



SUMMARY REPORT
WORKSHOP ON SHARING THE BEST PRACTICES OF THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF ACCEPTED UPR RECOMMENDATIONS

Luang Prabang, Lao PDR, 11-12 December 2024

INTRODUCTION:

1. The Workshop on Sharing the Best Practices of the Implementation of Accepted UPR Recommendations was convened as part of the AICHR's Five-Year Work Plan (2021-2025), aiming to promote effective implementation of international human rights obligations among ASEAN Member States. It provided a platform for government officials, National Institutions, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), and external partners to exchange experiences, lessons learned, and best practices on implementing accepted Universal Periodic Review (UPR) recommendations. The workshop sought to 1) enhance understanding of the UPR process and its value in promoting and protecting human rights; 2) facilitate dialogue on effective strategies for implementing UPR recommendations; and 3) strengthen collaboration among ASEAN Member States and external partners. The Agenda of the Workshop appears as **ANNEX 1**.

2. The Workshop was co-chaired by H.E. Ambassador Yong Chanthalangsy, Representative of Lao PDR to AICHR and Chair of AICHR in 2024, and representative from the Australian Embassy to the Lao PDR in Vientiane, Mrs. Elizabeth Adler.

3. The Workshop brought together representatives from ASEAN Member States, including government officials, CSOs, and regional and international experts such as the Australian Embassy in Vientiane, representatives from the OHCHR Regional Office and the Australian Human Rights Commission. The List of Participants appears as **ANNEX 2**.

OPENING SESSION

4. The Workshop was opened by **H.E. Ambassador Yong Chanthalangsy**, Representative of Lao PDR to AICHR and Chair of AICHR in 2024. He welcomed the participants by sharing the objectives of the Workshop which is aligned with AICHR's Five-Year Work Plan (2021–2025). The Workshop also focuses on enhancing the effective implementation of human rights treaty obligations among ASEAN Member States and provides a platform for sharing best practices, lessons learned, and experiences in tracking and implementing accepted UPR recommendations. In addition, he mentioned that the Workshop also marks the beginning of capacity-

building activities aimed at strengthening national mechanisms for reporting and understanding international obligations, particularly under the UPR framework. By highlighting Lao PDR's 3rd UPR cycle experience, where 160 out of 226 recommendations were supported, he underscored the importance of collaboration among stakeholders to implement a Plan of Action (POA) and prepare for the 4th UPR cycle. With contributions from OHCHR, the Australian Human Rights Commission, and ASEAN Member States, the workshop fosters dialogue, capacity-building, and actionable steps for improving human rights conditions across the region. Lastly, the special appreciation was extended to Australia for its financial and technical support, emphasizing the significance of active participation and shared insights for collective progress.

5. The Workshop continued with the remarks from **Ms. Elizabeth Adler**, representative from the Australian Embassy in Vientiane, emphasizing the significance of the UPR as an inclusive and peer-driven mechanism for advancing human rights globally. She commended Lao PDR for its leadership as ASEAN Chair in 2024 and for hosting the Workshop, which serves as a platform to discuss the implementation of UPR recommendations. Highlighting the transformative impact of UPR, she shared examples such as gender equality and free primary education, while acknowledging the challenges of implementation, including resource constraints and policy changes. Mrs. Adler encouraged participants to address these challenges collaboratively, emphasizing the need for a strong commitment to make human rights actionable. She concluded by connecting the workshop's focus to the 2024 International Human Rights Day theme, "Our Rights, Our Future, Right Now," underlining the role of human rights in creating inclusive and peaceful societies.

SESSION 1: THE VALUE OF THE UNIVERSAL PERIODIC REVIEW (UPR)

6. The Universal Periodic Review (UPR) is a vital international human rights mechanism that promotes and protects human rights through universal inclusivity and state-driven engagement. Over its three cycles since 2008, the UPR has emphasized accountability, fostering alignment of national laws and policies with international human rights standards. In a comprehensive session delivered by **Ms. Cynthia Veliko**, OHCHR Regional Office for South-East Asia, the significance of the UPR as a robust platform for dialogue and collaboration was explored. Ms. Veliko highlighted how the UPR encourages states to identify key areas for improvement, implement changes, and showcase progress, citing specific success stories from ASEAN Member States. The mechanism's inclusive nature was emphasized, showcasing its ability to bring together governments, civil society, and external partners.

