

Andorra

Mid-term Implementation Assessment



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



Introduction

1. Purpose of the follow-up programme

The second and subsequent cycles of the review should focus on, inter alia, the implementation of the accepted recommendations and the development of the human rights situation in the State under review.

A/HRC/RES/16/21, 12 April 2011 (Annex I C § 6)

The Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process takes place every four and half years; however, some recommendations can be implemented immediately. In order to reduce this interval, we have created an update process to evaluate the human rights situation two years after the examination at the UPR.

Broadly speaking, *UPR Info* seeks to ensure the respect of commitments made in the UPR, but also, more specifically, to give stakeholders the opportunity to share their opinion on the commitments. To this end, about two years after the review, *UPR Info* invites States, NGOs, and National Institutions for Human Rights (NHRI) to share their comments on the implementation (or lack thereof) of recommendations adopted at the Human Rights Council (HRC) plenary session.

For this purpose, *UPR Info* publishes a Mid-term Implementation Assessment (MIA) including responses from each stakeholder. The MIA is meant to show how all stakeholders are disposed to follow through on, and implement their commitments. States should implement the recommendations that they have accepted, and civil society should monitor that implementation.

While the follow-up's importance has been highlighted by the HRC, no precise directives regarding the follow-up procedure have been set until now. Therefore, *UPR Info* is willing to share good practices as soon as possible, and to strengthen the collaboration pattern between States and stakeholders. Unless the UPR's follow-up is seriously considered, the UPR mechanism as a whole could be adversely affected.

The methodology used by UPR Info to collect data and to calculate index is described at the end of this document.

Geneva, 16 May 2013



Follow-up Outcomes

1. Sources and results

All data are available at the following address:

<http://followup.upr-info.org/index/country/andorra>

We invite the reader to consult that webpage since all recommendations, all stakeholders' reports, as well as the unedited comments can be found at the same internet address.

1 stakeholders' report was submitted for the UPR. 2 NGOs were contacted. No UN agency was contacted. The Permanent Mission to the UN was contacted. No National Human Rights Institution (NHRI) does exist.

2 NGOs responded to our enquiry. The State under Review did not respond to our enquiry.

The following stakeholders took part in the report:

1. **NGOs:** (1) Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACPC) (2) Tandem Project (TP)

IRI: 3 recommendations are not implemented, 1 recommendation is partially implemented, and 0 recommendation is fully implemented. No answer was received for 63 out of 67 recommendations and voluntary pledges.



2. Feedbacks on recommendations

CP Rights

Recommendation n°9: *Intensify cooperation between the Inter-Religious Dialogue Group and the National Andorra Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization* (Recommended by Algeria)

IRI: *partially implemented*

TP response:

"The 10 religious communities make up the Interfaith Dialogue Group. The Andorran National Commission for UNESCO collaborates with the group, which meets periodically to deal with problems of religious traditions, beliefs, and convictions."

Women & Children

Recommendation n°2: *Enact and implement legislation that unambiguously prohibits all corporal punishment in the home* (Recommended by Netherlands)

IRI: *not implemented*

+

Recommendation n°7: *Take all necessary measures to fully implement the Convention on the Rights of the Child, including by prohibiting corporal punishment of children in all settings* (Recommended by Sweden)

IRI: *not implemented*

+

Recommendation n°10: *Continue to develop measures against domestic violence, maltreatment and abuse, including sexual abuse, and, as recommended by the Committee on the Rights of the Child, explicitly prohibit corporal punishment, not only in schools, but also in the family* (Recommended by Spain)

IRI: *not implemented*

GIEACPC response:

There has been no change in the legality of corporal punishment since the first cycle review of Andorra in 2010: it is lawful in the home and alternative care settings; while it may be considered unlawful in schools and penal institutions under laws protecting human dignity it is not explicitly prohibited by law in those settings. In reporting to the Committee on the Rights of the Child, the Government stated that corporal punishment is prohibited in the home under article 114 of the Penal Code as amended in 2010. But this article does not specifically refer to corporal punishment, only more generally to physical and psychological violence. The rationale for amending the law – the “Exposició de motius” – as outlined in the official bulletin appears to focus on ensuring that all violence is punished and not only habitual or repeated violence; there is no specific reference to violence inflicted in the guise of punishment or “discipline”.



