STATEMENT OF THE PHILIPPINE DELEGATION

At the informal consultations on the Universal Periodic
Review (UPR)
Room XVIII, Palais des Nations, Geneva
08 September 2006

Mr. Chairman,

At the outset, allow me to express our appreciation of the presentations yesterday and this afternoon of existing review mechanisms from which we may draw certain principles and guidelines for our own UPR.

The Philippe delay of the principles are guidelines for our own UPR.

We also wish to express our support for the statement by the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia on behalf of the Asian Group.

Further to the proposed modalities for UPR which are contained in a working paper submitted by the Philippine Delegation and which is now posted on the HRC extranet, we wish to present today further elaboration on our proposal:

 UPR should ideally be held every 5-6 years per country, in principle;

2. UPR may consist of 3 phases, namely, preparatory stage, dialogue and outcome. This demarcation could help clarify the required modalities and actors to be involved in each phase;

3. The preparatory phase could involve the drafting of a questionnaire and transmittal of said questionnaire to the country under reviews well in advance of the interactive dialogue, to give that country sufficient time to prepare its replies;

4. The interactive dialogue, the cornerstone of UPR, should be a peer review to be held in a private session, not a formal plenary, which could last between 2 to 3 hours, by experts to be designated by HRC member states. Discussion of the state's replies to the questionnaire shall form the core of the interactive dialogue. NGOs and other stakeholders may be present as observers.

5. The outcome phase of the review should take the form of a summary of proceedings, recommendations emanating from the interactive dialogue focused on capacity-building and/or voluntary pledges and

Todasied Le st

Ŋ

conducted

commitments made by the state under review. These recommendations should be at a general policy the level and drafted in full consultation with that state They should not duplicate the outcomes of other human rights mechanisms so as not to create unnecessary burdens on states. The outcome shall be adopted by the Council in a plenary session; The next succeeding UPR for the late would partly serve as the follow-up. serve as the follow-up Chairman. To the person under UPR.

President. To the person winder UPR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. we look found to a full partight in the cares grown. In conduir, arrightedule and mutys arrightedule and for his ben arrightedule at al consupper

The desire of state concerned

Consultant state concerned

The consultant state concerned state concerned

The consultant state concerned state con