



Promoting and strengthening  
the Universal Periodic Review  
<http://www.upr-info.org>

## Project “Coordination Meeting for UPR Stakeholders”: Outcome Report

# Multi-stakeholders Dialogue on Effective Implementation of UPR Recommendations

Freetown, Sierra Leone

3-4 August



## Executive summary

On 3-4 August 2016, *UPR Info*, the Government Justice Sector Coordination Office, the Human Rights Commission of Sierra Leone (HRCSL) and the Core UPR Working Group in Sierra Leone<sup>1</sup>, with the financial support of Sierra Leone Cement Corp Ltd. (LEOCEM), organised an inclusive multi-stakeholder national dialogue on the implementation of UPR recommendations that the country received during its second review on 27 January 2016. The event brought together representatives from an array of government ministries, departments and agencies, and civil society organisations with the objective to ensure that all national stakeholders will be equipped with the necessary knowledge and tools for maximum cooperation in the implementation phase of the UPR. The meeting aimed to foster effective dialogue between CSOs and Government representatives by creating a space for them to meet and discuss how to transmit the recommendations to positive human rights change on the ground.

The June meeting was the culmination of a nine-month project that began in December 2015, with the Pre-session on Sierra Leone in Geneva, and in April 2016 saw a UPR strategy workshop for CSOs in Bo City. A new opportunity for collaboration will arise in 2019 with the mid-term report of Sierra Leone.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Core UPR Working Group in Sierra Leone is comprised of the Human Rights Commission Sierra Leone, Western Area District Human Rights Committee, CSO UPR Monitoring Group, Prison Watch Sierra Leone and Human Rights Defenders Network Sierra Leone. UPR Info signed a partnership agreement with the Human Rights Defenders Network Sierra Leone (HRDNSL) making them our focal partner organisation for the implementation of this event.

The beginning of the first day, 3 August, commenced with the Opening Ceremony where Mr Gilbert Onyango, Regional Director of UPR Info; Alphonsus B.M. Gbanie, Core UPR Working Group; Ms. Inga Krastina, Head of Political, Press and Information Section at the Delegation of the EU to Sierra Leone; Mr Arne Johansen, Honorary Consul of Norway and Sweden to Sierra Leone and Managing Director of LEOCEM addressed the plenary. A passionate Key Note speech underlining the need for all stakeholders to genuinely commit to the UPR process was given by Mr. Brima Sheriff, Chairperson of the Human Rights Commission of Sierra Leone. After a timely tea break, CSOs and government representatives were divided into two parallel meetings to prepare for the following dialogue day. In the preparatory CSO meeting participants took stock of activities carried out since the workshop in Bo and familiarised themselves with the final UPR Working Group Report of Sierra Leone to inform themselves on which recommendations had been accepted and which had been noted. CSOs also seized the opportunity to fine tune their strategies to maximise the influence of their presentations to government during the second day. UPR Info shared best practices on how to interact with government and stressed the need to be willing to compromise and negotiate in a transparent manner. interventions and strategies. The focus of the Government meeting was to bring representatives from ministries, departments and agencies up to speed with the Sierra Leone's UPR timeline and to identify their role in the implementation of the recommendations. This meeting was also attended by a representative from the United Nations Development Program (UNDP).

On the second day, 4 June, a multi-stakeholder dialogue was organised between CSOs and Government representatives to discuss the way forward, including identifying the opportunities for cooperation on how to implement UPR recommendations on the ground. As a launch pad, the day started with UPR Info giving a presentation on the importance of indicators to measure the implementation rate of recommendations. The session stressed the importance that all stakeholders agree on the same set of indicators, and that these are incorporated into the national

implementation plan. The day continued with thematic representatives from civil society presenting suggestions on activities to be undertaken by the government and civil society to advance implementation, while also mapping out crucial partners, SMART indicators for follow-up and timeframes. Government representatives interacted with questions and comments which lead to several fruitful exchanges. It was understood that the lack of information sharing both within ministries and between ministries and civil society constituted a barrier for data collection on the human rights situation in the country. Before wrapping up the event, a Letter of Cooperation between the government and civil society was adopted, paving the way for an inclusive implementation phase.

A good number of media outlets were present throughout the two days. In addition, drawing on lessons learnt from previous interventions and the crucial role of media to disseminate information on the UPR to the public, a UPR training for journalists was conducted prior to the dialogue day in Freetown.

Sierra Leone has the potential of becoming a good example of cooperation among UPR stakeholders. The NHRI and CSOs are well-versed in the modalities and entry points of the UPR and have taken key steps to formalise partnerships with the donor and diplomatic community within the framework of the UPR. The Government has expressed its willingness to *work closely with all sectors of society and civil society to ensure the full implementation of all supported recommendations*<sup>2</sup>, and it is now time to go beyond words to realise that commitment. Even though the dialogue-day lacked the high-level of participation of government officials that was initially envisaged, the dialogues that took place did so in an open and transparent manner showcasing that the previous disconnect between these stakeholders can be bridged by the common interest of ensuring implementation of UPR recommendations. *UPR Info* will continue

---

<sup>2</sup> Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, Sierra Leone, Addendum, A/HRC/32/16/Add.1, para. 21, p. 4



*Promoting and strengthening  
the Universal Periodic Review*  
<http://www.upr-info.org>

to support UPR activities in Sierra Leone and look forward to sustained cooperation among all stakeholders.

## Table of Contents

1. Conceptual background.....	8
1.1. The pre-session.....	8
1.2. CSO strategy workshop on implementation of UPR recommendations.....	8
1.3. Multi-stakeholders Dialogue on Effective Implementation of UPR Recommendations.....	9
2. Main objectives.....	10
2.1. UPR Training for journalists.....	10
2.2. Civil Society Preparatory Meeting .....	10
2.3. Government Experts Preparatory Meeting .....	10
2.4. Multi-stakeholders Dialogue-day .....	11
3. Summary of the Multi-stakeholder National Dialogue.....	12
3.1. Day 1: UPR Training for journalists .....	12
3.2. Day 2: Opening Ceremony .....	14
3.3. Day 2: CSO Preparatory Meeting.....	17
3.4. Day 2: Government Experts Preparatory Meeting.....	19
3.5. Day 3: Multi-stakeholders Dialogue-day .....	19
3.5.1. Civil society presentations .....	23
4. Roundtable with diplomatic and donor community .....	29
5. The way forward.....	31
6. Lessons learnt .....	33
7. Outcomes and outputs .....	34
8. Annexes .....	37



*Promoting and strengthening  
the Universal Periodic Review*  
<http://www.upr-info.org>

8.1. Annex 1: Letter of Cooperation.....	37
8.2. Annex 2: Agenda.....	38
8.3. Annex 3: Implementation Plan Template.....	43
8.4. Annex 4: Participation in the dialogue-day .....	44

## 1. Conceptual background

To date, UPR Info has engaged with UPR stakeholders in Sierra Leone in a series of three events, each building upon the previous one. A fourth opportunity will arise on the occasion of Sierra Leone's voluntary midterm report, due in January 2019.

