



**CRIN**

CHILD RIGHTS INFORMATION NETWORK

# **Universal Periodic Review: The Status of Children's Rights**

*An Analysis of trends / Review of NGO Participation*

## *Published by*

### **Child Rights Information Network (CRIN)**

East Studio

2 Pontypool Place

London

SE1 8QF

United Kingdom

+44 20 7401 2257

[www.crin.org](http://www.crin.org)

First published 2010

© Child Rights Information Network, 2010

The Child Rights Information Network (CRIN) is a Company Limited by Guarantee, no. 6653398 and a charity registered in England and Wales (1125925).

CRIN encourages personal and educational use of this publication and grants permission for its reproduction in this capacity where proper credit is given in good faith. For resale or commercial distribution in any other manner, prior permission must be obtained in writing from the publisher.

## *Acknowledgements*

This report was written by Ed Renshaw, Child Rights Officer at CRIN.

A number of people have provided invaluable assistance to CRIN's research into the UPR, including Katherine Weston, Philippe Seidel, Victor Sande Aneiros, Sarah Pugh, Tengku Nadiahtul Zahraa Tengku Adnan and Sophie Macmillan.

An initial evaluation of children's rights and the UPR was undertaken in 2008 by members of the Working Group for the Human Rights Council of the NGO Group for the Convention on the Rights of the Child, they included: Cecile Trochu-Grasso, World Organisation Against Torture, Alan Kikuchi-White, SOS Children's Villages International and Simon Flacks, CRIN. This report builds on this important work.

Finally, the report was edited by Veronica Yates, Director of CRIN.

# Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>3</b>
The report's two main objectives.....	3
Why CRIN is writing this report.....	3
Why this report is important.....	4
<b>2 About the Universal Periodic Review</b> .....	<b>5</b>
Notable characteristics of the UPR.....	5
State Reviews completed to date.....	5
A guide to the UPR process.....	6
<b>3 CRIN's Children's Rights References Reports</b> .....	<b>9</b>
Structure of reports.....	9
Report Sources.....	10
<b>4 Methodology for Selecting Criteria for Analysis</b> .....	<b>11</b>
What constitutes a reference to children's rights in the UPR reports.....	11
Monitoring selected children's rights for the analysis.....	12
Criteria selected for recommendations .....	13
<b>5 Overall Analysis of Children's Rights in the UPR</b> .....	<b>15</b>
To what extent are children's rights addressed in the UPR.....	15
Which children's rights issues feature most prominently and which are most neglected.....	16
<b>6 Analysis of Children's Rights in the Recommendations</b> .....	<b>19</b>
Recommendations received by States under Review.....	19
Recommendations issued by UN Member States.....	26
<b>7 NGO Survey Findings</b> .....	<b>30</b>
Background to research.....	30
A stage by stage guide to NGO participation .....	31
Summary of NGO responses.....	33
<b>8 Conclusion</b> .....	<b>54</b>
Drawing conclusions on the report's two main objectives.....	54
Areas for further research and analysis.....	55
The UPR in the Human Rights Council Review 2011.....	56
<b>9 Appendices</b> .....	<b>57</b>
Appendix 1: Children's rights recommendations received by States and their responses.....	58
Appendix 2: All recommendations received by States and their responses.....	61
Appendix 3: Rejected children's rights recommendations.....	64
Appendix 4: Number of children's rights recommendations made by UN Member States.....	71
Appendix 5: Number of times States raise particular issues in the recommendations.....	75

Appendix 6: Children's rights organisations who have submitted reports.....	79
Appendix 7: Index of website links.....	90

# Chapter Guide

## **Chapter One: Introduction**

## **Chapter Two: About the UPR**

## **Chapter Three: CRIN's children's rights references reports**

*The chapter outlines the structure of CRIN's reports on the UPR , together with a guide illustrating the way in which the reports can be most effectively utilised.*

## **Chapter Four: Methodology for selecting criteria for analysis**

## **Chapter Five : Overall analysis of children's rights in the UPR**

*This chapter presents findings on the extent to which children's rights are addressed throughout the UPR process by looking at all reports submitted for all Review sessions (sessions 1 - 7), but also by looking at which particular children's rights issues are addressed.*

### **Each individual section of analysis includes:**

- A TABLE PRESENTING THE FINDINGS OF THE ANALYSIS
- A GUIDE TO UNDERSTANDING THE DATA
- A CRIN COMMENTS BOX, HIGHLIGHTING THE PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS FOR NGOs

## **Chapter Six: An analysis of children's rights in the recommendations**

*This section focuses on the final recommendations made by UN Member States to the States under Review, including a look at the number of recommendations received, and States' responses. It also includes a section on which issues States make recommendations on.*

## **Chapter Seven: NGO Survey findings**

*This section presents the findings of the survey and interviews conducted with a host of children's rights organisations (including international NGOs, national NGOs, Ombudspersons and academic bodies).*

**For each question asked in the survey, the following will be presented:**

-A SUMMARY OF RESPONSES BY SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

-EXAMPLES OF DIFFERENT APPROACHES TAKEN BY ORGANISATIONS

-A CRIN COMMENTS BOX, HIGHLIGHTING THE FACTORS THAT NEED TO BE CONSIDERED BY ORGANISATIONS WHEN ENGAGING WITH EACH SECTION OF THE UPR. THIS IS SPECIFICALLY DESIGNED TO ASSIST DIFFERENT TYPES OF ORGANISATIONS IN DECIDING WHAT SUITS THEIR NEEDS, ACCORDING TO CAPACITY AND INDIVIDUAL SITUATIONS.

## **Chapter Eight: Conclusion**

*In our concluding chapter we have identified further areas of research and present an overview of discussions on the UPR in the review of the Human Rights Council. This section also includes practical tips for those working on children's rights when engaging in the UPR process.*

# Executive Summary

The Universal Periodic Review (UPR) has attracted a great deal of attention since it was established in 2008, in part due to its emphasis on States questioning fellow States on their human rights records. With the mechanism yet to complete its first cycle of reviews (48 countries still have to undergo a review at the Human Rights Council), it is too early to fully evaluate its effectiveness, however some notable trends have already emerged.

This report assesses the status of children's rights in the first seven sessions of the UPR (112 countries reviewed), examining the extent to which they are addressed, and which children's rights issues receive prominence and which are neglected. The report also looks into experiences NGOs have had in using the UPR, drawing on successes achieved and challenges faced by a broad range of children's rights organisations.

Key findings include:

## **The status of children's rights in the UPR**

- **One in five mentions focus on children's rights:** Approximately one fifth of all points made across the UPR process are children's rights focused, but is this really satisfactory given children cut across all human rights clusters? Furthermore, the findings highlighted below raise concerns over which issues are being addressed adequately and which ones are not.
- **States are avoiding more controversial issues:** States tend to focus on, and accept, mostly recommendations on 'softer' issues, such as education and health, and neglect, or reject recommendations on more controversial issues, such as corporal punishment or juvenile justice.
- **NGOs have an important role to play:** NGOs lag behind UN bodies and UN Member States in the extent to which they address children's rights in the UPR. Indeed, with States shown to avoid the more controversial issues, NGOs have an important role to play to address the full spectrum of children's rights issues and ensure neglected issues are brought to the forefront of the agenda.

## **NGOs' experiences of using the UPR**

CRIN interviewed a number of children's rights focused organisations, including international NGOs, national NGOs, Ombudspersons and academic bodies, to get their experiences in engaging with all stages of the UPR process, from pre-review report submission and lobbying activities, through to post-review follow up strategies.

Key findings to emerge from the Survey were:



- **NGOs are still learning about the UPR:** As the UPR differs from existing UN mechanisms in a number of ways, NGOs are, to an extent, still finding their feet.
- **Two different perspectives:** A clear distinction exists between those who engage at the Geneva level (primarily international NGOs) and those far from Geneva (national NGOs amongst others). Having a representative based in Geneva enables organisations to combine report submission with lobbying. For obvious reasons, this is often not an option for national NGOs.
- **The UPR as an additional advocacy tool:** A number of organisations alluded to the need to treat the UPR as an additional advocacy tool that complements their existing day to day work. The UPR was often seen as an 'enforcer' of existing advocacy work done in relation to the CRC, for instance.
- **Wider benefits of engaging with the UPR:** A number of internal and external benefits emerged from the survey, particularly national NGOs reporting how the UPR helps them build alliances with the wider human rights community.

This practically orientated report provides organisations, both those who have already submitted reports to the UPR and those exploring opportunities to engage with the mechanism for the first time, with a presentation of trends in the reviews to date and a series of practical tips to consider when using the UPR.

The report also draws attention to CRIN's country by country reports, based on data extracted from the UPR process, and indeed several areas of further research which could be useful for organisations in the children's rights community, whether or not they are looking to use the mechanism.

A crucial point to emerge from this research is the need for the children's rights community to work together and share information on their experiences with the UPR. Many organisations have been developing their own strategies, toolkits and evaluations, and have collected a certain amount of 'learning' that could benefit many smaller, less experienced organisations around the world. This is CRIN's rallying call to all its members and partners!

# 1 Introduction

The Universal Periodic Review (UPR) is a new mechanism of the United Nations (UN) under which the Human Rights Council (HRC) will examine the human rights situation in every Member State of the UN. Each State will be examined once every four years and by other States. The UPR was created by the UN General Assembly on 15th March 2006 with [resolution 60/251](#)<sup>1</sup>.

With its first hearing in 2008, the UPR is the first UN mechanism to examine the full range of human rights. One hundred and forty four countries have completed their initial reviews under this new mechanism, with a further 48 countries due to be examined by the end of October 2011<sup>2</sup>.

But to what extent are children's rights addressed? And how can children's rights organisations most effectively use this new mechanism? This report will aim to answer some of these questions.

## The report's two main objectives

1. To determine the extent to which children's rights are addressed in the UPR
2. To assess ways in which civil society organisations can engage most effectively with the mechanism

## Why CRIN is writing this report

With the introduction of the UPR to the UN mechanisms portfolio, there is a potential opportunity to advance children's rights. Indeed, with an increasing number of children's rights NGOs and other organisations starting to engage with this new mechanism, there is a need for a closer look at how the UPR may contribute to the advancement of children's rights.

The intention of this report is not to make a case for or against the effectiveness of the UPR as a mechanism, but to identify trends in the UPR and provide organisations with a platform to further understand what the UPR is, how it operates, and how they can engage with it.

### The report provides the following:

- A guide to engaging with the Universal Periodic Review
- An analysis of how children's rights were addressed in the mechanism
- A look at which States make recommendations on which children's rights issues
- A comprehensive account of reporting on, and advocacy approaches to the UPR by a range of organisations

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix 7 for a link to the resolution

<sup>2</sup> With the exception of those excused on account of domestic emergencies

- A guide to the 144 country reports detailing children's rights references in the UPR

## Why this report is important

### **The UPR is a new mechanism**

The UPR is a new mechanism with the potential to advance children's rights and mainstream them into the human rights system. The mechanism is still widely unknown around the world, particularly amongst national and local NGOs.

### **Focus on children's rights**

Whilst some research and analysis has been conducted into the UPR, few studies have focused on the UPR from a children's rights perspective. This report concentrates exclusively on children's rights.

### **Opportunity to share successful reporting and advocacy strategies**

Examining the range of approaches adopted by organisations provides an opportunity to share effective ways of engaging with the UPR with others in the global children's rights community.

### **A practical guide for NGOs / wider civil society**

This report has been designed to be as practical as possible, presenting organisations with the opportunity to utilise the findings and incorporate them into their day to day advocacy work, and broader work on children's rights.

### **The UPR process provides a rich source of information for the children's rights community**

The UPR is an important source of information for organisations seeking to ascertain the positions adopted by States on particular issues, regardless of whether they have, or intend to work with the UPR specifically.

## 2 About the Universal Periodic Review

### Notable characteristics of the UPR

- *State participation obligatory*

All 192 UN Member States are obliged to participate in the review process. This is in contrast to other UN treaties for instance, which States first have to ratify.

- *State-driven process*

Under the UN treaty body system, such as the Committee on the Rights of the Child, States are questioned by established independent experts in the field of human rights. Whereas under the UPR, States are questioned by fellow States on their human rights records.

- *All human rights issues examined*

The UPR is the first mechanism to assess the full range of human rights in one review.

- *Final Recommendations*

States under review must outline their position on each recommendation issued to them by UN Member States, by accepting or rejecting the recommendation, or indeed leaving the recommendation pending.

- *NGO participation / Advocacy opportunities*

In addition to submitting a report to the UPR, NGOs are able to register to make a statement in the Plenary Session where the final outcome report is released. NGOs are not however permitted to speak during the main review.

### State Reviews completed to date

Nine sessions have now been completed in the UPR, with a total of 144 countries completing their initial review at the Human Rights Council in Geneva. The Council meets three times a year to conduct the UPR, with 16 countries reviewed in each session. By the end of 2011, all 192 UN Member States will have been reviewed. See **Appendix 7** for a link to the [full timetable](#) for first cycle reviews.

#### *State adherence to the UPR:*

So far, no State has failed to attend their review (with the exception of those excused as a result of national emergencies), which could be seen as a positive sign that States are somewhat committed to this process, or at least respect its existence.

The following sources provide additional useful information on the UPR:

- ◆ [www.crin.org](http://www.crin.org): Includes children's rights references reports for all completed reviews.

- ◆ [www.ohchr.org](http://www.ohchr.org) : Includes all reports submitted on the UPR by all stakeholders.
- ◆ [www.upr-info.org](http://www.upr-info.org) : A website dedicated to providing information on the UPR.
- ◆ [www.ishr.ch](http://www.ishr.ch) : Provides both information on the UPR and analytical coverage of State reviews.

## A guide to the UPR process

This section illustrates how the UPR process works, including the pre-review report submissions, the review itself, the post-review process, until the second review four years later.

### Pre-review

Prior to the review itself, the following reports are submitted to the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR):

- A report by the State under review, referred to as the “National Report”; This report is 20 pages long and generally due three to four months prior to the review. **Appendix 7** includes a link to the [guidelines for the State report](#).
- A report summarising information by UN bodies: This includes information from independent human rights experts and groups, known as the Special Procedures, human rights treaty bodies, and other UN entities; The report is 10 pages long.
- A report containing information from other stakeholders, including NGOs and National Human Rights Institutions; this report is summarised by OHCHR into one 10-page report. **Appendix 7** includes a link to the [guidelines for submitting NGO reports](#).

The State is then reviewed based on the three official documents outlined above.

### The Review

Each review lasts for three hours and is carried out by a Working Group (WG), composed of the 47 UN Member States of the Human Rights Council. Three rapporteurs, called 'troikas'<sup>3</sup>, are assigned to facilitate the review process. The review takes the form of an interactive discussion between the State under review and the UN Member States.

#### *The Format:*

- Presentation of the National Report by the State under review;
- Comments, questions, recommendations by the Working Group and Observer States;

The troikas may group issues or questions to be shared with the State under review to ensure that the interactive

---

<sup>3</sup> *Troika members are selected randomly and represent countries that are part of the Human Rights Council; however they are also regionally balanced. Countries under review have the right to veto one of the troika members, and to request that one member of the troika is from its region. A country can be excused from participating as a troika member for a specific review.*

dialogue takes place in a smooth and orderly manner.

- Response by the State under review;
- Adoption of report by the Working Group, including recommendations.

## Review Outcome

The troika is responsible for preparing the report, which includes:

- A summary of the proceedings of the review process;
- The list of recommendations and / or conclusions;
- Voluntary commitments made by the State.

However, before the report is finalised, States may decide which recommendations they are in agreement with and which ones they are not. Recommendations that enjoy the support of the State will be identified as such. Other recommendations, together with the comments of the State concerned, will be noted. Both will be included in the outcome report to be adopted by the Council.

## Post-review

Approximately four months after the State review, a final report is adopted during the Plenary Session of the Human Rights Council (HRC). States are presented with the opportunity to inform the Working Group of changes in their responses to recommendations issued in the Working Group's report. The Plenary Session of the HRC will spend half an hour adopting the final report.

## Follow-up Stage

- The States are then supposed to implement the recommendations that arise from the review
- Under Item 6, States have the opportunity to voluntarily update the Human Rights Council on their progress implementing the recommendations during a two hour slot as part of the Plenary Session.
- Some States have started to produce voluntary mid-term reports updating the HRC on the measures they are taking to implement the recommendations put to them.

## Next UPR review

Each State's second review will take place four years after the initial review. States will be questioned on the progress they have made in the four years since the first review, and measures taken to implement the recommendations and outcomes from the first UPR.

Take a look at the time-frame for the United States review to assess how the process works:

DEADLINE FOR NGO REPORTS	APRIL 19 <sup>TH</sup> 2010	SUBMITTED TO OHCHR
DEADLINE FOR US STATE REPORT	AUGUST 23 <sup>RD</sup> 2010	SUBMITTED TO OHCHR
DATE OF UNITED STATES UPR	NOVEMBER 5 <sup>TH</sup> 2010	HELD AT HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL, GENEVA
INFORMAL ADOPTION OF OUTCOME DOCUMENT	NOVEMBER 9 <sup>TH</sup> 2010	HELD AT HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL, GENEVA
FORMAL ADOPTION OF OUTCOME DOCUMENT	MARCH 2011	DURING REGULAR HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL SESSION, GENEVA

### 3 CRIN's Children's Rights References Reports

CRIN has compiled a report on every State reviewed in the UPR up to the 9<sup>th</sup> session<sup>4</sup>, extracting references to children's rights throughout the UPR process for each country. This chapter outlines the structure of these reports. Examples of CRIN's reports and a link to all reports for Sessions 1 – 9 of the UPR, can be found at the end of this section.

