US 12-02-07 AM

- Thank you very much, Mr. Facilitator, for the comprehensive approach you have presented for further work. ~~We are grateful for your guidance so far.~~

- Your paper represents a good faith effort to reflect the discussions in the working group, offers some very helpful compromises, and provides a firm basis for further work.

- The United States agrees with all those states that have promoted as the goal of the UPR to establish a true peer review system for considering the human rights practice of states.

- We must carefully consider how we establish this mechanism.

  -- We need to avoid duplicating the work of other mechanisms, especially the treaty bodies.

  -- Moreover, we have to be realistic, because, with over 190 states to review, our decision will have tremendous impact on resources – not only for ~~the~~ OHCHR and UN system, but also for our diplomatic missions and capitals.

- Mr. Facilitator, we will have comments on the individual sections of your paper, so ~~will~~ confine ourselves now to three points:

  -- First, we should keep the mechanism light and efficient.

  -- Second, we should avoid long prescriptive sections in the procedures. The working group should avoid getting into divisive debates about which treaties to mention or which outcomes to authorize.

  -- Third, we should avoid divisive debates about linking this process to other questions such as the complaints procedures or review of mandates. UPR is new and should stand on its own.

- Thank you, Mr. Facilitator, we look forward to continued progress in this working group.