### 1.1. The pre-session

At the [pre-session](#), a month prior to the official UPR of Sierra Leone, CSO and NHRI representatives from the country travelled to Geneva in order to present their concerns and priority recommendations to Permanent Missions to the United Nations, who then in turn used this information when drafting their UPR statements and recommendations.

### 1.2. CSO strategy workshop on implementation of UPR recommendations

In June 2016, during the formal adoption of its UPR by the UN Human Rights Council, the Government of Sierra Leone provided final responses to all recommendations it had received during its review in January 2016. This process marked the beginning of the implementation phase. In order to ensure that national CSO are equipped with the necessary tools for an effective and inclusive implementation phase, *UPR Info*, together with the Human Rights Defenders Network Sierra Leone (HRDNSL) and the other members of the Core UPR Working Group in Sierra Leone<sup>3</sup> organised in April 2016 a "[CSO strategy workshop on](#)

---

<sup>3</sup> The Core UPR Working Group in Sierra Leone is comprised of the Human Rights Commission Sierra Leone, Western Area District Human Rights Committee, CSO UPR Monitoring Group, Prison Watch Sierra Leone and Human Rights Defenders Network Sierra Leone.



[implementation of UPR recommendations.](#)” The workshop achieved two primary objectives. First, it **equipped civil society in Sierra Leone to utilise the opportunities** offered by the UPR framework to advance their human rights priorities, and second, **strengthened coordination** among national human rights defenders. During the event, CSOs worked on a document outlining their expectations on the government throughout the implementation process and a parallel document showcasing how CSOs can support the government towards realisation of UPR recommendations. At the end of a busy three day schedule, participants adopted an [Outcome Charter](#) containing their UPR priorities that will guide their up until Sierra Leone’s third cycle review in 2021.

### **1.3. Multi-stakeholders Dialogue on Effective Implementation of UPR Recommendations**

The Multi-stakeholders Dialogue on Effective Implementation of UPR Recommendations took place in Freetown 3-4 August and constitutes the main focus of this report. It brings together all national UPR stakeholders including the government, the national human rights institution, civil society organisations and UN agencies to provide space for a debate on how to embark on a joint pathway towards realisation of UPR recommendations. The meeting provided space for CSOs and the Government to constructively discuss implementation plans, and paved the way for future cooperation that will have a positive impact on the human rights situation in Sierra Leone.

## 2. Main objectives

The two-day Multi-stakeholders Dialogue was designed to have one session for CSOs and a parallel session for Government on the first day, and a plenary discussion among all the stakeholders participating in the workshop on the second day.

### 2.1. UPR Training for journalists

The UPR Training for journalists allowed for:

- Journalists to be briefed on the modalities and objectives of the UPR;
- Which recommendations Sierra Leone received during the second UPR cycle;
- How journalists increase knowledge on the national level about the UPR;

### 2.2. Civil Society Preparatory Meeting

The Civil Society Preparatory Meeting allowed for:

- CSOs to be aware of the status of the UPR recommendations;
- CSOs to work on their presentations for the following dialogue containing thematic implementation matrices for the next 5 years;
- CSOs were prepared to cooperate, compromise, negotiate with government representatives during the dialogue-day in a constructive manner.

### 2.3. Government Experts Preparatory Meeting

The government expert preparatory meeting allowed for:

- An introduction the UPR process in the context of international relations and international law;

- A briefing on the UPR of Sierra Leone and subsequent adoption of its UPR Working Group report;
- Sharing best practices observed in the framework of the UPR.

## **2.4. Multi-stakeholders Dialogue-day**

The multi-stakeholders 1-day dialogue between CSOs and Government officials provided an opportunity to:

- Discuss the implementation plan for the next five years;
- Clarify the Government ministries responsible for implementation;
- Create partnership opportunities between CSOs and the Government;
- Agree and discuss how to continue cooperation. A Letter of Cooperation was finalised between CSOs, HRSCL and the government shortly after the workshop.

### 3. Summary of the Multi-stakeholder National Dialogue

The Multi-Stakeholder National Dialogue was implemented over three days. On Day 1 *UPR Info* in collaboration with the HRCSL conducted a UPR training for journalists; on Day 2 a joint Opening Ceremony was followed by parallel preparatory meetings for CSO representative and government officials respectively; Day 3 brought CSO representatives and government officials together in a dialogue on how to move forward on UPR recommendations and ensure inclusive and sustainable implementation.

#### 3.1. Day 1: UPR Training for journalists

On 2 August, UPR Info together with the HRCSL and the HRDNSL organised a UPR training for 25 journalists at the premises of the HRCSL. After opening statements from the three organisers, *UPR Info* delivered an overview of the mechanisms and provided concrete examples of how journalists can engage with the UPR; share information to the public on what the UPR is and what recommendations Sierra Leone received; reporting on implementation and multi-stakeholders collaboration; hold actors accountable to their UPR commitments; establish a human rights network of journalists. Throughout the session, it was stressed that cooperation is the underpinning concept of the UPR and that also journalists must adhere to this pillar and avoid biased reporting and misrepresentation. The importance of keeping track on noted recommendations was also spotlighted, in particular since the government [committed](#) *to work closely with all sectors of society and civil society to ensure the full implementation of all supported recommendations, while laying the foundation for a smooth implementation of recommendations noted.*

In his presentation, the acting Executive Secretary of the HRCSL, Mr Joseph Ben Macking Kamara confirmed the Commissions willingness to continue working in partnerships with media outlets. He called on them to continue monitoring and reporting on human rights violations and to fulfil their role in an objective fashion. Mr Alphonsus B.M Gbanie, HRDNSL Executive Secretary, stated in his intervention that it was time to move away from the one-way-street relationship that has characterised CSOs relationships with media where the former only invited and informed journalists on issues they wanted to be published. A mutually beneficial partnership were both actors were treated on equal footing which each other was essential to form meaningful cooperation within the framework of the UPR, he concluded.



Questions from journalists evolved around the geographical imbalance of recommending states and what effect it brings that the top recommending states belong to the Western Europe and Others Group. One result discussed was that the rights these states prioritise are likely to get more pronounced in the UPR. Journalists agreed that they as a mitigating measure they could spread awareness about this and try to influence the government of Sierra Leone to increase their number of

recommendations. The issue of states making recommendations on human rights which they themselves do not fulfil also surfaced and the potential downfalls of this approach was debated. Before closing the session, journalists agreed that they would establish a human rights network of journalists and elect a working group to take this matter forward. *UPR Info* together with the HRCSL will continue to support this initiative.

The Secretary General of the Sierra Leone Association of Journalists closed the training with his final remarks endorsing the process of setting up the network and urged them to seek broad collaboration with all UPR stakeholders.

### **3.2. Day 2: Opening Ceremony**

Mr Solomon Sogbandi, Executive Director at Amnesty Sierra Leone, opened the ceremony by stressing that the purpose of the meeting was to remove tensions and misconceptions between the government and CSOs which previously have characterised their relationship. He urged all stakeholders to utilise the UPR as a driver towards transparency and meaningful cooperation. Mr Sogbandi concluded that national consultations in all areas of the country would be crucial to achieve an inclusive implementation process and a balanced national report ahead of Sierra Leone's third UPR in 2021.

