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**Abstract**

When the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) Mechanism was established in 2006, one of the criticisms was that it would undermine the work of other human rights mechanisms. The relationship between the UPR and other human rights mechanisms (treaty bodies and special procedures) have attracted some academic discourse, especially considering that the UPR was established to complement and not duplicate the work of the treaty bodies. Scholars have engaged with the ability of the UPR to impact on domestic human rights protection on a range of issues including the right to health, indigenous rights, rights of sexual minorities and the abolition of the death penalty. One area that has received no meaningful attention so far is the ability of the UPR mechanism to promote transitional justice process in post-conflict states. The UPR, through its deliberative, cooperative, and capacity building approach, can play a significant role in shaping a state’s response to the legacies of mass atrocities and serious human rights violations. Focusing on Burundi and South Sudan, this chapter examines the relationship between the UPR and transitional justice, and the extent to which the UPR mechanism can promote transitional justice processes in post conflict societies. This chapter argues that the UPR can play a significant role in promoting transitional justice measures, reinforcing, and increasing the visibility of recommendations from other international mechanisms, and promoting accountability for human rights atrocities.

1. **Introduction**

Transitional Justice has increasingly been characterised in different ways by scholars and practitioners in the discipline. In human rights law, the requirement for accountability for human rights abuses form the established basis for transitional justice. This conception of ‘transitional justice’ dominated early scholarly works in the 1990s[[1]](#footnote-2) and was elevated by the establishment of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) in 1993 and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTY) in 1994.[[2]](#footnote-3) The focus was on criminal accountability,[[3]](#footnote-4) and more recent discourse about corporate accountability.[[4]](#footnote-5) This understanding of transitional justice, originally rooted in law, has expanded over time with calls for a more interdisciplinary approach to transitional justice. The breadth of the discipline has expanded over time with increasing scholarship in law, criminology, sociology, political science, development studies and international relations. This expansion has enriched the discipline with the introduction of new theoretical and normative frameworks that elucidate some of the complex dilemmas in realising justice, truth, reparations and other goals in societies transitioning from a period of large-scale past violations and abuses. While the different disciplines may have different definitions of ‘transitional justice’, it is generally accepted by human rights scholars that transitional justice refers to the ‘set of practices, mechanisms and concerns that arise following a period of conflict, civil strife or repression, and that are aimed directly at confronting and dealing with past violations of human rights and humanitarian law.’[[5]](#footnote-6) This view of ‘transitional justice’ as a set of ‘mechanisms’ or ‘processes’ is shared by the UN which defines transitional justice as ‘the full range of processes and mechanisms associated with a society’s attempt to come to terms with a legacy of large-scale past violations and abuses to ensure accountability, serve justice, and achieve reconciliation.’[[6]](#footnote-7) These processes include prosecutions, truth-seeking, institutional reform, and memorialization. They are implemented with the goal of providing victims with justice, establishing the truth, provide reparations, guarantee non-recurrence of the atrocities, and achieve sustainable peace and reconciliation. The extent to which these goals are feasible or achievable in different post-conflict societies has been the subject of much academic discourse.[[7]](#footnote-8) However, central to the goals of transitional justice is addressing human rights violations that took place during the conflict.

Transitional justice is both backward looking (uncovering the root causes of human rights violations and providing redress for victims) and forward looking by contributing to creating the conditions under which human rights can be promoted and protected. Evidence from the scholarly literature indicate that transitional justice mechanisms contribute to improved human rights protection at the domestic level and the prevention of violations of human rights. Tricia Olsen, Leigh Payne and Andrew Reiter find that a combination of transitional justice mechanisms positively improves human rights.[[8]](#footnote-9) The international Centre for Transitional Justice found that transitional justice measures undertaken in Colombia, Morocco, Peru, the Philippines, and Sierra Leone, contributed to prevention human rights violations in each of these states.[[9]](#footnote-10) They contend that transitional justice is statistically correlated with fewer human rights violations and less recurrence of armed conflict.[[10]](#footnote-11) Transitional justice is therefore rooted in international human rights law and can be mutually reinforcing, but the extent to which transitional justice measures have been the object of UPR recommendations has not yet been examined. Even UPR Info that undertakes extensive categorisation of UPR recommendations across key human rights themes did not include transitional justice in its categorisation in the first two cycles of the review and the categorisation for the third cycle fails to capture key transitional justice measures.[[11]](#footnote-12) As noted in the definition, transitional justice is a ‘process’ and for some of the states the process is just beginning.

