

**Intervention by the Bangladesh delegation at the Informal Meeting on the
Universal Periodic Review, 7 September 2006**

Mr. ~~Chairman~~, *President*

My delegation associates itself with the statement made by the Ambassador of ~~Pakistan~~ ^{Saudi Arabia} ~~on behalf of OIC~~ ^{the Asian Group}. I would, however, highlight a few points.

First of all, we need to define the scope of the review as a most important first step in the process of establishing the modalities of the UPR.

According to the language of the Resolution 60/251, the Council is to undertake a review of the "...fulfillment by each State of its human rights obligations and commitments...". We need to determine the basis on which we commence with our task. States have human rights obligations emanating from their respective constitutions or fundamental documents. At the same time, there are some basic international instruments which need to be included into our consideration. (Furthermore, there are principles of equity involved) All of these ideas are contained in the UNGA Resolution. We cannot expect an open-ended mandate, nor can we allow each to tailor the scope to one's convenience.

We are also under instructions to complement and not duplicate the work of the treaty bodies. This requires a review of the reporting under all the treaty bodies. This is not difficult, but would require hard work. In our view, this is essential if we are to fulfill our mandate.

First, I would like to also comment on the process of preparation of the Report for the Review. We are told that the review should be done on the basis of objective and reliable information, with the full involvement of the country concerned. It would be useful for the Council to formulate a standard questionnaire, as a basis on which countries would prepare their Reports. The Reports of the countries should be made public. Based on the Report, questions could be posed to the country of the Review in the Council. Additional questions could be raised during the discussion. The reviewing State would answer those

questions in the Council. Where complete answers cannot be given at the Review, written responses are to be provided within a reasonable period of time.

The practice of the treaty bodies or conventions which require reporting should be looked into. The World Trade Organization has a procedure that would be particularly valuable to our undertaking.

The Council will need to determine the time-allocation for Review. Not more than one half-day Session (three hours) should be devoted to one country's review. (Based on the time available to the Council, the periodicity of the reviews may be considered) We are persuaded that we need a different periodicity for the developed, the developing and the least developed countries. This differentiation is required in consideration of the stage of development of the country. ^{is undertaken?} Each Review will require follow-up, and the question of implementation ^{the} will come up. It is obvious that there will be a need for differentiation, as the capacity of implementation differs ^{from country to country.}

The **outcome** of the discussion in the Council should be prepared under the authority of the Chair. 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. It should not be a forum of condemnation, naming or shaming. Nor should it be a forum for expiation for one past violations of human rights.

It will be the responsibility of the country concerned to follow-up. 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.

I thank you. Mr. President.