

My delegation prefers option - 1 to be the most suitable for UPR. Obviously, it would need further reflection and refinement, which we can do if we agree on the model first.

There is almost an agreement that the duration of review should be three hours. There is also a general agreement that periodicity should be 4 or 5 years. Though we have a proposal on the table to have differential periodicity, which we ~~can~~ may keep aside for the time being to facilitate focused discussion. Now, my delegation is persuaded that 4 weeks out of 10-12 weeks of Human Rights Council session can be devoted to consideration of UPR. It will leave 6-8 weeks to deal with other human rights issues. Still the left would be more than the time former CHR used to have.

Also from our experience with the Council programme, we feel that we can indeed do it without much difficulty. We see an attempt everytime in every session to fill in the gaps bringing in new elements which can be easily discarded.

As far as the formation of WGs. I don't think it will be possible for the small delegation and developing countries to efficiently participate in the review process. If it has to be one WG as proposed by US, then it should be open-ended. The difference between Plenary and open-ended WG would be formal and informal nature.

(2)

As for the participation of experts, we do not envisage their participation in the review. But I can accept your proposal that some sort of expert involvement can be at the time of compilation of information which are reliable and authentic. At the end, UPR is a peer review and we should not let loose its inter-governmental nature.

Like US we do not support a secondary set of questionnaire after the review.

---