This paper argues that the UPR can play an important role in helping post-conflict states achieve the goals of transitional justice by promoting and reinforcing the transitional justice mechanisms needed in post-conflict societies. UN General Assembly Resolution 70/262 makes a connection between the UPR and peacebuilding initiatives[[12]](#footnote-13) The OHCHR has highlighted[[13]](#footnote-14) the potential for the UPR to contribute to sustaining peace, provide valuable information for peacebuilding analysis, strategy and programming at the country level, and serve as a platform for dialogue and collaboration. An increasing number of recommendations have been made to states dealing with the legacies of war and repression in the context of the UPR. This paper will examine the extent to which these recommendations have touched on several transitional justice goals and processes including recommendations to end impunity, on accountability, peace agreements, truth commissions, institutional reform, reparations, return and reintegration programmes, and rule of law.

1. **Relationship between the UPR and related human rights mechanisms and disciplines**

It was evident during the negotiations leading to the establishment of the UPR mechanism that states considered the relationship it would have with other human rights mechanisms and related disciplines. In particular, the discussion focused on the relationship between the UPR and the treaty bodies, and between international human rights law and international humanitarian law (IHL).[[14]](#footnote-15) The goal was to ensure that the UPR would complement the work of the treaty bodies, support, and reinforce applicable humanitarian law. However, the literature has not always viewed these relationships positively, especially in the first few years of the UPR mechanism. In terms of the relationship with the treaty bodies, the UPR was criticised for encroaching on the work of the treaty bodies,[[15]](#footnote-16) undermining the validity of treaty body recommendations,[[16]](#footnote-17) and diverting material resources from treaty bodies.[[17]](#footnote-18) The inclusion of IHL as one of the legal bases for the UPR was contentious during the negotiation of the modalities for the UPR[[18]](#footnote-19) and has been criticised in some of the literature. Several states (including Norway and Australia) had opposed, ultimately unsuccessfully, the inclusion of IHL in the UPR on the basis that the mandate of the Human Rights Council did not include the promotion and protection of IHL.[[19]](#footnote-20) Claire Callejon argued that the inclusion of IHL as a basis for the UPR is ‘a questionable development as the Council has neither the mandate nor the competency to decide on the application of this body of law.’[[20]](#footnote-21)

However, there is emerging evidence that suggests the UPR can play a complementary role in relation to the treaty bodies, and reinforces human rights recommendations from various human rights mechanisms, including IHL. Helen Quane finds that UPR recommendations have contributed to enhance the engagement of Asian states with the UN human rights treaty bodies and special procedures.[[21]](#footnote-22) The UPR has also contributed to improve compliance with human rights treaty body reporting obligations by some African states.[[22]](#footnote-23) In relation to IHL, Lijiang Zhu finds that the UPR has been used as a forum to recommend ratification of IHL treaties and withdrawal of treaty reservations.[[23]](#footnote-24) Over 1000 IHL recommendations have been made in the UPR process by states during the first three cycles of the mechanism. Several of these recommendations are related to transitional justice processes.[[24]](#footnote-25)

