**Regional Dialogue on
National Mechanisms for
Reporting and Follow-up
29 - 30 August 2019**
Bangkok, Thailand

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The establishment and enhancement of National Mechanisms for Reporting and Follow-up (NMRFs) include a key component of building national capacities, in particular to enable States to facilitate and track implementation of its recommendations from the United Nations Human Rights Mechanisms (UNHRMs), to build a national framework for reporting and follow-up, and to stimulate national dialogue through meaningful participation of all stakeholders.

In South-East Asia, however, presence of a standing NMRF is limited. Therefore, a regional dialogue to exchange ideas on challenges and best practices on human rights reporting and follow-up was deemed helpful to raise awareness and build the capacity of relevant officials. Fiji hosted the Regional High-Level Dialogue on Building an international human rights implementation of National Mechanisms for Implementation, Reporting and Follow-Up (NMIRFs) on 11-12 April 2019 in Nadi, Fiji.

In this context, Thailand and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) Regional Office for the South-East Asia (OHCHR SEARO) jointly organized the Regional Dialogue on NMRFs on 29-30 August 2019 in Bangkok, Thailand, with the objective of strengthening States' capacities to implement their human rights treaty obligations.

The first day of the Dialogue was dedicated to the keynote speech by Prof. Emeritus Vitit Muntarbhorn (session 1), a general introduction to NMRFs (session 2), experiences from the region on engagement capacity (session 3), coordination, consultation and information management capacity (session 4) and lastly a session on enhancing the consultation capacity (session 5).

The second day of the Dialogue was dedicated to another session of sharing country experiences (session 6), a closing speech by the OHCHR Regional Representative Ms. Cynthia Veliko, followed by a session which dived deeper into the coordination and consultation capacity of NMRFs (session 7) and the development of sample terms of reference for an NMRF (session 8). As an alternative to the last two sessions, participants were free to attend a study visit to the Thai Court of Justice organized by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Thailand.

METHODOLOGY

The Dialogue was structured around:

1. Knowledge exchanges on NMRFs through panel discussions; and
2. Break-out groups.

Panel discussions allowed government officials in charge of the implementation of human rights recommendations and of reporting and engaging with international human rights mechanisms to learn from regional situations and share practices, benefits and available tools to strengthen or establish NMRFs in their respective countries, which included the introduction of the National Recommendations Tracking Database. The work in groups aimed to equip the partipants with better understanding of the key components and functions of NMRFs. The Dialogue featured international experts on UNHRMs and government representatives from NMRFs as speakers.

DIALOGUE OBJECTIVES

The primary objectives of the dialogue were to bring together government officials who are members of NMRFs or in charge of the engagement with the UNHRMs, representatives of governments in Asia with existing NMRFs and active engagement with the UNHRMs and international experts in order to:

- Explore and promote the establishment of a standing NMRF for more effective reporting and follow-up on the recommendations from the UNHRMs (Treaty Bodies, Universal Periodic Review, Special Procedures) by Member States in Asia; and
- Enhance the capacity of government officers in engaging with the UNHRMs, particularly through the strengthening of their capacities on reporting, monitoring and implementing recommendations from the UNHRMs.

THE DIALOGUE IN DETAIL

THURSDAY 29 AUGUST

1. OPENING REMARKS

> ❖ MRS. KANCHANA PATARACHOKE (Director-General, Department of International Organizations of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Thailand)

Mrs. Kanchana opened the Dialogue by stressing the importance of human rights reporting for the effective implementation of recommendations. NMRFs can assist states in implementing and tracking their human rights obligtaions. Mrs. Kanchana expressed the hope that human rights reporting could be improved by sharing knowledge and collaboration at the regional and global levels.

> ❖ MR. ADAM ABDELMOULA (Director, Human Rights Council and Treaty Mechanisms Division, OHCHR) (video message)

"Excellencies,
Ladies and gentlemen,
Distinguished guests,

On behalf of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, I am pleased to welcome you all at this important Regional Dialogue on National Mechanisms for Reporting and Follow-up for Asia.

To share knowledge and exchange practices on human rights reporting, implementation and follow-up becomes good tradition in many parts of the world, and Asia is one example. In April this year, Fiji hosted a successful Regional High-Level Dialogue on the establishment and enhancement of NMRFs. The event featured active discussions not only the four key capacities of NMRFs but also its linkage with the 2030 agenda for Sustainable Development and available international support for its strengthening.

I would like to express my great appreciation to the partnership with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Thailand, with special thanks to Her Excellency Kanchana Patarachoke, Director-General of the Department of International Organizations. During the coming two days, you will have an opportunity to exchange practices, challenges and new ideas on improving human rights reporting and follow-up frameworks among representatives of states from South-East Asia, South-Asia, North-East Asia and the Pacific.

The UN human rights mechanisms such as Treaty Bodies, Special Procedures and the Universal Periodic Review constitute a fundamental pillar of the international human rights protection system. Their effective functioning is vital for the full and effective implementation of international human rights instruments. In other words, it is crucial for

the achievement of the UN's major goal - promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Those of you whose countries have already undergone the Third Universal Periodic Review might have noticed a letter, which is sent from the High Commissioner after each review. This letter, addressed to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of a state under review, identifies priority areas for implementation of UPR recommendations for the following 4.5 years. This is done to facilitate effective follow-up and to encourage an action-oriented approach to implementing. One of the issues the High Commissioner is generally pointing out is establishing or strengthening NMRFs in the country. This point is often echoed by recommendations States receive following the constructive dialogues with UN Treaty Bodies.

It goes without saying that timely reporting to international human rights mechanisms and effective follow-up to recommendations benefit States. It is because it leads to the stronger national human rights protection system. Bringing international human rights norms and standards to the national level allows voices of victims of human rights violations to be heard and adequate response to be provided in a timely manner.

At the same time, the challenge that many UN Member States have in living up to their multiple reporting obligations is recognized. As one of the outcomes of the Treaty Bodies' strengthening process, the General Assembly in its resolution 68/268 of April 2014, recognized this difficulty and the benefits of having improved capacity and coordination at the national level. As a result, the Capacity Building Program was established with the mandate to work with countries to give them advice, technical help and other capacity building support, at the request of State parties, based on existing best practices.

Since the outset in 2015, the Treaty Body and Capacity Building Program has been continuing providing technical assistance to the Member States through producing training tools and guidelines, enhancing knowledge and skills of the Government officials on cooperation with UN human rights mechanisms and implementation of their recommendations and its linkages with the 2030 Agenda, including through adoption of national implementation action plans, as well provided assistance in establishing or strengthening of the National Mechanisms for Reporting and Follow-up. The strengthened partnership as the one we have with the government of Thailand for this event through the Treaty Body Capacity Building Program is a notable step forward for the implementation of the human rights recommendations in Asia region.

