation of the national report and the discussion that followed, the state promised to expedite their implementation. The NHRI thus has a monitoring role to ensure that recommendations are implemented in time, and for this it remains a privileged partner for the state.

Institutions (NHRI) (Alioune Ndiaye, Coordinator of the Building of NHRIs, a stronger degree of participation and accountability is required. Of the 50 recommendations in question and it responded to various questions asked during the review and questions asked during the discussion that followed.

The experience of National Human Rights Institutions (NHRI) (Alioune Ndiaye, Coordinator of the Building of NHRIs, a stronger degree of participation and accountability is required. Of the 50 recommendations in question and it responded to various questions asked during the discussion that followed. The preparation for the second stage, scheduled for June 2010. It examined the 50 recommendations that were subject to further discussion in the preparatory phase. For the convenience of the secretariat and the participants. Only NHRIs with “A”-status are entitled to be the President of Senegalese delegation was led by Senegal’s Minister of Justice, who wished to take part in the UPR process should therefore undertake efforts to obtain this status. Even though OHCHR had 5 minutes to recall the role of the state of Senegal in the human rights situation in the country. The independence of these institutions has been a cornerstone of the Gambia’s UPR experience. The important role played by civil society in the review process with an interactive dialogue that helps to clarify the human rights situation. NHRIs have the opportunity to address the Human Rights Council; NHRIs are already working in this area, especially in terms of capacity-building. NHRIs have the opportunity to encourage the state to examine/take up concerns expressed by the NHRI. In the role of the state of Senegal has played in the important role played by civil society in the review process with an interactive dialogue that helps to clarify the human rights situation.
The experience of civil society (Joseph Ndayizeye, President, Ligue iteka)

Only those NGOs that have advisory observer status participate in the Working Group. They may, however, address their concerns through a report. In many countries, CSOs already play an important role in contributing to the preparation of the national report, but the report was prepared in some haste due to a lack of time and funding. Civil society, UN agencies, OHCHR, and the final version was drafted and approved by a governmental committee. CSOs carry out advocacy within States or missions in Geneva of the countries examined, for instance, the Burundian report was drafted at a time when the state turned homosexuality into a crime, while civil society regarded this as an issue of individual privacy. The Family Code represses sexual promiscuity, which is seen as an obstacle to morality, but civil society considers that the code is outdated. Moreover, during the examination, NGOs continued to plead with members of the Working Group in favour of their position on homosexuality.

Civil society organizations can be present at the meetings of the Human Rights Council and may make oral statements containing general comments before the adoption of the final report of the reviewed country. They can also submit a written statement to the Council. In the case of Burundi, four representatives of civil society travelled to Geneva, with the support of the United Nations Integrated Office in Burundi. Finally, civil society is involved in disseminating the recommendations because much of the intellectual groundwork was done by smaller groups, outside the public eye. It was mainly CSOs that did the electoral monitoring of the implementation of the recommendations and commitments, because in the electoral context in Burundi, political concerns and priorities lay elsewhere. The Human Rights Council is not a second review, but rather the closing process of the UPR, where new recommendations and discussions are not reopened. NGOs are at this stage given particular space, because they were unable to make recommendations before.

It needs to be underlined that the plenary session at the Human Rights Council is not a second review, but rather the closing process of the UPR, where new recommendations and discussions are not reopened. NGOs are at this stage given particular space, because they were unable to make recommendations before.
Session 3

Session 3: A) Follow-up to the outcome of the review

During the following part of the session, the participants discussed strategies for the implementation of UPR recommendations. It was underlined that it is primarily the responsibility of reviewed States to implement UPR outcomes (including conclusions and recommendations and voluntary pledges and commitments as contained in the outcome document); however, resolution 5/1 provides that other relevant stakeholders, including civil society actors, also have a role to play in their implementation. The international community assists States to implement review outcomes regarding capacity-building and technical assistance, in consultation with them and with their consent.