7. Despite its transformative potential, the UPR faces challenges that hinder its effectiveness, such as selective implementation, insufficient resources, and competing national priorities. While best practices include enhanced stakeholder engagement, robust follow-up mechanisms, and regional cooperation, the tendency to focus on politically 'safe' recommendations undermines its broader impact. CSOs and National

Institutions have played critical roles in integrating recommendations into national plans, yet insufficient follow-up and monitoring weaken the accountability framework. To address these gaps, innovative strategies are needed, such as tiered recommendation prioritization, digital tools for transparency, and a centralized international monitoring system under the Human Rights Council. Building national capacities, amplifying marginalized voices, and promoting regional synergies remain crucial to optimizing the UPR's potential. States are encouraged to institutionalize follow-up mechanisms, establish formal UPR bodies, and leverage open-access databases to track and showcase progress comprehensively.

8. During the interactive Q&A segment, participants discussed challenges and opportunities for improving the UPR process. Key points included the need for states to establish platforms for meaningful CSO participation, as highlighted by Cambodia's practice of involving over 6,000 CSOs in consultations despite differing perspectives. The increasing number of UPR and Treaty Body recommendations was noted as a burden, particularly for states with limited capacity, emphasizing the need for streamlined processes and prioritization. Participants also stressed the importance of strengthening stakeholder engagement through national dialogues and developing robust monitoring systems to track progress. Suggestions for improving the UPR process included institutionalizing follow-up mechanisms, fostering regional cooperation, and leveraging digital tools for greater transparency and efficiency.

SESSION 2: EXCHANGING EXPERIENCES IN IMPLEMENTATION OF UPR RECOMMENDATIONS

SUB-SESSION 1: CASE STUDY AND EXPERIENCES FROM VIET NAM AND CAMBODIA

9. **Amb. Phoukhong Sisoulath**, Director-General of Treaty and Law Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Lao PDR, moderated the Sub-Session 1.

10. **Mr. Angkearith CHIN**, Director of the Regional and ASEAN Department of the Cambodian Human Rights Committee, discussed Cambodia's progress in implementing UPR recommendations, which presented a detailed case study focusing on the labor sector. Key initiatives included amending the Trade Union Law in 2020 to streamline union registration processes and improve union rights. This led to a 72.4% growth in registered professional organizations to 6,253, including 5,921 local unions and 278 union federations. Cambodia also addressed child labor through the National Action Plan on the Reduction of Child Labour (2016-2025), focusing on strengthening labor inspector mechanisms, law enforcement, and raising public awareness in high-risk industries. The National Review Committee was expanded to 23 members in 2019. These measures demonstrate Cambodia's commitment to fulfilling its UPR obligations and fostering collaboration among government bodies, unions, and international partners.

11. Following Cambodia, **Mr. Dinh Quang Minh**, Official, Department of International Organizations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Viet Nam, presented on Viet Nam's experience with the UPR emphasized its active participation and commitment across all four UPR cycles. Viet Nam has consistently increased its acceptance rate for recommendations, reaching 84.7% in the fourth cycle—the highest so far. Key strategies include developing a comprehensive implementation plan approved by the Prime Minister, tasking 18 agencies with specific responsibilities, and integrating UPR recommendations into national and ministerial plans. Viet Nam also highlighted its structured approach to reporting, including broad consultations with NGOs and other stakeholders, submission of a voluntary mid-term report, and drawing on international best practices. Furthermore, Viet Nam's achievements reflect its dedication to improving human rights through legal, civil, economic, and social frameworks, with particular attention to women's rights and vulnerable groups. Challenges, such as ensuring consistent implementation, were mitigated through collaboration and extensive stakeholder engagement, showcasing Viet Nam as a proactive participant in the UPR process.

SUB-SESSION 2: CASE STUDY AND EXPERIENCES FROM LAO PDR AND INDONESIA

12. **Ms. Sharon Ho Swee Peng**, representing the Malaysian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, moderated the Sub-Session 2.

13. The second sub-session featured Laos and Indonesia, where Laos, **Mr. Phouthabandith Warinthrasak**, Director of Division of Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law, Department of Treaty and Law, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Lao PDR highlighted the progress, challenges, and preparation efforts of Laos in implementing Universal Periodic Review (UPR) recommendations as part of the Human Rights Council process. Key highlights include the adoption of accepted recommendations across the first three UPR cycles, with progressive increases in engagement and commitments. The presentation emphasizes the implementation mechanisms such as the National Committee on Human Rights and related commissions, along with a Plan of Action that aligns with national priorities like human rights treaty ratifications, poverty eradication, and the rights of marginalized groups. In addition, key challenges include economic instability due to COVID-19, difficulty in disseminating the Plan of Action at local levels, and resource limitations in human rights expertise. Preparations for the fourth UPR cycle involve structured consultations, stakeholder involvement, and finalizing the national report. The presentation highlights the importance of continued capacity-building, international cooperation, and adherence to deadlines for submitting the national report by January 2025.