There will be negotiations on the 2020 Treaty Body Reform in New York next year. OHCHR will seek support from Governments with advocacy for a strong human rights mechanisms system, especially for the treaty bodies. Recognition by the governments for the benefits of technical cooperation offered by OHCHR to strengthen their engagement with human rights mechanisms and recommendations implementation would be appreciated.

I put tremendous faith that this event will become a platform for peer-to-peer learning, enriching discussions and know-how solutions to common challenges with regards to States' human rights obligations and their implementation. These exchanges will allow us

to learn not only from each other's achievements but also from lessons. I hope that the event will contribute for you to advance further on our common pathway towards promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

I wish you a fruitful work. Thank you."

2. SESSION 1: KEYNOTE SPEECH

❖ PROF. Emeritus VITIT MUNTARBHORN (CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY)

Prof. Emeritus Vitit opened his keynote speech by providing a brief **overview of the international human right's legal framework and mechanisms**. Reflecting on his own experiences as former Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Special Rapporteur of the UN Commission on Human Rights on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography, and Independent Expert on violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity, he stressed the need to learn from the past, listen to the present and leverage for the future. On the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the ILO, he drew on experiences from reporting under ILO Conventions and their relevance to human rights reporting.

Advocating for a **holistic approach** to human rights (i.e. implementing recommendations from the UPR, Special Procedures and Treaty Bodies), he put forward 10 entry points to be observed in order to effectively implement human rights at the national level. According to Prof. Emeritus Vitit, key points to evoke change are the adoption of good laws, policies, programmes, and practices, the provison of relevant resources (including political will), having good data collection and monitoring, education and capacity development, the provison of remedies and accountability as well as ensuring multi-stakeholder participation.

Further, Prof. Emeritus Vitit described the preferred characteristics he deems necessary for an effective national mechanism ("**5 P's**"). In his view, a national mechanism must be standing and not ad hoc and **Principled, Practical, Persistent, Participatory** and **Proactive**. As a final reflection, Prof. Emeritus Vitit stated that NMRFs are a "means and not an end" and that the key is effective human rights implementation through a comprehensive range of measures.

3. SESSION 2: INTRODUCTION TO NMRFs AND REGIONAL OVERVIEW

Following Prof. Emeritus Vitit's keynote speech, Ms. Christina Meinecke (Coordinator of the Treaty Body Capacity Building Programme, OHCHR) provided an introduction to NMRFs. She highlighted that the number of human rights recommendations from the UN human rights system ranges - for each of the countries attending the Dialogue - from 500 to over 1000 recommendations. In particular, as UPR recommendations are now being

made every 4.5 years and therefore tend to "pile up," Ms Meinecke stressed the need for more effective and standing NMRFs rather than an ad hoc engagement. Alluding to Prof. Emeritus Vitit's "5 P's," Ms. Meinecke identified the key characteristics any NMRF should have:

- A NMRF should be **standing** and **comprehensive** (i.e. considering more than one source when implementing a recommendation).
- A NMRF should be provided with a **mandate** backed by a **political will** and an empowerment within the ministries to act accordingly.
- A NMRF should have some sort of **executive secretariat** with the necessary human resources and the stability to engage consistently with human rights mechanisms.

Most importantly, each NMRF should have the following four capacities:

1. **Engagement capacity** (i.e. the capacity within the government to engage with international human rights mechanisms including tiered levels of knowledge- according to the level of responsibilities of the respective Ministries/bodies responsible for human rights implementation);
2. **Coordination capacity** (i.e. the capacity among ministries to engage with each other and other relevant international and national bodies such as parliament, judiciary, national statistics agency etc.);
3. **Consultation capacity** (i.e. the capacity to effectively engage with other stakeholders including civil society); and
4. **Information management capacity** (i.e. the capacity to track information, feed it into line ministries for implementation, receive information back for reporting without loss of information due to shifts in personnel, possibly using sophisticated information tools).

Ms. Meinecke added that the four capacities are intended to provide a conceptual framework against which States can access what they are already doing well or in which areas they wish to improve. The type of the NMRF was less important and rather **each country should be free to create a tailor-made NMRF according to each countries' needs**. In order to learn more about the challenges countries face, the participants then shared their experiences regarding human rights reporting and follow-up. Amongst others, **participants identified the following challenges**:

- Consolidating data and information across the different stakeholders such as ministries;
- Reporting within the set deadline;
- Implementing recommendations and following up on them;
- Engaging with civil society organizations (CSOs);
- Engaging constructively with NGOs (e.g. regarding data collection);
- Delivering on all stakeholder's expectations;
- Breaking the silos;
- Agreeing on a concerted approach (as different stakeholders have a different understanding and/or approach to human rights); and
- Ensuring continuity of knowledge (e.g. in case of personnel fluctuation within the government institutions).

4. SESSION 3: EXPERIENCES FROM THE REGION - ENGAGEMENT CAPACITY

State representatives from Bangladesh, Cambodia, China and Thailand presented on benefits, good practices and challenges of managing or establishing standing coordination mechanisms for engagement with the UNHRMs. The session was moderated by Dr. Pawat Satayanarug (Lecturer, Faculty of Law, Chulalongkorn University).

Thailand:
Ms. Nareeluc Pairchaiyapoom (Director of International Human Rights Division, Rights and Liberties Protection Department, the Ministry of Justice, Thailand)

With an overview of Thailand's ratification status, Ms. Nareeluc described the process of designating an agency responsible for a newly ratified human rights treaty. After an initial meeting of the relevant government agencies upon treaty adoption, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs would call for a meeting between the agencies to jointly select the main ministry to be responsible for the treaty in question. The main ministry then assigns such responsibilities to an existing department. Ms. Nareeluc then described the process of Thailand's implementation of the obligations under the human rights treaties:

1. **Guaranteeing treaty rights:** The Thai government aims at involving all stakeholders in reviewing existing laws for amendment and, where necessary, providing comments for an enactment of new law to implement the treaty provisions. This includes a discourse with civil society.

2. **Ensuring treaty implementation:** Treaty implementation is ensured through a multi-tiered approach. At the policy level, the national committee on the respective treaty holds regular meetings (including government representatives, human rights experts, academia and civil society) and a follow-up mechanism. At the working level, a curriculum is developed for each treaty through a participatory process for capacity building of officers. This overarching curriculum is then included in each government agency's curriculum or training programmes. This process is supplemented by various policy measures including, in particular, inclusion of the treaty in the national human rights plan and in the national agenda on human rights.

3. **Disseminating knowledge on the treaty to all stakeholders:** The government regularly organizes seminars and workshops in order to raise awareness and understanding on human rights treaties. It has also developed several forms of information and educational tools such as brochures, journals, booklets, cartoons, mobile exhibitions and e-learning tools.