The UPR should be approached as a continuous process, and therefore it was recommended to put in place permanent structures including all stakeholders involved throughout the UPR process, from the preparatory phase through the actual UPR session and during the implementation of the recommendations. Currently, many countries submit their reports after an extremely strenuous preparation process, given that they have not put the suggested structures in place.

One of the main issues identified regarding UPR recommendations is that States often receive quite general recommendations which might contain the request for the ratification of instruments that have already been ratified; it was also mentioned that, entities (including Government, the and NHRIs) to help the State meet its tors can often act as catalysts to efforts islative reforms and develop national use the UPR outcomes as a basis for s and for defining their own programs of
ights situation and steps taken at the t UPR outcomes;
: the UPR, the outcomes States are d how outcomes can be used to improve rights nationally. This may be done by essions, round tables, seminars and d publishing UPR outcomes and working al media, and by raising awareness of general public and civil society;
entities towards the preparation of oridic review; and
il society actors in the preparation and of follow-up information on the tcomes.
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occasionally, the manner in which the recommendations is formulated can create some confusion. It is thus important, in this light, for states participating in the UPR process to clearly identify their position in order to avoid possible confusion in the implementation and the monitoring process.

Some states benefit from the plenary sessions to inform the Human Rights Council that they have already begun to implement certain recommendations. In addition to the above, a practice has evolved by which the Human Rights Council opens discussions for two hours following the adoption of the final documents of the 16 countries that were discussed during the previous session. During this time, States can submit written periodic reports; the advantage of this procedure is that it creates a certain discipline when States know that they will have to report on their achievements, and it also serves as a forum for the sharing of best practices. Even though this practice is not obligatory, it helps to preserve the momentum created following the holding of the UPR.

Most recommendations made by States during the UPR process reflect the recommendations of the United Nations Treaty Bodies, the Special Rapporteurs and other independent experts; therefore, when taken in context, the recommendations made to the reviewed State often constitute a “roadmap” of measures it can take to improve its human rights situation – and which, in extension, can lay the foundations for the establishment of a National Human Rights Action Plan. In Indonesia, for example, a good practice was developed which involved the compilation of all recommendations – from the Treaty Bodies, Special Procedures and the UPR – into one document, thus providing an overview over which gaps need to be addressed in order to improve the country’s human rights situation. In conclusion, it was underlined by numerous participants that implementation efforts need to incorporate all recommendations in order for across-the-board progress to be made in a given State.
Session 4

Session 4 A: Designing a strategy for the implementation of the recommendations – support by OHCHR and UNDP

In this plenary session, chaired by Chinwe Dike, Resident Coordinator in The Gambia, Mahamane Cissé-Gouro, OHCHR Regional Representative for West Africa, and Patrick Van Weerelt, Practice Leader (Democratic Governance) at UNDP Regional Centre Dakar provided information on OHCHR and UNDPs engagement and support in the follow-up process to the UPR. They also provided examples of good practices of effective follow-up strategies supported by UNCTs.

Both speakers stressed that the United Nations are ready to support all Member States with regard to the implementation of the UPR recommendations. The rationale for support by UNCTs is the Human Rights Council Resolution 5/1 of 18 June 2007 which states:

“the international community will assist in implementing the recommendations and conclusions regarding capacity-building and technical assistance, in consultation with, and with the consent of, the country concerned.”

However, such support will require a request from the Member States to the UNCT in their country.

In West and Central Africa, UNDP and OHCHR are available to support the Governments through the respective UNCTs. While OHCHR WARO is focusing after all on Senegal and the Gambia as well as Togo through its OHCHR field office, UNDP, in collaboration with other agencies of the UNCTs in the region, aims to provide support to the Governments in all phases of the process but particularly with regard to the implementation of recommendations.

