

Northwest Model United Nations – Portland 2019 Human Rights Council - Universal Periodic Review (HRC-UPR) - Explanatory Note

What is the Human Rights Council - Universal Periodic Review?

The Universal Periodic Review is a process in which the human rights record of all UN Member States is reviewed. The Human Rights Council reviews 42 states per year, leading to each and every UN Member State being reviewed roughly once every five years. This process and its universality are designed to avoid both bias and the perception of bias in the Human Rights Council's work, and ensure that in addition to regular thematic debates at the Council level, there is a State-by-State focus to the Council's work as well. Philosophically, the Universal Periodic Review process also demonstrates that human rights is aspirational, and that all states have opportunities for future progress in this area. This Explanatory Note outlines the process for the HRC-UPR at NWMUN-Portland 2019.

Position Paper Process

Committee Members (delegates) submit their questions in advance to the State under Review (SuR) through the position paper process. Advanced questions from Member States will be posted on the NWMUN website for review and consideration by the Committee. States under Review, regardless of if they are also HRC members, will submit their National Reports through the position paper process; these national reports will also be available on the NWMUN website.

Committee Process

The order of reviews may be revised up to the beginning of committee session on Saturday. We are using the order listed in the Background Guide below as an example.

Session 1 (Saturday 3:00 PM - 5:30 PM): Interactive Dialogue and Responses by Bhutan

Session 2 (Saturday 7:00 PM - 9:45 PM): Draft recommendations for Bhutan

Session 3 (Sunday 9:00 AM - 12:00 PM): Finalize draft recommendations for Bhutan by 9:30 AM; Interactive Dialogue and Responses by Norway

Session 4 (Sunday 1:15 PM - 4:15 PM): Draft recommendations for Norway

Session 5 (Sunday 4:45 PM - 7:30 PM): Interactive Dialogue and Responses by Yemen

Session 6 (Monday 9:00 AM - 12:00 PM): Draft recommendations for Yemen

Session 7 (Monday 1:00 PM - 3:00 PM): Adoption of Outcome Document

Interactive Dialogue and Responses by the SuR

The interactive dialogue and responses is an opportunity for Committee Members to ask the SuR questions regarding their human rights and to seek further clarification regarding issues.

- The Dais will open the session and the SuR currently under consideration will be allotted 10 minutes to present on their human rights record.
- The Dais will open the Speakers List – a new speakers list is created at the start of each Interactive Dialogue.
- Delegates from the Speakers List may comment on the human rights situation in the SuR and also pose questions they have submitted in advance through the position paper process or any further questions that result from the debate. They may also suggest or discuss recommendations for later inclusion in working papers.

- Any State may add themselves to the Speakers List, which will normally proceed in the order states were added; However, the Dais may recognize the SuR at any point (if they are on the Speakers List) to respond to questions and comments by Committee Members.
- While most delegates are not permitted to have their technology open during formal session, the current SuR will be permitted to use technology during their 10-minute speech and the interactive dialogue.

Working Papers and Draft Reports

Recommendations adopted by the UPR will be considered in the form of Draft Report Segments, compiled from Draft Recommendations considered by the body. At the beginning of the process, Member States may create Working Papers consisting of one or more recommendations, with one or more sponsors.

Recommendations should be written in the format of an operative clause, with no pre-ambulatory clauses. This is a list of operative phrases appropriate for recommendations:

<i>Advises</i>	<i>Further recommends</i>	<i>Repeats</i>
<i>Calls</i>	<i>Further requests</i>	<i>Requests</i>
<i>Calls for</i>	<i>Instructs</i>	<i>Strongly advises</i>
<i>Calls upon</i>	<i>Invites</i>	<i>Strongly encourages</i>
<i>Encourages</i>	<i>Recommends</i>	<i>Suggests</i>
<i>Expresses its hope</i>	<i>Reiterates</i>	<i>Urges</i>
<i>Further invites</i>	<i>Renews its appeal</i>	

The State under Review may, when reviewing each working paper, choose to designate each recommendation as one they would *support*, one they would *consider*, or one they would *oppose* (sometimes this is referred to as “not enjoying support” or “noting”). The Sponsors of the working paper will then sort the recommendations into three corresponding sections within their working paper based on the SuR’s response.

The State under Review can only state its position on each recommendation at the working paper stage, and may not change its support unless the recommendation text is later amended. All other states who support the recommendations may serve as signatories. The clauses in a Working Paper require 20% of the body’s membership as a sponsor or signatory to become a Draft Recommendation. When the Working Paper is accepted by the dais, its clauses become Draft Recommendations, and are further sorted by the committee’s staff into one of three Draft Report Segments for each State under Review.

- The first Draft Report Segment consists of recommendations which the State under Review supports;
- The second Draft Report Segment consists of recommendations which the State under Review wishes to review and consider;
- The third Draft Report Segment consists of recommendations which the State under Review does not support.

All three Draft Report Segments will be voted upon, meaning that all Draft Recommendations approved by the dais and supported by 20% of the body's membership receive a vote regardless of the State under Review's opinion.

Working Papers and their component parts (Draft Recommendations) will be reviewed and ideally approved by the dais during the six sessions when States are reviewed by the Human Rights Council. By the seventh session, each of the Draft Recommendations will have been sorted by the committee staff into their respective Draft Report Segment.

Voting Process

During the seventh session of the Human Rights Council, the body will consider its nine Draft Report Segments (three segments for each of the three States under Review, with each SuR having a segment consisting of recommendations they support, a segment consisting of recommendations they will consider, and a segment consisting of recommendations they do not support). The seventh session will allow for amendments to draft report segments to be drafted and submitted by states. Amendments will require 20% of the body's membership as sponsors or signatories. If the amendment proposal is accepted by the dais, the committee staff shall (before voting commences) also obtain from the State under Review whether or not the amendment's potential adoption shall change whether the SuR wishes to support, consider, or oppose the Draft Recommendation.

The voting process, coming towards the conclusion of the seventh session, is as follows:

1. Individual consideration of amendments to the Draft Report Segments on the review of Bhutan by the Council (with a majority vote required to adopt an amendment);
2. Committee staff announces which recommendations to Bhutan, of those just amended, are now moved between the Draft Report Segments (based on the SuR's previous indication of whether or not the amendment would cause them to change their level of support, consideration, or non-support for the recommendation);
3. Vote on the Draft Report for Bhutan, consisting of all three Draft Report Segments, as a whole, with a two-thirds majority required to adopt;
- 4-6. Repeat steps 1-3 for Norway;
- 7-9. Repeat steps 1-3 for Yemen.

