Human Rights Council
The successive steps of the Universal Periodic Review process

Step 1: Preparation of the initial documentation on which the Review will be based

Document 1: Information prepared by the government of the State concerned (20 pages max.)

States are encouraged to prepare it through a **broad national consultation with all relevant stakeholders, including NGOs**. NGOs should lobby for inclusive consultations.

Document 2: OHCHR compilation of information contained in treaty bodies and special procedures' reports and other official UN documents (10 pages max.)

No direct role for NGOs.

Document 3: OHCHR summary of information provided by other relevant stakeholders, including NGOs (10 pages max.)

NGOs, including those without ECOSOC consultative status, should submit short, targeted and prioritized **written submissions**. These will be summarized by the OHCHR.

All 3 documents should be ready **6 weeks before** the actual Review in the UPR Working Group. **The NGO written submissions** should be sent within the deadline circulated by the OHCHR (**around 5 months before the review**)

Step 2: Preparation of actual review

1. Consideration by NGOs of the 3 documents on which the review would be based

Once made public, the 3 documents should be assessed by all actors interested in the UPR process.

2. Informal action of NGOs towards the troika of rapporteurs before the WG review

For each country under review, a group of three representatives of HRC member states (the "**Troika**"), selected by drawing of lots, will **facilitate the preparation** of the interactive dialogue, with the assistance and expertise of the OHCHR. The Troika will in particular help focussing the review. During the 6 weeks between the publication of the 3 reports and the session of the WG, **NGOs should** proactively and informally **interact with the Troika** members, the OHCHR and the HRC member states, to **ensure that their priorities will be given due attention** during the interactive dialogue.

Once the three documents are circulated and the members of the Troika are identified, the preparatory phase of the country review is initiated

Step 3: Actual conduct of the Review by a Working Group of the HRC

1. Three-hour Interactive Dialogue

The Human Rights Council, sitting as a **Working Group**, will accomplish the actual review during a purely **intergovernmental** process.

On the basis of the three documents and on the preparatory work performed by the Troika, assisted by the OHCHR, the State under review engages in an **interactive dialogue with the UPR Working Group**.

From this interactive dialogue will emerge the outcome of the UPR process.

2. NGO role during the interactive dialogue

NGO participation is limited to **silent attendance**: they can assist to the review and sit in the room, but without speaking right during the Interactive dialogue. But they should approach Council member and observer States to raise their concerns and make recommendations before the holding of the interactive dialogue.

The HRC WG on UPR will review 16 countries per session during each of its two-week sessions.

The WG will be convened three times a year, reviewing 48 countries every year.

Step 4: Preparation and adoption of the report in the WG

1. Preparation of the report of the Working Group

The Troika of rapporteurs will also help in the preparation of the report of the WG. This report will include a summary of the interactive dialogue, recommendation and voluntary commitments of the State under review.

It is expected that a reasonable time frame would be maintained between the interactive dialogue and the adoption of the report in the working group.

NGOs should approach the Troika to make their latest suggestions and comments, prior to the adoption of the report, on the basis of the content of the interactive dialogue.

2. Adoption of the report by the WG

30 minutes are allocated for the adoption of the report by the WG on UPR. NGO can sit in the room but cannot make statements.

It is expected that the adoption of the reports could take place at the end of the UPR WG Session during which the 16 countries are actually reviewed.
This is to be confirmed by the practice.

Step 5: Adoption of the outcome in the HRC Plenary

Once adopted by the WG on UPR, the report is submitted to **the HRC Plenary**, seating in **Regular Session**, and will be considered under its standing agenda **item 6**.

Up to one hour will be allocated for the adoption of the outcome by the HRC Plenary.

The state reviewed will have an opportunity to reply and present issues not sufficiently addressed. Member and observer States, as well as other relevant stakeholders, including **NGOs**, will be able to **make statements** before the adoption of the outcome.

However, given the short time scheduled for each reviewed country, it is expected that a rather small number of NGO representatives will be given an opportunity to deliver short statements.

The adoption during the Council's regular session might consist in a rubber stamping of the conclusions of the WG. NGOs should have a critical and forward looking approach on the UPR outcome.

Implementation and follow-up to the review

1. At the international level

A standing agenda item in the agenda of the HRC regular session's will allow with some follow up at the international level.

In addition, the Council can decide when any specific follow-up is necessary, as well as to address cases of persistent non-cooperation with this mechanism.

The next review cycle will also be an opportunity for follow-up.

2. At the national level

The UPR recommendations should be primarily implemented by the State concerned, and, as appropriate, by other relevant stakeholders.

The international community is encouraged to assist in the implementation of the UPR recommendations, through capacity building and technical cooperation.

As soon as the UPR outcome is adopted, and depending of any specific decision taken by the Council, NGOs should start monitoring implementation and raise awareness at the national and at the Council's level.

Several months before the review → ***6 weeks before the review*** → ***Review*** → ***Some time after the review*** → ***Next regular session of the Council, following the UPR WG*** → ***Standing process until the next review cycle***