Morning, General Comment. Afternoon: Mr. facilitator, CHIUM The paper laid a good basis for further discussion and for the final creation of the upr by augretulate you on your China support the creation, consider it will be helpful for the redress of the shortcomings of the chr, which is characterized by politicization, double standard selectivity. as the GA resolution stated. Upr should be a cooperative mechanism, at the same time, upr should take into due consideration different historic, cultural religious background and different stages of development. Upr should complement not duplicate Do not support the participation of ngos, because we can not ensure the reliability and phijectivity of the materials presented by ngos. With regard to the periodicity, support the period between review cycles should be at least 5 years, so that state can have enough time for the preparation for the review. ) n Thus the council each year can review 40 states. With 3 hours meeting allocated for every 6 state, the council should spend 4 weeks every for upr exercise. The upr should be conducted in the main session, with member states be the main player of the upr in order to ensure the objectivity and impartiality of the review.

Lasel on a standardized of the second adapted.

The upr should be based on information presented by states and sp and treaty bodys. No by the analyse of the second adapted. duplication The final outcome should be statement of the council including observations and recommendations. It should be a cooperative one and adopted by consensus with the full agreement of the state under review. concerned states, during its next review, should report how it implement the outcome of the previous review. t avoid (we are just imposing tomatry specific resolutions at the introducers) Confrontation but in favor of head to h 

Common Bryor. Granc Willes