#### Structure of reports

Children's rights references have been extracted from the following sections:

##### **Reports submitted to OHCHR prior to the review:**

- State under Review
- UN Compilation
- NGO Compilation

##### **Reports compiled by OHCHR detailing the outcomes of the review:**

- Interactive Dialogue (between UN Member States and the State under Review)
- Final Recommendations (made by fellow States to the State under Review)

As explained in the introduction, a key aspect of the UPR lies in the requirement of States to inform the Council of their position on the recommendations made to them. In the final recommendations section of CRIN's reports, sub-headings clearly indicate the State under Review's response to the recommendations.

*The three sections include:*

- 'Accepted' Recommendations
- 'Pending' / 'No clear position taken' Recommendations
- 'Rejected' Recommendations

---

<sup>4</sup> *The outcome reports (including the responses to recommendations) for the 9<sup>th</sup> Session will be released by OHCHR in due course and added to the CRIN site.*



**1. A closer look at each section:** By breaking down these categories, it is possible to identify the extent to which each of these different groups (UN bodies, NGOs, etc.) are addressing children's rights, and hence observing where children's rights are being neglected in the process. Identifying which recommendations have been accepted, rejected and are pending, provides NGOs with the information they need to press States in the follow-up process. These reports will be extremely useful for your day to day advocacy work on individual States.

**2. Useful referencing:** CRIN's individual reports include the paragraph reference numbers, taken from the original reports available on the OHCHR website. The purpose of this is to enable organisations to easily access the comment from the original reports.

## Report Sources

- ◆ [CRIN's Iran Report](#)
- ◆ [CRIN's Norway Report](#)
- ◆ [CRIN's 144 Children's Rights References Reports](#)
- ◆ [Original Reports on OHCHR's Website](#)

See **Appendix 7** for links to the above sources

## 4 Methodology for Selecting Criteria for Analysis

This chapter outlines the criteria adopted for CRIN's analysis of children's rights in the UPR. The methodology is divided into three stages:

### What constitutes a reference to children's rights in the UPR reports

#### A) Different types of references can be classified under children's rights

Examples:

- A reference to particular children's rights issues, *such as child labour, juvenile justice or children in armed conflict.*
- A reference to a government's National Plan of Action for children.
- A reference to independent bodies monitoring children's rights, *such as a Children's Ombudsperson or Commissioner*

#### B) The reference must have a clear focus on children

Examples:

*Included in the analysis:*

*“In 2000, CRC was concerned that child labour was widespread and that children might be working long hours at young ages”*

Comment made by the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child<sup>5</sup>

*“Reinforce concrete measures aimed at combating trafficking in women and young girls, and assistance to victims”*

*Recommendation by Belgium<sup>6</sup>*

*Not included in the analysis:*

*“Take further steps to address discrimination against vulnerable groups”*

Recommendation made by the United Kingdom

---

<sup>5</sup> Source: [CRIN's child rights reference report on Central African Republic's review](#)

<sup>6</sup> Source: [CRIN's child rights reference report on Costa Rica's review](#)

## Monitoring selected children's rights for the analysis

Whilst this report examines the full spectrum of children's rights, we focused our research on those nine issues that feature most regularly, namely:

HEALTH	EDUCATION	JUVENILE JUSTICE
CHILD LABOUR	CORPORAL PUNISHMENT	VIOLENCE
ETHNIC MINORITY GROUPS	CHILD TRAFFICKING	CHILDREN IN ARMED CONFLICT

It is important to note that we are in no way implying that those nine issues are the most important ones, rather, these are the ones that are most frequently brought up in the UPR. We will, hopefully be able to demonstrate why this might be through our findings.

### Tackling the overlaps between the selected issues

Due to the interconnectedness of children's rights issues and human rights issues in general, overlaps naturally exist. For example, when a recommendation refers to two particular issues in one point.

The following example illustrates CRIN's approach. The recommendation below would be included in both the 'ethnic minority groups' category and the 'education' category:

*“To take all steps necessary to remove ethnic segregation from schools, in order to encourage greater understanding among young people of different ethnicities”*

### Multiple issues included in one point

Where recommendations by States, or points made by UN bodies or NGOs, include two or more issues, each is assigned its own category. For example, the recommendation by Azerbaijan below includes three separate children's rights issues (street children, child labour and ethnic minority groups). Each category would be assigned one mention each.

*“Further tackle the problem of street children and child labour, as well as discrimination against indigenous children”*

### Further explanation of the selected nine issues

This section clarifies what comes under each of the nine children's rights issue:

**ISSUE 1 - Children in armed conflict:** All references to children affected by armed conflict, including recruitment of children into armed forces by States or non-State groups, rehabilitation and re-integration.

**ISSUE 2 - Corporal punishment:** Includes corporal punishment in all settings, including in the home, in education settings, in institutions, etc.

**ISSUE 3 - Juvenile justice:** All references to juvenile justice, including age of criminal responsibility, children

imprisoned with adults and measures of pre-trial detention.

**ISSUE 4 - Violence against children:** All references to domestic and sexual violence, child abuse, unspecified violence, violence at the hands of the State and harmful traditional practices (such as female genital mutilation). Corporal punishment, whilst a form of violence, is not included in this category as it appears so often as a stand alone category.

**ISSUE 5 - Health:** Specific references to child health, including children and HIV and AIDS, infant mortality, malnutrition, access to health-care, immunisation, health-care facilities, sexual and reproductive health, discrimination in health-care according to race, religion and gender. Only health issues relating to children are included. The issue of female genital mutilation and other harmful traditional practices has been included in the violence against children category.

**ISSUE 6 - Education:** All references to education for children, including access, facilities, primary and secondary schooling, enrolment and drop out rates, human rights education in schools and discrimination.

**ISSUE 7 - Child labour:** All references to child labour including legislation, prevention, prosecution and victim services.

**ISSUE 8 - Child trafficking:** All direct references to children being trafficked either within or between countries. References have to specifically state child trafficking, not just trafficking in persons.

**ISSUE 9 - Ethnic minority groups:** All references to children discriminated against because of their ethnic minority status, including indigenous children, Roma children, amongst others.

## Criteria selected for recommendations

### A) Particular children's rights recommendations must be action-oriented

As a result of the political nature of this inter-State mechanism (UPR), some States tend to simply praise other States on various human rights issues or produce vague recommendations which could be seen as a way of compromising or bargaining. Taking this into account, only action-oriented recommendations are recorded. Any more general recommendations will still be noted down as a children's rights recommendation and included in the overall trends, but in the 'other' category.

The following is an example of an action-oriented recommendation:

*“Take actions to avoid the further recruitment of child soldiers, and ensure the reintegration of all ex-child soldiers to avoid future re-recruitment”*

Recommendation made by Argentina<sup>7</sup>

The following recommendation made by the United Arab Emirates to Kuwait<sup>8</sup> would not be included:

<sup>7</sup> Source: [CRIN's children's rights reference report on the Democratic Republic of Congo's review](#)

<sup>8</sup> Source: [CRIN's children's rights reference report on Kuwait's review](#)

*“Continue its remarkable efforts to promote the rights of the child and to ensure adequate protection to women, children and victims of human rights violations”*

**Focused lobbying information:** The purpose of this approach is to enable NGOs to clearly see which States are genuinely pressing fellow States on selected issues, rather than providing information on States who are just playing the political game. All children's rights recommendations (providing they meet the criteria set out in points 1 and 2 above) will be included in the overall figures so that an accurate picture of the broad trends is displayed, but the selected issues will focus on action-oriented recommendations made, to provide NGOs with information that can be used practically in their day to day lobbying activities.

#### **B) What constitutes an 'accepted', 'rejected' or 'pending' recommendation**

Using the above strategy, CRIN extracted children's rights references from UPR-Info.org's completed list of recommendations, documented for each State in Sessions 1 – 7. UPR-Info.org<sup>9</sup> conducted their own methodology to establish the response status of each recommendation by the State under Review and filtered the responses into the three categories: 'Accepted Recommendations', 'Rejected Recommendations' and a third category which included 'Pending Recommendations' and recommendations where the States under Review has taken 'No clear position'. For the purpose of this report, CRIN has grouped 'pending' and 'no clear position' recommendations into one category.

**Appendix 7** includes a link to [UPR-Info.org's recommendation criteria document](#) and disclaimer

<sup>9</sup> *UPR-info.org is a project of UPR Info, an NGO established to raise awareness of the UPR and provide capacity-building tools to the different actors of the UPR process.*

## 5 Overall Analysis of Children's Rights in the UPR

To what extent are children's rights addressed in the UPR

Table 1 - Children's Rights in the UPR

	National Report	UN Compilation	NGO Compilation	UN Member State final recommendations
SESSION 1	25%	45%	22%	17%
SESSION 2	18%	46%	29%	21%
SESSION 3	15%	28%	21%	22%
SESSION 4	12%	30%	11%	21%
SESSION 5	19%	36%	19%	19%
SESSION 6	16%	38%	15%	22%
SESSION 7	12%	26%	15%	16%
OVERALL AVERAGE (SESSIONS 1 - 7)	17%*	36%	19%	20%

**Overall average across UPR - 23%**

**Table Explanation:**

-The figures in Table 1 represent the percentage of mentions<sup>10</sup> of children's rights in the UPR, compared to all mentions.

\* For example: 17% implies that on average, 17% of all mentions in the National Reports for Sessions 1-7, focus on children's rights.

- Table 1 shows the breakdown for the different groups (States under Review, NGOs, etc.), and the averages for each Session.

<sup>10</sup> In structuring their national reports, States tend to assign a separate paragraph for each point (issue) they are looking to make. The analysis, therefore, is based on these individual paragraphs. Where one or more issues are raised within a paragraph, this is reflected in the overall figures. Likewise, in the NGO and UN compilations, each paragraph is generally assigned a given issue.

## Findings and Analysis

### 1) Twenty three per cent of all points in the UPR are children's rights focused

Table 1 shows that, on average, one in five points made throughout the UPR process (across the pre-review reports submitted to OHCHR and the final outcome report documenting the final recommendations) are children's rights focused.

### 2) NGOs lag behind UN bodies in addressing children's rights in the UPR

Table 1 shows that children's rights are raised most in the UN Compilation, with 36 per cent of all points made across UN Compilation reports being children's rights focused. National Reports submitted by States address children's rights the least, with NGOs only raising children's rights marginally more, but less so than UN Member States and UN bodies.

**Which children's rights issues though?** As the analysis shows, approximately one in five points made in the UPR are children's rights focused. However, is this figure really that high given the prominence of children across all human rights clusters. It is also important to refrain from drawing conclusions before assessing which particular children's rights are being addressed. Table 2 below examines which issues are being addressed most. Table 1 also illustrates that NGOs fall behind in the extent to which they address children's rights in the UPR, a rallying call for NGOs to engage with the mechanism.

## Which children's rights issues feature most prominently and which are most neglected

Table 2: References to particular children's rights issues compared to all mentions of children's rights

	Health	Education	Juvenile Justice	Child Labour	Corporal Punishment	Violence	Ethnic Minorities	Trafficking	Armed Conflict
STATE REPORTS	157**	560	143	75	14	169	107	94	19
UN COMPILATION	229	263	133	117	69	225	211	103	55
NGO COMPILATION	63	174	65	25	103	73	108	21	21
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS	58	257	135	70	72	306	72	102	101
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>507*</b>	<b>817</b>	<b>476</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>773</b>	<b>498</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>196</b>

**Table Explanation:**

*-The figures in Table 2 illustrate the total number of mentions in Sessions 1-7.*

*\* For example: 507 refers to the total number of mentions on the issue of child health for the first seven sessions.*

*\*\* For example: 157 refers to the total number of mentions on the issue of child health in the National Reports.*

**Findings and Analysis****1) Education the most prominent issue in the UPR**

Table 2 shows that education is the most prominent children's rights issue in the UPR, with 817 mentions in the first seven sessions of the UPR. Violence against children is the next most prominent issue, on 773 mentions, and then there is a big gap to health in third place.

**2) States given prominence to 'safer' issues, UN bodies and NGOs address a broader range of issues**

Table 2 shows how the different groups prioritise particular children's rights issues in their reports. The two issues, education and corporal punishment, illustrate the different approaches adopted towards the UPR by States under Review and NGOs. The National Reports (submitted by States under Review) are dominated by the 'safer' issue of education, with corporal punishment only mentioned 14 times in National Reports throughout the first seven Sessions. In contrast, Table 2 shows how the number of mentions made by NGOs on all issues is far more balanced, with 174 mentions on education and 103 mentions on corporal punishment. Interestingly, whilst the final recommendations column (UN Member States mentions), shows a high number of references to education, the figure for corporal punishment is far higher than that of the States under Review, perhaps a sign of the influence of NGOs and UN bodies on the UN Member States when considering which particular recommendations to issue in the UPR.

**3) Other findings beyond the nine selected issues highlighted in Table 2**

As has been explained, when looking beyond general trends in children's rights, CRIN has focused on the nine selected issues to look at which children's rights are found to be most prominent in the UPR and which most neglected. The UPR, however, includes a host of children's rights issues across its reports and review stages:

**a) Other rights:** Other children's rights issues that do appear (but not as much as the nine most prominent) include: children with disabilities, street children, birth registration, adoption and the minimum age of marriage.

**b) Status of Ratifications:** States under review are also regularly questioned on the status of ratification of UN and other Conventions and treaties, most notably the Optional Protocols to the CRC, but also other Conventions which have a focus on children's rights, such as the The Hague Convention No. 33 of 1993 on Protection of Children and Cooperation in Respect of Inter-country Adoption or the ILO Convention No. 182 concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour. The majority of States make some reference to the current status of UN mechanism ratifications in their National Reports.

**c) Independent monitoring bodies:** The issue of Children's Ombudspersons or National Human Rights Institutions is



often mentioned, notably by UN Member States in the final recommendations. States under review are often quizzed on why they have not got an Ombudsperson or what they are doing to ensure its independence and so on.

#### **4) Neglected issues**

##### ***a) Child participation***

The issue of child participation is largely ignored throughout the various reports in the UPR, a point highlighted in the responses to the NGO survey seen in Chapter 7, which illustrates how NGOs see child participation as the next step. However, a few references to child participation do appear in State reports. Iraq refer to the establishment of a children's parliament in their report, whilst Slovenia refer to their launch of a pilot project "Child Advocate – Voice of the Child" in 2006.

##### ***b) Other neglected issues***

Other notable issues neglected in the UPR process could probably in a general way be grouped into children's civil and political rights. Further research into this area could be useful for those organisations working in these areas.

**Less controversial issues appear the most:** Following on from the previous CRIN comment, Table 2 clearly reveals that it is the less controversial issues, notably education, that are raised the most, with more controversial issues neglected by the majority of States in their National Reports. This raises concerns over the extent to which children's rights are fully addressed. Perhaps, States merely raise children's rights issues as a way of avoiding other difficult ones? Point 4 above also highlights further issues neglected or excluded completely, demonstrating the need for the UPR to address issues such as child participation among others.

## 6 Analysis of Children's Rights in the Recommendations

This chapter examines trends in the recommendations made to States by Members of the Human Rights Council (fellow States). The first section looks at trends in the recommendations States receive, and their responses (the extent to which they are accepted, rejected, or left pending). The second section looks at the recommendations proposed by UN Member States throughout the UPR sessions, to ascertain which States raise which issues.

### Recommendations received by States under Review

Table 3 – Summary of Received Recommendations  
(Children's Rights Only)

AVERAGE NO. OF CHILDREN'S RIGHTS RECOMMENDATIONS RECEIVED PER COUNTRY REVIEW (ACCEPTED, REJECTED AND PENDING RECOMMENDATIONS)	13.75%
AVERAGE NO. OF RECOMMENDATIONS ACCEPTED (ACROSS REVIEWS – AS A % OF TOTAL)	77.60%
AVERAGE % OF RECOMMENDATIONS REJECTED	6.80%
AVERAGE % OF RECOMMENDATIONS PENDING	15.30%

Table 4 – Summary of Received Recommendations  
(All Human Rights Recommendations)

AVERAGE NO. OF RECOMMENDATIONS RECEIVED PER COUNTRY REVIEW (ACCEPTED, REJECTED AND PENDING)	68.9
AVERAGE NO. OF RECOMMENDATIONS ACCEPTED (ACROSS REVIEWS – AS A % OF TOTAL)	67.40%
AVERAGE % OF RECOMMENDATIONS REJECTED	17.80%
AVERAGE % OF RECOMMENDATIONS PENDING	14.00%

## Findings and Analysis

### 1) States receive on average just over 13 recommendations on children's rights

As tables 3 and 4 above indicate, the average number of recommendations per country review for all human rights issues is around 69 and for specific children's rights issues, just over 13.

### 2) States reject more children's rights recommendations comparatively than broader recommendations

Although similarities exist in the share of accepted recommendations between specific children's rights recommendations and all human rights recommendations, a disparity exists in the percentages of recommendations rejected in the children's rights table and separately in the overall human rights table (6.8 per cent of children's rights recommendations are rejected out of an overall total of 17.80 per cent of all rights rejected recommendations), so just about a third of those are children's rights. Hence, if children's rights recommendations make up approximately 20% of the total recommendations made in the UPR, but a third are rejected, then comparatively speaking, they are rejected much more than general human rights.

**Which issues are rejected?** Later in the analysis we will look at which particular issues are raised in the recommendations by UN Member States and which of these are rejected most and least.