Transitional justice scholars generally embrace a human rights-based approach that seek to empower victims, and transitional justice goals including peace, reconciliation, truth-telling, prosecution, reparations, restitution, deterrence and prevention, are intertwined with international human rights law. The ability of the UPR to complement other human rights mechanisms can create a complex regime in which there is duplication of human rights recommendations between domestic and international human rights mechanism, and between different international human rights bodies. Valentina Carraro undertakes the first empirical study that finds that duplications are frequent between recommendations made by states in the UPR process and those made by human rights treaty bodies.[[25]](#footnote-26) In addition, scholars have highlighted the impact of the UPR in advancing a range of human rights thematic issues at the domestic level including, health,[[26]](#footnote-27) indigenous rights,[[27]](#footnote-28) rights of sexual minorities,[[28]](#footnote-29) abolition of the death penalty,[[29]](#footnote-30) and peace and development.[[30]](#footnote-31) This paper adds to that body of knowledge by examining the relationship between the UPR and transitional justice. It acknowledges the existence of duplication of human rights recommendations but views this rather positively. The chapter argues that the ability of the UPR to complement, support, and promote transitional justice mechanisms is an achievable utopian goal. The repetition of same recommendations across multiple mechanisms not only highlights the importance of the issue but also creates pressure that can incentivise compliance or positively influence state behaviour. The UPR can give renewed visibility, amplify, and reinforce the recommendations from other domestic and international human rights mechanisms on transitional justice measures.

1. **Methods**

I undertook empirical analysis on all recommendations made to two African states (Burundi, and South Sudan). Burundi has been grappling with transitional justice since 2000 while South Sudan is more recently emerging from conflict and seeking to deal with the legacies of war and repression. I analysed the UPR recommendations made to these three states during the UPR’s first three cycles with the goal of determining the extent to which the recommendations referred to transitional justice goals. The analysis was guided by three key questions: (1) How prominent was transitional justice goals in the UPR’s recommendations? (2) What was the distribution of recommendations between different transitional justice issues? (3) How specific, useful, and measurable were the recommendations? This paper is based on these findings, and a desk review of literature on the UPR.

I undertook a desk-based review of all the recommendations made to the two states under study. Transitional Justice covers a broad range of issues. It was necessary to apply restrictions when coding UPR recommendations on transitional justice. First, the categorisation was restricted to recommendations that directly referred to transitional justice measures aimed at dealing with human rights abuses that took place during the conflict or reinforcing a recommendation from a domestic or international transitional justice mechanism. For example, a recommendation on sexual violence was coded as a transitional justice recommendation only if it was related to the conflict or made as part of a truth commission or related transitional justice mechanism. Second, the range of transitional justice goals were restricted to six core categories. These included (i) Criminal Accountability, including Prosecutions and engagement with the ICC; (ii) Truth Commissions or Commission of Inquiry; (iii) Return and Reintegration; (iv) Reparations; (v) Constitutional, Legal and Institutional Reform; and (vi) Peace and Reconciliation. This categorisation is broadly reflective of that adopted by the OHCHR,[[31]](#footnote-32) The UN Security Council,[[32]](#footnote-33) and the International Centre for Transitional Justice (ICTJ)[[33]](#footnote-34) in their work. Almost all the relevant recommendations fall into one of these categories, but it is conceivable that this work may have excluded a small number of UPR recommendations that may be relevant to transitional justice if they did not directly refer to transitional justice or fall into one of the six categories.

1. **Transitional Justice Contexts**
	1. **Burundi**

Burundi suffered from several decades of ethnic conflict and civil war after independence in 1962. The conflict was propelled by political rivalry between two ethnic groups, the Hutus (about 85 per cent of the population), and the Tutsis (about 14 per cent).[[34]](#footnote-35) The period between 1962 and 2000 was marked by political assassinations,[[35]](#footnote-36) military coups,[[36]](#footnote-37) ethnic massacres,[[37]](#footnote-38) and large-scale displacement of people.[[38]](#footnote-39) Some of the most egregious human rights violations reported included the 1972 massacre of about 300,000 Hutu civilians, 1988 Ntenga and Marangara massacres of over 50,000 Hutu civilians, the massacre of about 20,000 Hutus in 1991 in Cibitoke[[39]](#footnote-40) The 1993 report by the UN Commission of Inquiry on Burundi refers to the ‘genocide’ of Tutsi civilians.[[40]](#footnote-41) In 1999, over 800,000 civilians (12% of the population) were reportedly displaced.[[41]](#footnote-42) The scale and consistency with which these human rights violations were carried out were underscored by Rene Lemarchand who asserted that ‘nowhere in Africa have human rights been violated on a massive scale and with such brutal consistency than in Burundi’.[[42]](#footnote-43)