In general UNCTs can:

- Encourage the State to follow-up on the recommendations, including by providing assistance in specific areas, as relevant.
- Ensure the translation and broad dissemination of recommendations adopted by the Human Rights Council.
- Support States in mobilizing resources to implement the recommendations.
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- Encourage / facilitate the use of the recommendations by all relevant actors at the national level.
- Integrate the recommendations in the UN planning and programming instruments, including future CCAs / UNDAFs.

In general both speakers underlined, that a holistic approach is taken with regard to recommendations from International Human Rights Mechanisms. All recommendations should be looked at as a whole for the country to improve its human rights situation. In addition, as discussed in the previous session, it was stressed that most recommendations made by States during the UPR process reflect the recommendations of the United Nations Treaty Bodies, the Special Rapporteurs and other independent experts or even recommendations from regional human rights mechanisms. Therefore, the panel strongly recommended States to take the recommendations as a strong foundation for the design and implementation of National Human Rights Action Plans. Such initiative shall find the strong support from the United Nations, in particular OHCHR and UNDP.

In fact, in 2009 a study was conducted to analyze all the 1523 UPR recommendations adopted by that date. Around 80-85% of the recommendations are closely linked to the type of support that UN Agencies have been providing for a long period of time such as:

- Development of National Human Rights Action Plans;
- Harmonisation of national legislation with international human rights standards;
- Establishment and/or strengthening of national human rights institutions; and
- Supporting the implementation of recommendations of UN treaty bodies and special procedures

In West and Central Africa OHCHR, UNDP and its partners are currently supporting several countries in the preparations of the UPR and their efforts to develop National Action Plans for the implementation of UPR recommendations as well as recommendations from treaty bodies. Furthermore and increased effort is made in integrating UPR recommendations in UN programming at the country level.
Several good practices with regard to the follow-up and support to implementation of UPR recommendations by UNCTs worldwide were presented:

**Kingdom of Bahrain**

With the support of the UNCT the Kingdom of Bahrain developed a National Action Plan to implement pledges and recommendations.

- A three-year USD 1.2 million dollar program was designed.
- Major components included the development of a database to track human rights;
- The creation of a National Human Rights Institution in conformity with the Paris Principles;
- Capacity development of to monitor the realisation of human rights;
- The development of “Annual Summary Reports on human rights”;
- A Government led web-site was created to ensure transparency, and to increase awareness and dialogue.

**Sri Lanka**

With the support of the UNCT developed a National Action Plan for the Protection and Promotion of Human Rights.

- A UN Joint Program was developed.
- Stocktaking exercise in 8 thematic areas of human rights.
- Strengthen the communication and reporting functions of the Human Rights Commission.
- Independent Reviews and involvement of Civil Society.
- Establishment of a database tracking system on human rights violations, specifically: disappearances, torture, extra-judicial executions and arbitrary detention.
- Capacity development of government institutions.
- Broad engagement with academic institutions.

**Turkmenistan**

The UNCT is supporting a high level interdepartmental commission for monitoring the implementation of the international human rights instruments (chaired by the Minister of Foreign Affairs).”

**Session 4: B) Different aspects of implementation of recommendations**

In the following session, the different participants presented their experience with regard to the implementation of UPR recommendations in their respective country in three different working groups:
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National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) of