4. **Drafting of State Party Report:** After the national committee initially sets out the structure of the report, public regional consultations are held and the first draft of the report is drafted. The report is revised after the second public regional consultation. After consultations at the national level, the national committee finalizes the draft in both Thai and English. This final draft requires approval by the cabinet before it is submitted to the UN. In preparation of the oral report, amongst others, mock sessions are held with support from the UN Country Team.

Ms. Nareeluc then described the procedure of treaty implementation. The National Committee on Driving Forward Human Rights Works plays a key role in ensuring that human rights treaties are implemented. It is chaired by the Deputy Prime Minister and manages the two sub-committees: the Sub-Committee on Driving Forward Human Rights Works and the Sub-Committee on Driving Forward International Human Rights Obligations.

Further, Ms. Nareeluc elaborated on the benefits of engaging with the UNHRMs and specific achievements in this regard. As a success story, she cited the Thai Draft Act on the Prevention and Suppression of Torture and Enforced Disappearance. She also described some challenges she experienced in coordinating with other government agencies, which included a lack of awareness and understanding of human rights in some agencies, a lack of a common human rights database, non-coherence in collecting and categorizing data and contraints of human and financial resources. To address these challenges, Ms. Nareeluc discussed next steps for strengthening collaboration with other agencies, which include continuing to raise awareness and providing capacity-building on human rights, developing its NMRF, creating a National Recommendations Tracking Database (NRTD) and initiating an annual human rights dialogue for the policy level to ensure a continuing human rights commitment and political will.

Cambodia:
Mr. Katta Orn (Member of the Cambodian Human Rights Committee)

Mr. Katta briefly explained Cambodia's commitment to human rights including the national framework. Cambodia has five institutions responsible for human rights reporting. The Cambodian Human Rights Committee, established in 2000, is responsible for the ICESCR, ICCPR, ICERD, ICED and UPR. Amongst others, it participates in the drafting of laws, in investigating human rights violations and in human rights training. The Cambodian National Council for Children, established in 1995 and reformed in 2009, is responsible for CRC. It coordinates and provides comments to the government on works related to the survival, development, protection, improved welfare of children and child participation. The Cambodian National Council for Woman, established in 2001, is responsible for CEDAW. It coordinates and provides comments to the government in implementing the

national welfare and gender policy for women, implements the law against women and children trafficking and the law on domestic violence. The Disability Action Council, established in 2012, is responsible for the CRPD. It coordinates and provides comments to the government in implementing the national strategy plan for persons with disabilities. Finally, the National Committee Against Torture, established in 2017, is responsible for CAT. It coordinates and provides comments to the government in implementing the national policy against torture, implements the law against torture and visits prisons, and correctional and rehabilitation centers.

Mr. Katta then described the drafting process in Cambodia. The five-step process includes consultations with the technical working groups of the relevant line ministries, OHCHR, CSOs and other relevant partners, a plenary session of ministers and finally the adoption of the final report. He further elaborated on some of the past State Party reports submitted to Treaty Bodies and UPR.

China:
Ms. Xiaolin Wang (Counselor, International Organizations and Conference, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, China)

Ms. Wang shared her experiences regarding China's third UPR cycle. This cycle was characterized by a multi-department working group led by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and included more than 40 agencies. Each government agency involved was assigned a certain responsibility. More than 40 NGOs and academic institutions were included in the process and more than 300 questions answered. At the end of the UPR, according to Ms. Wang, 284 recommendations (82%) were accepted and implemented, including through the amendment of laws. Finally, Ms. Wang reaffirmed China's willingness to exchange ideas and best practices with other countries and OHCHR.

Bangladesh:
Mr. Md Showeb Abdullah (Assistant Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Bangladesh)

Mr. Abdullah briefly explained Bangladesh's commitment to human rights including the national framework. The principles of the UDHR have been embodied in part II and III of the Constitution of Bangladesh. No designated committees exist; rather all reporting is done on an ad-hoc basis with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs taking a coordinating role. Implementation responsibilities are assigned to different ministries and divisions under the coordination of the Ministry of Foregin Affairs. Most recently, a designated inter-ministerial committee was established for CAT.

After briefly describing Bangladesh's third cycle of the UPR, Mr. Abdullah talked about the challenges faced in coordination for human rights reporting. Most notably, he

experienced huge delays in submitting reports, a lack of political will among relevant stakeholders and an unwillingness to share necessary information. On the other hand, Mr. Abdullah identified several benefits of engagement with UNHRMs, such as increased awareness for human rights among the implementing agencies, bridging the gap between development strategy and human rights as well as the improvement of domestic human rights mechanisms. Challenges to effective human rights reporting include coordination among the implementing agencies, the participation of CSOs, social customs and norms (e.g. LGBT issues) and public opinion (e.g. on capital punishment).

Discussion:

During the discussion which followed the presentations by State representatives, several participants stated that one of the main obstacles they encountered was that the government invests too much time in reporting rather than in the implementation of recommendations. Mr. Abdullah (Bangladesh) suggested that there be a standing mechanism for following up on recommendations and that the responsibility of reminding the line ministries of implementing recommendations should lie with the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Ms. Nareeluc (Thailand) stated that the Thai government has set up an action plan on UPR recommendations, including a table that identifies all responsibilities including a timeframe for implementation.

5. SESSION 4: EXPERIENCES FROM THE REGION – COORDINATION, CONSULTATION & INFORMATION MANAGEMENT CAPACITY

In this session, as a first step, participants engaged in a session on experiences from the region with a focus on coordination and consultation capacity. Ms. Meinecke, who moderated the session, asked the participants to assess:
1. **with whom** they engage regarding NMRFs;
2. **why** they think that consultations are important (participants were invited to vote and assess a number of possible pre-formulated reasons); and
3. **when** they consult.

The participants were divided into different groups to assess the questions and come up with their findings. The following are the main answers to the questions posed:

1. **With whom**

   - Legislative, executive and judiciary
   - Government agencies both central and local (national statistics office, focal points for Sustatinable Development Goals (SDGs), security, armed forces, police)
   - International organizations
   - CSOs

- NGOs
- Donors
- Media
- Academia
- Religious organizations
- National Human Rights Institution

2. Why

The following reasons were given the most votes.

- Consultations will help me prepare my report to the UPR or the treaty bodies more accurately and efficiently (**21 votes**)
- Consultations will build trust and cooperation among different stakeholders (**12 votes**)
- Consultations increase accountability for my organization's/institution's work (**11 votes**)
- Consultations will help me solicit support for the implementation of recommendations addressed to my country (**11 votes**)
- Consultations will assist in building knowledge of all those who participate (**10 votes**)
- Consultations will make us understand better the perspective of State/CSOs (**6 votes**)

3. When

Most participants agreed that two to three consultations are necessary. One consultation should take place prior to the drafting of the report and another one upon receipt of the recommendations before implementation. Another consultation could be held at the constructive dialogue phase. Some participants suggested that consultations should occur during every phase of reporting.