Mr Gilbert Onyango, Regional Director at UPR Info Africa Regional Office, reminded the plenary that the purpose of this event was to ignite the implementation process, stating that the real work starts after the two-day workshop. He noted that Sierra Leone had the potential of becoming a role model of multi-stakeholders cooperation as all actors displayed commitment to bear the collective responsibility of the UPR. On a final note Mr Onyango applauded that the government and CSOs alike had learnt lessons from the first UPR of Sierra Leone. He applauded that CSOs worked in

efficient CSO coalitions and the government had shown willingness of including the HRCSL and CSOs early on in the follow-up phase.

Ms Inga Krastina, Head of Political, Press and Information Section at the EU Delegation, highlighted in her remarks that protection and promotion of human rights was close to the heart of the EU. In this light, while the EU as an entity are not allowed to make UPR recommendations, she highlighted that their member states are actively involved in the peer-review mechanism both as recommending states and states under review. Ms Krastina mentioned the universality as the pinnacle component of the UPR, but noted that its success ultimately depends on implementation. In this vein she applauded the commitment of the government to make the implementation an inclusive process bolstered by meaningful partnerships. She wrapped up her intervention by thanking the organisers for providing space for a multi-stakeholders dialogue soon after the adoption of Sierra Leone's UPR Working Group report.

Mr Arne Johansen, Honorary Consul of Norway and Sweden to Sierra Leone and Managing Director of Sierra Leone Cement Corp Ltd. (Leocem), noted that while countries such as Norway and Sweden today enjoyed a robust human rights climate, the process to arrive at this point was often a painful process for states. Whereas the importance of upholding international human rights law, Mr Johansen argued that there is no 'one-way-fits-all' solution and that the process of advancing human rights must be acceptable for local circumstances in order to be sustainable. Copying procedures from other countries are not always a receipt for success, he said. The Honorary Consul made a special mentioning of the Outcome Charter from the CSO Strategy Workshop in Bo in April 2016. He commended its practical approach as it can be used as a tool to guide the day-to-day work of its signatories. As a final remark, Mr Johansen made reference to the public-private dichotomy and affirmed that the citizens of Sierra Leone must have their rights protected in both spheres.

The Keynote Speech was delivered by Mr Brima Sheriff, Chairperson of the Human Rights Commission Sierra Leone (HRCSL), who started by clarifying their mandate as an independent institution tasked to bridge the government with civil society. As a result, of the HRCSL and outlining what their mandate allow them to do, and not to do. As a National Human Rights Institution (NHRI), the HRCSL engaged with the UPR in all its stages. HRCSL monitors government compliance with its human rights obligations, provides technical support to the government and organises national consultations for government officials and CSOs to gather feedback on the implementation of recommendations that Sierra Leone received during their first UPR in 2011. The Commission has also been involved in all steps of the second cycle, including participating in UPR Info's pre-session in Geneva and delivered an oral intervention during the adoption of Sierra Leone's UPR report.<sup>4</sup> Mr Sheriff expressed disappointment over the lack of high-level government participation, which had been cancelled with very short notice. In this context, he quoted H.E. Mr Mohamed Gibril Sesay, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who led the Sierra Leonean delegation during the adoption of their UPR working group and during this procedure stated that the government was ready to work closely with CSOs in the implementation of accepted recommendations.

The Chairperson emphasised that the success of the UPR of Sierra Leone was not to be decided by the percentage of accepted recommendations, but on the number of recommendations that would be fully implemented before the next review. He called upon CSOs to move from passive spectators to active partners in the implementation stage. He also noted that the UPR training for journalists that had taken place the day before was a tremendous step towards ensuring national ownership of the UPR and mitigating the information gap as citizens are not aware of what went on during

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.upr-info.org/en/review/Sierra-Leone/Session-24---January-2016/Adoption-in-the-Plenary-session#top> (minute 14)



Sierra Leone's UPR in Geneva. Lastly, Mr Sheriff underscored that the UPR is a mechanism tailored for sustainable partnerships between all stakeholders and stated that the more actors are included, the more credible and effective the UPR of Sierra Leone will be.

### 3.3. Day 2: CSO Preparatory Meeting

The CSOs preparatory meeting gathered a group of 24 prominent national human rights defenders out of which approximately half of them had participated in the CSO strategy workshop in Bo. In order to bring everyone up to speed, *UPR Info* gave a presentation on the modalities of the UPR, the review of Sierra Leone, and how CSOs can interact with the UPR. The need for sustained cooperation between all actors permeated the session as the UPR should not be employed as a venue for naming and shaming the government. Particular attention was given to the need for CSOs to partner not only with the government but also with the donor and diplomatic community well in advance of the UPR. This way CSOs could influence the recommendations that Sierra Leone receives as capitals are likely to reach out to Embassies in Freetown to receive information that will lay the foundation for UPR recommendations. Such an approach also ensures that recommendations are action-oriented and relevant for the national context. It furthermore facilitates mutual beneficial partnerships between Embassies and CSOs in the implementation process as the former will be interested in evidence gathered around their recommendations in the follow-up stage. By bringing such information to the attention of the donor and diplomatic community CSOs cement their credible and legitimate space within the UPR and increase the likelihood of securing funding to stay engaged with the mechanism throughout the five-year cycle. To this end, *UPR Info* organised a roundtable meeting with these actors at the EU Delegation on 5 August.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> See chapter 4.



After lunch, CSOs went on to finalise the presentations that they would deliver during the following dialogue-day. The presentations mirrored the thematic groups created during the CSO strategy workshop in Bo: (1) Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, (2) Civil, Political Rights and Other Vulnerable Groups, (3), Justice, (4) Women's rights, and (5) Rights of the child. The content of the implementation plans and action strategies that CSOs worked on in the April workshop tapped into the presentations, showcasing the linkage between this workshop and the dialogue-day. Presentations were finalised with input from members of all thematic clusters which evidenced the positive impact of cross-thematic CSO cooperation within the UPR framework. Special focus was given to formulate SMART indicators which will facilitate monitoring the implementation rate of recommendations. Participants also discussed whether the same recommendations had been made by national or regional mechanisms and found several such instances that they incorporated into their presentations. *UPR Info* provided information on international mechanisms that had made the same recommendations as those that Sierra Leone received during their second UPR. The importance of noting similar recommendations in other bodies cannot be overemphasised as it gives added legitimacy to the UPR recommendations and shows how the UPR should be utilised in conjunction with other human rights mechanisms at national, regional and international level. Throughout the preparatory meeting, it was clear that CSOs were eager in engaging

in a dialogue with government representatives and paid much attention to fine tuning details in their interventions.