...group of the Human Rights Council. The NHRC of Burkina Faso was fully involved throughout the process, from the preparatory phase of preparing and adopting a new law that was consistent with the Paris Principles to involving public authorities and the Government in the process of preparing and adopting a new law that was consistent with the Paris Principles. The NHRC of Burkina Faso was, for instance, asked to adapt its law on the NHRC to be in accordance with its mandate. It is therefore essential to develop strategies for approaching various public institutions and technical and financial partners. If civil society organizations and public authorities are to operate effectively, they should as a result be involved in the designing and implementation of recommendations. Technical and financial partners are also required for the implementation of certain UPR recommendations which have received no recommendations in regard to their implementation. Burkina Faso played an important role in the process and the Government took appropriate measures for the implementation of recommendations. Despite the fact that this might be difficult depending on the nature of the recommendations, the involvement of the NHRI at all stages of the process should not be misunderstood as assimilation with the government. While taking effective measures for the implementation of recommendations, human rights institutions in Geneva raised concerns over a recommendation that public authorities were to be informed about the recommendations and to play their rightful role. If civil society organizations and public authorities are to operate effectively, the NHRI should help them to function better.
Government experiences regarding follow-up to recommendations (Ambassador Cheikh Tidiane Thiam, Director, Judicial and Consular Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Senegal)
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- Finding a better connection between the recommendations and the various programs and projects that are already being implemented nationwide;
- Setting priorities and programming for the implementation of recommendations;
- Establishment of a monitoring committee with a clear set of guiding principles, and the appointment of a Coordinator to oversee the Committee’s work.

The use of consultants, experts or resource persons is highly important and further reflections on financing the implementation of recommendations with financial implications should be undertaken.
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Conclusions and Recommendations:

The final session of the meeting was dedicated to draw conclusions of the experiences shared and the rich discussions which took place over three days. It was underlined that the UPR is an equal, continuous and inclusive process lead by States that asks for the commitment and coordinated efforts of national authorities. Participants concluded that the NHRIIs and civil society organizations should be involved in the different phases of the UPR process and that the efficient implementation of the recommendations is only possible with the commitment and participation of all relevant stakeholders at the national level. Furthermore, it was noted that the UNCTs and other UN agencies play an important role in ensuring that the Governments have the information and capacity to produce a solid and representative report, that there is wide national ownership and engagement in the UPR process and they play a supporting role engaging in capacity development of Governments to implement the recommendations resulting from this process.

Participants made the following general recommendations:

1) Engage authorities at the highest level of the state – including heads of state or governments – in the UPR process;
2) Establish coordination and monitoring mechanisms at the country level to ensure that all relevant governmental departments are involved in the implementation of the recommendations of the UPR process;
3) Empower Ministries with regard to the management of budgets allocated for the implementation of recommendations;
4) Develop National Human Rights Actions Plans based on the UPR recommendations as well as recommendations from other international and regional human rights mechanisms;
5) Develop a regional action plan with regard to the implementation of UPR recommendations;
6) Advocate for adequate funding to be provided to National Human Rights Institutions in order to enable them to play the key role intended for them in the UPR process. Other stakeholders, such as CSOs, also need to be provided with adequate means with which to play their part in the UPR process;
7) Strengthen links between States and civil society actors by involving them closely in all stages of the UPR process. The latter can play the roles of surveillance and alert, with respect to the implementation of UPR recommendations and commitments made by the various UN member States.
8) Organize a regional meeting to discuss issues pertaining to follow-up to the review and the implementation of the recommendations, once all countries of the sub-region have undergone their respective UPR processes (first round);
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9) Establish a fund at the sub-regional level to facilitate activities carried out under the regional action plan for implementation of UPR recommendations;
10) Provide technical expertise and documentation to NHRIs, civil society organizations, and UNCTs to enable them to fully play their role as advisors in relation to Governments of States undergoing the UPR process;
11) Recommendations made to States during the UPR-process should be formulated in a precise and clear manner;

The following recommendations were made to the United Nations:

12) Strengthen Resident Coordinators’ knowledge of the UPR, and provide more information on UPR to UN coordination specialists, in recognition of the strategic role they can play in initiating and coordinating the support of UNCT to the UPR process;
13) Encourage and provide advice to UN agencies on how best to incorporate the recommendations of the UPR and the treaty body mechanisms into their strategic planning processes;
14) UNCTs shall support process and efforts in countries to strengthen cooperation amongst all relevant stakeholders (government, NHRIs, civil society);
15) Establish general guidelines by the United Nations in order to facilitate the drafting by States of National Human Rights Action Plans.
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### Day 1  TUESDAY 6 JULY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session/Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00-09:00</td>
<td>Registration and Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00-10:30</td>
<td>Opening session: Welcome and overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video message from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Michel Balima, Deputy Director UNDP Regional Centre Dakar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bacre Ndiaye, Director, Human Rights Council and Special Procedures Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maître Madické Niang, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Senegal (tbc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:00</td>
<td>Coffee/Tea Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-13:00</td>
<td>Session 1: Introduction to the UPR Process &amp; Preparation for the Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenary</td>
<td><strong>Introduction of participants:</strong> Facilitator, Alioune Loum, UNIC Dakar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Presentation of the agenda:</strong> Paul d’ Auchamp, Deputy Regional Representative,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• OHCHR WARO and Isabelle Tschan, Policy Specialist, Human Rights and Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• to Justice, UNDP Regional Centre Dakar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Session 1: A) What is the UPR?</strong> Bacre Ndiaye, OHCHR HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00-14:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td><strong>Plenary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Session 1: B) How to Prepare for the Review - Plenary</strong></td>
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<tr>
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<td><strong>Chair:</strong> Mahamane Cisse, Regional Representative, OHCHR WARO</td>
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<td></td>
<td><strong>Guidelines for Preparation: Introduction (HRC Dec. 6/102)</strong> Myriam Tebourbi, OHCHR HQ</td>
</tr>
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<td><strong>Planning the National Report, including the national consultation process / public information strategy:</strong> Cheikh Tidiane Thiam, Directeur des Affaires Juridiques et Consulaires, Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, Sénégal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Support by and role of UNCTs:</strong> Isabelle Tschan, Policy Specialist, Human Rights and Access to Justice, UNDP Regional Centre Dakar and Komi Gnondoli, Human Rights Adviser, UNCT Niger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Role of NHRIs and CSOs in the preparation of the review:</strong> Alioune Ndiaye, President, Comité Sénégalais des Droits de l’Homme and Gnanou Karfa Mouvement Burkinabé des Droits de l’Homme et des Peuples - MBDHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-16:30</td>
<td><strong>Coffee/Tea Break</strong></td>
<td>.................................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30-17:30</td>
<td><strong>Session 1: C) How to Prepare for the Review – Working Groups</strong></td>
<td>.................................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Working Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WG 1: Governments, NHRIs and CSOs:</strong> Marc Somda, Conseiller Technique, Ministère de la Promotion des Droits Humains, Burkina Faso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Chair:</strong> Bacre Ndiaye, OHCHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WG 2: Planning the National Report with a special focus on the national consultation process:</strong> Esther Keimer, Swiss Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Chair:</strong> Paul d’ Auchamp, Deputy Regional Representative, OHCHR WARO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17:30-18:00</td>
<td>Report back from Working Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair: Mahamane Cisse- Gouro, Regional Representative, OHCHR WARO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00-21:30</td>
<td>Dinner Cocktail – Hotel Radisson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30-10:30</td>
<td>Session 2: Conduct of the review in the Working Group and in the HRC Plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenary</td>
<td>Session 2: A) Review in the HRC Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modalities of review in Working Groups: Myriam Tebourbi, OHCHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extracts of webcasts from previous UPR sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary Trust Fund for Participation in the UPR Mechanism: Bacre Ndiaye, OHCHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:00</td>
<td>Coffee/Tea Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-12:15</td>
<td>Session 2: B) Sharing experiences of the review in the HRC Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Working Groups</td>
<td>WG 1: The experience of Ghana : Evelyn Keelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Myriam Tebourbi, OHCHR HQ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dakar 6-8 July 2010
West and Central Africa Regional Meeting on the Universal Periodic Review (UPR)

WG 2: The experience of Gabon: Eric Dodo Bouenguendza (tbc)
Chair: Mahamane Cisse-Gouro, OHCHR WARO