As a second step, discussions commenced regarding the information management capacity. During a short exercise, the participants were provided with sample recommendations from various human rights mechanisms and were asked to place them under corresponding posters featuring each SDG and related human rights treaty provisions which were hung up on the walls of the room. The participants noted that many of the recommendations concerned more than one SDG, highlighting the interrelatedness of SDGs and the need for cross-sectoral coordination for the realization of human rights.

Ms. Hanae Hanzawa (Human Rights Officer, Treaty Body Capacity Building Programme) concluded the session with a short presentation on information management tools offered by OHCHR: the Universal Human Rights Index (UHRI) and NRTD.

6. SESSION 5: ENHANCING CONSULTATION CAPACITY

Day one concluded with three presentations on enhancing the consultation capacity,

moderated by Mr. Marc Limon (Executive Director, Universal Rights Group).

Mr. Limon began the session with a presentation on the **importance of multi-stakeholder participation in human rights monitoring, tracking and follow up**. First, he stressed the importance of NMRFs. According to him, over 90% of all SDGs are grounded in human rights. If progress can be made on the NMRF process, this will automatically lead to progress with SDGs. Mr. Limon then elaborated on the reporting mechanisms of small island developing states. Due to their size and human resource constraints, these States have set up effective NMRFs in order to simplify the reporting and follow-up process. Mr. Limon then highlighted criteria he sees as crucial for any NMRF. These include the following criteria: **a permanent and standing institution** (rather than being ad-hoc), **a single institution, holistic** (i.e. covering all mechanisms and all recommendations), **a high political backing**, with a special emphasis on implementation of recommendations, being **efficient and highly inclusive** (i.e. including many national stakeholders). Mr. Limon put special weight on inclusiveness, as 50% of all recommendations require new laws or the amendment of existing laws. This means that a large number of stakeholders must be involved. He finished his presentation by elaborating on the examples of Samoa (whose government sorts recommendations into clusters, allowing easier review and implementation) and Georgia (with a sophisticated consultation process in line with the principle of separation of powers).

Mrs. Tuenjai Deetes (Former National Human Rights Commissioner of Thailand) presented the **experience of CSOs and their role played in effective follow-up** from her experience of working with communities of ethnic minorities in the northern Thai provinces. In the past 20-30 years, the movement of people crossing border to Thailand was caused largely by income inequality as well as conflicts and unrest in their places of origin. Some refugees or migrants entered Thailand illegaly, which makes them spent their lives hiding with fear of arrest, legal prosecution, and deportation according to laws and regulations of Thailand. Groups of civil society organizations and NGOs worked together to help these affected people.

According to Mrs. Tuenjai, specific achievements made through public advocacy for stateless persons were: acknowledgement for the issue of statelessness and legal status of stateless persons; proposing laws for reinstatement of nationality for Thai displaced persons; campaignign for persons in need of protection and coordinating with broadcasting and printing media. Milestones include the enactment of nationality laws in 2008 and 2012, the promulgation of civil registration acts in 2008 and 2019 and the adoption of a cabinet resolution in 2016 with decentralization of power from the Minister of Interior to provincial and district governors regarding the granting of Thai nationality for children and youth born in Thailand.

Mrs. Tuenjai identified the need for strenghtening cooperation among all relevant actors

such as state authorities, CSOs, academia, legal enforcing entities, media and national human rights institutions in order to allow for an effective follow-up for the implementation of the recommendations from UNHRMs. Most importantly, she stressed the need to educate the society on human rights, as vulnerable people are often not aware of the system to protect human rights.

Ms. Varamon Ramangkura (Judge, Office of the President of the Supreme Court, Thailand) then made a presentation on the **role of the judiciary in ensuring effective monitoring of the implementation of human rights recommendations**. Ms. Ramangkura gave two examples of the important role of the judiciary in this regard: Firstly, the Office of the Judiciary of the Court of Justice provides legal opinions on draft legislation and has the authority to initiate legislation. Secondly, the Office of the Judiciary concretely initiated the amendments of the Thai Criminal Procedure Code to address strategic litigation against public participation (SLAPP) and to allow the usage of electronic monitoring as part of the collateral for bail. With the electronic bracelets devices, the monetary bail criteria may be reduced by 80% upon the discretion of judges. This is to solve the reality that while the affluent can afford bail, the poor are left with no other choice but to be detained awaiting trial.

FRIDAY 30 AUGUST

1. SESSION 6: STORYTELLING OF COUNTRY EXPERIENCES

Moderated by Ms. Meinecke, the participants first reflected on Day One through a question and answer game. Next, Ms. Seema Pravina Chand (Senior Legal Officer, Office of the Attorney-General, Fiji) shared her experiences regarding human rights reporting and follow-up in Fiji.

One of the recommendations of the first UPR cycle was to implement all core human rights treaties. At that time, Fiji responded that it did not have the capacities to ratify all core treaties but promised to do so by 2020. Currently, Fiji has ratified seven core treaties and Ms. Chand indicated that Fiji is on the path to ratify the remaining two. However, the increase in treaty ratifications led to a large amount of reporting responsibilities, and due to the lack of financial resources and personnel for reporting and follow-up for treaty reporting, Fiji had to devise an efficient and pragmatic system.

In response to these challenges, the Fiji government uses a cluster approach. Rather than looking at each set of recommendations separately, recommendations from all treaty bodies and the UPR are collected and clustered according to thematic areas. Then, the core ministries or independent agencies for implementation are identified and tasked with implementation. One of the biggest challenges for the government is the loss of

institutional memory due to the lack of digital tools to keep track of work. Often information is lost or data collection does not take place at all. The government had good experiences in engaging openly with the treaty bodies experts and in highlighting these challenges including on the lack of sufficient data. In response, the experts, including a Special Rapporteur, have provided the government with advice on how to better collect data. The government also works together closely with NGOs, as they often have data the government does not.

2. CLOSING OF REGIONAL DIALOGUE (MS. CYNTHIA VELIKO, REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVE, OHCHR SEARO

"Excellencies,
Ladies and gentlemen,
Distinguished guests,

As we are coming to the end of the Regional Dialogue on National Mechanisms for Reporting and Follow-up, NMRFs, on behalf of the organizers of this event let me sum up the work we have completed during these two days.

On behalf of OHCHR, I would like to once again thank the Government of Thailand which hosted this event and all the support it provided to make it happen. We also would like to thank participants and experts who overcame significant distances to be able to join us at this event to share their national practices and contribute to the discussion.