14. **H.E. Ms. Yuyun Wahyuningrum**, AICHR Representative of Indonesia, shared Indonesia's experiences in implementing UPR recommendations, highlighting key achievements and challenges. Indonesia accepted 210 of 269 recommendations in its fourth UPR cycle, focusing on areas such as gender equality, migrant worker

protection, education, healthcare access, and combating trafficking. Successes include the 2022 Sexual Violence Law and improved frameworks for indigenous rights and migrant workers. However, challenges persist, such as inconsistent political will, bureaucratic inertia, cultural resistance, and resource limitations. H.E. Ms. Wahyuningrum emphasized the importance of political leadership, stakeholder collaboration, and transparent accountability in addressing these issues. Indonesia's structured approach, including integrating UPR commitments into its National Action Plan on Human Rights, underscores the complexities and opportunities in advancing human rights domestically and regionally. The presentation concluded with strategic recommendations to enhance coordination, capacity building, and inclusivity to sustain progress.

15. During the interactive Q&A segment, participants raised key issues regarding the fulfillment of human rights obligations, emphasizing the role of development partners in Laos' National Plan of Action due to budgetary limitations, particularly in supporting capacity-building for local authorities. Malaysia shared its challenges in implementing accepted UPR recommendations, citing evolving internal practices that led to partial acceptance of recommendations on the death penalty and freedom of expression. Australia highlighted that while recommendations are generally accepted in principle, their implementation depends on specific circumstances. The discussion also underscored the importance of collaboration with national development agencies to advance human rights commitments effectively.

SUB-SESSION 3: CASE STUDY AND EXPERIENCES FROM THAILAND AND MALAYSIA

16. **H.E. Ambassador Prof. Dr. Nguyen Thai Yen Huong**, AICHR Representative of Viet Nam, moderated the Sub-Session 3.

17. The final sub-session explored Malaysia and Thailand's experiences. **Ms. Sharon Ho Swee Peng**, representing the Malaysian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, presented Malaysia's approach to implementing UPR recommendations, focusing on its fourth UPR cycle. Malaysia received 348 recommendations, addressing areas such as vulnerable groups, economic and social rights, human trafficking, and stateless people. To manage implementation, Malaysia established a National Action Committee on Human Rights in 2024, including representatives from federal and state agencies, CSOs, and the private sector. Key strategies include appointing focal points, consulting stakeholders, and developing SMART indicators to monitor progress. Challenges include cross-sectoral coordination, transparency, and policy alignment. Lessons emphasized the need for realistic indicators, ownership by implementing agencies, and capacity-building programs. Malaysia's approach underscores a structured, inclusive process to fulfill human rights obligations and improve accountability.

18. **Ms. Nareeluc Pairchaiyapoom**, Director of the International Human Rights Division, Rights and Liberties Protection Department, Ministry of Justice of Thailand, shared Thailand's comprehensive approach to the UPR process and implementation of recommendations. Thailand integrates UPR recommendations into key national frameworks, such as the National Human Rights Plan and the National Action Plan on Business and Human Rights. Significant achievements include the enactment of the Act on Prevention and Suppression of Torture and Enforced Disappearance (2022), ratification of the ICPPED, and withdrawal of interpretative declarations under the CAT. Institutional advancements include re-accreditation of the National Human Rights Commission with "A Status," establishment of the Human Rights Development Institute, and climate change-related initiatives. Additionally, reforms such as raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility, enabling same-sex marriage, and strengthening justice mechanisms highlight Thailand's commitment to advancing human rights. The UPR process in Thailand features regular consultations with stakeholders, UPR National Committee meetings, and the development of an action plan to track progress, demonstrating a strong framework for collaboration and accountability.