WG 3: The experience of Mali: Bakary Doumbia (tbc)
Chair: Komi Gnondoli, Human Rights Adviser, Niger UNCT

12:15-13:00
Plenary
Report back from Working Groups
Feedback and discussion
Chair: Paul d’Auchamp, Deputy Regional Representative, OHCHR WARO

13:00–14:30
Lunch

14:30-16:00
Plenary
Session 2: C) Human Rights Council Plenary
Chair: Myriam Tebourbi, OHCHR

General modality of HRC plenary session: Bacre Ndiaye, OHCHR


NHRI inputs during the Human Rights Council Plenary: Alioune Ndiaye, President, Comité Sénégalais des Droits de l’Homme (tbc)

CSO inputs during the Human Rights Council Plenary: Joseph Ndayizeye, Ligue Iteka, Burundi (tbc)

Outcome of the review: Bacre Ndiaye, OHCHR
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:00-16:30</td>
<td>Coffee/Tea Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30-18:00</td>
<td><strong>Session 3: Follow-up to the outcome</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Session 3: A) Follow-up to the outcome of the review – Plenary:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provisions for specific follow-up: Mahamane Cisse-Gouro, Regional Representative OHCHR WARO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:30-10:30</td>
<td><strong>Session 4: Implementation of recommendations/sharing experiences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Session 4: A) Designing a strategy for the implementation of the recommendations – methodology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Chinwe Dike, Resident Coordinator, Gambia UNCT (tbc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OHCHR’s involvement in follow-up of UPR in the framework of technical assistance: Mahamane Cisse-Gouro, Regional Representative OHCHR WARO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good practices of an effective follow-up strategy supported by UNCTs: Patrick Van Weerelt, Practice Leader, Democratic Governance, UNDP RCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The experience of Eritrea – designing a National Human Rights Action Plan: Mohammed Salih, UNCT Eritrea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:00</td>
<td>Coffee/Tea Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-13:00</td>
<td><strong>Session 4: B) Group Work on different aspects of implementation of recommendations</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|            | **WG 1: Government experiences regarding follow-up to recommendations:** Cheikh Tidiane Thiam, Directeur des Affaires Juridiques et Consulaires, Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, Sénégal  
**Chair:** Ekkehard Strauss, Chief, Human Rights Section, BINUB, Burundi |
|            | **WG 2: NHRIs experiences regarding follow-up to UPR and implementations of recommendations:** François Sales Bado, Président, Commission Nationale des Droits de l’Homme, Burkina Faso (tbc)  
**Chair:** Komi Gnondoli, Human Rights Adviser, Niger UNCT |
|            | **WG 3: Good practices of UNCT support for follow-up to UPR:** Patrick Van Weerelt, UNDP RCD  
**Chair:** Oumar Kane, Human Rights Adviser, Rwanda UNCT |
| 13:00-14:30| Lunch                                             |
| 14:30-15:30| Report back from Working Groups  
Feedback and discussion  
**Chair:** Isabelle Tschan, UNDP |
<p>| 15:30-16:00| Coffee/Tea Break                                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:00-17:00</td>
<td>Conclusions &amp; the way forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00-18:00</td>
<td>Closing session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# West and Central Africa Regional Meeting on the Universal Periodic Review (UPR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Institution/Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>ADJOLOHOUN Horace</td>
<td>Secrétaire Général</td>
<td>ONG AGIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGBODJI Jacques Houensou</td>
<td>Chef Unité Gouvernance</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOUSSOUVIPKO Antonin</td>
<td>Secrétaire Général</td>
<td>Commission Nationale des Droits de l'Homme- CNDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TODJIHOUNDE Dieudonné</td>
<td>Direction des Droits de l'Homme</td>
<td>Ministère de la Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>De SALES BADO François</td>
<td>Président</td>
<td>Commission Nationale des Droits de l'Homme- CNDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KARFA Gnanou</td>
<td>Secrétaire Adjoint aux Relations Extérieures</td>