Let me recall that during the first day we discussed the notion of a NMRF, its key features and capacities. We also were able to get acquainted with experiences from Bangladesh, Cambodia, China and Thailand on benefits, good practices and challenges of managing or establishing standing coordination mechanisms for engagement with UN human rights mechanisms. Amongst others, panelists elaborated on their governments' reporting and implementations procedures and their individual experiences. Challenges that were identified include in particular delays in the reporting process, a strong focus of governments on reporting rather than on implementation, difficulties in the cooperation with the responsible ministries and the lack of continuity of knowledge within the responsible departments. Further, Mr. Marc Limon from Universal Rights Group, shared with us the experience of multi-stakeholder participation in human rights monitoring, tracking and follow-up. We also benefited from presentations of representatives of a member of the judiciary, Judge Varamon, and from Ms. Tuenjai, former National Human Rights Commissioner of Thailand, who shared their visions and insights. This triggered an exchange of good practices on the engagement with parliament and the judiciary as well as the private sector. Active participation of civil society was also deemed as beneficial, including for soliciting support in the implementation of recommendations addressed to countries.

During these two days, we witnessed that the establishment and enhancement of the National Mechanisms for Reporting and Follow-up is a key for building national capacities, in particular to enable States to fulfill their international human rights obligations. From the experience of different UN Member States, we observe that such mechanisms, where they are fully operational, stimulate national dialogue through meaningful participation of all stakeholders, including parliament, judiciary, National Human Rights Institutions and civil society, enhance coherence at the national level and regular reviews of laws, policies and practices towards the improvement of human rights. The growing appreciation for the need to create a sustainable national capacity for reporting and implementation has been noted in the second biennial report of the Secretary-General on the status of the human rights treaty body system. This issue will surely be further pursued in his third report to be published next year.

In Asia, the presence of standing NMRFs is evolving. Therefore, we hope that having platforms for knowledge exchange, such as this Regional Dialogue, will contribute to raising awareness and strengthening the capacity of relevant officials. In the long run, it will lead to the establishment of new mechanisms and strengthening the existing ones by nourishing them with know-how and lessons learnt from the neighborhood and far beyond.

NMRFs also play a role as enablers for Member States to achieve the 2030 Agenda, because the full and effective implementation of international human rights instruments is of major importance for States' efforts to achieve Sustainable Development Goals. Going forward, it is important for all stakeholders to acknowledge the interlinkages between human rights and sustainable development and to seek to progress in both areas.

To turn this vision into a reality requires not only political commitment, but also to increase synergies between implementation of human rights obligations and SDG commitments and reporting thereon. Such an integrated approach to human rights and sustainable development has enormous potential for strengthening coherence, efficiency and accountability in the follow-up to UN human rights recommendations, which could be further strengthened and integrated with national SDG implementation plans and processes and vice versa.

With the increasing number of reporting obligations both at regional and international levels, it is crucial to ensure that NMRFs keeps pace with time. Nowadays, digitalization brings new opportunities in all spheres of life, and the public sector is not an exception. IT solutions can assist in tracking progress on implementing UN human rights mechanisms' recommendations. And with this in mind, OHCHR has introduced its "National Recommendation Tracking Database" to provide technological support for States wishing to digitalize their work in the human rights field.

As I conclude my remarks, I would like to restate the important role that National Mechanisms for Reporting and Follow Up play in addressing the root causes of many of today's challenges and creating synergies towards progressing with the implementation of States' human rights obligations and their SDG commitments, which are mutually interdependent and mutually reinforcing.

While I close the Regional Dialogue with my remarks, this is not the end of all the activities we planned for you. This afternoon, we will have an opportunity to strengthen your skills and knowledge via workshop sessions or a study visit to the Court of Justice.
Let me close this meeting and wish you a productive continuation of your work.

Thank you!"

3. WORKSHOP ON NMRFs FOR TECHNICAL OFFICERS (MODERATED BY CHRISTINA MEINECKE AND HANAE HANZAWA)

a. SESSION 7: COORDINATION AND CONSULTATION CAPACITY

Session 7 intended to allow an exchange on the coordination and consultation capacities of different States during the reporting and follow-up process. The participants were split into different groups and requested to answer: (1) methods of consulting and (2) how they could improve consulting. After deliberating amongst themselves, the participants presented their findings.

Findings to **question 1 (methods of consulting)** include the following:

- Setting up of task forces and coordination lines with ministries and relevant stakeholders;
- Continuous engagement and regular meetings;
- Raising awareness through media platforms (e.g. webcasts, radio, mobile applications, social media, newsletters);
- Dissemination;
- Forming coalitions;
- Conducting of surveys;
- Inclusion of UN agencies;
- Creating a focal point for every stakeholder clustered by thematic issues;
- Creating social indicators; and
- Including representatives from CSOs to be members in the NMRF.

Findings to **question 2 (ways to improve consultations)** include the following:

- Using an interactive online platform;
- Publishing the outcomes of consultation meetings;
- Encouraging CSOs to form a coalition on reporting;
- Increasing consultations of CSOs (e.g. on a bi-monthly basis);
- Introducing a capacity building programme for CSOs; and
- Inviting the broader public to participate in consultations.

The exercise showed that while in some States there exists a continuous consultation engagement, in others consultations are conducted only sporadically. In most States, consultations are done not only through formal, but increasingly also through informal channels. One example is Fiji, where high school students are included in consultations on questions of national budget (e.g. regarding expenditures for student loans, scholarships, grants etc.).

Next, participants engaged in an **exercise on information management**. Each group received cards with different categories (e.g. torture prevention, disabilities, violence against women) and a set of recommendations. The participants were asked to cluster the recommendations under corresponding categories. The rationale was to make participants aware of the benefits of clustering recommendations. Participants observed that some recommendations were cross-cutting. Participants were also reminded to discuss which government body will be responsible for the implementation upon assigning recommendations to different clusters. Designating the competent body can have an immense impact on the quality of how the recommendation is implemented. An emphasis was put on prioritising recommendations. In deciding which recommendation to prioritise, it was suggested to prioritise recommendations that are a national priority for the current government or coming from a larger number of treaty bodies as well as to look at whether any recommendation is given special emphasis in the treaty Concluding Observations.

Concluding the session, Ms. Hanzawa gave a demonstration of **NRTD**.

b. SESSION 8: DEVELOPMENT OF TORs FOR AN NMRF

For the last session of the Dialogue, participants were asked to discuss sample terms of reference (TORs) for an NMRF. Participants were split into five groups that rotated between five tables with faciliators who asked them to list the contents of different sections of a TOR. This way, each team provided input to all sections of a sample TOR. In annex 3, sample Terms of Reference for an NMRF can be found. The summary of participants' contributions during the Dialogue is as follows:

Group 1: Rationale of NMRF

The participants agreed that an NMRF should be guided by certain objectives, in particular, to:

- Effectively coordinate government branches;
- Fill implementation gaps;
- Improve awareness and capacity regarding human rights;
- Provide transparency and accountability;
- Preserve data and build human expertise;
- Overcome capacity constraints;
- Address overdue reports;
- Promote the enjoyment of human rigts;
- Link the international with the national; and
- Create a link to SDGs.