### **3.4. Day 2: Government Experts Preparatory Meeting**

*UPR Info* seeks to provide training sessions for government representatives in order to discuss the UPR mechanism, its best practices, and prepare them to the dialogue-day with CSOs. In Sierra Leone, the 20 government representatives engaged in a training situating the UPR in both a national and international context with a strong focus on best practices from other countries. Funding opportunities, “noted” recommendations, and the importance of cooperation among the different stakeholders were also discussed during the session. Considering the limited knowledge of the UPR among participating government officials, this last minute revamp significantly raised their awareness of the UPR and their role in the implementation process. It further contributed to making the government representatives more confident in engaging with civil society during the dialogue-day.

### **3.5. Day 3: Multi-stakeholders Dialogue-day**

During a meeting with all organisers ahead of the parallel preparatory meetings, it was agreed that following the CSO presentations, CSO representatives and government officials would be divided into thematic groups to start drafting a joint national implementation plan. However, the session set out to provide an overview of the government’s strategy for implementation and monitoring of UPR recommendations had to be removed with short notice (because of the cancellation of the participation of the Justice Sector Coordination Office). It was substituted with an interactive briefing on the need for all UPR stakeholders to agree on a set of indicators per UPR recommendations in order to be able to track implementation. Discussions among the 63 participants emerged on the issue of gaining credible

statistics and information to even set out baseline markers of where Sierra Leone presently was in a range of human rights issues. The issue of getting up to date data on the number of schools was used as an example by a CSO representative demonstrating the issue of extracting information from ministries. Government representatives agreed that the first point of contact within any ministry should be the respective Permanent Secretary. In terms of accessing fresh data, CSOs were advised to use the “Statistics Sierra Leone website portal” as it is the same database that government use, thus having the added value of avoiding conflicting data between government and CSOs. Participants moreover agreed that it was crucial to engage with local level government to extract statistics on what was going on at district level. Although our organisation always emphasise the need for good indicators, we welcomed a discussion on the need to obtain credible information among UPR stakeholders.

The focus on the second stage of the presentation was on how the indicators established to measure the realisation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) can be invoked to measure implementation of UPR recommendations on the same topic. Together, these tools constitute a powerful allegiance as the SDGs has been successful in garnering substantial backing and the UPR is characterised by significant political willingness to achieve results. As an example, the indicator measuring SDG target 5.1, *End all forms of discrimination against all women and girls everywhere*, reads: *5.1.1 Whether or not legal frameworks are in place to promote, enforce and monitor equality and non-discrimination on the basis of sex*. As a reoccurring UPR recommendation calls for states to “end all forms of discrimination against women and girls”, SDG indicator 5.1.1 is ideal to measure the implementation of such a recommendation. As the saying goes, there is no need to reinvent the wheel and participants were delighted to see how the SDGs could be used in conjunction with the UPR in ways that would accelerate the implementation of both regimes. This exercise had the added value of portraying that the UPR is nothing new, but relates to issues that stakeholders are already working on.

During the government meeting the day earlier, it had become evident that the government officials present during the two-day activity had never been exposed to the UPR recommendations that Sierra Leone received during its second UPR. This illustrates that not only is there an information gap between government and CSOs, but also within the government and its ministries in terms of raising awareness about the UPR.<sup>6</sup> A government representative noted that Sierra Leone had received a recommendation on eradication of harmful cultural practices. He firmly stated that no international mechanism had the power to enforce a sovereign state to change its cultural norms. This prompted an intense, yet constructive debate where several CSOs noted that cultures are never stagnant but always evolving and the mere fact that they were able to discuss harmful cultural practices today was a testimony that cultural principles changes as this dialogue would have been unimaginable just a few years ago. The government conceded that practices that guided the cultural doctrine of Sierra Leone a decade ago not necessarily have the same influence today. *UPR*



<sup>6</sup> As a result, all 208 recommendations were displayed on the projector screen and UPR Info stressed that recommendations could be clustered into a set of themes, thus demonstrating that 208 unique actions were not necessary to implement the recommendations. In reality, one well designed action can contribute to the implementation of several recommendations.

*Info* stressed that UPR recommendations in no way infringe on the sovereignty of the State under Review, and that Sierra Leone indeed had noted all recommendations on harmful cultural practices. In this light it was crucial to note that the government of Sierra Leone had left the door open to continue the discussion on noted recommendations.<sup>7</sup>

Other comments evolved around how certain recommending states can be allowed to make recommendations to Sierra Leone when they themselves do not have flawless human rights record. *UPR Info* raised the fact that the UPR is a highly political mechanism and that sovereign states are free to pose any recommendations that they deem relevant. When reviewing the recommendations government officials outlined already ongoing activities that would contribute to realising the recommendation. This was an opportunity for CSOs to ask for more clarification on those initiatives and assessing how they could work together with the government. It furthermore showed that the government does not always have to take additional actions to address UPR recommendations.

As an introduction to CSO presentations, Ms Nwanne Vwede-Obahor, Senior Human Rights Adviser to the Office of the United Nations Resident Coordinator, OHCHR, took the floor. She urged all stakeholders to partner with UN agencies in their implementation activities and stressed that coordination, collaboration, and communication<sup>8</sup> among all actors were central ingredients for a successful UPR. The essence of the mechanism, she stipulated, is to achieve positive human rights change on the ground. She asserted that it was essential that the government fulfilled its role as the primary duty-bearer responsible for implementing recommendations. Turning to CSOs, she invited them to set short and

---

<sup>7</sup> Remind the words said during the UPR by the minister or by Henry?

<sup>8</sup> The three “C’s” advocated for by *UPR Info*



long term goals with their UPR activities and to assess where in government process they could plug in to contribute to existing initiatives geared towards implementation. The UPR also lend itself as an exercise in which CSOs must move beyond their watchdog role and take active part in the implementation. In order for this to become a reality, Ms Vwede-Obahor encouraged the government to involve them in their work and mentioned that in Latin and South America some government are even funding CSOs to carry out their legitimate work. While this is not yet a reality in Africa, she said that such best practise should be noted by the Sierra Leonean government in the spirit of genuine multi-stakeholders cooperation. In this light, she also urged CSOs to be creative when looking for funding and utilising the UPR by submitting proposals to donor on how they specifically would work on follow-up to the UPR and contribute to shaping the future of human rights in Sierra Leone. Ideally, such proposals could result in Memorandum of Understanding being signed between donors and CSOs which would secure funding to the latter throughout the five-year UPR cycle. On a final note, she tasked present government officials to become UPR advocates within their ministries. She also thanked the organiser for providing this much needed space for a transparent dialogue between CSOs and the government.

### *3.5.1. Civil society presentations*

In their presentation, the Women's rights group focused on a set of recommendations pertaining to access to quality healthcare in rural areas and destigmatisation of Ebola survivors. As one of their activities to support implementation the group identified capacity trainings for health care workers to strengthen their knowledge on national and international instruments set out to promote and protect the right to health. A government representative intervened and made a good point in that such an activity must be coordinated with the Health Service Commission to avoid duplication of similar activities. The Group Rapporteur welcomed the remark and *UPR Info* urged CSOs to take contact with the Commission to collaborate on this issue.