19. During the interactive Q&A segment, the discussion highlighted the importance of raising societal awareness about the UPR process across all generations and fostering effective partnerships with CSOs as essential stakeholders. Participants explored Malaysia's experience in collaborating with its parliament, guided by OHCHR's recommendations, to streamline the lawmaking process, enhance policy adoption, and ensure a "check and balance" approach to implementing UPR recommendations. Thailand's UPR National Committee, a standing body coordinating between the Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Foreign Affairs, was discussed in detail, drawing comparisons to Laos' National Committee on Human Rights and its cycle-specific UPR Drafting Committee. The exchange also touched on the challenges posed by the increasing scope of UPR recommendations, the need for stronger coordination mechanisms, and the differentiation in national reporting templates, emphasizing the importance of alignment and collaboration to ensure effective implementation.

SESSION 3: EXTERNAL PARTNER'S SHARING EXPERIENCES

20. **H.E. Ambassador Yong Chanthalangsy**, Representative of Lao PDR to AICHR and Chair of AICHR in 2024, moderated the Session 3.

21. **Mr. Kieran O'Brien**, Director of the Human Rights Branch at the Australian Attorney-General's Department, shared Australia's experiences in implementing UPR recommendations, emphasizing the country's commitment to human rights and active engagement across three UPR cycles (2011, 2015, 2021). He highlighted Australia's approach, which involves considering recommendations in good faith, consulting stakeholders (including civil society and human rights institutions), and coordinating implementation across federal, state, and territory levels. Key challenges identified

include navigating competing priorities, achieving community buy-in, addressing complex legislative and geographical considerations, and managing reforms within a federal system. Success stories included the establishment of the Modern Slavery Act 2018 and the National Action Plan to Combat Modern Slavery 2020–2025, as well as robust engagement through the ASEAN-Australia Counter Trafficking Program. Another significant focus was addressing gender-based violence, with the adoption of the National Plan to End Violence Against Women and Children 2022–2032 and a \$4.7 billion investment to tackle systemic issues, improve responses to high-risk perpetrators, and address harmful social attitudes.

22. Additionally, **Mr. O'Brien** emphasized best practices such as involving civil society, adopting an incremental approach to reform, sharing implementation responsibilities, and prioritizing impactful actions over reporting. He also stressed the importance of ongoing collaboration with stakeholders and peer-learning among Member States to overcome challenges and ensure meaningful progress in advancing human rights.

23. **Ms. Laura Mancini** from the OHCHR Regional Office presented on the importance of National Mechanisms for Implementation, Reporting, and Follow-Up (NMIRFs) to address practical challenges in coordinating and implementing UPR recommendations. She emphasized that NMIRFs serve as a government structure mandated to coordinate reporting and engagement with international and regional human rights mechanisms, as well as to track and implement human rights recommendations. Key features of effective NMIRFs include robust coordination capacity across ministries and stakeholders, meaningful consultations with civil society and marginalized groups, and advanced information management systems to cluster and track recommendations, including alignment with SDGs. Engagement capacity is also crucial for liaising with human rights bodies and facilitating state reporting. Tools such as the National Recommendations Tracking Database (NRTD), developed by OHCHR, support states by enabling clustering, tracking, and implementation of recommendations. Since its launch in 2022, the NRTD has been successfully rolled out in countries like the Philippines, Malaysia, and Thailand, with over 70 requests globally.

24. **Ms. Mancini** also underscored the value of institutionalizing NMIRFs to ensure timely reporting, quality follow-up, and sustainable technical expertise. She also highlighted the need for states to leverage digital tools, standardized procedures, and collaborative approaches to enhance the implementation of human rights obligations effectively.

25. During the interactive Q&A segment, the session highlighted diverse perspectives and practical challenges in the UPR process. Participants emphasized the importance of public awareness and broad stakeholder consultations, including CSOs, private sectors, and marginalized communities, to ensure inclusive implementation of human rights obligations. A recurring theme was the role of mutual

respect and trust in fostering constructive relationships between governments and CSOs, which are critical for advancing human rights reforms. Key challenges were raised, such as integrating international recommendations into domestic frameworks, ensuring political continuity amid leadership changes, and addressing resource constraints in implementing UPR recommendations. Discussions also covered leveraging tools like the Human Rights Index and National Recommendations Tracking Database (NRTD) to track progress and align recommendations with SDGs.

26. Specific examples were provided, including Australia's success in implementing recommendations on human trafficking and disability rights through robust legislative frameworks and coordinated stakeholder engagement. However, challenges in areas such as the Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture (OPCAT) were noted, requiring ongoing dialogue and incremental progress. Lastly, participants called for greater professionalism and collaboration in engaging with international mechanisms, including special rapporteurs, to create a more effective and constructive environment for advancing human rights. The session underscored the importance of tailoring solutions to national contexts while maintaining strong partnerships with civil society and international actors.

