



**25<sup>th</sup> Session of the UN Human Rights Council  
Item 6 of the Agenda: General Debate  
March 21, 2013**

**Joint Oral Statement**

**Submitted by**

**IIMA – Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice**

**and co-signed by**

**Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII**

**Compagnie des Filles de la Charité de St Vincent de Paul**

**Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd**

**Dominicans for Justice and Peace (Order of Preachers)**

**Edmund Rice International**

**Franciscans International**

**Good Neighbors International**

**International Catholic Child Bureau**

**International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education, Development**

**Marist International Solidarity Foundation**

**Mouvement International d'Apostolat des Milieux Sociaux Indépendants**

**Office Internationale de l'Enseignement Catholique**

## **Thank you Mister President,**

IIMA, on behalf of a coalition of 13 NGOs, welcomes the commitment of States to the UPR process in compliance with relevant core documents of GA resolution 60/251 (2006) and HRC resolution 5/1 (2007).

While we recognize the progress made by States in ensuring the effective functioning of this mechanism, we express our concern for the lack of **follow up on recommendations** issued in the previous UPR cycles and we stress the need for a more systematic evaluation on the status of implementation of such recommendations.

Therefore, we would like to emphasize, among the new challenges raised by the second UPR cycle, the importance of maintaining **consistency** and **continuity** between the dialogue and implementation of recommendations made in subsequent reviews.

In fact, we consider that specifically addressing past recommendations and continuing to monitor their progress during succeeding cycles would allow for new recommendations to be made consistently and in a continuous context. As HRC resolution 16/21 states, “subsequent cycles of the review should focus on, *inter alia*, the implementation of the accepted recommendations and the developments of the human rights situation in the State under review.”<sup>1</sup>

In order to do so, an effort must be made to ensure a systematic approach to reviewing past recommendations and ensuring that they are taken into account in subsequent recommendations. The improvement of the human rights situation in States under review cannot be truly achieved if measures undertaken by States are not systematically assessed in the light of previous commitments made through the acceptance of relevant recommendations.

Mister President, the UPR is a cyclical mechanism which is meant to build upon the achievements realized in past years, identifying persistent issues as well as new challenges in the implementation of human rights. This concrete and progressive approach is the guarantee of its success as well as the pre-condition for Civil Society participation in the process. Therefore, in order to ensure continuity and consistency between UPR review cycles, we suggest the Human Rights Council to have a dialogue with Member States to ensure the implementation of past recommendations in a transparent manner.

## **Thank you Mister President.**

---

<sup>1</sup> HRC Res. 16/21, Annex, § 6.