Now let's take a look at how the number of recommendations has increased from Session 1 - 7

Table 5 – Trends in Recommendations over the 7 sessions  
(Children's Rights Only)

Session	Total No. of Recommendations	Total Accepted	Total Rejected	Total Pending
1	55	65%	5%	27%
2	124	74%	2%	23%
3	164	70%	10%	20%
4	224	82%	4%	14%
5	243	85%	7%	8%
6	385	73%	6%	21%
7	304	82%	10%	8%

Table 6 – Trends in Recommendations over the 7 sessions  
(All Human Rights Recommendations)

Session	Total no. of recommendations	Total Accepted	Total Rejected	Total Pending
1	318	60%	10%	25%
2	598	65%	14%	21%
3	740	55%	20%	25%
4	1059	65%	19%	16%
5	1308	77%	11%	12%
6	1746	70%	10%	20%
7	1956	80%	14%	6%

## Findings and Analysis

### 1) A dramatic rise in the number of recommendations from Session 1 to Session 7

The tables above show a dramatic rise in the number of recommendations issued from the initial Session 1 back in 2008, to Session 7 in 2010. In Session 1, 318 recommendations were made concerning all human rights issues, this is for the whole session (16 countries). By Session 7, a total of 1956 recommendations were made by Member States. This is not necessarily surprising as States become more used to the new mechanism and used to drafting recommendations for other States.

### 2) Proportion of children's rights recommendations remains consistent

The final column in Table 1 (on page 15) shows there is no real rise or fall in the percentage of children's rights against all human rights issues as the sessions progress.

Now let's look at individual States and the recommendations they receive

Table 7 below lists a select group of countries, detailing the number of children's rights recommendations received and their responses to the recommendations from Member States.

Table 7 - Children's Rights Recommendations  
received by States

State under Review	UPR Session Number	No. of recommendations received	Accepted	Pending	Rejected
ALBANIA	Session 6	21	14	5	2
UNITED KINGDOM	Session 1	9	6	1	2
SAN MARINO	Session 7	19	14	0	5
COTE D'IVOIRE	Session 6	45	33	11	1
ANGOLA	Session 7	25	25	0	0
ECUADOR	Session 1	1	1	0	0
BANGLADESH	Session 4	17	17	0	0
CHAD	Session 5	42	37	3	2
CZECH REPUBLIC	Session 1	4	4	0	0
DJIBOUTI	Session 4	25	16	8	1
IRAN	Session 7	30	10	11	9

**Appendix 1:** A full list of *children's rights recommendations* received by States and their responses

**Appendix 2:** A full list of *all recommendations (all human rights issues)* received by States and their responses

Now look at some of the more significant findings in Table 8 below:

Table 8 – Examples of anomalies

<b>State under Review</b>	<b>Anomalies</b>
<b>NORTH KOREA</b>	<i>Received 27 recommendations: Accepted 1, rejected 8, rest pending</i>
<b>RUSSIA</b>	<i>Received 13 recommendations: Accepted none, all pending</i>
<b>EGYPT</b>	<i>Received only 5 recommendations on children's rights</i>
<b>ECUADOR</b>	<i>Received only 1 recommendation on children's rights (though Session 1 did see few overall recommendations made)</i>

## Findings and Analysis

### 1) Large disparities exist from State to State in the number of recommendations received

As table 7 illustrates, some States receive many recommendations on children's rights and others receive only a few. For example, Cote d'Ivoire received 45 children's rights recommendations. However, in the same Session (Six), Portugal received only 13 recommendations on children's rights. Table 8 also shows a strange anomaly in the case of Egypt, who received only 5 children's rights recommendations.

### 2) Politics at play

Table 8 shows some interesting anomalies and there certainly appears to be an element of politics in action. Both Russia and North Korea, for example, failed to accept any recommendations on children's rights. However, they were not the only States who failed to accept any children's rights recommendations put to them. The following States also failed to accept any:

Belarus	Luxembourg	South Africa	Peru	Israel
Cyprus	Malawi	France	Malta	Gabon
Poland	North Korea	Russia		

## Rejected Recommendations

CRIN has compiled a document detailing children's rights recommendations rejected by each State reviewed in Sessions 1 – 7. The full list can be found in **Appendix 3**.

Table 9 highlights a few rejected recommendations:

Table 9: List of rejected recommendations by States

State under Review	Reference	Rejected Recommendation	Recommendation proposed by
SLOVAKIA	89.9	<i>“Adopt a comprehensive legal instrument which recognizes the rights of persons belonging to minority groups, including Roma, and offers the necessary protection, in particular to children, as recommended by the Committee on the Rights of the Child”</i>	Cuba
NORTH KOREA	34	<i>“Take effective measures against the practice of forced labour, including child labour and join ILO”</i>	Italy
COTE D'IVOIRE	23	<i>“Grant investigative competences to the National Committee to combat violence against women and children created in 2000”</i>	Belgium
ERITREA	65	<i>“Take effective measures to protect all children against torture, cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment as well as investigating and punishing those responsible”</i>	Argentina
QATAR	16	<i>“To increase the age of criminal responsibility to a minimum of 12 years, in line with recommendations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child”</i>	Chile
BOSNIA & HERZEGOVINA	58	<i>“To put in place adequate channels for the reporting of child abuse, with a view to criminal persecution, and to provide physical and psychological assistance for the victims of such violence”</i>	Brazil

## Reasons for States rejecting recommendations

**REASON 1:** They disagree with the recommendation. As we will see further on in the section about which issues are most rejected, corporal punishment is raised frequently in the UPR process, but is also the most rejected among all children's rights issues. Just over half of the recommendations on juvenile justice are accepted, with about 30 per cent

left pending. Those two are often considered 'controversial' issues for States. Find out which other issues are most rejected or accepted on page 29.

**REASON 2** - The State may already have taken action, or is currently taking action, to address the issue proposed (or, they may just say they are taking action!)

**Example:** *San Marino's reason for rejecting a recommendation from Israel*

Rejected recommendation: *“To clarify the status of the relationship between San Marino's international obligations and its domestic legislation, to ensure that those international obligations are given effect by domestic courts, and to carry out a comprehensive review of its ius commune in order to identify provisions of domestic legislation that contradict principles and provisions of the Conventions, as recommended by the Human Rights Committee, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Committee on the Rights of the Child, respectively.”*

San Marino's response: *“As indicated in the national report and during the interactive dialogue, international instruments concerning human rights and freedoms, once ratified, prevail over domestic legislation and are directly applied by judges. Should a previous domestic norm be in conflict with an international instrument, the latter always prevails.”*

**REASON 3** - The State may have their reasons for rejecting the recommendation, which they believe are in the best interests of the child.

**Example:** *Norway's reason for rejecting a recommendation on juvenile justice from Algeria*

Rejected recommendation: *“Take necessary measures to separate incarcerated minors from adults.”*

Norway's response: *“The imprisonment of juvenile offenders is used only as a last resort. As stated in Norway's UPR report, a guiding principle of Norwegian penal policy is that convicted persons should serve their sentences in close proximity to their homes. Due to Norway's geography and demography, the very few juveniles who are imprisoned would be placed in almost total isolation if the principle of separating juveniles from the adult population were to be adhered to, along with the principle of proximity. It is the view of the Government that total isolation is not in the child's best interest; cf. CRC Article 37 (c). Hence, the reservations are being upheld. Norway is currently establishing separate prison units for young offenders with multidisciplinary staff and close follow-up on release with a view to further limiting the number of juvenile offenders serving together with adults.”*

**REASON 4** – A major issue which needs addressing in the UPR is the phrasing of recommendations. On many occasions, UN Member States issue recommendations which are unclear, too general or contain more than one issue simultaneously, making it difficult for the State under Review to be in a position to accept or reject the recommendation.



**1. Further concerns:** There have been cases where a State rejected a recommendation that was in effect the same as a recommendation issued by the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child in their Concluding Observations. This has been highlighted by NGOs as being a major issue of concern. Surely States should not be allowed to reject a recommendation issued by a Treaty Body.

**2. Action point for the children's rights community:** The issue of recommendation reform has been taken up in the Human Rights Council Review Working Groups, as detailed in the conclusion to this report. With the recommendations being a focal point of the UPR process, it is important NGOs play a role in this reform.

### Recommendations issued by UN Member States

The second part of this chapter examines which UN Member States are most active in making recommendations to States under Review, and significantly which children's rights issues States are raising. This should be a useful tool for knowing which States to lobby on which issue.

Table 10 - States issuing the most children's rights recommendations overall  
(Figures include recommendations from Session 1 - 7 inclusive)

State	No. of recommendations
SLOVENIA	80
ITALY	75
BRAZIL	57
ALGERIA	51
CZECH REPUBLIC	51
MEXICO	51
CANADA	49
MALAYSIA	49
GERMANY	45
CHILE	42

**Appendix 4** details the number of children's rights recommendations made by all States.

## Findings

In selecting a couple of other notable findings, the United Kingdom made 26 children's rights focused recommendations in the first seven sessions of the UPR, the United States made 18 and Iran made 24.

### Who is pushing what issue in the final recommendations

Table 11: States raising each of the nine particular issues the most

<b>Selected Issues</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup></b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>5<sup>th</sup></b>
JUVENILE JUSTICE	<i>Czech Republic</i>	<i>Slovenia</i>	<i>Brazil</i>	<i>Austria</i>	<i>Italy</i>
EDUCATION	<i>Algeria</i>	<i>Italy</i>	<i>Bangladesh</i>	<i>Angola</i>	<i>Slovenia</i>
CORPORAL PUNISHMENT	<i>Chile</i>	<i>Slovenia</i>	<i>Italy</i>	<i>Germany</i>	<i>Sweden</i>
CHILD LABOUR	<i>Brazil</i>	<i>Italy</i>	<i>Slovakia</i>	<i>Germany</i>	<i>Chile</i>
CHILDREN IN ARMED CONFLICT	<i>Slovenia</i>	<i>Spain</i>	<i>Austria</i>	<i>Canada</i>	<i>Argentina</i>
HEALTH	<i>Brazil</i>	<i>Bangladesh</i>	<i>United Kingdom</i>	<i>Philippines</i>	<i>Netherlands</i>
ETHNIC MINORITY GROUPS	<i>Canada</i>	<i>Mexico</i>	<i>Algeria</i>	<i>Malaysia</i>	<i>Netherlands</i>
VIOLENCE	<i>Slovenia</i>	<i>Italy</i>	<i>Malaysia</i>	<i>Canada</i>	<i>Argentina</i>
CHILD TRAFFICKING	<i>Malaysia</i>	<i>Belarus</i>	<i>Canada</i>	<i>Germany</i>	<i>Argentina</i>

**Table key:** 1<sup>st</sup> refers to the State issuing the particular issue the most, 2<sup>nd</sup> refers to the State issuing the particular issue the second most, and so on.

**Appendix 5** lists the number of recommendations made by all States on each of the above issues.

## Findings and Analysis

### 1) Czech Republic top proponents of juvenile justice, Algeria for education, Chile for corporal punishment

Table 11 indicates which States raise which issues the most during the final recommendations of the UPR. The findings reveal that some States pay a great deal of attention to specific issues. For example, Table 12 below illustrates how 17 of the 51 children's rights recommendations made by the Czech Republic, focus on the issue of juvenile justice.

TABLE 12: One Approach to making Recommendations

State	Total no. of recommendations made (Sessions 1 - 7)	Issue raised most	Issue raised second most
CZECH REPUBLIC	51	Juvenile Justice (17)	Education (4)
BANGLADESH	25	Education (13)	Health (4)

### 2) Strange Outcomes: Chile raise corporal punishment most despite failure to fully ban at home

Table 11 shows that Chile raises the issue of corporal punishment more than any other UN Member State, a strange finding considering Chile has not banned corporal punishment in the home and in schools, and has not even made a commitment to doing so!<sup>11</sup>

**1. Lobbying States on key issues:** If, as an organisation, you are focusing on a particular children's rights issue, then you should find out which State(s) has raised this issue.

**2. Note of caution:** The reason States focus on particular children's rights issues may be as a result of an individual's personal interest within the government. It is worth being mindful of this, as governments change and individuals are replaced, potentially altering the focus.

**3. Examples of lobbying strategies:** In Chapter 7, we will examine various national and international lobbying approaches adopted by a range of NGOs in the UPR.

<sup>11</sup> See <http://www.endcorporalpunishment.org/pages/pdfs/GlobalProgress.pdf>

### Which particular issues are accepted and rejected most In the final recommendations?

Earlier in the chapter, Tables 3 and 4 (page 19) illustrated the extent to which children's rights as a whole are accepted and rejected in the UPR, highlighting the fact that children's rights are more likely to be rejected than general human rights issues. Table 14 below reveals which particular children's rights issues are accepted and rejected the most.

Table 14: States responses to particular recommendations

Children's rights issue	% Accepted	% Rejected	% Pending
VIOLENCE	83%	4%	14%
EDUCATION	85%	4%	11%
JUVENILE JUSTICE	56%	13%	30%
CHILD TRAFFICKING	92%	5%	3%
CHILDREN IN ARMED CONFLICT	68%	10%	22%
ETHNIC MINORITY GROUPS	67%	13%	20%
CORPORAL PUNISHMENT	50%	31%	19%
CHILD LABOUR	80%	4%	16%
HEALTH	95%	0%	5%

## Findings and Analysis

### Corporal punishment the most rejected issue

Table 14 clearly illustrates the range of responses given by States under Review to the selected issues. Corporal punishment is rejected the most by States of the nine issues selected. Of the 72 recommendations made on the issue of corporal punishment, only 50 per cent were accepted and 30 per cent were rejected. On the other hand, of the 257 recommendations proposed on education, only four per cent were rejected by States under Review.

**Note:** It is interesting to note that juvenile justice is the second least accepted issue; only 56 per cent of recommendations are accepted, but 30 per cent are left pending. It might be interesting to carry out further research into which particular aspect of juvenile justice remains pending for most States.

## 7 NGO Survey Findings

Chapter Six looks at how NGOs can most effectively engage with the UPR. The purpose of this research is to understand the various approaches taken by a range of organisations and enable the children's rights community to learn from their experiences. CRIN hopes that the findings of the survey will assist NGOs and others to prepare their UPR strategy.

### Background to research

#### 1. A survey was designed to examine the approach taken by organisations towards the UPR

The survey is divided into four sections:

- Pre-review stage: Questions on the submission of reports and national / international lobbying activities
- During-review stage: Questions on attendance and ways of following the review
- Post-review stage: Questions on the follow-up process
- Evaluation section: Questions on successful / unsuccessful approaches and lessons learned

**A useful preparation tool:** For NGOs looking to report to the UPR for the first time, you may want to read through the questions in the survey (outlined in this chapter) and ask yourselves the same questions. For NGOs already familiar with the UPR process, and perhaps those that have already reported to the mechanism, you may want to run through the questions detailed to explore different approaches for the next review.

#### 2. Children's rights organisations who have submitted a report to the UPR were identified.

**Appendix 6** lists the organisations

**A guide to which organisations have reported:** CRIN has attempted to list as many children's rights focused organisations as possible, but is aware that many others have included children's rights in their reports to the UPR. This list will be useful for organisations to see which NGOs are already engaging with the UPR, and more importantly, where a Children's Rights Coalition has been established (or already existed).

### 3. interviews

We conducted interviews face to face or over the phone with a number of individuals from organisations that had submitted reports to the UPR. Interviews took place after the organisation had completed the questionnaire, to elaborate on certain findings.

Those interviewed included representatives from:

- International NGOs – Geneva offices
- International NGOs – Country offices
- National NGOs
- National Coalitions
- Ombudspersons / National Human Rights Institutions
- Academic Organisations

**Broad range of perspectives:** In order to achieve an accurate and balanced set of findings, we interviewed organisations from different parts of the world. Some were country focused and others thematically focused. The survey was adapted according to the organisation being interviewed in order to extract the relevant information.

## A stage by stage guide to NGO participation

Chapter Two briefly outlined the UPR process, from the pre-review report submissions through to the post-review follow-up stage. Before assessing NGOs' responses to the survey, this section briefly documents the different stages where NGOs can participate in the process.

### STAGE 1 - Engage with the State prior to the review

With reference to States preparing their reports for the UPR, Resolution A/HRC/RES/5/1 documents:

*“States are encouraged to prepare the information through a broad consultation process at the national level with all relevant stakeholders”.*

NGOs should push for meetings with the State prior to the submission of the national report.

**STAGE 2 - Submit a report**

NGOs can submit reports outlining their perspective on human rights in the State under review. As mentioned in the introduction, reports can be submitted individually or as a joint submission through a coalition. A link to the [report guidelines](#) can be found in **Appendix 7**.

**STAGE 3 – Lobby at a national / international level**

With the UPR being an inter-State mechanism, the opportunity to lobby both nationally and internationally is an integral part of the process. There are a number of lobbying options for NGOs to consider, many of which will be presented in this chapter.

**STAGE 4 - Attend the UPR Working Group Session**

NGOs with appropriate accreditation (ECOSOC status, etc.) are allowed to attend the interactive dialogue between the State under review and the UN Member States. However, they are not permitted to speak during the three hour review. Opportunities exist for NGOs to hold parallel events during the session of the Working Group and to raise awareness of the review through the local and international media.

**STAGE 5 - Attend the Plenary Session**

NGOs are also allowed to attend the Plenary Session, where the final outcome report is published. Unlike the Working Group Session, NGOs can [register to make a statement](#). See **Appendix 7** for a link.

**STAGE 6 - Follow up the review and monitor the implementation of the recommendations**

States have to implement the recommendations they accepted and the voluntary pledges made during the review. Progress will be examined when they are reviewed a second time around. NGOs have a very important role to play between the UPR reviews, to monitor implementation of the recommendations.