SESSION 4: CONTRIBUTIONS OF NON-PROFIT ASSOCIATIONS AND CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS IN UPR

SUB-SESSION 1: EXPERIENCES FROM VIET NAM AND LAO PDR

27. **Ms. Elizabeth Adler**, Second Secretary of the Australian Embassy in Vientiane, moderated the Sub-Session 1.

28. **Ms. DOUNG THI NGA**, Deputy Secretary General, Vietnam Peace and Development Foundation (VPDF), highlighted the vital contributions of Vietnamese CSOs to the UPR process, leveraging their grassroots expertise, advocacy, and international engagement to promote human rights. CSOs actively participate by providing inputs to national reports, submitting shadow reports, and engaging in monitoring and consultation processes, with achievements including enhanced civil society involvement and broader dissemination of UPR information. The VPDF, holding Special Consultative Status under UN ECOSOC, has contributed across UPR cycles through shadow reports, dialogues on human rights and development, and fostering regional and global partnerships. Despite challenges such as limited awareness of UPR mechanisms and resource constraints, **Ms. Nga** emphasized opportunities to enhance capacity-building, align UPR efforts with SDGs, and strengthen collaboration between governments and CSOs. Lastly, recommendations included developing systematic coordination mechanisms, fostering international partnerships, and supporting shared learning to advance Viet Nam's human rights agenda were also made.

29. **Mr. Thongdam Phongphichith**, Director of the Sustainable Agriculture and Environment Development Association (SAEDA), presented the significant contributions of Lao CSOs in promoting sustainable development, human rights, and national progress. Through the Lao National CSO Coordination Committee (LCCC), representing over 100 non-profit associations and foundations, CSOs have been instrumental in shaping rights-based development initiatives. Key activities include active participation in the 4th UPR of the UN Human Rights Council, where priorities such as rights to work, social security, health, education, and family life were emphasized. SAEDA has demonstrated leadership in advancing sustainable agriculture, receiving the ASEAN Leadership Award in 2017 for its impactful work. The organization has also engaged in significant national and international collaborations, including contributions to the 3rd Voluntary National Review (VNR) for SDG implementation, participation in high-level forums such as the UN's High-Level Political Forum (HLPF) in New York, and training CSOs in using tools like the People's Scorecard for monitoring SDGs. Additionally, SAEDA and Lao CSOs have played a pivotal role in Lao PDR's Smooth Transition Strategy for graduating from the Least Developed Country (LDC) status and participated in regional workshops addressing human rights-compliant approaches to counter-terrorism financing. These efforts underscore SAEDA's unwavering commitment to fostering inclusive development and strengthening civil society's role in Lao PDR's national and international progress.

30. During the interactive Q&A segment, participants discussed key aspects of civil society engagement, resource challenges, and procedural improvements. The Lao government's openness to CSOs was highlighted as a positive step, fostering collaboration on human rights initiatives through informal mechanisms. However, budgetary insufficiency from donors remains a significant challenge, impacting the sustainability of long-term projects. Additionally, Viet Nam showcased notable progress, particularly in advancing gender equality and social protection, reflecting the benefits of effective coordination and resource utilization. This discussion emphasized the need to address systemic challenges to strengthen the implementation of UPR commitments across the region.

SUB-SESSION 2: EXPERIENCES FROM THAILAND AND CAMBODIA

31. **Mr. Kieran O'Brien**, Director of the Human Rights Branch at the Australian Attorney-General's Department, moderated the Sub-Session 2.

32. **Ms. Monika Mak**, Executive Director, Cambodian Disabled People's Organization (CDPO), presented on the organization's role and engagement in the UPR process, particularly focusing on disability inclusion. Established in 1994 and governed by people with disabilities, CDPO represents over 20,000 members across all 25 provinces of Cambodia. Despite limited involvement in previous UPR cycles due to logistical challenges and the COVID-19 pandemic, CDPO actively engaged in the fourth cycle by organizing consultations with its network of Organizations of Persons with Disabilities (OPDs) to prioritize issues and recommendations. The organization

also participated in pre-sessions in Geneva, meeting with international stakeholders and missions to advocate for disability rights. Key achievements include recognition by the OHCHR and collaborative efforts to ensure disability perspectives are integrated into UPR recommendations. The presentation highlighted the importance of strengthening government and civil society collaboration to implement national and international disability laws effectively.