The Economic, Social and Cultural rights group presented on recommendations related to inclusive education for people living with disabilities and access to safe drinking water. Again, representatives from government ministries, departments and agencies commended the presentation but urged the Group Rapporteur to consider partnering with the Ministry of Works, Housing and Infrastructure as they were currently undertaking a national assessment on the accessibility of housing, including schools, which would be presented to the cabinet in the near future. A spokesperson from the National Disability Commission made a strong argument in favour of making existing and new schools disability friendly instead of separating students living with disabilities into different school buildings. On the topic of water, CSOs were informed that the government is engaged in a national mapping exercise on access to water and that they should lobby the parliament in the budget process to increase the allocation for safe and accessible drinking water at chiefdom level. Government representatives also suggested that CSO working on this issue partnered with local authorities to improve access to water as they were often the first line of government response. In this discussion, *UPR Info* spotlighted the need for all actors to employ a human rights based approach to development and programming which brings the added benefit in ensuring a human rights perspective. In practice, this may demonstrate itself by making water wells accessible for persons using wheelchairs and providing ramps in school buildings.





The Rights of the Child Group had selected to present what they expected from the government and how CSOs could assist in the implementation of recommendations pertaining to universal basic education for children and eradication of child labour. A major issue that surfaced in the dialogue was that children living in rural areas often had to walk several miles to the nearest school. All actors agreed that a proliferation of school in these areas in combination with making these more attractive workplaces for qualified teachers were key measures needed to combat the current inadequate situation. A representative from the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology shared that they together with United Kingdom's Department for International Development were active in reviewing the conditions of schools not yet officially approved.

The issue of child labour in agricultural schools was also discussed with some CSOs arguing that allowing children who were supposed to receive a quality education to work on farms during school hours was to be equated with child labour. Some government representatives held the position that this was not the case and rather constituted a key cornerstone in the practical approach taken to education in these schools which would give students a competitive edge on the labour market. Lack of clarity on what really demarcated child labour further complicated this particular issue and all participants agreed that a solid legal definition must be established. Another concern that surfaced was that of private schools enrolling overage students in the lower segments of education or forcing students to go through the same year several times. The aim, it was said, was to increase the profit of the private schools. This approach resulted in a plethora of negative effects for these students as it significantly slowed down their schooling. Representatives from all stakeholders agreed that CSOs should work in close cooperation with local councils who could enact by-laws to tackle this practice. Another arena through which CSOs could promote universal basic education was that of supporting vulnerable parents in a sustainable manner so that they could afford to let their children go to school. Even if their education was free, to let a child go to school could mean that a family lost a

member who otherwise would contribute to the income of the family. CSOs were advised to partner with The National Commission for Social Action who has experience in working on these issues.

The Civil and Political and Other Vulnerable Groups group illustrated its readiness to support the government in the implementation process by giving suggestions on how to follow up on recommendations related to freedom of expression of human rights defenders and journalists and a second recommendation related to prevention of torture and ill-treatment. It was the latter that triggered a passionate debate on cases of overcrowding, isolation and flogging in prisons. While national legislation prevents torture, it allows for 18 strokes with a cane as a measure of punishment. Regardless of the provisions of the law, the Group Rapporteur maintained that such corporal punishment ran counter to international human rights law and must be defined as torture. A representative from the Correctional Service Department, who worked closely with the Group Rapporteur on several issues related to prison conditions, stated that this practice in no way was to be compared to torture but was a lawful way of enforcing compliance with existing rules and regulations. The representative added that in 2014 the department embraced the policy of rehabilitation and reintegration of prisoners into society. It was positive to note that although there was disagreement on the subject matter a constructive and collegial dialogue took place. This was further assisted by the Correctional Service working in cooperation with experienced CSOs.

The Justice Group took the floor introducing their responses to recommendations on the right to be tried within reasonable time and civil society space within the implementation process. The Group Rapporteur referenced the government's national rapport and the addendum to their second UPR Working Group report highlighting that the government had committed to provide a safe and enabling space for CSOs to stay involved in all stages of UPR implementation. The Rapporteur also expressed a desire to increase the number of national consultations ahead of the

third UPR cycle and including as many CSOs as possible in the process. Government officials stated that it was difficult to financially support CSO activities from an already strained budget and urged them to pursue other avenues for funding. In response the Rapporteur noted that it was not just a monetary issue but that the government also could extend its political support for CSO involvement in implementing recommendations. The spokesperson also thanked *UPR Info* for making it possible for Sierra Leonean CSOs to participate in the pre-sessions and stay engaged after the UPR through the CSO strategy workshop and now the multi-stakeholders dialogue. Addressing the recommendation on timely trials, an official from the Correctional Service Department briefed participants on a recent initiative which had resulted in the establishment of magistrates' courts in each district which inevitably would contribute to more speedy trials.

Drawing on the many pieces of new information that surfaced during the dialogue it was clear that more frequent space for information sharing would benefit all actors. In this light, a Letter of Cooperation was drafted in which stakeholders agreed to meet at least twice a year to discuss implementation of UPR recommendations; reinvigorate the governmental coordinating committee, with participation of HRCSL and civil society, to be in charge of the implementation of recommendations of the UPR, UN treaty bodies and other international human rights mechanisms; include UPR recommendations in the plan of action of Government ministries, departments and agencies; establish a UPR focal point within every government ministry, department and agency; task the Parliamentary Committee on human rights to lay and bring up for discussion in parliament the implementation of UPR recommendations received by Sierra Leone. The Letter of Cooperation sets out an enabling structure for sustained follow-up on UPR recommendations by the government and civil society.

Due to the lack of a senior government representative able to participate in the press conference, the organisers decided to cancel it. Media coverage of the event was



*Promoting and strengthening  
the Universal Periodic Review*  
<http://www.upr-info.org>

however secured throughout the two days and amplified with the UPR training for journalists on 2 August.

## 4. Roundtable with diplomatic and donor community

The roundtable with diplomatic and donor community on 5 August was hosted by the Delegation of the EU to Sierra Leone. It brought together 9 human rights defenders from CSOs and the HRCSL protecting and promoting a wide range of human rights with diplomats from the Embassies of the US, Ireland and Germany, the British High Commission; the Honorary Consul of Norway and Sweden to Sierra Leone; and the EU.

The informal meeting started with *UPR Info* giving a brief overview of the UPR explaining why *UPR Info* worked in Sierra Leone, what activities had been undertaken to-date and next steps. The representative from the Embassy of Ireland commended the organisers for their ongoing dedication to making the UPR of Sierra Leone an efficient and inclusive process underpinned by meaningful local ownership. He stated that the chief added value of the UPR was its practical approach that brought together a vibrant spectrum of actors in all stages of the UPR process. The representative was pleased to share that they were working together with the Attorney General and Minister of Justice on their recommendation to repeal or revise the Public Order Act and Criminal and Seditious Libel laws, and guarantee freedom of expression for journalists. The process was moving forward in this regard and he promised to keep participants at the meeting posted on future developments. He expressed however concern that Ireland's recommendation to reverse the policy barring pregnant girls from attending schools and sitting state examinations, and encourage girls to return to school after childbirth was noted as well as other recommendations on gender and equality. In this light, he said it was interesting to learn that 20% of noted recommendations had triggered action at halftime in the first UPR cycle.