## Summary of NGO responses

### Pre-review Stage

For NGOs, the period leading up to the review itself is taken up with: (1) Report Submission, (2) Lobbying:

#### 1) Report Submission

**Question 1a) Did you submit a report to the UPR individually or as a coalition / joint submission, and if as a coalition, was it an existing one or established specifically for the UPR?**

#### **Response summary:**

The majority of organisations interviewed submitted reports as part of a coalition, with approximately one third submitting reports individually. Reasons primarily depended on the type of organisation writing the report and the situation in the country concerned, notably the safety of reporting on human rights. Of those organisations reporting as part of a coalition, more than half joined or were part of an existing coalition established to report to the CRC. Others implied that the coalitions were established specifically for the UPR. Some national NGOs explained how they joined coalitions for the UPR, which were made up of members focusing on the full range of human rights.

#### **Advantages of coalitions:**

Organisations reporting as a coalition (joint submissions) cited the following advantages:

- *Overcoming the issue of confidentiality / sensitivity:* Organisations stated that in some countries it is not safe to report individually or sometimes at all. Being part of a coalition was often seen as an alternative option.
- *A more cohesive approach:* Many organisations reported how coalitions provided an opportunity to join forces with other NGOs and construct a more cohesive approach to pressing the key issues.
- *Avoid duplication*
- *Avoid using a new set of reporting guidelines:* Often NGOs reporting as part of a coalition would submit information to the coordinator of the coalition on specific elements of the report. The coordinator would be responsible for following the UN guidelines, hence relieving the NGOs of this responsibility.
- *Strengthening relationships:* Joining a coalition for the UPR can strengthen an organisation's ties with other NGOs focusing on children's rights and indeed broader human rights organisations. National NGOs in particular cited this as a key advantage.

#### **Advantages of individual submissions:**

One national NGO explained how they cooperate with other NGOs and determine who is going to focus on



which issue. Rather than submit a joint report, they each submit individual reports. Through submitting an individual report, NGOs are presented with the opportunity to emphasise certain issues.

**Consider your organisation's objectives and circumstances:** As an NGO looking to report to the UPR for the first time, or an NGO considering alternative ways of reporting to the UPR, it is important to consider the points above and weigh up the advantages and disadvantages. The options you select will depend on a number of issues, including the capacity of your organisation, how familiar you are with the UN guidelines, your relationship with other NGOs and coalitions, the sensitive nature of your country situation and so on. Return to the beginning of this chapter to access the list of existing coalitions reporting to the UPR.

### Question 1b) How did you approach the UPR in terms of thematic issues?

#### Response summary:

In reporting to the UPR, organisations naturally focused on issues at the core of their organisation's work. However, the majority of organisations documented how they adapt their approach according to the most pressing issues at the time of the State's review. It was particularly interesting to note the various approaches organisations adopted, often in contrast to their approach to the CRC which many stressed involved more detail.

*Here are some examples of different approaches taken by organisations interviewed:*

CHILDREN'S OMBUDSPERSON	<i>"Whereas for the CRC we cover the full range of issues, for the UPR we pick out the most pressing issues"</i>
NATIONAL NGO	<i>"Whereas we approach the CRC article by article, for the UPR we try and focus on issues repeatedly abused and violated and see the UPR as a chance to press on these issues. This governs our approach"</i>
NATIONAL NGO	<i>"Our organisation focuses on children's rights issues not covered in national law"</i>
NATIONAL NGO	<i>"We try to focus on issues that would not feature in the UN Compilation"</i>
NATIONAL NGO	<i>"For the UPR, we tend to concentrate on an issue or issues which are constantly being ignored and need external international pressure"</i>

**Question 1c) Have you used the guidelines published by OHCHR and how did you find them / what could be changed? What are the general issues / problems with using a new mechanism?**

**Response summary:**

Of the organisations that used the guidelines (some did not if they were part of a coalition), the responses revealed mixed reactions. The general response was that they were useful, but could be made clearer, simpler and shorter. A number of organisations alluded to the fact the UPR mechanism comes with a new reporting system and hence the guidelines are different to what they are used to for the CRC. This issue appeared more problematic for national NGOs, particularly smaller organisations. A number of international NGOs developed their own toolkits for reporting to and following up the UPR process, which they disseminated to their own country offices.<sup>12</sup>

INTERNATIONAL NGO, COUNTRY OFFICE	<i>“There are lacking guidelines for children”</i>
INTERNATIONAL NGO, COUNTRY OFFICE	<i>“It would be good if the information states all the phases of the process and include more tips for writing alternative report submissions”</i>
NATIONAL NGO	<i>“It would be useful for us to have a Spanish version as we only received the English ones”</i>
INTERNATIONAL NGO, COUNTRY OFFICE	<i>“These guidelines are helpful, but it is necessary to increase awareness of their existence”</i>

**Supporting national NGOs:** The findings reveal that the challenges presented by a new set of guidelines are mostly felt by national and local NGOs. In talking with NGOs, we found that many have, or are in the process of developing their own toolkits or guidelines. NGOs that have such toolkits are strongly encouraged to share these with the wider child rights community, through existing networks like CRIN or the NGO Group for the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Before developing your own, find out what already exists, you could save yourself a lot of time.

<sup>12</sup> The NGO Group Working Group for the Human Rights Council produced [guidelines for NGOs](#) to report to the UPR. An updated version is currently being drafted. See **Appendix 7** for link.

### Question 1d) Have you submitted reports or cases to other UN treaty bodies, Special Procedures or regional mechanisms?

#### Response summary:

**Reporting to other UN treaty bodies:** In addition to reporting to the UPR, the majority of organisations interviewed also reported to the CRC - Less than 20 per cent of the organisations reported to five or more treaty bodies, with the common ones aside from the CRC being the Convention against Torture (CAT), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) and the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW).

**Special Procedures:** A small number of organisations reported that they cooperated with Special Procedure mandate holders, including the Special Rapporteur on Education, the Special Rapporteur on Torture, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention.

**Regional Mechanisms:** Likewise, only a small percentage of organisations interviewed said they submitted reports or information to regional mechanisms. One Kenyan national NGO stated:

*“We use the African Charter as our government takes it more seriously than UN treaty bodies because it is an African mechanism”*

**Capacity issue:** A number of organisations alluded to the amount of work required to submit reports to the UN treaty bodies, stating they simply did not have the capacity and resources. The general theme running through the responses was that organisations reported to the CRC firstly, and then other key treaty bodies relevant to their issues according to the time and resources available to them. It was interesting to observe how some organisations with a focus on one thematic issue only, would regularly report to all treaty bodies. A task made feasible by the nature of their organisation.

One national coalition explained how their annual report prepares them for reporting to treaty bodies:

NATIONAL COALITION

*“Our organisation publishes a yearly report on children's rights in the UK so we use this information for our UPR reporting and other treaty mechanism reports”*

**1.Engaging with Special Procedures (thematic and country focused):** Can present a major opportunity for NGOs to push their issues, especially if the experts' country visits coincide with your organisation's reporting time-scale to the UPR. Don't forget information from Special Rapporteurs is included in the pre-review UN compilation.

**2.Visit [CRIN's Special Procedures page](#)** (also found in **Appendix 7**): Includes information on past and upcoming visits by Special Rapporteurs and other Independent Experts, and CRIN's reports extracting children's rights mentions from reports by these experts.

**3. Regional mechanisms:** Several positives can be attributed to regional mechanisms. The European and Inter-American systems, for example, both have courts which issue binding judgements. Find out more about [regional mechanisms](#) and how to engage with them (see **Appendix 7** for link).

### Question 1e) Do you submit the same information for the UPR as you do for the CRC (or other bodies)?

#### Response summary:

The responses indicated that to an extent the same information was used for the UPR as for the CRC. However, information used for the UPR was often shorter, more concise and with a focus on a few issues. In contrast, information contained in the CRC alternative reports was said to be more detailed, covering the full spectrum of children's rights issues.<sup>13</sup>

The overall responses clearly indicate how reporting to the CRC provides a foundation for reporting to the UPR. Organisations often summarise the findings of the CRC report to submit information on the UPR, highlighting one way in which the UPR can be an extension of the CRC or an additional opportunity to press issues, as opposed to a stand alone mechanism. As previously mentioned, it depends of course on the time-line of CRC and UPR reporting.

*Below are some of the responses to this question:*

INTERNATIONAL NGO

*“Yes, generally we re-frame it, adapt it, and update it”*

CHILDREN'S OMBUDSPERSON

*“Yes, very similar and we were particularly lucky because both hearings occurred at a similar time. We adapted the UPR information to make it a different level because the report goes to the Council, not the CRC committee”*

NATIONAL NGO

*“As the co-ordinator of the coalition for the CRC and the UPR, I summarise the findings of our CRC alternative report*

<sup>13</sup> You can read the [NGO reporting guidelines for the CRC](#) here or see **Appendix 7** for the link

NATIONAL NGO

*for submission to the UPR. We were able to do this as the two reviews were close together so the information was up to date”.*

*“We had just reported on the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict (OPAC), and so used a lot of information on child recruitment used in the OPAC report, as it was up to date”.*

**View reports:** This section has highlighted the various approaches taken by organisations in submitting reports to the UPR. View a [list of reports submitted by NGOs](#) (both by children’s rights focused and broader human rights organisations), go to **Appendix 7** for a link.

## 2) Lobbying: National and international

### Question 2a) Have you done any lobbying at the national level?

#### Response summary:

The majority of organisations interviewed had participated in lobbying at the national level in some shape or form. For many, this meant lobbying the government itself. The Ministry of Justice was often cited as the department with responsibility for drafting the State report. Other departments lobbied included the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or more specific government departments responsible for specific issues relevant to the NGO, such as the Ministry of Gender, Development and Children's Services. As will be discussed in the conclusion to this report, further research is needed to understand in more depth the role of the various government departments, so as to know which departments to lobby when monitoring the implementation of the recommendations.

#### Issues with lobbying at national level:

A couple of organisations said they had to be careful when reporting on human rights issues, stating how risk assessments sometimes have to be carried out to ascertain whether the reporting process is feasible and in their long term interests. Responses from the surveys also alluded to wider difficulties faced by NGOs when considering national lobbying approaches, for example, an NGO working in Palestine stated that lobbying the Israeli government was a futile exercise given the circumstances.

**Look at the situation in your country:** It is important to consider your own organisation's situation when addressing the issue of reporting, and in more sensitive cases, joining an existing coalition of NGOs to report to the UPR may be more practical and safer. An important point to remember here is that whereas for the CRC, the deadline for NGO submissions is after the State report deadline, for the UPR the opposite applies. This could mean that they have an opportunity to set the agenda rather than react to the State's submission and own account of issues in the country.

## Question 2b) What are you doing to encourage other NGOs to engage with the UPR?

### Response summary:

A number of organisations, most notably international NGOs and national coalitions, reported making efforts to raise awareness of the UPR to national and local NGOs, and in the process encouraged them to engage with this new mechanism.

One NGO reported:

*“We do a global newsletter which includes Sessions coming up in the UPR and other mechanisms, to encourage other members to engage”*

### Case Study: Training on the UPR

One NGO interviewed described their involvement in encouraging the formation of a coalition in Nepal to report to the UPR. The coalition, the first in Asia established for the UPR, is made up of 238 NGOs, some of which are children's rights focused, others focusing on broader human rights issues. The international NGO financed and trained the members of the coalition alongside OHCHR, who play an active role in encouraging civil society engagement with the UPR in a number of countries around the world. The coordinator from the NGO reported how 150 leaders turned up to the training meeting and, this in turn meant the media were talking about the UPR in the country.

**Raising awareness:** The UPR is still relatively unknown in many parts of the world and a concerted and collective effort is required to raise awareness of this new mechanism, how it operates and how national and local NGOs can engage with the UPR.

## Question 2c) Did you meet with your government prior to the review?

### Response summary:

This question received a mixed response, with some organisations reporting to have liaised with governments prior to the review and others reporting no contact with the government at any stage in the lead up to the review. In certain cases, this process was not possible as alluded to in the earlier sections of the survey findings. Of the organisations that

had met with the governments, some stated how pro-active and sincere the government had been in consulting them, others viewed the cooperation by governments as a far less sincere exercise, some stating the government's cooperation was simply a means to receive assistance in drafting their own national reports.

**Engaging with the government:** Naturally, the extent to which it is possible for NGOs and other organisations to meet or generally cooperate with governments prior to the review will vary according to the circumstances in individual countries. If cooperation is feasible, it is worthwhile focusing on how best to approach this consultation. One NGO stated, *“When we meet with the government prior to the review, we tend to prioritise three key themes and focus on making headway with these, as opposed to tackling all issues. We feel this is more feasible and effective”*

### Question 2d) Child participation: Did you involve children in the reporting process?

#### Response Summary:

Only a couple of organisations involved children in the reporting process, or at any stage of the UPR. However, when asked what they would do differently next time, more than half said they would involve children in the process. The responses suggested the lack of child participation was more a result of time and capacity issues as opposed to recognising the benefits of involving children in the UPR.

#### Case Study: Child participation in Lebanon's UPR

One NGO successfully incorporated the views of children into their alternative report for Lebanon's review. The NGO staged a series of workshops with children in different parts of the country and in different socio-economic contexts to discuss the issues they faced in their own country. After hearing about the broad range of issues that existed, the children voted on the concerns they felt were particularly problematic and which affected them most. Research was then conducted alongside the children into evidence of these violations and reports were drawn up. Finally, a lessons learned session with children and staff involved in the child-led reporting process was conducted to help improve the process for the next UPR session. A 16 year old child, who was involved in the process, attended the review in Geneva and will report back to his peers about the experience.

**What has worked well already:** Further research would be useful to find out how other organisations may have involved children in the UPR process. It would be useful to collect both good examples, but also not so good examples. When considering involving children, organisations need to ensure that they have thought this through and that it will not simply be done in a tokenistic way. The NGO Group for the CRC is currently working with the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child to prepare guidelines on involving children in the CRC reporting process and quite a few international NGOs have involved children in different ways in their own work. It is worth finding out what has worked and what has not before considering doing this.

### Question 2e) If you have a children's Ombudsperson or National Human Rights Institution (NHRI), did you cooperate with them and how?

#### Response summary:

The majority of organisations stated their country did have either an Ombudsperson or a National Human Rights Institution, however very few co-operated with them on the UPR. Few offered reasons for this lack of cooperation, but some cited the lack of independence of these bodies or their inadequacies. One NGO who did cooperate with their NHRI, stated that the institution did not have a children's rights specific section, though they were pushing for this. Another NGO reported that they successfully worked with the Children's Ombudsperson, coordinating their efforts to push key issues.

**1. Cooperating with Ombudspersons:** NGOs should find out whether there is an Ombudsperson for Children in their country, or similar role, and find out whether they are planning to send in their own report on the UPR. It is worth coordinating input, as in many cases, these institutions may be able to push issues that NGOs cannot. See whether you have such an [institution in your country](#) (see **Appendix 7** for link).

**2. Further analysis:** The issue of Children's Ombudspersons (or NHRIs more generally) feature prominently throughout the recommendations of the UPR reports. CRIN have identified this as an important further area of analysis.

### Question 2f) Have you done any lobbying at the international level, and with whom?

#### Response summary:

Responses to this question highlighted the marked difference between international and national NGOs. International NGOs generally responded favourably to the opportunity to lobby States to ask questions or make recommendations in the State reviews, with some NGOs reporting to have in place a systematic lobbying approach to press certain States to raise particular issues. For national NGOs, the response was often that they would like to take advantage of this opportunity, however simply do not have the capacity, contacts or Geneva representation. Certain national NGOs reported how they did take advantage of contacts, lobbied through coalitions or used locally based diplomats. Lobbying was not just confined to Geneva; NGOs also lobbied the European Union and other institutions.

#### Examples of how organisations approached the lobbying process:

**INTERNATIONAL NGO, COUNTRY OFFICE** *“Our Geneva representative lobbied 16 missions in Geneva, choosing to focus on 3 or 4 issues from our reports. More than that is unmanageable. Our representative selected particular States for each issue. We will try and be even more strategic in the future”*



INTERNATIONAL NGO, GENEVA OFFICE	<i>“We know which States are strong on the issues we are trying to push, and for one in particular, we use our country office in that country to lobby the State to put our case across. It has proved very successful”</i>
INTERNATIONAL NGO, GENEVA OFFICE	<i>“Linking up with other Geneva representatives from fellow international NGOs to maximise the lobbying power is very important”</i>
NATIONAL NGO	<i>“We would really like to lobby in Geneva, but we do not know how to go about the process”</i>

**1 Lobbying an important part of the UPR:** The chance to lobby States to raise issues or make recommendations to other States presents a significant opportunity for NGOs to push key issues to the forefront of the discussions. CRIN's analysis in Chapter 6 showing which States raise which issues is an important starting point for NGOs.

**2. Troikas not necessarily a stronger way in:** Organisations who have lobbied States on the UPR reported that the Troikas were not necessarily a better option to lobby than general Member States, unless they have a particular interest in one of the issues at the core of your organisation's work. Consequently, if your organisation is not able to contact the Troikas, contacting other member countries can be just as effective.

### Question 2g) Do you have anyone representing you in Geneva? (from your organisation or another)

#### Response Summary:

The majority of international NGOs stated they now have an office in Geneva, with representatives responsible for lobbying and wider coordination of the organisation's UPR approach. National NGOs, as explained previously, have significantly less access to Geneva.

**What can National NGOs do:** There is nothing surprising in hearing that national NGOs often do not have the capacity to lobby whether at home, or in Geneva. This is where working as coalitions internationally is so important and where international NGOs should support national ones. The NGO Group for the CRC and CRIN are working together to make the UPR and the UN in general more accessible to national organisations.

