

The UPR in

in my view, The review should be conducted in a spirit of constructive dialogue with a view to helping the country to comply with its human rights obligations. Therefore, the outcome of the interactive dialogue in the Council should be <sup>contribution and experience</sup> the form of a <sup>It may take the</sup> summary of discussions prepared under the authority of the Chair.

It will be the responsibility of the country concerned to follow-up. This is of particular importance in order to preserve the cooperative character of the UPR ~~and also keeping in mind the fact~~. The country under review could announce voluntary pledges/ commitments. Where capacity-building is required for follow-up, the country concerned will inform the Council accordingly. The Council will determine the means by which such capacity-building assistance will be provided. This responsibility of the Council will ensure that demands on the country are reasonable.

We are against adopting any resolution on the country under review. It would mean consideration of a large number of country-specific resolutions by the Council every year.

~~They should not duplicate the outcomes of other human rights mechanisms so as not to create unnecessary burdens on states. The Council shall adopt the outcome in a plenary session.~~ <sup>should</sup> The Council shall adopt the outcome

*Let me reiterate that the UPR*

**should** not be a forum of condemnation, naming or shaming. Nor should it be a forum for expiation for one's past violations of human rights.