The representative from the United States embassy informed that they were working with Ireland on repealing the Public Order Act in addition to pushing for pregnant school girls right to participate in mainstream education during their pregnancy and to sit exams; combating overcrowding in prisons and tackling issues of discrimination; cooperating with the Ministry of Social Welfare, Gender and Children's Affairs to develop a strategy addressing the issues of female genital mutilation. In order for the latter to be successful increased buy-in from stakeholders was needed.

The Head of the Political, Press and Information Section of the EU Delegation echoed the previous speakers concern on noted recommendations on gender equality. She affirmed that they would stay engaged with the government on this matter and stated that while enacting favourable laws was a necessary first step, implementation was the deciding factor.

Statements from both civil society and HRCSL were given emphasising the paramount importance that funds were made available for CSO coalitions to stay engaged with the UPR during the five-year implementation period. The EU delegation encouraged civil society participants to send them project proposals outlining their foreseen UPR activities. The ability of CSOs to undertake the planned activities and their relevance would be assessed against a set list of criteria, the EU representative said. The Letter of Cooperation between CSOs and government drafted during the dialogue was presented and next steps were discussed. CSOs also seized the opportunity to speak on their priority recommendations and urged the diplomatic community to not shy away from pushing noted recommendations and to address the underlying root causes to why they were noted. It is not an option to 'note' the universality of human rights, a CSO representative stated.

## 5. The way forward

The objective of the two-day meeting was to ensure that all national stakeholders are equipped with the tools to make the most of the implementation phase of the Universal Periodic Review. Most importantly, the workshop aimed to create space for a cooperative dialogue between CSOs and Government representatives, a space to meet and discuss the way forward and the possibility of securing partnerships to ensure an effective and inclusive process of implementation of UPR recommendations in Sierra Leone. This meeting provided all the participants with the basics for a joint long-term strategy for the implementation of UPR recommendations in the country. As foreseen in the Letter of Cooperation, future meetings and thematic working groups offers additional platforms to discuss UPR recommendations.



Due to the lack of internet access in all meeting venues, *UPR Info* disseminated the relevant materials to participants through USB sticks during the sessions. In addition, all UPR documents pertaining to Sierra Leone's UPR have been electronically disseminated in accordance with the list of participants from the various meetings



*Promoting and strengthening  
the Universal Periodic Review*  
<http://www.upr-info.org>

and workshops. This is one way of mitigating the information gap that undermines effective work on the UPR in the country. However, in order to ensure a sustainable flow of information, it is key that all actors work together in a transparent and cooperative manner, and share information; both within ministries and the CSO community, but also between ministries and CSOs. The HRCSL, UN agencies based in Freetown as well as journalist also have important roles to fulfil in disseminating information.

Sierra Leone is at a crossroads in its UPR engagement. The level of implementation will ultimately decide the success of the process and it is pivotal that transparent cooperation between government and civil society is established at the outset. In order for the latter to uphold its position as a legitimate partner to the government, CSO coalitions must be funded throughout the implementation phase. Donors are therefore strongly encouraged to partner with CSOs and extend sustainable funding for their UPR activities. If these criteria are fulfilled, the future for strong local ownership of the UPR exercise in Sierra Leone looks bright. Sierra Leone is a key actor in Geneva when it comes to supporting the advancement of universal human rights, the country would therefore gain much to complement this commitment with robust implementation of UPR recommendations on the national level.



## 6. Lessons learnt

While the circumstances for implementing projects largely various from one country to another, the following lessons learnt were drawn from the particular context of implementing the Multi-stakeholders Dialogue on Effective Implementation of UPR Recommendations in Sierra Leone:

- *UPR Info* needs to procure the meeting venue and ensure access to internet, printing facilities, lunch, projectors and screens, registration desk and the possibility of accommodating group work;
- *UPR Info* needs to bring and disseminate an extensive number of hard copies of all relevant UPR documents for the state we are working with;
- A lack of high-level participation from government, UN agencies has a negative impact of the level of participation of other sectors of the government and parliamentarians;
- *UPR Info* needs to encourage partner organisations, CSOs, NHRIs and government to delegate their UPR work so that we do not rely on one focal point per actor in the implementation of the project;
- A meeting with all focal points from the various organiser should be conducted the day before the first day of the project to ensure to the best of our abilities that everyone agree on and are familiar with the agenda.

## 7. Outcomes and outputs

### **The main outcomes and outputs of the UPR Training for Journalists:**

- Journalists are introduced to the UPR, both through a national and international lens;
- Journalists are aware of the recommendations Sierra Leone received during the second UPR cycle;
- Journalists are provided examples of how to engage in monitoring implementation of UPR recommendations;
- A discussion on establishing a Human Rights Network of Journalists has started.

### **The main outcomes and outputs of the Government Expert Preparatory meeting included:**

- Government officials are aware of the UPR recommendations and their status;
- Government officials are briefed on their responsibilities in the implementation phase and good practices on inter-ministerial coordination for reporting and follow-up.

### **The main outcomes and outputs of the CSOs Preparatory Meeting included:**

- CSOs are aware of the UPR recommendations and their status;
- An updated draft implementation plan for the next four years will continue to be elaborated on;
- CSOs were prepared to discuss with the government their action strategies and implementation plans;
- An updated draft implementation plan for the next four years will continue to be elaborated on containing SMART indicators.

### **The main outcomes and outputs of the CSOs dialogue-day;**

- Increased understanding among CSO representatives and government officials of the needs, challenges and opportunities for government and civil society respectively to engage in a meaningful way in the implementation process;
- Contributed to defuse the sometimes adversarial relationship between the government and civil society by offering a platform for constructive dialogue on UPR follow-up;
- Adoption of a Letter of Cooperation.

### **Expected long-term effects of the project:**

- Incentive to re-establish a functional forum in charge of monitoring and implementing recommendations, comprised of government and CSOs representatives;
- Opportunities for regular meetings between CSOs and the inter-ministerial body;
- Opportunity to discuss a joint implementation plan for UPR recommendations;
- CSOs are empowered with a long-term UPR strategy;
- CSOs are more aware of the UPR framework and how to cooperate with the Government and access information;
- Government is more aware of the UPR framework and how to cooperate with CSOs. It identified main CSOs interested in the UPR;
- Several UPR recommendations were discussed in depth and many more will be discussed in future meetings keeping the UPR momentum at the centre of the human rights discussion involving the government, HRCSL, parliamentarians and journalists;
- Mutual understanding and coordination between the government, HRCSL and CSOs are enforced in the area of human rights protection and promotion;
- A Human Rights Network of Journalists will be established in the near future.

