

**Statement of the Bangladesh delegation on the Universal Periodic Review,  
at the Human Rights Council, 2 October 2006**

Mr. President,

The Universal Periodic Review is an important value addition to the work of the Human Rights Council. We believe it will make this Council different from its predecessor, if we can make it effective and functional. Now, there is a broad understanding among the States that UPR should be a light exercise and that it should not duplicate the works of treaty bodies or other mechanisms. The briefing by the coordinator of the Working Group made it further clear to us.

The UNGA resolution 60/251 has provided us the scope for conducting UPR and necessary guide lines to operationalize it. Operative paragraph 5(e) of the Resolution has provided the fundamental principles, basic requirements, as well as a parameter for a UPR in the Human Rights Council. The Council is to undertake a review of the "...fulfillment by each State of its human rights obligations and commitments in a manner which ensures universality of coverage and equal treatment with respect to all States....". States have human rights obligations emanating from their respective constitutions or fundamental documents. At the same time, they have obligations and commitments under international instruments to which they are party, as well as broader obligations under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. All these need to be taken into consideration in reviewing a country.

I would like to comment on the process of preparation for the Review. It should be done on the basis of objective and reliable information, with the full involvement of the country concerned. It would be useful for the Council to formulate a standard questionnaire, as a basis on which countries would prepare their Reports. Based on the Report, questions could be posed to the country during the Review in the Council. The reviewing State would answer those questions in the Council. Where complete answers cannot be given at the Review, written responses are to be provided within a reasonable period of time. An interactive dialogue with other States, both Members and non-Members, should be the central element. Other stakeholders could be present during the review as observers.

The Council will need to determine the time-allocation for Review. Not more than one half-day Session, three hours, should be devoted to one country's review. The periodicity of the UPR would depend on the amount of time the Council

would like to devote to this process. It should strike a balance between the number of States to be reviewed each year, the workload of the Council and the resource constraints of States, particularly the developing and the least developed countries. Based on the time available, periodicity of the reviews may be considered. It is clear that we need a different periodicity for the developed, the developing and the least developed countries. This differentiation is required in consideration of the stage of development of the country. There are many developing countries that will have difficulty coping with the management needs of such an exercise; they will require more time than a developed country. It is important that the special and differential treatment be built into the Review process, to make it realistic and meaningful.

The outcome of the discussion in the Council should be prepared under the authority of the Chair. It should be a consensual one. In general, it should be a summary of discussions.

It will be the responsibility of the country concerned to follow-up. Where capacity-building is required for follow-up, the country concerned will inform the Council accordingly. The Council will determine the means by which such capacity-building assistance will be provided to the country concerned. This responsibility on the Council will ensure that demands on any country are reasonable.

UPR should lead to constructive engagement and cooperation that can assist the State concerned to build and enhance its capacity to live up to its human rights obligations and commitments. The purpose is to promote cooperative action among Member States to uphold and protect human rights. This exercise should not transform the UPR into a forum of condemnation, naming or shaming. Above all, we must avoid the politicization of human rights that we have seen in some other forums.

I thank you.