## During-Review

### Question 3a) Did you attend the Working Group Review meeting in Geneva?

#### Response Summary:

Generally, Geneva representatives of international NGOs attended the majority of reviews on behalf of their country offices, with representatives from their country offices attending where possible. As far as international NGOs are concerned, where country offices were not in attendance, the outcome of the review would be disseminated to the country office. National NGOs found it far more difficult to attend the reviews, and would often have to rely on a fellow member of the coalition to attend, that is if they were part of a coalition. Of all the organisations interviewed for the survey, only one NGO had followed the UPR on the webcasts operated through the OHCHR website.

#### Ways to follow the Reviews – See Appendix 7 also for links

- ◆ OHCHR operate a [webcast](#) of the UPR sessions.
- ◆ International Service for Human Rights (ISHR) produce [analytical reports](#) on the State reviews, made available on their website after the event.
- ◆ OHCHR also publish the [final report and recommendations](#) on their website.
- ◆ Of course, you can access [CRIN's specialised children's rights references reports](#) after each review

### Question 3b) Did you make a statement during the Plenary Session (or did someone on your behalf)?

#### Response summary:

Some of the organisations reported that they made a statement in the Plenary Session which takes place approximately four months after the review. As detailed in Chapter 2 of this report, NGOs have a brief slot to make oral statements on the final outcome report of the State under review. The majority of organisations interviewed, however, said they did not make statements. On the whole, NGOs were sceptical about the impact of making a statement or were unaware the opportunity exists for NGOs.

A comment expressed a couple of times was summed up below by an international NGO:

*“The problem with the statement option is that the window for NGOs is only 20 minutes, and that is for all NGOs. What we find is that the bigger NGOs receive the main slots. The second point is that the State under review does not respond to the statements and they do not go into the final recommendations”*

**A guide to making a Statement – See Appendix 7 also for links**

- [NGOs can register to make an oral statement](#)
- [View past oral statements made during the Plenary Sessions on UPR-Info.org's website](#)

Post-review

**Question 4a) Do you plan to disseminate the outcomes / findings of the review?**

**Response summary:**

The majority of organisations reported that they disseminated the findings of the review in one way or another. The extent to which this happened ranged from disseminating documents detailing outcomes and recommendations to country offices and coalition partners, to simpler documents to wider civil society, to addressing the media. Below are a couple of examples of how organisations have disseminated the outcomes of the reviews internally and externally.

**Dissemination internally:**

International offices to their country offices:

*“We send a short summary to our country offices and partners detailing children's rights recommendations that were accepted, so that advocacy offices can build this into their own strategy”*

*“We create a two page document summarising the review and the outcomes from it, and send to our country offices and national associations”*

*“We put an outcome document, together with all the final recommendations on our website for members to see”*

**Dissemination externally:**

*“We would love to disseminate information to, and engage with, the media, but do not have the capacity or contacts within the media”*

*“Together with the child protection coalition, we are going to follow up on the recommendations related to child protection, and disseminate the outcomes and encourage other local coalitions to follow up on areas they are interested in”*

**Importance of information sharing:** Disseminating information about the individual reviews, notably the accepted and rejected recommendations, internally, with the media, and indeed with the wider children's rights community is an important part of the process. Once again, if you do not have your own ways of doing this, such as newsletters or mailing lists, contact CRIN or the NGO Group who can support you in this. For instance, CRIN has a mailing list specifically on the Human Rights Council, so you can use this list to share your reports or findings.

**Question 4b) Do you have plans to follow-up on the outcomes of the UPR, in particular the recommendations (individually / as a coalition)? Are you aware of the government's follow-up plans?**

**Response summary:**

It was evident from the survey that the follow-up measures undertaken by organisations post-review had been on the whole limited, and that this critical period in the UPR process was not being adequately addressed. A number of organisations agreed it was an extremely important part of the process, and that merely submitting a report was not enough. Some NGOs alluded to the additional workload reporting to this new mechanism created, seeing the UPR as a stand alone instrument as opposed to a complementary advocacy tool.

One NGO commented on how best to utilise the UPR:

*“The UPR is an ongoing process, it is not just about submitting a report. Furthermore, the key is to integrate the UPR process into your day to day advocacy work, to use it as another advocacy tool. It is not a stand alone instrument but will add to the artillery”*

**Ways to monitor the implementation progress**

**1) Monitor changes in policies and practise**

Monitor steps taken by States to implement the recommendations following the review, paying close attention to changes in government policies and practices. Through consultations with the States post review, NGOs can question the State's plans for implementing the accepted recommendations made in the review, and at the same time press States to re-consider their positions on recommendations they rejected or recommendations where they failed to provide a clear position or left pending. In the second cycle of the UPR, States will be questioned on their implementation progress. In addition, NGOs have the opportunity to press States to implement the UPR recommendations by engaging with treaty bodies and Special Rapporteurs.

One NGO reported on their plans for follow-up:

*“We will be following up through a systematic analysis of progress (policies and practices) regarding thematic issues brought up in the review. We will be monitoring the indicators and meeting the government”.*

A national coalition explained how they monitored the government's overall progress on children's rights, which included measures taken by the State to implement the UPR recommendations:

*“Each year, we produce a 'State of Children's Rights' report, which monitors the government's progress on implementing the most recent Concluding Observations from the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child. The report covers changes in the law or national policy; new statistics and major research findings; conclusions and recommendations (where explicitly relevant) from a human rights monitoring body or parliamentary committee; legal judgements, the views of children, and so on. The UPR recommendations affecting children are all picked up here.”*

## **2) Have a look at the mid-term update reports**

Some States have produced and disseminated voluntary mid-term UPR reports approximately two years after their review, presenting an update on the measures being taken to implement the outcomes of the review and particularly the recommendations. Norway and the Netherlands are two examples of States who have produced these reports. These mid-term reports can provide a key opportunity for NGOs to track progress made by States and to press the State on certain areas of implementation. States who have yet to take up this option should be encouraged to do so by NGOs.

One Ombudsperson's office reported:

*“The government decided to do a voluntary mid-term report on the UPR two years after their report. The process started this summer. They will monitor the follow up of the recommendations. They held a meeting in June for NGOs to discuss the UPR review and follow-up process”*

All mid-term UPR reports are posted on the [OHCHR website](#) (link also in **Appendix 7**). Generally, States list the recommendations and below each one, explain the measures they are taking to implement the recommendation, documenting where they are in the implementation process.

### **The example of the Netherlands**

Below are a couple of examples of what the Netherlands have included in their mid-term report:

1. Recommendation made in the Review by Russia to the Netherlands:

*“Consider withdrawal of reservations with respect to the Convention on the Rights of the Child”*

Response to recommendation in mid-term report by the Netherlands:

*“The Kingdom of the Netherlands did not support this recommendation but is now considering this recommendation and will inform the treaty body about its progress in the next CRC report.”*

2. Recommendation made in Review by Brazil to the Netherlands:

*“Ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading*

*Treatment or Punishment”*

Response to recommendation in mid-term report by the Netherlands:

*“Documents concerning the approval of the Optional Protocol to the CAT were presented to the parliaments of the three countries of the Kingdom on 23 February 2009. After the Dutch House of Representatives approved the protocol, it was sent to the Senate this month.”.*

Read the mid-term report submitted by the Netherlands (link also in **Appendix 7**)

**Maximise the mid-term report opportunity:** These mid-term reports, if done well can provide an important opportunity to monitor the State's progress. If your government has not produced a mid-term report, it might be worth encouraging them to do so by referring them to existing ones. You might want to contact NGOs in countries where they do exist to find out whether they think the report is useful, or how it could be improved before you then lobby your own government.

### **3) Item 6 at the Human Rights Council:**

Governments may also voluntarily update the Human Rights Council on their progress in implementing the recommendations of the UPR under Item 6.

## Overall Evaluation

### **Question 5a): Did your issues make it into the final report and recommendations?**

#### **Response summary:**

A high percentage of the organisations reported that their issues were included in the final recommendations, many stating that a good number of the issues they raised in their reports or through lobbying activities were visible in the final outcome reports.

One national coalition reported:

*“We were pleased that many children's rights issues were mentioned in the final recommendations and very pleased that 8 of the 12 issues our organisation included in our submission were observed in the final recommendations’*

Several organisations did however question whether this success was a result of their own organisation's efforts, with one NGO commenting:

*“They did appear, but it was hard to tell if it was our reports that made the difference or whether these*

*general issues were picked up from other organisations and bodies.”*

Another NGO noted that it was hard to measure the impact of the UPR against other lobbying platforms:

*“Yes, many of our recommendations appeared in the final document and indeed the recommendations are in the national amendment bill which is fantastic. We have been lobbying these issues for some time now however, so it is hard to measure the extent to which this success was due to the UPR. The UPR certainly played a role though and put international pressure on”*

**Success at the Geneva level anyway!** The responses clearly reveal that points raised in the pre-review reports by NGOs did, on the whole, make it into the final recommendations.

### **Question 5b) What proved the most effective advocacy approach towards the UPR?**

#### **Response summary:**

The question as to whether success in the UPR was as a result of reporting or lobbying or indeed both, largely depended on the type of organisation interviewed or whether or not they had in fact lobbied over and above submitting a report - International NGOs (both Geneva representatives and country offices) on the whole attributed success to the combination of reporting and lobbying, with some national NGOs reporting the same. More often, national NGOs attributed success to report submissions, generally as a result of not having the capacity to lobby.

One NGO highlighted the importance of combining reporting and lobbying:

*“You can't have one without the other; You need lobbying to draw attention to the report and without the report you have no real substance to draw attention to”*

This point was supported by another NGO response:

*“Lobbying internationally in particular played a big big part, but the reports were important as you need something to refer to when lobbying. It is easier to lobby if you refer to a report”*

### **Question 5c) Do you think engaging with the UPR was worthwhile and why?**

#### **Response summary:**

Generally, organisations responded that their efforts were worthwhile, with an interesting array of reasons documented. Outlined below are the various responses, divided into categories to best summarise the findings. It was interesting to observe some responses that might not have been anticipated, such as the way engaging with the UPR helped organisations develop internal relationships.

## Reasons in favour of the UPR

### 1. Another platform for advocacy / Reduces length of time between reporting on children's rights

*“Our next CRC alternative report is not due in until 2016, and so the UPR is our only opportunity to push the children's rights agenda, particularly as the government has agreed to produce mid-term UPR reports updating their progress on the implementation of the final recommendations from the UPR”*

A National Coalition stated how the UPR complements its day to day work as opposed to creating extra work.

*“Reporting to these other bodies (over and above the CRC) complements our day to day work, and helps add external international pressure on the government. The UPR is consequently part of our overall advocacy campaign and another outlet to push on certain issues.”*

Some NGOs have seen the direct impact of the UPR on children's rights:

*“In the end, it was an additional pressure instrument which saw the eventual withdrawal of the Government's reservation to the CRC”*

National NGO

*“In the political and legal practice, some recommendations from the UPR have already been introduced”*,

National NGO.

### 2. States fear of being exposed in front of their Peers

One NGO explained:

*“States are less likely to want to be embarrassed in front of their peers, whereas the CRC is just a Committee”*

The representative continued:

*“The UPR is a much bigger forum than other treaty bodies, States will have to show progress on human rights and NGOs need to be on the sidelines pushing it”*

Another NGO added:

*“States are afraid of the UPR, much more so than the CRC, because of the name and shame nature. Our Minister brought 38 staff to the UPR, this says everything”*

Another NGO also commented on the level of State representation in the UPR compared to the CRC:

*“The UPR goes to a higher level than other Conventions, more senior people attend, often higher up in foreign affairs”*



### **3. Opportunity to develop external relationships**

A number of organisations commented on the external impact of the UPR, with regards to the opportunity the mechanism provides for NGOs to network with other children's rights NGOs and indeed wider human rights focused organisations. This appeared particularly crucial for small national NGOs who felt cut off and limited by capacity. The chance to join coalitions and build alliances within the human rights community proved a crucial aspect of the UPR, particularly in countries that have few children's rights NGOs or advocates. The fact the UPR incorporates all human rights issues and hence organisations, proved a key opportunity for smaller children's rights focused NGOs.

### **4. Opportunity to develop Internal relationships**

A couple of organisations, mainly international NGOs, talked about the internal impact the UPR process had on their organisations, in terms of building relationships between the head offices and the country offices, particularly where country offices are receptive to engaging with the UN mechanisms. One international NGO commented on how the UPR had enabled their organisation to develop closer ties with their South American country offices, a region where they found their colleagues to be particularly open to engaging with a new UN mechanism.

## **Reasons against the UPR**

### **1. Hard to tell if you are making a difference**

One international NGO stated:

*“With lots of NGOs working together, it is hard to tell if as an individual NGO you are making a difference”*

### **2. The UPR is a labour intensive process**

A number of organisations raised the issue of the amount of time and work required to report to the UPR, and indeed all UN treaty mechanisms. This issue was particularly stressed by national and local NGOs or country offices of international NGOs (though country offices often receive support and assistance from their Geneva offices). Some organisations also commented on the issue of reporting to a new mechanism with new guidelines, as mentioned earlier in the chapter.

### **3. Issue of political bargaining**

Whereas some organisations clearly viewed the political nature of this inter-State mechanism as a positive influence and an opportunity to push States by lobbying other States, other organisations were less convinced by the political nature, often suggesting that States bargain and compromise with each other to maintain inter-State diplomacy. Some organisations interviewed were extremely sceptical about the process of States questioning other States and subsequently place little emphasis on this lobbying approach.

#### 4. Is it making a difference on the ground?

Some responses questioned the impact the UPR actually has on the ground. Some national NGOs, in particular, feel cut off from the procedures in Geneva and want to first see the actual impact these recommendations may have before judging the process a success.

#### Question 5d) Is the UPR part of your core work and will it be in the future?

##### Response summary:

The majority of international NGOs stated that the UPR is part of their core work and indeed would be in the future. From a national NGO perspective, the response was more varied, though a reasonable number of national NGOs did state that whilst it wasn't necessarily a priority at the moment, it would be in the future. A couple of national NGOs said their immediate focus was on the CRC.

**Different perspectives:** Given the UPR is still yet to complete its first cycle, these findings are perhaps not surprising. International NGOs, close to the action in Geneva, have had more experience of engaging with the UPR, whereas national NGOs are currently more focused on the CRC and waiting to see how the UPR plays out.

#### Question 5e) What would you do differently next time you engage with the UPR?

##### Response summary:

Many organisations stressed the importance of the follow-up process, acknowledging their failings in this crucial area. This point was acknowledged as a matter of urgency not just for the UPR, but also across UN mechanisms. One international NGO summed up the general response:

*“It is a learning curve, every State review has been a learning experience, you take something from each one. At the moment we are not sticking to any strict methodology, but may at some point”*

The responses of how organisations would act differently the next time they report can be grouped into sections:

##### 1. More pre-review preparation

One international NGO responded:

*“Have a greater lead time, and be more prepared, structured in our approach in the build up to the review. Also focus on those country offices that buy into the UPR and UN advocacy and go for it with them. Then with success, the others will follow”*

Another commented:

*“Start the preparation process earlier and conduct a clear analysis of policies and practices in order to reflect accurate information to the UPR”*

## **2. A more effective follow-up plan**

As highlighted above, a number of organisations agreed that the overall follow-up approach carried out by NGOs on UN mechanisms was inadequate and urgently needed addressing, and the UPR was no different in this respect. The organisations emphasising the importance of a stronger follow-up plan were largely the international NGOs who had more capacity and resources than national NGOs.

One international NGO stated:

*“Adopt a better follow-up plan after the review and use the recommendations and any sign of positive response from the State. At the same time, provoke others to do the same”*

Another reported:

*“Focus on following up the outcomes of the review in a more structured and calculated way”*

Another NGO mentioned the important role the media could play in following up the outcomes of the review. Few organisations commented on their interaction with the media on the UPR. Once more, this is an important area that requires further research in order to collate successful examples of media coordination.

## **3. Increase participation of children in the reporting process**

Whilst very few NGOs had involved children in the reporting process for the UPR, a number of organisations highlighted this as a priority for future reporting, signalling their views that the participation of children would enhance their engagement with the mechanism.

## **4. Encourage participation of more NGOs**

The overall lack of awareness about the UPR, and how it works, regularly surfaced in the responses, particularly when organisations were talking about fellow national and local NGOs, those distant from the Geneva arena. Whilst some organisations had already promoted awareness of the UPR, its benefits and ways to engage with this new mechanism, many acknowledged that this is an important area to focus on.

## **5. Stronger lobbying, particularly making use of international lobbying**

The majority of organisations acknowledged the power of lobbying for this new mechanism, but either had not had the time or the capacity to do this, or were unaware of how to do it.

One person said:

*“We need to apply more intensive lobbying, through our Geneva office, on States and troikas to push our issues.”*

Another stated:

*“We have to find out which States could push our issues in the UPR*

## 8 Conclusion

With the UPR yet to complete its first cycle of reviews, it is too early to judge its effectiveness. Indeed, the real test will be when States participate in the second round of reviews, where they will be obliged to give an update on their progress in implementing the recommendations from their first review. However, as the findings of this report show, some key trends have already emerged, notably the way States and indeed other Stakeholders are interacting with the UPR, and which issues are being raised and which ones are neglected.