<td>Mouvement Burkinabé des droits de l’homme et des Peuples- MBDHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OUEDRAOGO Harouna</td>
<td>Chef Unité Gouvernance</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOMDA Marc</td>
<td>Conseiller Technique</td>
<td>Ministère de la Promotion des droits humains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ZONGO Fortuné Gaétan</td>
<td>Directeur Général de la Défense des Droits Humains</td>
<td>Ministère de la Promotion Des Droits Humains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>NDAYIZEYE Joseph</td>
<td>Président</td>
<td>Ligue Iteka -ONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGARIGARI Ida</td>
<td>Directrice du Département</td>
<td>Ministère de la Promotion des Droits de la Personne Humaine, de l'Education à la Paix et de la Réconciliation Nationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRAUSS Ekkehard</td>
<td>Chef de la Section des Droits de l'Homme</td>
<td>Bureau Intégré des Nations Unies au Burundi -BINUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap Verde</td>
<td>ANDRADE GOMES Joselene Safira</td>
<td>Conseillère</td>
<td>Ministère de la Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIMA Sonia</td>
<td>Coordinatrice de Programme</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SILVA Carlos Emilio</td>
<td>Membre de la Direction</td>
<td>Zé Moniz -ONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>SALIH Mohammed</td>
<td>Communications Analyst</td>
<td>UNO/RCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>BOUGUENDZA Eric Dodo</td>
<td>Directeur Général des Droits de l'Homme</td>
<td>Ministère en charge des Droits de l’Homme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ONDO EVA Joseph</td>
<td>Secrétaire Général</td>
<td>Commission Nationale des Droits de l'Homme -CNDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAGBO Chantal Sasse</td>
<td>Présidente</td>
<td>SIFOS RENEF -ONG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gambia</strong></td>
<td>TIELLO Oumar Samba</td>
<td>Spécialiste de la Coordination</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIKE Chinwe M.</td>
<td>Resident Coordinator</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GARBA-JAHUMPA Bashirou</td>
<td>Programme Specialist, Governance and Human Rights Unit</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAWARA Ramatoulie</td>
<td>State Counsel Lawyer</td>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAINÉ FIRDAUS Marie</td>
<td>Ambassador</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghana</strong></td>
<td>KEELSON Evelyn Daawee</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guinea</strong></td>
<td>BARRY Rouguiatou</td>
<td>Magistrat Directrice Nationale des Droits de l'Homme et des Libertés Fondamentales</td>
<td>Ministère de la Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guinea</strong> Bissau</td>
<td>KRAFT Antje</td>
<td>Spécialiste Genre et Gouvernance Bureau Coordonnateur Résident Nations Unies</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SANHA Cletche</td>
<td>Chargé du Dossier de Droits de l’Homme</td>
<td>Ministère des Affaires Etrangeres, de la Cooperation Internationale et des Communautés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liberia</strong></td>
<td>BLAMA Viama J.</td>
<td>Legal Counsellor</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Chariman of the Sub-Committee on UPR Sterring Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MONIBAH James P.</td>
<td>Sociologist/Rule of Law Programme Associate</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mali</strong></td>
<td>BA Amadou</td>
<td>Président</td>
<td>Sous-Commission Droits Economiques Sociaux et Culturales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOUMBIA Bakary</td>
<td>Conseiller</td>
<td>Ministère des Affaires Etrangères et de la Coopération Internationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KONE Brahima</td>
<td>Président</td>
<td>Association Malienne des Droits de l'Homme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traoré Macky</td>
<td>Magistrat</td>
<td>Ministère Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mauritania</strong></td>
<td>EL MOUNIR Mohamed</td>
<td>Coordinate du Programme Conjoint Prévention des Conflits</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koita Bamaram</td>
<td>Président</td>
<td>Commission Nationale des Droits de l’Homme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OULD MOHAMED Cheikh Tourad</td>
<td>Directeur des Droits de l'Homme</td>