Group 2: Structure of the NMRF

The participants agreed that an NMRF should include the following components:

- Secretariat that takes over executive functions;
- Participation of line ministries (e.g. Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Justice, Women and Children, Social Affairs, Interior, Labor and the Statistics Office);
- Two layer structure;
  - o Higher Level Committee (two meetings per year, secretary-level of ministry) and
  - o Technical Level Committees (more frequent meetings (e.g. montly), including directors/deputy directors of departments);
- Alternatively: One-layer structure on the (deputy) director level;
- Participation of CSOs; and
- Some participants stated that parliamentarians and judges should not be included in an NMRF but rather be consulted in their respective areas.

Group 3: Secretariat

The participants agreed that an NMRF Secretariat should have the following functions:

- Draft reports;
- Facilitate coordination among the government and with international organizations,

NGOs and other relevant stakeholders;

- Manage information;
- Build capacity and conduct trainings;
- Disseminte information on implementation (e.g. drafting or cross-checking report); and
- Track and monitor the implementation of the recommendations.

Group 4: Working methods

The participants agreed that an NMRF should have the following working methods:

- Designate focal points with possible contact lists;
- Take decisions on who is going to be the lead agency for preparation of a specific report and, after recommendations have been received for designationg who is the lead agency for implemenation of specific recommendations;
- Induction programme and continuous coordination (e.g. on quartertly basis);
- For visibility, NMRF should be placed under a high-ranking office such as the Prime Minister;
- Annual meeting to monitor the implentation status; and
- Develop database or inventory for storage of information.

Group 5: Consultation

The participants agreed that NMRF consultations should include the following:

- Drafting TORs regarding contact lists of relevant stakeholders clustered by thematic issues;
- Regular consultation with CSOs;
- Monthly meetings regarding thematic issues;
- Communication also through un-official channels;
- Publication of results;
- Conducting surveys to obtain public opinion on thematic issues;
- Inclusion of UN agencies; and
- Creating a focal point for every stakeholder clustered by thematic issues.

4. FOR OFFICERS NOT ATTENDING THE WORKSHOP: STUDY VISIT ORGANIZED BY THAI MOFA

Technical Officers who did not attend the workshop attended a study visit to the Supreme Court of Thailand organized by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Thailand.

CONCLUSIONS

A range of challenges emerged from the discussion groups, which can be summarized as follows:

- Consultations with CSOs and line ministries;
- Lack of political will to implement treaty obligations;
- Institutional memory especially during rotation of personnel;
- A strong focus on reporting and less focus on implementation of recommendations; and
- Effective information management.

In conclusion, all States will benefit from having a standing NMRF. While some elements are crucial to the effective functioning of NMRnFs and therefore indispensable (see above the keynote speech of Prof. Emeritus Vitit and session 2), each State should be free to adapt a tailor-made NMRF according to its own needs.

NEXT STEPS

In annex 3, sample Terms of Reference for an NMRF can be found which can inform further discussions at the national level. To strengthen the capacity of States to manage information and facilitate implementation of recommendations and tracking thereof, OHCHR intends to continue rolling-out of the NRTD. States were invited to consider it as an option to systematize their information management capacities. For more details please contact Ms. Hanae Hanzawa (hanae.hanzawa@un.org).

OHCHR encourages States to benefit from and support the Treaty Body Capacity Building Programme.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: PROGRAMME

Thursday 29 August 2019		
8:30-9:00	Registration	
9:00-9:10	Opening Remarks	Ms. Kanchana PATARACHOKE, Director-General, Department of International Organizations Video Message from Mr. Adam ABDELMOULA, Director, Human Rights Council and Treaty Mechanisms Division, OHCHR
9:10-10:00	**Session 1:** Keynote Speech	Prof. Emeritus Vitit MUNTARBHORN, Professor, Chulalongkorn University
10:00-10:30	**Session 2:** Introduction: NMRF and Regional Overview	Ms. Christina MEINECKE, Coordinator of Treaty Body Capacity Building Programme, OHCHR - What is an NMRF- benefits of having a standing NMRF - Difference between NMRFs and NHRIs - 4 key capacities of NMRFs - NRTD as a tool to strengthen info management capacity
10:30-10:45	Break	
10:45-12:00	**Session 3:** Experiences from the Region – Engagement Capacity	Moderator: Dr. Pawat SATAYANURUG, Lecturer, Faculty of Law, Chulalongkorn University Bangladesh Cambodia China Thailand
12:00-13:00	Lunch	
13:00-15:00	**Session 4:** Experiences from the Region – Coordination, Consultation & Information Management Capacity	Moderator: Ms. Christina MEINECKE - Work in groups - Presentation on Universal Human Rights Index and National Recommendations Tracking Database
15:00-15:15	Break	

15:15-16:30	**Session 5:** Enhancing Consultation Capacity	Moderator: Mr. Marc LIMON Mr. Marc LIMON, Executive Director, Universal Rights Group Importance of multi-stakeholder participation in human rights monitoring, tracking and follow-up Ms. Varamon RAMANGKURA, Judge, Office of the President of the Supreme Court, Thailand Role of judiciary in ensuring effective monitoring of the implementation of HR recommendations Ms. Tuenjai DEETES, Former High Commissioner, National Human Rights Commission of Thailand CSO's experiences and role played in effective follow-up
Friday, 30 August 2019		
9:00-10:15	**Session 6:** Storytelling country experiences	Moderator: Ms. Christina MEINECKE - Recap from day 1 - Fiji experience
10:30-10:40	Closing of Regional Dialogue	Ms. Cynthia VELIKO, Regional Representative, OHCHR SEARO
10:40-11:00	Break	
For Technical Officers		
11:00-13:00	Workshop on NMRFs for Technical Officers	Treaty Body Capacity Building Programme, OHCHR Ms. Christina MEINECKE Ms. Hanae HANZAWA 10.45-12:00 **Session 7:** Re-cap of day before- Coordination and consultation capacity **Session 8:** Development of TORs for an NMRF
13:00-14:00	Lunch	
14:00-16:00	Workshop (continued)	
16:00	Closing and coffee	
For officers not attending the workshop		
10:30-14:00	Study Visit organized by Thai MOFA	COURT

ANNEX 2: PARTICIPANT LIST

Total number of participants: 53 (28 women, 25 men).