### Drawing conclusions on the report's two main objectives

To what extent are children's rights addressed in the UPR

- **Is one in five mentions satisfactory?** Approximately one fifth of all points made across the UPR process are children's rights focused, but is this really satisfactory given children cut across all human rights clusters? Furthermore, the findings highlighted below, raise concerns over which issues are being addressed adequately and which ones are not.
- **States are avoiding more controversial issues:** The findings have clearly shown how States tend to focus on, and accept mostly recommendations on 'softer' issues, such as education and health, and neglect, or reject recommendations on more controversial issues , such as corporal punishment or juvenile justice.
- **NGOs have an important role to play:** NGOs lag behind UN bodies and UN Member States in the extent to which they address children's rights in the UPR. Indeed, with States shown to avoid the more controversial issues, NGOs have an important role to play in addressing the full spectrum of children's rights issues and ensuring neglected issues are brought to the forefront of the agenda.

**The role of NGOs:** CRIN hopes that the findings of the analysis act a as a rallying call for NGOs to play their part in ensuring **all** children's rights are addressed.

Lessons learned by and practical tips for NGOs

- **NGOs are still learning about the UPR:** The mechanism differs from existing mechanisms in a number of ways. Organisations must assess their own situation, together with the situation in the country they are reporting on, and consider the range of approaches available to them before engaging with the UPR.
- **Two different perspectives:** A clear distinction exists between those who engage at the Geneva level (primarily international NGOs) and achieve success by seeing their issues raised in the final recommendations,

and those who feel excluded from the process and are waiting to see the impact of this mechanism reflected in changes on the ground (national NGOs). All organisations in the children's rights community are encouraged to share knowledge and experiences to support all actors in using the UPR.

- **The UPR as an additional advocacy tool:** A number of organisations alluded to the need to treat the UPR as an additional advocacy tool, to complement their existing day to day work. The way the CRC complements the UPR was repeatedly mentioned, with the UPR often seen as an 'enforcer' of advocacy work undertaken towards the CRC. Use the survey findings which show how reporting to the CRC can provide a platform for reporting to the UPR and how to use States' responses to recommendations in the UPR as part of your CRC work.
- **Wider benefits of engaging with the UPR:** A number of internal and external benefits emerged from the survey, particularly national NGOs reporting how the UPR helps them build alliances with the wider human rights community. Explore options to join forces with other NGOs through coalitions and cooperate with Ombudspersons and national human rights institutions. (Appendix 7 lists all children's rights focused coalitions)

**A guide for all organisations:** With the UPR being a fairly new mechanism, it is more important than ever for the children's rights community to work together and share information, from existing toolkits on approaching the various stages of the process, to examples of successful strategies, to raising awareness of coalitions, and so on. As mentioned earlier CRIN and the NGO Group for the CRC are fulfilling some of these tasks, but more needs to be done. Contact us if you would like to participate.

## Areas for further research and analysis

Throughout this process, we often came across issues or areas that would benefit from further research. Where possible, we have tried to highlight these.

Further research can be grouped into four areas:

### 1. Further research into the nine issues analysed

*For example, research into particular areas of juvenile justice, such as the age of criminal responsibility.*

### 2. Research beyond the nine issues

*For example, research into children with disabilities, child participation or the extent to which Ombudspersons are mentioned in the UPR.*

### 3. Research examining the correlation between the UPR and other UN mechanisms

*For example, examining the similarities between the Concluding Observations issued by the Committee on the*

*Rights of the Child and the final recommendations issued in the UPR.*

#### **4. Other useful areas of research**

*For example, further research into which government departments are responsible for each of the stages of the UPR process: drafting the national report, attending the review and implementing the outcomes.*

### **The UPR in the Human Rights Council Review 2011**

The UPR will be firmly on the agenda when the Human Rights Council undertakes a full review in 2011. Two Working Groups are taking place in the lead up to next year's review (the first took place from October 25 – 29, the second is due to take place in March 2011). NGOs have a role to play in these discussions, for instance by suggesting how the process could be improved. A set of recommendations by NGOs were contributed to the first Working Group meeting. To view these recommendations and for further information on the Human Rights Council Review, click [here](#), or see the link in **Appendix 7**.

## 9 Appendices



## Appendix 1: Children's rights recommendations received by States and their responses

<b>State under Review</b>	<b>Number of recommendations received</b>	<b>Number Accepted</b>	<b>Number Pending / No clear position</b>	<b>Number Rejected</b>
Afghanistan	16	15	1	0
Albania	21	14	5	2
Algeria	3	3	0	0
Angola	25	25	0	0
Argentina	11	11	0	0
Azerbaijan	21	18	2	1
Bahamas	18	8	5	5
Bahrain	1	1	0	0
Bangladesh	17	17	0	0
Barbados	7	1	4	2
Belarus	1	0	0	1
Belize	11	9	0	2
Benin	11	10	0	0
Bhutan	27	19	8	0
Bolivia	19	18	0	1
Bosnia and Herzegovina	19	11	0	8
Botswana	21	15	0	6
Brazil	1	1	0	0
Brunei Darussalem	20	8	8	4
Burkina Faso	24	24	0	0
Burundi	12	8	2	2
Cambodia	17	17	0	0
Cameroon	23	23	0	0
Canada	7	6	0	1
Cape Verde	16	15	0	1
Central African Republic	23	19	4	0
Chad	42	37	3	2
Chile	6	6	0	0
China	7	3	1	3
Colombia	11	11	0	0
DR Congo	31	30	1	0
Congo	21	20	0	1
Costa Rica	31	31	0	0
Côte d'Ivoire	45	33	11	1
Cuba	7	6	1	0
Cyprus	14	0	14	0
Czech Republic	4	4	0	0
Djibouti	25	16	8	1
Dominica	17	14	3	0
Dominican Republic	17	17	0	0
Ecuador	1	1	0	0
Egypt	5	5	0	0

<b>State under Review</b>	<b>Number of recommendations received</b>	<b>Number Accepted</b>	<b>Number Pending / No clear position</b>	<b>Number Rejected</b>
El Salvador	27	27	0	0
Equatorial Guinea	23	23	0	0
Eritrea	25	23	0	2
Ethiopia	36	23	11	2
Fiji	8	8	0	0
Finland	1	1	0	0
France	3	0	3	0
Gabon	9	0	9	0
Gambia	35	22	13	0
Germany	14	13	0	1
Ghana	12	11	1	0
Guatemala	3	3	0	0
India	2	1	1	0
Indonesia	4	2	2	0
Iran	30	10	11	9
Iraq	21	20	0	1
Israel	3	0	3	0
Italy	13	12	0	1
Japan	7	7	0	0
Kazakhstan	15	15	0	0
North Korea	27	0	19	8
South Korea	4	2	2	0
Liechtenstein	5	5	0	0
Luxembourg	12	0	12	0
Macedonia	12	12	0	0
Madagascar	11	11	0	0
Malawi	2	0	1	1
Malaysia	20	14	5	1
Mali	22	14	8	0
Malta	8	0	6	2
Mauritius	18	17	1	0
Mexico	12	12	0	0
Monaco	2	2	0	0
Montenegro	5	5	0	0
Netherlands	4	3	0	1
New Zealand	7	5	2	0
Nicaragua	16	16	0	0
Nigeria	18	18	0	0
Norway	21	17	0	4
Pakistan	4	4	0	0
Peru	1	0	1	0
Philippines	4	2	2	0
Poland	4	0	4	0
Portugal	13	13	0	0
Qatar	16	11	0	5
Romania	14	14	0	0

<b>State under Review</b>	<b>Number of recommendations received</b>	<b>Number Accepted</b>	<b>Number Pending / No clear position</b>	<b>Number Rejected</b>
Russia	13	0	13	0
San Marino	19	14	0	5
Senegal	22	20	2	0
Serbia	6	5	1	0
Slovakia	23	18	1	4
Slovenia	25	24	0	1
South Africa	5	0	5	0
Sri Lanka	15	9	4	2
Switzerland	3	3	0	0
Tonga	2	2	0	0
Turkmenistan	6	6	0	0
Tuvalu	3	3	0	0
Ukraine	7	6	0	1
United Arab Emirates	4	3	0	1
United Kingdom	9	6	1	2
Uruguay	20	20	0	0
Uzbekistan	11	6	5	0
Vanuatu	14	13	0	1
Vietnam	10	9	0	1
Yemen	25	22	1	2
Zambia	7	7	0	0

## Appendix 2: All recommendations received by States and their responses

<b>State under Review</b>	<b>No. of recommendations received</b>	<b>Number Accepted</b>	<b>Number pending / no clear position</b>	<b>Number Rejected</b>
<b>Session 1</b>				
Algeria	25	17	0	8
Argentina	21	21	0	0
Bahrain	12	9	3	0
Brazil	15	0	0	0
Czech Republic	30	29	0	1
Ecuador	10	10	0	0
Finland	8	8	0	0
India	18	5	13	0
Indonesia	13	9	3	0
Morocco	13	11	2	0
Netherlands	40	28	2	10
Philippines	20	12	4	4
Poland	29	0	29	0
South Africa	22	0	22	0
Tunisia	12	12	0	0
United Kingdom	30	19	1	10
<b>Session 2</b>				
Benin	34	33	0	1
France	33	0	33	0
Gabon	30	0	30	0
Ghana	35	23	10	2
Guatemala	43	43	0	0
Japan	27	14	2	11
Mali	27	21	5	1
Pakistan	51	43	0	8
Peru	21	3	17	1
South Korea	33	15	18	0
Romania	31	29	0	2
Sri Lanka	85	52	8	25
Switzerland	32	21	0	11
Tonga	42	31	0	11
Ukraine	40	34	0	6
Zambia	34	27	1	6
<b>Session 3</b>				
Bahamas	25	11	7	7
Barbados	25	13	3	9
Botswana	41	21	3	17

<b>State under Review</b>	<b>No. of recommendations received</b>	<b>Number Accepted</b>	<b>Number pending / no clear position</b>	<b>Number Rejected</b>
Burkina Faso	46	27	1	18
Burundi	84	41	28	15
Cape Verde	48	43	2	3
Colombia	78	65	2	11
Israel	54	3	51	0
Lichtenstein	43	32	0	11
Luxembourg	18	0	18	0
Montenegro	20	20	0	0
Serbia	27	16	9	2
Turkmenistan	42	19	13	10
Tuvalu	29	27	0	2
United Arab Emirates	74	36	8	30
Uzbekistan	86	30	39	17

**Session 4**

Azerbaijan	55	30	10	15
Bangladesh	45	35	6	4
Cameroon	61	41	5	15
Canada	72	54	4	14
China	99	42	7	50
Cuba	89	60	17	12
Djibouti	52	37	8	7
Germany	45	35	1	9
Jordan	78	53	2	23
Malaysia	103	62	19	22
Mauritius	63	44	19	0
Mexico	92	83	6	3
Nigeria	32	30	2	0
Russia	62	0	57	5
Saudi Arabia	71	50	2	19
Senegal	40	31	9	0

**Session 5**

Afghanistan	143	117	16	10
Belize	46	36	9	1
Central African Republic	99	64	35	0
Chad	112	86	14	12
Chile	77	71	4	2
Comoros	59	52	0	7
Congo	61	51	1	9
Macedonia	43	42	0	1
Malta	47	0	43	4
Monaco	41	23	7	11
New Zealand	64	36	21	7
Slovakia	91	79	3	9
Uruguay	88	88	0	0

<b>State under Review</b>	<b>No. of recommendations received</b>	<b>Number Accepted</b>	<b>Number pending / no clear position</b>	<b>Number Rejected</b>
Vanuatu	49	44	0	5
Vietnam	146	94	6	46
Yemen	142	124	3	15
<b>Session 6</b>				
Albania	106	88	15	3
Bhutan	99	73	26	0
Brunei Darussalem	85	33	25	27
Cambodia	91	91	0	0
Costa Rica	102	96	4	2
Cote d'Ivoire	147	108	37	2
Cyprus	73	0	69	4
North Korea	167	0	117	50
DR Congo	163	124	28	11
Dominica	61	51	8	2
Dominican Republic	79	74	0	5
Equatorial Guinea	115	111	0	4
Eritrea	136	62	56	18
Ethiopia	142	99	11	32
Norway	91	73	0	18
Portugal	89	86	0	3
<b>Session 7</b>				
Angola	166	158	0	8
Bolivia	79	78	0	1
Bosnia and Herzegovina	126	89	1	36
Egypt	165	135	5	25
El Salvador	119	116	3	0
Fiji	103	97	0	6
Gambia	146	68	50	30
Iran	188	126	16	46
Iraq	180	136	17	27
Italy	92	80	0	12
Kazakhstan	128	121	0	7
Madagascar	84	65	17	2
Nicaragua	110	92	8	10
Qatar	113	87	1	25
San Marino	57	22	0	35
Slovenia	100	92	3	5

## Appendix 3: Rejected children's rights recommendations

Below are a list of all children's rights recommendations **rejected** by States for Sessions 1 – 7 of the Universal Periodic Review. The rejected recommendations below, together with the recommendations accepted and pending, can be found on [CRIN's main UPR page](#).

### Session 7

#### **Qatar (State under review)**

85. R - 6. To consider re-examining reservations to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the Convention against Torture with a view to withdrawing them (Brazil);

R - 16. To increase the age of criminal responsibility to a minimum of 12 years, in line with recommendations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child (Chile);

86. R - 1. To continue to focus work on the rights of women and children, and to lift its reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women to guarantee fair and equal legislation (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);

R - 3. To review its reservations to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women with a view to withdrawing them, especially the reservation to the right of a child to obtain Qatari nationality from a Qatari women married to a foreign man (Netherlands);

R - 10. To consider abolishing the death penalty and corporal punishment, in particular against children (Brazil);

#### **Italy**

84, R - 38. To incorporate in its legislation the 1996 Supreme Court judgement that corporal punishment was not a legitimate method of discipline in the home, and criminalize corporal punishment in all cases, including in education (Spain);

#### **San Marino**

R - 32. To guarantee dual nationality in order to prevent discrimination against children whose parents have not renounced their nationality of origin (Mexico).

R - 2. To clarify the status of the relationship between San Marino's international obligations and its domestic legislation, to ensure that those international obligations are given effect by domestic courts, and to carry out a comprehensive review of its *ius commune* in order to identify provisions of domestic legislation that contradict principles and provisions of the Conventions, as recommended by the Human Rights Committee, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Committee on the Rights of the Child, respectively (Israel); *San Marino response: As indicated in the national report and during the interactive dialogue, international instruments concerning human rights and freedoms, once ratified, prevail over domestic legislation and are directly applied by judges. Should a previous domestic norm be in conflict with an international instrument, the latter always prevails.*

R - 8. To amend its legislation in order to ensure that children are not discriminated against on the grounds of nationality (Brazil);

San Marino is not in a position to accept the recommendation above, since children are not discriminated against on the basis of their nationality;

R - 10. To raise the minimum age for military recruitment under any circumstances to at least 18 years, and to provide for conscientious objection to military service (Slovenia);

R - 11. To raise the minimum age of those subject to military draft to 18 (Austria);

*San Marino response: San Marino is not in a position to accept recommendations Nos. 10, 11 above, as there is neither compulsory*

*military service nor compulsory civil service in the country. Recruitment into the military corps, which is on a strictly voluntary basis, is reserved for citizens older than 18 years of age;*

### **Iran**

92. R - 12. Repeal or amend all discriminatory provisions against women and girls in national legislation (Israel);

R - 14. Ensure that all minorities, and particularly the Baha'i community, can exercise all of their rights free from discrimination and persecution, in conformity with the recommendations of the Human Rights Committee, the Committee on the Rights of the Child and the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing (Mexico);

R - 20. Abolish the death penalty (Luxembourg)/immediately stop executions and abolish the death penalty (Germany)/amend the relevant legislation to abolish capital punishment entirely, in keeping with General Assembly resolutions 62/149 and 63/168, as well as the Second Optional Protocol to ICCPR, and transfer the existing death sentences to imprisonment terms (Slovakia)/consider a moratorium on the death penalty with a view to abolishing it (Brazil)/ introduce a moratorium on the death penalty with a view to its abolition (Italy)/extend the moratorium on the death penalty and abolish the death penalty, especially for juveniles, in keeping with its international commitments (Estonia)/introduce a moratorium on executions as soon as possible (Belgium)/put an end to executions and adopt a moratorium on the death penalty (France)/commute all death sentences, in particular executions of political prisoners, and abolish, in practice, public executions by hanging and stoning (Israel);

R - 21. Immediately halt the execution of juveniles and political prisoners and, furthermore, establish an official moratorium (Canada)/comply with its obligations under article 37 of CRC and article 6 of ICCPR and prohibit executions of persons who, at the time of their offences, were under the age of 18 (Israel)/cease immediately the use of the death penalty, especially for minors and those who committed offences while they were juveniles (New Zealand)/favourably consider alternative sentences for juvenile offenders, and immediately halt executions of all juvenile offenders on death row (Slovenia);

R - 22. Consider the elimination of cruel punishment, including juvenile execution and stoning (Japan);

R - 39. Provide for urgent instructions to all schools to respect freedom of religion or belief and to take specific measures to reprimand any teacher or school administrator who intimidates or discriminates against Baha'i children (Slovenia);

### **Iraq**

83 R - 27. Ensure that Iraq's national legislation guarantees the rights of boys, girls and adolescents and establishes 18 as the age of adulthood, especially regarding penal responsibility (Mexico).

