

Indonesia's Intervention At The  
Working Group On The Implementation Of Op 6 Of The Ga Res. 60/251  
Universal Periodic Review

Geneva, 14 February 2007 (AM)

**V. Outcome of the Review**

Mr Facilitator,

**1. Format of the Outcome**

With regard to comments concerning the outcome, we are of the view that in order not to duplicate the work of the treaty bodies, the outcome report should consist of the summary of the proceedings at the review. If there is a decision and /or recommendation and/or conclusions, they should be made with the consent of the countries concerned. Above all, the outcome should be adopted by consensus.

**2. Content of the Outcome**

We can go along with most of the elements of convergence mentioned in your non-paper. However, with regard to the provisions concerning technical assistance and capacity building, it should be at the request and with the consent of the countries concerned.

Furthermore, my delegation has reservations concerning two elements requiring my delegation has reservations concerning two of the elements requiring further consideration under letter B., namely assessment of the implementation of treaty body and special procedure recommendations and conclusions, as well as their follow-up; and appointment of a special procedure mandate, dispatching of fact-finding missions, investigative teams or commissions of inquiry.

In our view, neither of these processes are appropriate or relevant under the UPR mechanism since they are already fully catered for by other specific procedures charged with examining countries' human rights records. When reviewing countries, the emphasis must be on existing procedures coordinating their data, not on their duplication by new mechanisms. Moreover, introducing the latter into a public process such as the UPR is to run the risk of drifting back into the politicization and finger-pointing which