### **Outputs of the project:**

- 1 implementation plan was discussed among CSOs and Government;
- The implementation solutions that CSOs developed will be shared with the Justice Sector Coordination Office and possibly included in the National Action Plan;
- Concrete indicators were clearly identified and discussed among the stakeholders and were included in the implementation solutions presented by CSOs;
- Adoption of a Letter of Cooperation setting out the modalities for continuous cooperation between national UPR stakeholders;
- Financial support towards the organisation of the project was for the first time received from the private sector;
- 1 UPR training for 25 journalists implemented;
- 1 roundtable meeting with 9 CSOs and HRCSL representatives and 7 diplomats organised.

## 8. Annexes

### 8.1. Annex 1: Letter of Cooperation



#### Multi-stakeholders National Dialogue: For Strengthening the Cooperation to implement UPR recommendations

Supported by Sierra Leone Cement Corp Ltd. (Leocem) and UPR Info

Sierra Leone's human rights record was reviewed for the second time on 27 January 2016 at the United Nations in Geneva, during the 24<sup>th</sup> session of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review. Sierra Leone received 208 recommendations and will implement them until the next UPR.

On 24 June 2016, the Human Rights Council, at its 3<sup>rd</sup> session, adopted Sierra Leone's Report of Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review: the Government accepted 177 recommendations.

Within the UPR framework, cooperation is encouraged among all the different stakeholders during the implementation of UPR recommendations towards advancement of human rights and freedoms. Therefore, the Government representatives present today, together with representatives of the CSOs including CSOs coalitions for the UPR and the Human Rights Commission of Sierra Leone (HRCSL) came together for a dialogue and after attentive deliberation agreed on enhancing their mutual understanding, and to discuss future collaboration for the implementation of UPR recommendations.

As a result of the dialogue, all participants have agreed to:

- Request to the Government to reinvigorate the Inter-ministerial UPR Coordinating Committee to be in charge of the implementation of recommendations of the UPR, UN treaty bodies and other international human rights mechanisms, with representation of the Human Rights Commission Sierra Leone, government, parliamentarians and civil society representatives;
- Continue to hold multi-stakeholders meetings at least twice a year with a view to monitor the level of implementation of UPR recommendations and to discuss about ways to address challenges;
- Support participation of all stakeholders in the implementation process of recommendations of the UPR and other human rights bodies;
- Include UPR recommendations in the plan of action of Government ministries, departments and agencies with expected outcomes, assessment indicators, concrete activities, timeframe and responsible parties;
- Establish a UPR focal point within every Government ministry, department and agency;
- Task the Parliamentary Committee on human rights to lay and bring up for discussion in parliament the implementation of UPR recommendations received by Sierra Leone.

Freetown, 4 August 2016

## 8.2. Annex 2: Agenda

Please consult chapter 7 for changes in the agendas.

Day 1 – 3 August 2016 Opening Ceremony	
9:00 – 9:30	Registration
<b>09:30-09:35</b>	<b>Call to Order and Prayers</b>
<b>Objective</b>	<p><b>INTRODUCTION &amp; OPENING REMARKS</b></p> <p><i>To welcome all participants, government experts and civil society representatives, and to provide a general explanation for organising the 2-day Multi-stakeholders National Dialogue to foster cooperation between government agencies and civil society throughout the UPR implementation phase.</i></p>
<b>9:35 – 10:00</b>	<p><b>WELCOME REMARKS – Coordinator JSCO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Mr. Gilbert Onyango</b>, Africa Regional Director, UPR Info (TBC)</li> <li>• <b>Mr. Alphonsus B.M. Gbanie</b>, Executive Secretary, Human Rights Defenders Network Sierra Leone (TBC)</li> <li>• OHCHR Sierra Leone (TBC)</li> <li>• <b>Ms. Inga Krastina</b>, Head of Political, Press and Information Section, EU Delegation</li> <li>• <b>Mr. Arne Johansen</b>, Honorary Consul of Norway and Sweden to Sierra Leone (TBC)</li> </ul>
<b>Speakers/Guests (5 minutes each)</b>	
<b>10.00-10.30</b>	<p><b>KEYNOTE ADDRESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Mr. Brima Sheriff</b>, Commissioner, Human Rights Commission Sierra Leone (TBC)</li> </ul> <p>After the Opening Ceremony, participants will separate into two meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government experts preparatory meeting</li> <li>• Civil society preparatory meeting</li> </ul>

## Day 1: Government Experts Preparatory Meeting

Day 1 – 3 August 2016 Government Experts Preparatory Meeting	
9:00 – 10:30	<b>Joint Opening Ceremony</b>
10:30 – 10:45	Coffee Break
10:45 – 12:15	<b>Session 1: The UPR as an Effective International Tool for Improving Human Rights</b>
Objective	<i>To provide reminders on the UPR process and share best practices from different countries on the effectiveness of the UPR process: cooperation, coordination, implementation and monitoring.</i>
Facilitator	<b>Mr. Gilbert Onyango</b> , Director of Programmes, UPR Info
Discussion	Participants introduce their UPR work and ask questions for clarification on the UPR.
12:15 – 13:30	Lunch Break
13:30 – 14:30	<b>Session 2: Panel Discussion “Sierra Leone’s UPR Cycle: Process, Successes and Challenges”</b>
Objective	<i>To provide participants with a clear overview and understanding of the work undertaken by different stakeholders during Sierra Leone’s 1<sup>st</sup> UPR Cycle and reflect on challenges and successes which would influence the cooperative approach in implementing the 2<sup>nd</sup> Cycle UPR recommendations. Participants will be provided the latest position of the Government of Sierra Leone on its second cycle recommendations.</i>
Moderator Panelists	<b>Ms. Gilbert Onyango</b> , Regional Director, UPR Info Africa <b>(TBC)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Dr. Henry Mbawa Jr., Coordinator</b>, Justice Sector Coordination Office, Ministry of Justice, Government of Sierra Leone <b>(TBC)</b></li> <li>• <b>Mr. Brima Sheriff</b>, Commissioner, Human Rights Commission Sierra Leone <b>(TBC)</b></li> <li>• <b>Mr. Alphonsus B.M. Gbanie</b>, Executive Secretary, Human Rights Defenders Network Sierra Leone <b>(TBC)</b></li> <li>• OHCHR Sierra Leone <b>(TBC)</b></li> </ul>
Q&A	Discussion with participants.
14:30 – 15:15	<b>Session 3: The Government Plan for the UPR Implementation Phase</b>
Objective	<i>To provide an overview of the Ministry of Justice’s plan for the UPR Implementation Phase, including the inter-ministerial UPR working group.</i>
Facilitator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Justice Sector Coordination Office, Ministry of Justice, Government of Sierra Leone <b>(TBC)</b></li> </ul>
Discussion	Discussion with participants.

15:15 – 15:30	Coffee Break
15:15 – 16:15	<b>Session 4: The Human Rights Commission of Sierra Leone's Plan for the UPR Implementation Phase</b>
Objective	<i>To provide an overview of the NHRI's plan for the UPR Implementation Phase</i>
Facilitators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Mr. Brima Sheriff</b>, Commissioner, Human Rights Commission Sierra Leone (TBC)</li> </ul>
Discussion	Discussion with participants.
16:15 – 16:45	<b>Closing: Wrap up of Day 1 and Objective of Day 2 – Dialogue Day</b>
	Roundtable for government expert participants to reflect on Day 1 and expectations for Day 2.