The foundations for transitional justice in Burundi are rooted in the 2000 Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement for Burundi (hereafter referred to as the Arusha Agreement) and the 2005 Report of the assessment mission on the establishment of an international judicial commission of inquiry for Burundi led by Tuliameni Kalomoh (the Kalomoh Report).[[43]](#footnote-44) The Arusha Agreement which was signed on 28 August 2000 in Arusha, Tanzania (came into force in November 2001) was a peace agreement and a political power sharing settlement between the different ethnic groups. This peace agreement ended the political violence that had persistent since independence in 1962 although failure to adhere to the terms of this settlement has led to renewed conflict in recent years.[[44]](#footnote-45) The Arusha Agreement acknowledge the commission of atrocity crimes in Burundi including acts of genocide, war crimes and other crimes against humanity, as well as violations of human rights.[[45]](#footnote-46) The parties to the agreement committed to ending and preventing the commission of these crimes.[[46]](#footnote-47) Some of the transitional justice actions the government of Burundi was required to take pursuant to the Arusha Agreement included:

1. Institute a National Day of Remembrance for victims and identification of mass graves;
2. Erect a national monument in memory of victims of genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity;
3. Enact domestic legislation against genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and other violations of human rights;
4. Request the establishment by the UN Security Council of an International Judicial Commission of Inquiry on genocide, war crimes and other crimes against humanity;
5. Request the UN Security Council to establish an international criminal tribunal for Burundi
6. Establish a National Truth and Reconciliation Commission
7. Institutional Reform[[47]](#footnote-48)

The establishment of a national truth and reconciliation commission and an international judicial commission were some of the key recommendations advanced in March 2005 by the Kalomoh Report.[[48]](#footnote-49) These recommendations were subsequently endorsed in June 2006 by the UN Security Council Resolution 1606,[[49]](#footnote-50) and have been reinforced by other human rights bodies including the UN Special Rapporteurs,[[50]](#footnote-51) the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights (ACHPR),[[51]](#footnote-52) and the Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding in Burundi (SFPB).[[52]](#footnote-53)

There have been significant delays in implementing several of the above transitional justice measures in Burundi[[53]](#footnote-54) that have contributed to renewed conflict in the country. Since April 2015, renewed political violence in the country has resulted in the death of about 1,200 people and about 400,000 refugees.[[54]](#footnote-55) Failure to adhere to the Arusha Agreement contributed to this renewed conflict. It is therefore important to examine the extent to which the UPR can contribute to support the implementation of the transitional justice measures set out in the transitional justice framework for Burundi. There have been several years since states have given any significant attention to the transitional justice process in Burundi. The UPR provides a forum that can bring renewed visibility to the transitional justice needs in Burundi. The Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Burundi, Fortuné Gaétan Zongo, has underscored the importance of implementing the various transitional justice mechanisms including on accountability, truth, reparations and institutional reform as recommended by various human rights bodies.[[55]](#footnote-56)

* 1. **South Sudan**

South Sudan was a part of Sudan until 2011 when it gained statehood. Between 1955-1972 and 1983-2005, civil wars between the north and south of Sudan resulted in the commission of human rights atrocities including systematic violence against women.[[56]](#footnote-57) The conflict was primarily between the government of Sudan and two rebel groups - the Sudan Liberation Movement (now the ruling party in South Sudan) and the Justice and Equality Movement. An accurate official historical record of the root causes of the conflict is yet to be established. However, commentators have generally attributed the root causes of the conflict to the racial (‘Arab’ against ‘African’) and religious (the majority Muslim North against the largely Christian and Animist South) divide, and to the differences in regional access to power that resulted in differential economic development.[[57]](#footnote-58) It is estimated that about 2 million people reportedly died and 4 million were displaced as a result of the civil wars.[[58]](#footnote-59) The Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) signed between the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement (SPLM) brought an end to the civil war. The CPA provided the legal basis for South Sudan to hold a referendum on independence in which over 98% of South Sudanese citizens voted for independence from Sudan on 9 July 2011. Whereas the CPA prescribed the power sharing arrangement between the government of Sudan and the SPLM, it was vague in terms of specific transitional justice measures to address the human rights atrocities from the conflict. The focus was more on peace and less on justice for human rights violations. There were references in the CPA to a reconciliation process to be undertaken by the parties but no specific mention of accountability for human rights atrocities or reparations to victims. While scholars in peace studies may see this as beneficial to the peace negotiations,[[59]](#footnote-60) ignoring transitional justice measures in the CPA left unaddressed questions on accountability and reparations for victims which are essential for sustainable peace.