Country	First Name	Last Name	Title		Organization
Government Officials:					
China	Xiaolin	Wang	Counselor, International Organizations and Conference		Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Yang	Luo	Third Secretary		Chinese Embassy in Thailand
Bangladesh	Md Showeb	Abdullah	Assistant Secretary		Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Farjana	Akter	Senior Assistant Secretary		Legislative and Parliament Affairs Division
Brunei	Nur Masitah	Mohd Jafaar	Second Secretary		Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Dpt. Of International Organizations
	Mohd Nasrullah El-Hakiem	Mohammad	Principal		Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sports, Dpt. Community and Development
Cambodia	Katta	Orn	Member of Cambodian Human Right Committee		Member of Cambodian Human Right Committee
	Somoly	Heng	Chief of Human Rights Bureau		Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation
Fiji	Suliana	Taukei	Legal Officer		Office of the Attorney-General
	Seema	Chand	Senior Legal Officer		Office of the

	Pravina			Attorney-General
Lao PDR	Khataphone	Somvorachit	Desk officer, Human Rights and Humanitarian Law Division, Department of Treaty and Law	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Soubandith	Latanavong	Desk officer, Human Rights and Humanitarian Law Division, Department of Treaty and Law	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Xayfhong	Sengdara	Deputy Director of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law Division, Department of Treaty and Law	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Malaysia	Azmaini	Isa	Principal Assistant Secretary	Ministry of Women, Family and Community Development
	Azrina	Aznan	Principal Assistant Secretary	Ministry of Women, Family and Community Development
Myanmar	Thu Rein Saw Htut	Naing	Assistance Director	International Organizations and Economic Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Nandar	Nwe Han	Director	Department of Social Welfare
Pakistan	Hasan	Abbas	Assistance Director	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Muhammad	Ramzen	Assistance Director	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Philippines	Juan Carlos	Borromeo	Third Secretary and Vice Consul	Embassy of the Republic of the Philippines
Thailand	Kanchana	Patarachoke	Director-General, Department of International Organizations	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Bolbongse	Vangphaen	Director of Social Division, Department of International Organizations	Ministry of Foreign Affairs

	Sorawut	Norapoompipat	First Secretary, Department of International Organizations	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Athikarn	Dilogwathana	First Secretary, Department of International Organizations	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Pornrawe	Poenateetai	Second Secretary, Department of International Organizations	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Arissara	Bureesirirat	Human Rights Officer, Department of International Organizations	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Wichayatorn	Foocharoen	Human Rights Officer, Department of International Organizations	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Sunadda	Damrongmanee	Intern, Department of International Organizations	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Patsalin	Reephrom	Legal Officer, Practitioner Level, International Affairs Division	Office of Permanent Secretary for Justice
	Krisana	Lokathajariya	Legal Officer, Practitioner Level, International Affairs Division	Office of Permanent Secretary for Justice
	Panatda	Udomthanlak	Social Development Worker, Practitioner Level	Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities
	Achara	Sriratampai	Social Development Worker, Senior Professional Level, Division of Gender Equality Promotion	Department of Women's Affairs and Family Development
	Nareeluc	Pairchaiyapoom	Director of International Human Rights Division	Rights and Liberties Protection Department
	Chattraphon	Ditthasriphon	Justice officer, International Human Rights Division	Rights and Liberties Protection Department
	Tanyakan	Daengsubha	Justice Officer, International Human Rights Division	Rights and Liberties

				Protection Department
	Supanat	Kaewlek	Justice Officer, International Human Rights Division	Rights and Liberties Protection Department
	Siripong	Sriarkha	Foreign Relations Officer	Foreign Affairs Division
	Thida	Pongcharoenchai	Social Development Officer, Department of Women's Affairs and Family Development	Ministry of Social Development and Human Security
Timor Leste	Inasio	Do Carmo Ferreira	Desk officer of human rights council	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Flaviano	Moniz Leao	National Human Rights Officer	Ministry of Justice
Viet Nam	Hong Anh	Pham	Officer, Department of International Organizations	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Duc Thanh	Dang	Officer, Department of International Organizations	Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Non-government participants:

NGO	Marc	Limon	Executive Director	Universal Rights Group
Thailand	Varamon	Ramangkura	Judge	Office of the President of the Supreme Court
	Vitit	Muntarbhorn	Professor Emeritus	Faculty of Law, Chulalongkorn University
	Paisit	Pusittrakul	Coordinator to Prof.Emeritus Vitit Muntarbhorn	Faculty of Law, Chulalognkorn University
	Pawat	Satayanurug	Lecturer	Faculty of Law, Chulalongkorn University
	Tuenjai	Deetes	Former Member	National Human Rights Commission of Thailand
UN	Cynthia	Veliko	Regional Representative	OHCHR SEARO

		Christina	Meinecke	Coordinator, Treaty Body Capacity Building Programme	OHCHR
		Hanae	Hanzawa	Human Rights Officer	OHCHR SEARO
		Jinha	Kim	Technical Specialist	UNDP
		Jannis	Breitschwerdt	Intern	OHCHR SEARO

ANNEX 3: TEMPLATE TERMS OF REFERENCE

National Mechanisms for Reporting and Follow-up

Suggested elements for a Terms of Reference

Background

A national mechanism for reporting and follow-up (NMRF) is a permanent national governmental mechanism or structure that is mandated to coordinate and prepare reports to and engage with international and regional human rights mechanisms (including treaty bodies, the universal periodic review and special procedures), and to coordinate and track national follow-up and implementation of the treaty obligations and the recommendations emanating from these mechanisms. It may be ministerial, inter-ministerial or institutionally separate.

The NMRF performs these functions in coordination with ministries, specialized State bodies (such as the national statistics office), SDG implementation focal point (agency/Ministry), parliament and the judiciary, as well as in consultation with the national human rights institution(s) and civil society.

A national mechanism for reporting and follow-up may be established by legislation (passed through parliament), formal regulation (by the executive, but not through parliament), or a policy mandate (formed after the adoption of an executive/ministerial policy provision).

In addition, effective NMRFs typically have the following four key capacities:
- Engagement capacity: The capacity to engage and liaise with international and regional human rights bodies and organize and centrally facilitate the preparation of reports and responses to international and regional human rights mechanisms;
- Coordination capacity: The capacity and authority to disseminate information, and to organize and coordinate information gathering and data collection from government entities, the national office for statistics, SDG implementation focal point (agency/Ministry), parliament and the judiciary, for reporting and follow-up to recommendations;
- Consultation capacity: The capacity to foster and lead consultations with the country's NHRI(s) and civil society; and
- Information management capacity: The capacity to (1) Track the issuance of recommendations and decisions by the international and regional human rights mechanisms; (2) Systematically capture and thematically cluster these recommendations and decisions (including against SDGs) in a user-friendly spreadsheet or database; (3) Identify responsible government ministries and/or agencies for their implementation; (4) Develop HRM recommendations implementation plans, including timelines, with relevant ministries to facilitate such implementation; and (5) Manage information regarding the implementation of treaty provisions and recommendations, including with a view to preparing the next periodic report

---

In their efforts to establish or strengthen an existing NMRF, States may wish to take the elements below into consideration when drafting or amending the text describing and NMRF's Terms of Reference. These elements are based on existing national practices as well as findings as reflected in the Practical Guide and Study on NMRFs.