Methodology

A. First contact

Although the methodology has to consider the specificities of each country, we applied the same procedure for data collection about all States:

1. We contacted the Permanent Mission to the UN either in Geneva (when it does exist) or New York;
2. We contacted all NGOs which took part in the process. Whenever NGOs were part of coalitions, each NGO was individually contacted;
3. The National Institution for Human Rights was contacted whenever one existed.
4. UN Agencies which sent information for the UPR were contacted.

We posted our requests to the States and NHRI, and sent emails to NGOs and UN Agencies.

The purpose of the UPR is to discuss issues and share concrete suggestions to improve human rights on the ground. Therefore, stakeholders whose objective is not to improve the human rights situation were not contacted, and those stakeholders' submissions were not taken into account.

However, since the UPR is meant to be a process which aims at sharing best practices among States and stakeholders, we take into account positive feedbacks from the latter.

B. Processing recommendations and voluntary pledges

Stakeholders we contact are encouraged to use an Excel sheet we provide which includes all recommendations received and voluntary pledges taken by the State reviewed.

Each submission is processed, whether the stakeholder has or has not used the Excel sheet. In the latter case, the submission is split up among recommendations we think it belongs to. Since such a task is more prone to misinterpretation, we strongly encourage stakeholders to use the Excel sheet.

If the stakeholder does not clearly mention neither that the recommendation was “fully implemented” nor that it was “not implemented”, UPR Info usually considers the recommendation as “partially implemented”, unless the implementation level is obvious.



UPR Info retains the right to edit comments that are considered not to directly address the recommendation in question, when comments are too lengthy or when comments are defamatory or inappropriate. While we do not mention the recommendations which were not addressed, they can be accessed unedited on the follow-up webpage.

C. Implementation Recommendation Index (IRI)

UPR Info developed an index showing the implementation level achieved by the State for both recommendations received and voluntary pledges taken at the UPR.

The **Implementation Recommendation Index (IRI)** is an individual recommendation index. Its purpose is to show an average of stakeholders' responses.

The *IRI* is meant to take into account stakeholders disputing the implementation of a recommendation. Whenever a stakeholder claims nothing has been implemented at all, the index score is 0. At the opposite, whenever a stakeholder claims a recommendation has been fully implemented, the *IRI* score is 1.

An average is calculated to fully reflect the many sources of information. If the State under Review claims that the recommendation has been fully implemented, and a stakeholder says it has been partially implemented, the score is 0.75.

Then the score is transformed into an implementation level, according to the table below:

Percentage:	Implementation level:
0 – 0.32	Not implemented
0.33 – 0.65	Partially implemented
0.66 – 1	Fully implemented

Example: On one side, a stakeholder comments on a recommendation requesting the establishment of a National Human Rights Institute (NHRI). On the other side, the State under review claims having partially set up the NHRI. As a result of this, the recommendation will be given an *IRI* score of 0.25, and thus the recommendation is considered as “not implemented”.

Disclaimer

The comments made by the authors (stakeholders) are theirs alone, and do not necessarily reflect the views, and opinions at UPR Info. Every attempt has been made to ensure that information provided on this page is accurate and not abusive. UPR Info cannot be held responsible for information provided in this document.

Contact

UPR Info

Rue de Varembé 3

CH - 1202 Geneva

Switzerland

Website:

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



Phone:

+ 41 (0) 22 321 77 70

Fax:

+ 41 (0) 22 321 77 71

General enquiries

info@upr-info.org

Follow-up programme

followup@upr-info.org

Newsletter "UPR Trax"

uprtrax@upr-info.org