33. **Ms. Chalida Tacharoensak**, Chairperson of People's Empowerment Foundation, Thailand, presented on the role of civil society in the UPR process. She highlighted the importance of stakeholder engagement in drafting reports, monitoring government implementation of recommendations, and promoting human rights advocacy. Thailand's approach includes active participation from CSOs in preparing UPR reports, submitting joint and individual recommendations, and conducting consultations. Key recommendations for improving implementation include establishing thematic cooperation committees between government and CSOs, promoting ownership among CSOs, and institutionalizing biannual monitoring and evaluation to align with government mid-term reporting. The presentation emphasized the need for collaboration between CSOs and National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs) to ensure comprehensive and effective follow-up on UPR commitments.

34. In Q&A session, several key points were discussed regarding the implementation of UPR recommendations and the role of civil society. One participant highlighted the need to incorporate a formal role for CSOs in the UPR action plan, acknowledging the importance of involving civil society in consultations before developing implementation strategies. This suggestion was well-received, and the idea will be explored further with the concerned authorities to establish a structured channel for CSO interaction. Furthermore, another concern raised was the challenge of ensuring effective monitoring and implementation of UPR recommendations, particularly in managing large volumes of data. A participant emphasized the need to streamline reporting processes, recognizing that different departments may face varying levels of capacity and resource constraints. The discussion underscored the necessity of balancing thorough oversight with efficient, actionable reporting.

CLOSING SESSION

35. As the Co-chair, **Ms. Elizabeth Adler**, emphasized the importance of turning commitments into tangible actions to advance human rights. The speaker highlighted the diversity of stories shared during the event, showcasing the positive impact of countries implementing UPR recommendations. Despite challenges, such as resource constraints and the complexity of multi-stakeholder engagement, the importance of regional collaboration and the role of relevant stakeholders were underscored. She recognized the value of learning from various national reviews and follow-up mechanisms across different countries while stressing the need for accountability in tracking accepted recommendations.

36. In his closing remarks, **H.E. Ambassador Yong Chanthalangsy** concluded with a heartfelt acknowledgment of participants' active engagement and valuable contributions, emphasizing the success of the event in fostering meaningful dialogue and collaboration. The discussions highlighted a shared commitment to strengthening the implementation, reporting, and follow-up mechanisms of ASEAN Member States in relation to human rights. Participants gained deeper insights into their roles and responsibilities in upholding these commitments, supported by the expertise of esteemed speakers who provided valuable perspectives on national reporting frameworks. Gratitude was extended to the Australian Embassy, the Australian Human Rights Commission, the OHCHR Regional Office for Southeast Asia, the ASEAN Secretariat, and ASEAN Member States for their technical and financial support. The Co-chair officially closed the Workshop by wishing all participants good health, happiness, and success, encouraging them to carry forward the knowledge and inspiration gained from this event.

AGENDA**AICHR Workshop on Best Practice Approaches to Implementation of Accepted UPR Recommendations**

11-12 December 2024, Souphattra Hotel, Luang Prabang

Workshop Day 1		
Time	Session	Speakers
09:30-10:00	Registration	All participants
10:00-10:10	ASEAN Anthem Opening remarks	Amb. Yong Chanthalangsy, Chair of AICHR, AICHR Lao PDR Ms. Megan Jones, Australia's Ambassador to Lao PDR
10:10-10:40	Session #1 The value of the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) Q & A	Ms. Cynthia Veliko, Regional Representative of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in South- East Asia (OHCHR)
10:40-10:50	Group Photo & Coffee break	All participants
10:50-12:00	Session #2 A. Exchanging experiences of implementation of UPR recommendations Moderator: Amb. Phoukhong SISOULATH, Director General of the Department of Treaty and Law (5 mins) - Case study from Cambodia (4 th cycle) (20 mins) - Case study from Vietnam (4 th cycle) (20 mins) Q&A (30 minutes)	Amb. Phoukhong SISOULATH, Director General of the Department of Treaty and Law - Mr. Angkearith CHIN, Director of Regional and ASEAN Human Rights Department, the Cambodian Human Rights Committee Cambodia - Mr. Dinh Quang Minh, Official, MoFA Vietnam
12:00-13:30	Lunch	All participants
13:30-14:45	Session #2 B. Exchanging experiences of implementation of UPR recommendations Moderator: Ms. Sharon Ho Swee Peng , Government Official, MFA Malaysia (5 mins) - Case study from Laos (3 rd cycle) (20 mins) - Case study from Indonesia (4 th cycle) (20 mins)	Ms. Sharon Ho Swee Peng , Government Official, MFA Malaysia - Mr. Phouthabandit WARINTHARSAK, Director of Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law