[Name of the NMRF]

Terms of reference

1. Rationale

[*This section sets out the general background and rationale for establishing the NMRF. Elements which may be included are:*
- *The recognition that reporting and engaging with international human rights mechanisms offer a unique opportunity for the advancement of human rights domestically, self-assessment, and legislative and policy review;*
- *The identification of the need to adopt a comprehensive, efficient and sustainable approach to implementing treaty obligations, reporting to and engaging with the international and regional human rights systems and following up on the recommendations or decisions emanating from them;*
- *The announcement that the State is establishing a NMRF, titled the [name of body/structure]; and*
- *The acknowledgement that this sustainable approach will create national ownership of reporting and implementation, regular interaction within and between State bodies; and structured and formalized contacts with parliament, the judiciary, national human rights institution (NHRI) and civil society.*]

2. Functions

[*This section sets out the mandated functions of the NMRF. Elements which may be included are:*
- *to engage and liaise with international human rights bodies, including the UN human rights treaty bodies, the Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council and the UPR of the Human Rights Council;*
- *to engage and liaise with regional human rights bodies, including [name of the regional human rights mechanism, if applicable];*
- *to organize and centrally facilitate the preparation of reports to international human rights mechanisms, including mid-term and follow-up reports including possibly the preparation of voluntary national reports on SDG implementation;*
- *to respond to individual communications and follow-up questions and recommendations/decisions received from such mechanisms, as well as to facilitate visits by Special Procedures mandate holders and the Sub-Committee on Prevention of Torture;*
- *to disseminate information, and to organize and coordinate information gathering and data collection from Government entities, fully involving other national State actors such as the National Office for Statistics, SDG implementation focal point (agency/Ministry), the parliament and the judiciary, for reporting and follow-up to recommendations;*
- *to foster and lead regular consultations for reporting and follow-up with the NHRI and civil society organizations; and*

- *to track the issuance of recommendations and decisions by the international and regional human rights mechanisms, to systematically capture and thematically cluster these recommendations and decisions, to identify responsible Government ministries and/or agencies for their implementation, to develop HRM implementation plans, including time-lines, with relevant ministries to facilitate such implementation; and to manage information regarding the implementation of treaty provisions and recommendations, including with a view to preparing the next periodic report.*]

3. Structure and composition

[*This section sets out the structure and composition of the NMRF. It is always up to the State to determine the structure that works best at the national level, be it ministerial, inter-ministerial or institutionally separate. The section could specify:*
- *Which Ministry or Government entity has the lead of the NMRF;*
- *which Ministries are part of the NMRF network (ideally all, including the National Statistical Office and SDG implementation focal point/lead agency/Ministry)*
- *the level of representation of the member Ministries (ideally Ministerial level with a designated alternate);*
- *that each member Ministry designates a NMRF focal point at the working level;*
- *that the network of member Ministries shall appoint a member from the NMRF to serve as chair for one/two years; and*
- *The modalities of involvement of parliament and the judiciary in the work of the NMRF.*]

4. Meetings of the NMRF

[*This section could specify:*
- *the frequency of the meetings of (a) the Ministerial NMRF network, and (b) the network of Ministerial NMRF focal points (ideally, the Ministerial network meets 3-4 times per year, and the focal point network meets more frequently, depending on the tasks at hand, such as drafting of reports, coordination of follow up and implementation efforts);*
- *Whether the meetings of the Ministerial NMRF network are public or closed meetings (ideally civil society and the NHRI are invited to participate at selected meetings); and*
- *The involvement and role of civil society and the NHRI in meetings of the Ministerial NMRF focal points (NB: the involvement of an NHRI should be in an observer capacity, so as to safeguard its independence in line with the Paris Principles – A/RES/48/134.)*

5. NMRF Secretariat

[*If an executive secretariat to the NMRF is envisaged, this section could specify:*
- *The location of the NMRF executive secretariat, as well as its staffing (also aiming at gender balance in its composition);*
- *The functions and responsibilities of the executive secretariat, which could include:*
  - *The continuous building of knowledge and capacities on international and regional human rights mechanisms of its secretariat staff;*

- o *the engagement with international and regional human rights mechanisms;*
- o *the facilitation of visits of Special Procedures mandate holders and the Sub-Committee on Prevention of Torture;*
- o *to respond to individual communications and follow-up questions and recommendations/decisions received from international human rights mechanisms;*
- o *the servicing of meetings of the NMRF member network;*
- o *the coordination of information collection from Ministerial NMRF focal points (for reporting purposes as well as the management of information on implementation of recommendations);*
- o *the coordination of the drafting process;*
- o *the organisation of consultative processes with the NHRI as well as civil society organisations (including at the local level);*
- o *the periodic circulation of a table of clustered recommendations of the international human rights mechanisms;*
- o *the coordination and tracking of the implementation of the recommendations*
- o *the reporting on NMRF meetings;*
- o *the maintaining of an NMRF website and/or social media presence; and*
- o *to ensure hand-over to new secretariat staff.]*

6. Resources

[The effectiveness of an NMRF is enhanced through extensive planning, with individual ministries providing for the necessary budgetary allocations to cover the work of the NMRF. Another important factor is the continuity of staff. This section could specify:
- *Which ministry(ies) are to make budgetary allocations (including for travel for UPR and TB reviews, knowledge management tools, secretariat functions, and the organisation of consultations at the national and local levels);*
- *That budgetary resources should be sufficient for the performance of NMRF activities;*
- *That sufficient human resources be dedicated to the NMRF (Ministerial focal points and NMRF secretariat staff); and*
- *The modalities for secondment of Ministry staff to support the NMRF executive secretariat.]*

7. Working methods and operational aspects

This section could specify that the working methods of the NMRF (its operational aspects) are to be elaborated and adopted at the first plenary NMRF meeting(s).

[The rules of procedure that are to be adopted at such a meeting could elaborate upon:
- *The required quorum for NMRF meetings;*
- *The procedure for agenda setting and dissemination of working documents;*
- *The establishment and use of email lists of NMRF members and NMRF Ministerial focal points;*
- *The conditions for inviting stakeholders and external experts to NMRF meetings;*
- *The establishment and use of an email list of stakeholders (NHRI, CSOs); and*
- *The development and use of:*

(1) an NMRF work plan and calendar of activities;

(2) an inventory of upcoming UPR reviews, TB reporting obligations and reviews, SP mandate holder visits and SPT visits;

(3) standardized internal reporting guidelines and procedures (which would include the details of how to coordinate with Ministries, the national statistical office, the judiciary and parliament, and how consultations with the NHRI and CSOs should be conducted);

(4) a checklist for the organization of visits of SP mandate holders and the Sub-Committee on Prevention of Torture.]