### Day 1: Civil Society Preparatory Meeting

Day 1 – 3 August 2016: Civil Society Preparatory Meeting	
9:00 – 10:30	<b>Joint Opening Ceremony</b>
10:30 – 10:45	Coffee Break
10:45 – 11:30	<b>Session 1: Reminders on the UPR Process &amp; Debrief on the Adoption of Sierra Leone's UPR</b>
Objective	<i>To provide reminders on the UPR Process and debrief on the Adoption of the UPR Working Group adopted on 24 June 2016.</i>
Facilitator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Mr. Hans Fridlund</b>, Follow-up Programme Manager, UPR Info</li> </ul>
Discussion	Discussion with participants.
11:30 – 12:15	<b>Session 2: Updates on the UPR Implementation Plan / Monitoring Tool</b>
Objective	<p><i>For thematic groups to update each other on the activities undertaken since April 2016 and to provide detailed instructions and examples for updating the implementation plans, including SMART Indicators. The goal is for participants to partner and work in a cooperative manner with CSOs, NHRI and the government when implementing UPR recommendations.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Women's rights</li> <li>• Rights of the child</li> <li>• Other vulnerable groups</li> <li>• Economic, Social &amp; Cultural Rights</li> <li>• Civil and political rights</li> <li>• Justice</li> </ul>
Facilitator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Mr. Hans Fridlund</b>, Follow-up Programme Manager, UPR Info</li> </ul>
Q&A	Discussion with participants.
12:15 – 13:30	Lunch Break



13:30 15:15	-	<b>Session 3: “Preparing for Dialogue-Day with Government”</b>
Objective		<i>To provide Guidelines to participants for the Dialogue-Day: presentation of their implementation plan. Thematic Working Groups to select speakers and prepare for Dialogue-Day.</i>
15:15 15:30	-	<b>Coffee Break</b>
15:30 17:30	-	<b>Session 4: Reporting Back in Plenary</b>
Objective		<i>Rapporteurs of thematic working groups to report back in Plenary and receive feedbacks from all.</i>
Closing		<i>Roundtable of participants to reflect on Day 1.</i>

## Day 2 – Multi-stakeholders Dialogue-Day to Foster Cooperation on UPR Implementation

Day 2 – 4 August 2016 Multi-Stakeholders Dialogue to Foster Cooperation on UPR Implementation		
8:30 – 9:00		<b>Registration</b>
09:00 9:30	-	<b>OPENING REMARKS</b>
Speakers		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Justice Sector Coordination Office, Ministry of Justice, Government of Sierra Leone (TBC)</li> <li><b>Mr. Brima Sheriff, Commissioner</b>, Human Rights Commission Sierra Leone (TBC)</li> <li><b>Alphonsus B.M. Gbanie</b>, Executive Secretary, Human Rights Defenders Network Sierra Leone (TBC)</li> </ul>
9:30 10:30	-	<b>Session 1: A guide to Developing a National Implementation Plan for Sierra Leone</b>
Objective		<i>To provide an overview of the Government of Sierra Leone’s Strategy for Implementation and Monitoring.</i>
Facilitator		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Justice Sector Coordination Office, Ministry of Justice, Government of Sierra Leone: (TBC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Presentation of Sierra Leone’s UPR report</b> adopted in Geneva in June 2016</li> <li><b>Implementation &amp; Monitoring Strategy:</b> Government plan for the years to come on how all UPR stakeholders will be included in the process, with an emphasis on resources challenges, as well as presentation of existing monitoring tool</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Discussion		Discussion with participants.

10:30 – 10:45	<b>Coffee Break</b>
10:45 – 11:30	<b>Session 2: Establishment of Sierra Leone’s Monitoring Tools: Existing tools and Ideas for Improvement</b>
Facilitator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OHCHR Sierra Leone (TBC)</li> </ul>
Discussion	Discussion with participants.
11:30 – 13:00	<b>Session 3: Collaborative &amp; Cooperative Implementation Strategies</b>
Objective	<p>CSOs to present to Government representatives their effective strategies on how to support the government implementing received recommendations (rapporteur for each working groups by theme):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Justice, Women’s Rights, Rights of the child, Other Vulnerable Groups, Economic Social and Cultural Rights, Civil and Political Rights</li> </ul>
13:00 – 13:30	<b>Lunch Break</b>
13:30 – 15:30	<b>Session 4: Joint Group Work on Draft National Implementation Matrix</b>
Objective	MDAs and civil society representatives break into thematic groups to commence work on a National Implementation Matrix
15:30 – 15:45	<b>Coffee Break</b>
15:45 – 16:25	<b>Session 4 Continued: Joint Group Work on Draft National Implementation Matrix</b>
Objective	MDAs and civil society representatives break into thematic groups to commence work on a National Implementation Matrix
16:25 – 17:00	<b>Session 4: Discussion on Informal Agreement &amp; Closing</b>
Objective	Government and CSOs discuss the potential adoption of an informal agreement about the next steps of collaboration, including the periodicity which they planned to meet to discuss implementation.
<b>4 June 2016: PRESS CONFERENCE</b> Miata Conference Hall	
17:00 – 17:30	<b>SPEAKERS</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Justice Sector Coordination Office, Ministry of Justice, Government of Sierra Leone (TBC)</li> <li><b>Mr. Brima Sheriff, Commissioner</b>, Human Rights Commission Sierra Leone (TBC)</li> <li><b>Mr. Alphonsus B.M. Gbanie</b>, Executive Secretary, Human Rights Defenders Network Sierra Leone (TBC)</li> <li>OHCHR Sierra Leone (TBC)</li> <li><b>Mr. Gilbert Onyango</b>, Africa Regional Director, UPR Info</li> </ul>

### 8.3. Annex 3: Implementation Plan Template

Rec #	RS	Recommendation(s)	Response	Was the same recommendations made by other mechanisms?		Goal to be achieved	Expected action from Government	Indicators/data to track progress of implementation	Government body responsible for recommendation
				National	International				
111.167	Israel	Continue efforts to facilitate a greater participation and representation of women in public offices and in higher levels of decision-making positions	Accepted						
111.205	Poland	Engage the civil society in the follow-up implementation process of the recommendations raised during the universal periodic review	Accepted						

#### 8.4. Annex 4: Participation in the dialogue-day

Total Participants Dialogue-Day	Male	Female	Organisational data		
			Government MDAs	Civil Society	Media
63	45	18	16	27	9



Promoting and strengthening  
the Universal Periodic Review  
<http://www.upr-info.org>

## Contact

---

---

### UPR Info

*Rue de Varembé 3  
1202 Geneva  
Switzerland*

---

Website:

<http://www.upr-info.org>



Phone:

+ 41 (0) 22 321 77 70

*General enquiries*

[info@upr-info.org](mailto:info@upr-info.org)



<http://twitter.com/UPRInfo>



<http://www.facebook.com/UPRInfo>