	Q&A (30 minutes)	Division, Department of Treaty and Law - Ms. Wahyuningrum, AICHR Indonesia
14:45-15:00	Coffee break	All participants
15:00-16:15	<p>Session #2 C. Exchanging experiences of implementation of UPR recommendations</p> <p>Moderator: Mr. Thiphasone SENGSOURLINHA, Deputy Director of General, Department of Treaty and Law, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (5 mins)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Case study from Malaysia (4th cycle) (20 mins) - Case study from Thailand (3rd cycle) (20 mins) <p>Q&A (30 minutes)</p>	<p>Mr. Thiphasone SENGSOURLINHA, Deputy Director of General, Department of Treaty and Law, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms. Sharon Ho Swee Peng, Government Official, MFA Malaysia - Ms. Nareeluc Pairchaiyapoom, Director of International Human Right Division, Rights and Liberties Protection Department, Ministry of Justice of Thailand
16:15-16:20	Close Day 1	Amb. Yong Chanthalangsy, Chair of AICHR, AICHR Lao PDR

Workshop - Day 2		
Time	Session	Speakers
08:30-09:00	Registration	All participants
09:00-10:15	<p>Session # 3 External Partner's sharing experiences</p> <p>Moderator: Amb. Yong Chanthalangsy, Chair of AICHR, AICHR Lao PDR</p> <p>Topic:1. Exchanging experiences of implementation of UPR recommendations by the Australian Government (20 mins)</p> <p>Q&A (20 minutes)</p> <p>Topic: 2. The role of National Mechanisms for Implementation, Reporting and Follow-Up (NMIRFs) by Ms. Laura, OHCHR Regional Office (20 mins)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q&A (20 minutes) 	<p>Amb. Yong Chanthalangsy, Chair of AICHR, AICHR Lao PDR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Kieran O'Brien, Director, Human Rights Branch, Australian Attorney General's Department

		- Ms. Laura Mancini, OHCHR Regional Office
10:15-10:30	Coffee break	All participants
10:30-12:00	<p>Session # 4 NPAs/CSOs' contribution in UPR</p> <p>Moderator: Ms. Elizabeth Adler, Second Secretary of the Australian Embassy (5 mins)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lao NPAs (20 mins) • Vietnam's CSO (20 mins) • Q&A (20 mins) 	<p>Ms. Elizabeth Adler, Second Secretary of the Australian Embassy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lao NPAs - Ms. DUONG THI NGA, Deputy Secretary General, Vietnam Peace and Development Foundation.
12:00-13:30	Lunch	All participants
13:30-14:35	<p>Moderator: Mr Kieran O'Brien, Director, Human Rights Branch, Australian Attorney General's Department</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambodia's CSO (20 mins) • Thailand's CSO (20 mins) • Q&A (20 mins) 	<p>Mr Kieran O'Brien, Australian Attorney General's Department</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms. Monika Mak, Executive Director, Cambodian Disabled People's Organisation - Ms. Chalida Tacharoensak, Community Empowerment Organization from Thailand
14:35-14:45	<p>Closing remarks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amb. Yong Chanthalangsy, Chair of AICHR, AICHR Lao PDR • Ms. Elizabeth Adler, Australian Embassy 	<p>Amb. Yong Chanthalangsy, Chair of AICHR, AICHR Lao PDR</p> <p>Ms. Elizabeth Adler, Australian Embassy</p>