### **Slovenia**

R - 58. To establish specialized tribunals with a view to accelerating trials related to family cases, in which the best interests of children should prevail,

### **Bosnia and Herzegovina**

90. R - 6. To implement the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, and to incorporate it into the criminal justice system (Qatar);

R - 23. To intensify its efforts to progressively implement the recommendations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child, in collaboration with the relevant United Nations agencies (Morocco);

R - 38. To take further activities to improve the situation of women and to secure children's rights (Slovenia);

R - 39. To continue the implementation of comprehensive strategies aimed at the protection of children's rights (Belarus);

R - 41. To intensify efforts to implement the country's international commitments, as well as the corresponding national strategies and plans of action regarding children's rights (Slovakia);



R - 58. To put in place adequate channels for the reporting of child abuse, with a view to criminal persecution, and to provide physical and psychological assistance for the victims of such violence (Brazil);

R - 63. To work on long-term preventive programmes targeting the trafficking of persons, especially women and children (Germany);

R - 64. To continue efforts to prevent internal trafficking and trafficking from the country to other countries, in accordance with the recommendation of the Special Rapporteur on the trafficking in persons, especially women and children (Kazakhstan);

## Session 6

### Eritrea

R - 56. Take all possible measures to prevent the recruitment and torture or cruel and degrading treatment by the police and military of children (Germany);

R - 57. Make means available to give effect to the norm which raises the minimum age for military service and guarantees that minors not be subjected to any treatment that violates fundamental human rights and that they be ensured the right not to do their military service (Argentina);

R - 61. Look to ensure the avoidance of national service conscripts being used as forced labour for private enterprises and to end the recruitment of children under the age of 18 into military service and training (United Kingdom);

R - 62. Curb abuses of Eritrean citizens in the national service programme, pass and enforce a comprehensive anti-trafficking statute, and cease the conscription of children into military services (United States );

R - 63. Take effective measures to eradicate underage recruitment (under 18), to elaborate programmes for protection of children from torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment and to provide independent access to physical and psychological recovery, social reintegration and compensation for victims of armed conflicts (Poland);

R - 64. Make a concerted effort to prevent the use of child soldiers in its recurrent armed conflict (Ghana);

R - 65. Take effective measures to protect all children against torture, cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment as well as investigating and punishing those responsible (Argentina);

### Norway

R - 6. Withdraw reservations to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), within the context of Human Rights Council resolution 9/12(Brazil); consider lifting its reservations in respect of article 10 (2) (b) and (3) of ICCPR (South Africa); reconsider its reservations to ICCPR, especially with regard to article 10(2) (b) and its compatibility with article 37(c) of the Convention of Rights of the Child with regard to the separation of children from adults in detention centres (Spain); withdraw the reservations to ICCPR (Portugal);

R - 13. Work with the Ombudsman for Children and relevant civil society organizations to create programmes to educate law enforcement officials on how to proactively address the problem of adolescents from ethnic minority backgrounds feeling stigmatized by and lacking trust in the police (United States);

R - 19. Strengthen the 2009-2012 action plan put in place by the Government to promote equality and prevent ethnic discrimination against immigrants, their children and national minorities, by supplementary measures to remedy the causes of social disparities of those affected (Algeria);

R - 30. Take necessary measures to separate incarcerated minors from adults (Algeria);

### Albania

R - 1. Prohibit corporal punishment as a method of admonishing children and adolescents (Chile);

R - 2. Prohibit by law the practice of corporal punishment of children as a disciplinary method (Argentina).

*Albania responded to the above, stating:*

*71. With regard to the two recommendations above : "The Albanian legislation provides necessary measures to address domestic violence including violence against children. The Law on Measures against Domestic Violence (article 10) provides a set of protective measures for victims of domestic violence. Domestic violence is included as a penal offence in the Penal Code of the*

*Republic of Albania."*

### **Cote d'Ivoire**

R - 23. Grant investigative competences to the National Committee to combat violence against women and children created in 2000 (Belgium);

### **North Korea**

R - 13. Allow urgently the development of international operations of food distribution in the whole country; put an end to discrimination in the governmental food distribution, prioritizing children, pregnant women, persons with disabilities and senior citizens (Spain);

R - 20. Establish a moratorium on executions with a view to the rapid abolition of the death penalty, and in the immediate future, respect minimum international standards, including the right to a fair trial, the limitation of the death penalty to the most serious crimes, as well as the non application of the death penalty to minors, pregnant women and persons suffering from mental diseases (France);

R - 27. Abolish the practice of torture, cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment, including the collective punishment of families, as reported by the Special Rapporteur, and amend national legislation to prohibit the torture and other ill-treatment of children, as recommended by the Committee on the Rights of the Child; (Israel);

R - 29. End collective punishment of families, especially against children (Slovenia);

R - 30. Abolish military training for children (Slovenia);

R - 32. Create and adopt a law that specifically addresses trafficked persons in the country and abolish all practices of penalizing trafficked women and children for unlawfully exiting the country upon their deportation back to DPRK (Israel);

R - 33. Take immediate action to cease the practice of forced labour, including in detention facilities, and take urgent measures to ensure that children are not forced to participate in mobilization projects (United States);

R - 34. Take effective measures against the practice of forced labour, including child labour and join ILO (Italy);

### **Brunei Darussaleam**

R - 18. Specifically prohibit corporal punishment in institutions (Germany); prohibit corporal punishment in other public institutions and abolish whipping as a form of punishment (Italy); abolish the practice of corporal punishment (France); legally prohibit any form of corporal punishment of children and adolescents (Chile);

### **Ethiopia**

R - 14. Give favourable consideration to prohibit the death penalty and corporal punishment in the Constitution and Ethiopian legislation in the area of the right to life (Mexico);

R - 20. Take effective measures, in line with the Committee on the Rights of the Child, to protect all children from torture, cruel and degrading treatment, particularly from members of the military (Germany);

R - 21. Strengthen the human rights education and training of military forces and police, prison and judicial staff, and ensure their accountability for any violations of human rights, in particular for violence or sexual violence against women, children and persons of minority sexual orientation or gender identity (Czech Republic)

## **Session 5**

### **Belize**

68. 2. Increase the age of criminal responsibility and the minimum age for marriage so that they comply with international standards (Czech Republic); change the legislation to raise the age limit for criminal responsibility to eighteen (Germany);

7. Abolish corporal punishment for children (Germany);

**Chad**

84, 50b R - Paragraph 50 (b) (Slovenia) "Take immediate and adequate measures to ensure that the minimum age for recruitment in military forces is 18, to release underage fighters from its military forces and to facilitate contact between armed groups and the United Nations in order to demobilize and prevent the recruitment of children, particularly the practice of recruitment of children in refugee camps".

R - Paragraph 65 (e) (Spain) "Take immediate actions to establish a minimum age of 18 for recruitment and ensure that those still fighting are demobilized, and take measures to prevent recruitment of minors in refugee camps"

**Congo**

81, R - Paragraph 26 (f) (United States) "Increase efforts to provide care to trafficking victims and end the practice of jailing children found in prostitution and increase efforts to raise awareness among vulnerable populations of the danger of trafficking"

**Malta**

R 30. Introduce an explicit prohibition by law of the recruitment of children under the age of 15 into armed forces or armed groups (Germany);

R 32. Explicitly and entirely prohibit any kind of corporal punishment of children by law, even in cases of so-called "reasonable chastisement" within the family (Italy and Germany); and strengthen measures to prevent and combat child abuse and ill-treatment (Italy);

**Vietnam**

102 R - Paragraph 90 (a) (Poland) "Recommended establishing a permanent independent human rights monitoring body, including child rights monitoring body"

**Yemen**

94 R - 9. Abolish torture and other cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment in all forms, in particular stoning, flogging and the amputation of limbs, and the execution of minors, as recommended by the Human Rights Committee and the relevant special mandate holders, respectively (Israel);

R - 10. Abolish corporal punishments such as flogging and, in a few cases, amputation of limbs, as they are in violation of article 7 of ICCPR. (Nigeria);

**Vanuatu**

R 20- Consider imposing adequate sanctions on parents who fail to send their children to school (Austria);

**Slovakia**

89. R - 9. Adopt a comprehensive legal instrument which recognizes the rights of persons belonging to minority groups, including Roma, and offers the necessary protection, in particular to children, as recommended by the Committee on the Rights of the Child (Cuba);

R - 72. Enact and implement new legislation as well as practical measures to end discriminatory practices against Roma in the education system, in particular provisions of the School Act which lead to Roma children being pushed out of the regular school system and into special educational institutions, thereby perpetuating their segregation (Austria);

R- 75. Develop and implement a strategy to address the disproportionate enrolment of Roma children in comparison with children with disabilities in special schools (New Zealand);

R- 76. Establish practical measures to resolve the issue of Roma children being placed into special schools for disabled children, without clearly defined selection criteria or effective independent complaint mechanisms for parents (Japan);

## Session 4

### Germany

81. 4. Withdraw reservations and declarations to the Convention on the Rights of the Child

### Djibouti

54(b) (Italy): "To conduct national awareness campaigns concerning the prohibition of FGM"

### Canada

86 :R - 9. Within the context of paragraph 1 (a) of resolution 9/12 of the Human Rights Council, entitled "Human Rights Goals", withdraw Canadian reservations to the Convention on the Rights of the Child; particularly regarding the duty to detain children separately from adults (Brazil);

### Azerbaijan

Paragraph 74 (Armenia): "to stop the discriminatory practices against its own citizens, and redress the situation to achieve full protection of human rights for all its citizens, especially children"

### China

117- Paragraph 79(c) (Finland): "To withdraw its reservation to the article 6 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child."

117.Paragraph 84(a) (Argentina): "Recommended analysing the possibility of ratifying human rights instruments which are considered relevant in strengthening its promotion and protection, highlighting: ICCPR, International Convention for the Protection of All Persons Against Enforced Disappearances, and assess the possibility of accepting the competency of the Committee on Enforced Disappearances in accordance with the Convention, and the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children, supplementing the Convention against Transnational Organised Crime".

117. Paragraph 85(b) (Portugal): "To ensure that primary education attains the constitutionally guaranteed universal compulsory status"

### Malaysia

105. 21(f) "To develop and adopt national legislation and practices granting formerly trafficked and exploited women and children remaining in Malaysia immunity from penalties under national immigration laws." (Israel)

## Session 3

### Cape Verde

63. 17. To develop a national strategy for human rights education in the school system at all levels, in accordance with the plan of action 2005-2009 of the World Programme for Human Rights Education, including the review and revision of curricula and textbooks, the training of teachers and the practice of human rights in the school community (Italy);

### United Arab Emirates

93. Paragraph 62(b) (Sweden): "To consider legislative changes to repeal corporal punishment and bring legislation into line with international human rights obligations"

### Barbados

77. 13 (first half) Take appropriate legislative and administrative measures to fight against domestic violence and physical abuse of children, and engage in an exchange of information with those countries that are developing best practices in these fields (Italy);

14.(1st part) Eliminate all forms of corporal punishment from its legislation (Chile);

**Burundi**

81. 3. Develop and implement policies and measures to address inequality between boys and girls in access to education and reported widespread child labour (Slovenia);

**Bahamas**

54. 3. To consider undertaking studies on children involved in the commercial sex industry, factors luring or compelling them to engage in such crimes, and to take appropriate action (Bangladesh);

- 4. To focus more efforts on combating child prostitution and pornography and in aiding its victims in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child (Canada);

- 5. To eliminate corporal punishment from Bahamas legislation in accordance with the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (Chile); to continue, as a matter of priority, efforts to prohibit corporal punishment, of children as well as of adults, and to allocate necessary resources to allow the full implementation of the Convention of the Rights of the Child (Sweden); to put an end to corporal punishment in schools and in the home, and to revise article 1.10 of the Criminal Code (Haiti);

**Botswana**

92. 20. Continue to incorporate the provisions of the Convention on the Rights of the Child into domestic legislation, especially article 19(1), in relation to deep concerns about the corporal punishment of children (Chile); consider changing legislation to expressly prohibit all forms of corporal punishment in all settings (at home, in schools and in other institutions) and conduct awareness-raising efforts to change the public's attitude to corporal punishment (Slovenia); to continue efforts to eliminate corporal punishment (Brazil, Sweden), especially in schools (Sweden); to put an end, de jure and de facto, to the practice of corporal punishments in traditional judicial systems (France);

**Session 2****Ukraine**

59- Paragraph 20 (b). To ensure, in areas of compact residence of linguistic minorities, conditions for the unhindered use of the native language and to receive education in the mother tongue; (Russian Federation)

**Sri Lanka**

84. Paragraph 21 (c) (Canada): R - "To continue to take steps to ensure that those organizations, with which it is affiliated, like the TMVP, stop recruiting child soldiers and release them"

Paragraph 49 (Romania): R - "To investigate the role of security forces in child recruitment and hold those responsible accountable."

**Session 1****Netherlands**

R- 10. Consider withdrawal of reservations with respect to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (Russian Federation)

**United Kingdom**

56. 2 (2nd part)- To put an end to the so-called "painful techniques" applied to children. (Algeria)

25. To withdraw its reservation to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, concerning the provision that detained children be separated from adults while in detention, as well as the reservation concerning refugee and asylum-seeking children. (Indonesia)

## Appendix 4: Number of children's rights recommendations made by UN Member States

<b>State making recommendations</b>	<b>Number of children's rights recommendations made (UPR Sessions 1 – 7)</b>
Slovenia	80
Italy	75
Brazil	57
Algeria	51
Czech Republic	51
Mexico	51
Canada	49
Malaysia	49
Germany	45
Chile	42
Austria	42
France	37
Netherlands	35
Argentina	32
Spain	32
Belarus	31
Azerbaijan	29
United Kingdom	26
Norway	26
Bangladesh	25
Iran	24
Sweden	23
Turkey	23
Angola	20
Cuba	19
Philippines	18
United States	18
Japan	18
Israel	17
Slovakia	17
Ireland	15

<b>State making recommendations</b>	<b>Number of children's rights recommendations made (UPR Sessions 1 – 7)</b>
Finland	15
Luxembourg	15
Switzerland	15
Morocco	14
Portugal	13
Ghana	13
Belgium	13
Holy See	12
Hungary	12
Russia	12
Kazakhstan	11
Australia	11
Egypt	11
South Africa	11
Nigeria	11
New Zealand	11
Saudi Arabia	11
Uruguay	9
Poland	8
Qatar	8
Libya	8
Indonesia	8
Djibouti	7
Ukraine	7
Syria	7
Venezuela	6
Burkina Faso	5
Tunisia	5
Denmark	5
Uzbekistan	4
Jordan	4
DR Congo	4
Sudan	4
Vietnam	4
Botswana	4

<b>State making recommendations</b>	<b>Number of children's rights recommendations made (UPR Sessions 1 – 7)</b>
South Korea	4
Palestinian Territory, Occupied	4
Côte d'Ivoire	4
Bolivia	4
Serbia	3
Mauritius	3
Congo	3
Kyrgyzstan	3
Afghanistan	3
Burundi	3
Yemen	3
Pakistan	3
Bosnia and Herzegovina	3
Colombia	3
Thailand	2
Bahrain	2
Costa Rica	2
Uganda	2
Albania	2
Liechtenstein	2
Greece	2
Romania	2
Kuwait	2
Haiti	2
Niger	2
Estonia	2
Singapore	2
Sri Lanka	2
Lithuania	1
Mauritania	1
Myanmar	1
India	1
North Korea	1
Bahamas	1



---

<b>State making recommendations</b>	<b>Number of children's rights recommendations made (UPR Sessions 1 – 7)</b>
Panama	1
Paraguay	1
Armenia	1
Tanzania	1
Ecuador	1
Honduras	1
Croatia	1
Brunei Darussalem	1
Bulgaria	1
Gabon	1
Senegal	1
Swaziland	1
Ethiopia	1
El Salvador	1
Moldova	1
Bhutan	1

## Appendix 5: Number of times States raise particular issues in the recommendations

Listed below are the nine selected issues with all the States who have made recommendations on each issue (and the number of times they have raised the issue). Next to each of the issues is the total number of recommendations made by all States.