<td>Commissariat aux Droits de l’Homme, à L’Action Humanitaire et aux Relation avec la Société Civile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization/Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>GNONDOLI Komi</td>
<td>Conseiller en Droits de l'Homme</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LABO Zeinabou</td>
<td>Directrice des Droits de l'Homme</td>
<td>Ministère de la Justice et des Droits de l'Homme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>KANE Oumar</td>
<td>Conseiller en Droits de l'Homme</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NKERABIGWI Etienne</td>
<td>Coordinateur</td>
<td>Ministère des Affaires Etrangères</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>KAMA Fatou</td>
<td>Directrice Exécutive</td>
<td>RHADDO Sénégal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOUM Abdoul Aziz</td>
<td>Conseiller</td>
<td>Ministère des Affaires Etrangères</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDIAYE Alioune</td>
<td>Coordinateur</td>
<td>Comité Sénégalais des Droits de l'Homme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDIAYE Assane Ndioma</td>
<td>Président</td>
<td>Organisation Nationale des Droits de l'Homme - ONDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SECK El Hadj Abdoulaye</td>
<td>Coordinateur Mobilisation Croissance et Formation</td>
<td>Amnesty International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THIAM Cheikh Tidiane</td>
<td>Ambassadeur- Directeur des Affaires Juridiques et Consulaires</td>
<td>Ministère des Affaires Etrangères</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>NYUMA Joe Fayia</td>
<td>Director, International Legal Affairs and Research Division</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAM Edward</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>National Human Rights Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIDIQUE Abdul Razaq Lamin</td>
<td>Human Rights Officer</td>
<td>UNIPSIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>KEIMER Esther</td>
<td>Human Rights Section, Political Division IV</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>OFFERMAN Michael</td>
<td>Chargé du bureau</td>
<td>HCDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POLO Nakpa</td>
<td>Directrice Générale des Droits de l'Homme</td>
<td>Ministère des Droits de l'Homme, de la Consolidation de la Démocratie et de la Formation Civique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILSON-DE SOUZA Leonardina Rita Doris</td>
<td>Ministre des Droits de l'Homme</td>
<td>Ministère des Droits de l'Homme de la Démocratie et de la Formation Civique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>NDIAYE Bacre Waly</td>
<td>Director Human Rights Council and Special Procedures Division</td>
<td>OHCHR HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEBOURBI Myriam</td>
<td>Human Rights Council and Special Procedures Division</td>
<td>OHCHR HQ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Dakar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAMBA Mamadou</td>
<td>Consultant en Droits de l'Homme</td>
<td>HCDH/BRAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CISSE-GOURO Mahamane</td>
<td>Représentant Régional</td>
<td>HCDH/BRAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d'AUCHAMP Paul</td>
<td>Représentant Régional Adjoint</td>
<td>HCDH/BRAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUNTON Benjamin</td>
<td>Spécialiste des Programmes</td>
<td>HCDH/BRAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOURE Oumou</td>
<td>Consultante en Genre</td>
<td>HCDH/BRAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAN BUYTEN Kristien</td>
<td>Experte Associée en Droits de l'Homme</td>
<td>HCDH/BRAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEINBERG Deborah</td>
<td>Experte Associée en Droits de l'Homme</td>
<td>HCDH/BRAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALIMA Michel</td>
<td>Directeur Régional Adjoint a.i.</td>
<td>PNUD/CRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDIAYE Agnès</td>
<td>Consultante</td>
<td>PNUD/CRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOURE Amina</td>
<td>Consultante</td>
<td>PNUD/CRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCHAN Isabelle</td>
<td>Conseillère en Droits de l'Homme et Accès à la Justice</td>
<td>PNUD/CRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAN WEERELT Patrick</td>
<td>Practice Leader Gouvernance Démocratique</td>
<td>PNUD/CRD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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