List of Participants

1. Amb. Yong Chanthalangsy, AICHR Chair
2. Ms. Wahyuningrum, AICHR Indonesia
3. Mr. SREANG CHENDA, representative from AICHR Cambodia
4. Ms. Monika Mak, Executive Director, Cambodian Disabled People's Organisation
5. Mr. Angkearith CHIN, Director of Regional and ASEAN Human Rights Department, the Cambodian Human Rights Committee Cambodia
6. Mr. Chanti Somsack, Executive Director, Cambodian Disabled People's Organisation
7. Amb. Prof. Dr. Nguyen Thai Yen Huong, AICHR Vietnam
8. Mr. Dinh Quang Minh, officer, MOFA Vietnam
9. Ms. DUONG THI NGA, Deputy Secretary-General, Viet Nam Peace and Development Foundation
10. Ms. Sharon Ho Swee Peng, Government Official, MFA Malaysia
11. Mr. Jharas Boonrak, Assistant of AICHR Thailand
12. Ms. Nareeluc Pairchaiyapoom, Director of International Human Right Division, Rights and Liberties Protection Department, Ministry of Justice of Thailand
13. Ms. Chalida Tacharoensak, Chairperson of People's Empowerment Foundation from Thailand
14. Ms. Chanlida Tralasack, People's Empowerment Foundation from Thailand
15. Mr. Julio DA COSTA FREITAS, Counselor, MOFA, Timor Leste
16. Mr. Lourenco Guterres Harnay Dos Reis, Timor Leste
17. Ms. Hilda Suherman, ASEAN Secretariat
18. Ms. Brigid O'Farrel, Australian Human Rights Commission
19. Mr. Kieran O'Brien, Director, Human Rights Branch, Australian Attorney General's Department
20. Ms. Elizabeth Adler, Second Secretary of the Australian Embassy
21. Ms. Dalavieng Thiladej, Australian Embassy
22. Ms. Laura Macini, OHCHR
23. Ms. Cynthia Veliko, Regional Representative of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in South-East Asia (OHCHR)
24. Ms. Rineeta Naik, OHCHR
25. Amb. Phoukhong Sisoulath, Director General, DTL, MOFA
26. Mr. Thiphasone Sengsourinha, Deputy-Director General, DTL, MOFA
27. Mr. Sengphaarthid Sanookphon, Deputy Director General of ASEAN Department, MOFA
28. Mr. Phouthabandith Warrinhasak, Director of Division, DTL, MOFA
29. Mr. Atsany Siribuly, Deputy-Director of Division, DTL, MOFA
30. Ms. Sililath Siengsounthone, Deputy-Director of Division, DTL, MOFA
31. Ms. Anita Phanthavone, Deputy-Director of Division, ASEAN Department, MOFA
32. Ms. Panatda Luanglath, officer, DTL, MOFA
33. Mr. Soulasak Phichit, Officer, DTL, MOFA

34. Ms. Vathida Phonekeo, Officer, ASEAN Department, MOFA
35. Mr. Soubandith Lattanavong, Officer, DTL, MOFA
36. Ms. Pathoumma Lathsavong, Officer, DTL, MOFA
37. Ms. Thanikone, Officer, Division on the Treaty in the field of Economic, Culture, Social and Environment, MOFA
38. Mr. Vassana Mounsavang, Director of Division on the Treaty in the field of Political, Security and Justice, MOFA
39. Mr. Sylaphet Thinkeomeuan, Deputy-Director of Foreign Affairs and regulation Division, MOFA
40. Ms. Naly Phengphommy, Deputy-Director of Division, representative from SOM-ED Laos
41. Mr. Thiphasone Soukkhathammavong, Deputy-Director General, representative from SLOM Laos
42. Mr. Lakhangthong Panyanouvong, Official, General of Cabinet, representative from SOMHD Laos
43. Ms. Bounluan, Head of consultant and protection of women and children centre
44. Ms. Sonenaly Siyavong, Deputy-Director of Division, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
45. Ms. Manivone Luangsombath, Head of National commission for Advancement of Women, Mother and Children
46. Mr. Chomyaeng, Director General, Head of National Committee for People with Disabilities (NCPD)
47. Ms. Manivanh Soutyavong, Executive director, Gender Development Association
48. Ms. Inthana Boubphasavanh, Executive Director, Women Development and Law Association
49. Ms. Sivilay Phommisouk, Deputy Director Counselling and Protection Center
50. Ms. Thippavon Phavong, Head of CEDAW Division
51. Mr. Thongdam Phongphichith, Director of Sustainable Agriculture and Environment Development Association
52. Ms. Nampherng Somanivanh, Senior project officer, Gender Development Association
53. Ms. Phetsamone Manola, Director, Friends of Phatadke Association
54. Mr. Sengkham Thailée Xunghueu, Association for Mutual Assistance AMA
55. Mr. Khongvandy Mitthiyaphone, Vice president of Luangprabang Silk Association
56. Mr. Sombath Chansamone, Foreign Affairs Division
57. Ms. Sonemany, Foreign Affairs Division
58. Mr. Phouthasith Vilasack, Provincial Office
59. Ms. Ammala Chanthamaly, International Relations Officer, Education and Sport Division
60. Ms. Saysamone Souvatdy, Officer, Labor and Social welfare Division