<b>Child labour</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>Children and armed conflict</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>Juvenile justice</b>	<b>135</b>
Brazil	7	Slovenia	11	Czech Republic	17
Italy	6	Spain	7	Slovenia	11
Slovakia	5	Austria	7	Brazil	8
Germany	4	Canada	6	Austria	7
Chile	4	Argentina	4	Italy	7
France	3	Mexico	4	Germany	7
Slovenia	3	France	4	Mexico	6
Netherlands	3	United States	4	France	5
United States	3	Malaysia	3	Canada	5
Azerbaijan	2	United Kingdom	3	Israel	4
Finland	2	Chile	3	Spain	3
Canada	2	Italy	3	New Zealand	3
Switzerland	2	Azerbaijan	3	Algeria	3
DR Congo	2	Belgium	3	Hungary	3
Malaysia	2	Germany	3	Malaysia	3
Belarus	2	Hungary	2	Slovakia	2
Turkey	2	Romania	2	Azerbaijan	2
Côte d'Ivoire	1	Luxembourg	2	Argentina	2
United Kingdom	1	Turkey	2	Sweden	2
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1	Sweden	2	Indonesia	2
South Korea	1	Holy See	1	Belarus	2
Czech Republic	1	Ireland	1	Belgium	2
Luxembourg	1	Serbia	1	Portugal	2
Syria	1	Israel	1	Chile	2
Congo	1	Gabon	1	Kazakhstan	2
Costa Rica	1	Slovakia	1	South Africa	2
Russia	1	Japan	1	Japan	2
Spain	1	Czech Republic	1	Estonia	2
Algeria	1	Djibouti	1	Mauritius	1
Ireland	1	Switzerland	1	Ghana	1
Australia	1	New Zealand	1	United Kingdom	1
Portugal	1	Panama	1	Switzerland	1
Uzbekistan	1	Australia	1	Philippines	1
		Mauritius	1	Botswana	1
		Uruguay	1	Afghanistan	1
		Russia	1	Poland	1
		Bulgaria	1	Australia	1
		Nigeria	1	Ireland	1
		Morocco	1	Qatar	1
		Colombia	1	Cuba	1

<b>Child labour</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>Children and armed conflict</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>Juvenile justice</b>	<b>135</b>
		Brazil	1	Finland	1
				Iran	1
				Netherlands	1
				Kyrgyzstan	1
				Denmark	1
<b>Child trafficking</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>Corporal punishment</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>Ethnic minorities</b>	<b>72</b>
Malaysia	10	Chile	10	Canada	6
Belarus	7	Slovenia	9	Mexico	5
Canada	6	Italy	8	Algeria	4
Germany	5	Germany	7	Malaysia	3
Argentina	4	Sweden	7	Netherlands	3
Israel	4	France	6	Czech Republic	3
Iran	4	Argentina	3	Japan	3
Philippines	3	Austria	3	Cuba	2
Angola	3	Brazil	3	Finland	2
Slovenia	3	Norway	2	Brazil	2
Bangladesh	3	Spain	2	New Zealand	2
Mexico	3	Mexico	2	Russia	2
United States	3	Turkey	1	United States	2
France	3	Azerbaijan	1	Ghana	2
Brazil	3	Israel	1	Slovenia	2
Netherlands	3	Nigeria	1	Bangladesh	2
Egypt	3	Bangladesh	1	Saudi Arabia	1
Slovakia	2	Russia	1	Israel	1
Italy	2	Haiti	1	Sweden	1
Belgium	2	Finland	1	Nigeria	1
Kazakhstan	1	Hungary	1	Iran	1
Poland	1	Swaziland	1	South Korea	1
Pakistan	1			Uruguay	1
Morocco	1			Kazakhstan	1
Palestine	1			Austria	1
Saudi Arabia	1			Switzerland	1
Norway	1			Sri Lanka	1
Spain	1			Azerbaijan	1
Czech Republic	1			Morocco	1
Sudan	1			Italy	1
Cuba	1			Philippines	1
Croatia	1			Denmark	1
Finland	1			Norway	1
Chile	1			South Africa	1
Djibouti	1			Luxembourg	1
Uganda	1			Indonesia	1
DR Congo	1			Albania	1
Ukraine	1			Ukraine	1
United Kingdom	1			Ecuador	1

<b>Child trafficking</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>Corporal punishment</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>Ethnic minorities</b>	<b>72</b>
Bahamas	1			Indonesia	1
Australia	1			Germany	1
Ghana	1			Palestine	1
Vietnam	1			Jordan	1
Hungary	1				
Algeria	1				
Turkey	1				

<b>Education</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>Health</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>Violence</b>	<b>306</b>
Algeria	25	Brazil	5	Italy	19
Italy	18	Bangladesh	4	Slovenia	19
Bangladesh	13	United Kingdom	3	Malaysia	15
Angola	9	Philippines	3	Canada	13
Slovenia	8	Netherlands	3	Argentina	13
Saudi Arabia	7	Germany	3	Mexico	12
Cuba	7	Chile	2	Brazil	12
Azerbaijan	6	Slovenia	2	Norway	11
Iran	6	Iran	2	Sweden	10
Philippines	6	Tunisia	2	Germany	10
Egypt	5	Ireland	2	Austria	9
Turkey	5	Malaysia	2	France	9
Malaysia	5	Honduras	1	Netherlands	9
Portugal	5	Azerbaijan	1	Azerbaijan	7
Libya	5	New Zealand	1	Spain	7
Holy See	5	Czech Republic	1	Czech Republic	7
Finland	5	Libya	1	Ireland	6
Canada	5	Holy See	1	United Kingdom	6
Belarus	4	Algeria	1	Luxembourg	6
Czech Republic	4	Portugal	1	Angola	6
Venezuela	4	Syria	1	Algeria	6
Austria	4	Thailand	1	Turkey	6
Morocco	4	Belgium	1	Iran	5
Mexico	4	Vietnam	1	Chile	5
Norway	4	Colombia	1	Japan	5
Netherlands	4	Botswana	1	Belarus	5
France	3	Canada	1	Switzerland	4
Spain	3	Saudi Arabia	1	Nigeria	4
Ghana	3	India	1	Ghana	4
Chile	3	Uruguay	1	Slovakia	4
Germany	3	Italy	1	Portugal	3
Uruguay	3	Djibouti	1	Russia	3
Bolivia	2	Ghana	1	Ukraine	2
Ireland	2	Morocco	1	Côte d'Ivoire	2
Burundi	2	Argentina	1	Denmark	2
Qatar	2	Switzerland	1	Qatar	2
Syria	2	Indonesia	1	Bangladesh	2
Indonesia	2			New Zealand	2

<b>Education</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>Health</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>Violence</b>	<b>306</b>
Sudan	2			Holy See	2
Hungary	2			Philippines	2
Kazakhstan	2			Israel	2
Brazil	2			Belgium	2
United States	2			Senegal	1
Tunisia	2			Albania	1
Yemen	2			Burundi	1
Kuwait	2			Egypt	1
Japan	2			Greece	1
New Zealand	2			Kyrgyzstan	1
Jordan	2			South Africa	1
Mauritius	1			Australia	1
Tanzania	1			Hungary	1
Mauritania	1			Burkina Faso	1
Argentina	1			Syria	1
Australia	1			Niger	1
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1			Bolivia	1
Greece	1			Indonesia	1
United Kingdom	1			Colombia	1
Pakistan	1			Costa Rica	1
South Africa	1			Jordan	1
Haiti	1			South Korea	1
Côte d'Ivoire	1			Lichtenstein	1
Belgium	1			Finland	1
Myanmar	1			Bahrain	1
Nigeria	1				
Djibouti	1				
Switzerland	1				
El Salvador	1				
Ethiopia	1				
Bhutan	1				
Burkina Faso	1				
Singapore	1				
Palestine	1				
Russia	1				
Luxembourg	1				
Ukraine	1				
Israel	1				
Sweden	1				

## Appendix 6: Children's rights organisations who have submitted reports

SESSION / STATE REVIEW	NGOs (Individual Submission)	NGOs (Joint Submission)	OTHERS REPORTING
<b>Session 8</b>			
<b>Kyrgyzstan</b>	The Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment against Children (GIEACPC) Save the Children, Sweden	<i>Coalition of NGOs:</i> NGO Network for Children	
<b>Sweden</b>	Save the Children, Sweden		UNICEF
			The Office of the Children's Ombudsman, Sweden
<b>Belarus</b>	Belarusian Association of Assistance to Children and Young People with Disabilities, Belarus Republican Public Association “Belarusian Children's Fund”, Belarus Municipal Public Association on the Prevention of		

SESSION / STATE REVIEW	NGOs (Individual Submission)	NGOs (Joint Submission)	OTHERS REPORTING
	Children's Cruel Treatment "Children not for Violence", Belarus		
<b>Session 7</b>			
<b>Nicaragua</b>	GIEACPC	<i>Coalition: CODENI</i> Nicaraguan Federation of NGOs Working with Children and Adolescents, Managua; Nicaragua	
<b>Italy</b>	GIEACPC	<i>Coalition: Comitato per la promozione e protezione dei diritti umani (CPPDU)</i> Save the Children, Italy Centro Italiano Aiuti all'Infanzia (CIAI)* Gruppo di Lavoro per la Convenzione sui Diritti dell'Infanzia e dell'Adolescenza*	UNICEF
<b>Bolivia</b>	GIEACPC	<i>Coalition: Coalición Boliviana de organizaciones no gubernamentales y sin fines de lucro que trabajan en la temática de derechos de la niñez</i> Plan International Aldeas Infantiles SOS	

<b>SESSION / STATE REVIEW</b>	<b>NGOs (Individual Submission)</b>	<b>NGOs (Joint Submission)</b>	<b>OTHERS REPORTING</b>
<b>Fiji</b>	GIEACPC		
	Save the Children, Fiji		
<b>Iran</b>	Committee of the Rights of the Child of the Isfahan		
	Lawyers' Association Iran		
	GIEACPC		
	Stop Child Executions, Iran		
<b>Iraq</b>	Iraqi Child Rights Network		
<b>Egypt</b>	GIEACPC	<i>Coalition of NGOs:</i>	
		Egyptian Foundation for the advancement of childhood conditions	
		AACM – The Abanos Association for childhood and motherhood	
		The Egyptian Institution to Develop Childhood Status	
<b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>	GIEACPC	<i>Coalition: Bosnia and Herzegovina Working Group on Child Protection</i>	
		Hopes and Homes for Children Bosnia and Herzegovina	
		Save the Children, Norway	



SESSION / STATE REVIEW	NGOs (Individual Submission)	NGOs (Joint Submission)	OTHERS REPORTING
		Save the Children UK	
		SOS	
		World Vision	
<b>Session 6</b>			
<b>Norway</b>	The Norwegian Forum on the Rights of the Child, Norway Norwegian ombudsman for children	<i>Coalition: The Norwegian NGO-Forum for Human Rights (NNGOFHR)</i> Save the Children Norway	
<b>Albania</b>	GIEACPC	<i>Coalition: The Albanian Coalition 'All together against child trafficking' (ATACT)</i> BKTF Albania SOS Villages	
<b>Session 5</b>			
<b>New Zealand</b>		<i>Coalition of NGOs:</i> Action for Children and Youth Aotearoa	

SESSION / STATE REVIEW	NGOs (Individual Submission)	NGOs (Joint Submission)	OTHERS REPORTING
<b>Vanuatu</b>	GIEACPC Youth Challenge International, Vanuatu		
<b>Macedonia</b>		<i>Coalition: Macedonia Without Discrimination (MWD)</i> First Children's Embassy in the World, Macedonia (MEGJASHI)	
<b>Session 4</b>			
<b>Germany</b>	League for Children's Rights, Germany	<i>Coalition: Child Rights, Duisburg, Germany</i> AFET – Federal Association of Child Rearing Support Children's Charity of Germany European Master in Children's Rights Federal Association of Unaccompanied Minor Refugees German Association for children in hospital German Children's Aid Kindernothilfe Working Group for refugee children within centres for refugees	

<b>SESSION / STATE REVIEW</b>	<b>NGOs (Individual Submission)</b>	<b>NGOs (Joint Submission)</b>	<b>OTHERS REPORTING</b>
<b>Canada</b>	Canada Coalition for the Rights of Children	<i>Coalition: British Columbia UPR Coalition 2008</i>	
		Coalition of Child Care Advocates of BC	
		Justice for Girls	
		<i>Coalition: FAFIA</i>	
		Child Care Advocacy Association of Canada	
		Childcare Resource and Research Unit	
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	SOS Children's Villages, Azerbaijan Association		
<b>China</b>		<i>Coalition: Beijing Children's Legal Aid and Research Centre</i>	
		Beijing Children's Legal Aid and Research Center	
		Child Protection Legal Affairs committee of Beijing Lawyers	
		Child Protection Committees of the Anhui Lawyers	
		Youth working Committee of Shanxi Lawyers Association	
		Shanxi Child legal Aid	
<b>Mauritius</b>	SAFIRE - Service d'accompagnement, de formation, d'intégration et de réhabilitation de l'enfant		

SESSION / STATE REVIEW	NGOs (Individual Submission)	NGOs (Joint Submission)	OTHERS REPORTING
<b>Malaysia</b>		<i>Coalition: Coalition of Malaysian NGOs in the UPR Process (COMANGO)</i>	
		Protect and Save the Children	
		<i>Coalition: Migration Working Group and the Northern Network for Migrants and Refugees (MWG and JUMP)</i>	
		Shelter Home for Children	
		Pusat Jagaan Kanak Kanak NurSalam*	
<b>Session 3</b>			
<b>Burundi</b>	GIEACPC	<i>Coalition of NGOs:</i>	
	Observatoire INEZA pour les Droits de l'Enfant au Burundi (OIDEB)		
<b>Israel</b>	CRIN	<i>Coalition of NGOs:</i>	
	Defence for Children International – Palestine Section	Save the Children Sweden	
	The Right to Education Campaign, West Bank Palestine	Save the Children UK World Vision	

SESSION / STATE REVIEW	NGOs (Individual Submission)	NGOs (Joint Submission)	OTHERS REPORTING
<b>Colombia</b>	GIEACPC	<i>Coalition of NGOS:</i> Plan International Colombia Aldeas SAS Colombia Save the Children, Reino Unido Observatorio sobre Infancia de la Universidad Nacional de Colombia World Vision	
<b>Session 2</b>			
<b>Switzerland</b>	Defence for Children International, Switzerland		
<b>Zambia</b>	GIEACPC	<i>Coalition : Child Rights Organisations</i> Children in Need Network (CHIN) Zambia Civic Education Association Plan International Save the Children, Norway Save the Children, Sweden Child Care and Adoption Society of Zambia Mulumbo Early Childhood Care and Development (MECCDF) Christian Children's Fund (CC)	

SESSION / STATE REVIEW	NGOs (Individual Submission)	NGOs (Joint Submission)	OTHERS REPORTING
		African Network for the Prevention and Protection of Children Abuse and Neglect (ANPPCAN)	
		Zambia National Education Coalition (ZANEC)	
<b>Japan</b>	GIEACPC	<i>Coalition: Japan International Human Rights NGO Network</i>	
		Action for the Rights of Children (ARC)	
		Association for the support of children out of wedlock (ASCW), Japan	
<b>Sri Lanka</b>	GIEACPC		
	SLCSWG – Sri Lankan Civil Society working group on child recruitment		
<b>France</b>	DEI Défense des Enfants International		
	GIEACPC		
<b>Romania</b>	Save the Children, Romania		
	SOS Children's Villages, Romania		
<b>Session 1</b>			

<b>SESSION / STATE REVIEW</b>	<b>NGOs (Individual Submission)</b>	<b>NGOs (Joint Submission)</b>	<b>OTHERS REPORTING</b>
<b>Tunisia</b>	Association Tunisienne des Droits de l'Enfant GIEACPC		
<b>Morocco</b>	National Association of Centres for Defence of Child Rights (ANCED) GIEACPC		
<b>UK</b>	Child Rights Alliance for England (CRAE) Commission on Families and the wellbeing of children (CFWC) GIEACPC NSPCC Save the Children UK		
<b>India</b>	GIEACPC Youth Coalition for Sexual and Reproductive Rights		
<b>Netherlands</b>	GIEACPC	<i>Coalition of NGOS:</i> Defence for Children International, Nederland	
<b>South Africa</b>	GIEACPC Children Now, Alliance of South African NGOs		

---

<b>SESSION / STATE REVIEW</b>	<b>NGOs (Individual Submission)</b>	<b>NGOs (Joint Submission)</b>	<b>OTHERS REPORTING</b>
<b>Argentina</b>	Colectivo de Derechos de Infancia y Adolescencia GIEACPC		

---



## Appendix 7: Index of website links

Hyperlinks to the various sources mentioned in this report are included throughout. The links have also been listed below for those reading a hard copy version of this report.

### 1. *Child Rights Information Network (CRIN)*: [www.crin.org](http://www.crin.org)

- UPR homepage  
<http://www.crin.org/resources/infoDetail.asp?ID=22015&flag=report>
- CRIN's children's rights reference reports  
<http://www.crin.org/resources/infoDetail.asp?ID=22015&flag=report#ww>
- Example of CRIN's reports: Iran  
<http://www.crin.org/resources/infoDetail.asp?ID=22004&flag=report>
- Example of CRIN's reports: Norway  
<http://www.crin.org/resources/infoDetail.asp?ID=21836&flag=report>
- Special Procedures page  
<http://www.crin.org/resources/infoDetail.asp?ID=21669&flag=event>
- Regional Mechanisms page  
<http://www.crin.org/resources/infoDetail.asp?ID=18055&flag=report>
- Ombudspersons / National Human Rights Institutions page  
<http://www.crin.org/resources/infoDetail.asp?ID=18060&flag=report>  
<http://www.crin.org/enoc/network/index.asp>
- Human Rights Council page  
<http://www.crin.org/resources/infoDetail.asp?ID=18042&flag=report>
- Human Rights Council Review 2011  
<http://www.crin.org/resources/infodetail.asp?id=23468>

### 2. *The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)*: [www.ohchr.org](http://www.ohchr.org)

- UN Resolution 60/251  
<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/BackgroundDocuments.aspx>
- UPR first cycle timetable  
<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/UPRSessions.aspx>
- Original reports  
<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/Documentation.aspx>
- NGO report guidelines for the UPR  
<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/NgosNhris.aspx>

- State report guidelines  
<http://www.upr-info.org/-Countries-.html>
- UPR webcast archive  
<http://www.un.org/webcast/unhrc/index.asp>
- Oral statement registration  
<http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/ngo.htm>
- Mid-term report page (including Netherlands report)  
<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/UPRImplementation.aspx>
- List of troikas  
<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/UPRSessions.aspx>
- How to apply for ECOSOC status  
<http://esango.un.org/paperless/Web?page=static&content=intro>
- NGO reporting guidelines for the CRC  
<http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/crc/index.htm>

### **3. UPR-info.org:** [www.upr-info.org](http://www.upr-info.org)

- UPR-info.org's recommendations criteria document  
<http://www.upr-info.org/-Recommendations-.html>
- List of NGO report submissions  
<http://www.upr-info.org/NGO-submissions.html>
- List of oral statements made in the Plenary Session  
<http://www.upr-info.org/NGO-plenary-statements.html>

### **4. Other information sources:**

- International Service for Human Rights (ISHR) analysis archive of past reviews  
<http://www.ishr.ch/archive-upr>
- Guidelines by the NGO Group Working Group for the Human Rights Council (A more up to date and user friendly version is currently being drafted)  
[http://www.crin.org/docs/UPRtoolkit\\_summary.pdf](http://www.crin.org/docs/UPRtoolkit_summary.pdf)