However, in December 2013, South Sudan relapsed into civil war following power sharing disagreements and a political feud between President Salva Kiir Mayardit and Vice President Riek Machar.[[60]](#footnote-61) This conflict quickly took on an ethnic dimension (between the Dinka ethnic group that supported Kiir, and those from the Nuer ethnic group supporting Machar), and reportedly resulted in the death of about 400,000 people and displacement of millions of others.[[61]](#footnote-62) Following mediation by regional and international organisations, and threat of sanction by the UN Security Council,[[62]](#footnote-63) the *Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in the Republic of South Sudan (ARCSS)* of 17August 2015 was signed between the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement and Army in Government (SPLM/A-IG) (represented by President Salva Kiir Mayardit) and the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement and Army in Opposition (SPLM/A-IO) (represented by Riek Machar Teny Dhurgon).[[63]](#footnote-64) Chapter V of the ARCSS enshrined the foundation principles for transitional justice in South Sudan anchored on three key measures: (i) the Commission for Truth, Reconciliation and Healing (CTRH); (ii) the Hybrid Court for South Sudan (HCSS); and (iii) Compensation and Reparation Authority (CRA).[[64]](#footnote-65) These measures were intended to provide accountability for human rights atrocities, promote healing, reconciliation, and provide material and financial support to victims impacted by the conflict. The ARCSS also set out some parameters for a permanent constitution for South Sudan, institutional reforms and the establishment of a Joint Monitoring and Evaluation Commission (JMEC).[[65]](#footnote-66)

After about a year, none of the transitional justice measures in the ARCSS had been implemented, some of which had to be implemented within six months. There were several reasons for this including the fact that the parties had signed the agreement out of pressure from the international community rather than conviction in the provisions of the agreement.[[66]](#footnote-67) Renewed conflict in 2016 and subsequent peace negotiations culminated to the Revitalized Agreement on the Resolution of Conflict in South Sudan (R-ARCSS) in 2018 that established the Revitalized Transitional Government of National Unity (RTGoNU) and maintained the transitional justice measures set out in the ARCSS 2015.[[67]](#footnote-68)

The transitional justice process is South Sudan is occurring at a time when the UPR and other international mechanisms can make a meaningful contribution to the realisation of key transitional justice goals for the state. Several of the transitional justice measures outlined here have been reinforced by various international mechanisms. The African Union Commission of Inquiry on South Sudan has proposed similar measures to achieve ‘healing, reconciliation, accountability and institutional reforms.’[[68]](#footnote-69) The Human Rights Council and the UN Security Council have both recommended the establishment of a truth commission, hybrid court, and reparations programme as a road map for transitional justice in South Sudan.[[69]](#footnote-70) Resolution 2625 of 15 March 2022 by the UN Security Council required South Sudan to establish a Hybrid Court for South Sudan to prosecute perpetrators of human rights violations during the conflict, including perpetrators of sexual and gender-based violence.[[70]](#footnote-71)

It is within the contexts above that Burundi and South Sudan undertook the first three cycles of the UPR. This paper will now turn to examine the relationship between the UPR and transitional justice, highlighting the contributions of the UPR to reinforcing the six core categories for transitional justice defined earlier in this paper and contextualised in this section.

1. **Analysis and Findings: Relationship between the UPR and Transitional Justice Measures**

This section engages with the three key questions raised by this chapter - (1) How prominent was transitional justice goals in the UPR’s recommendations? (2) What was the distribution of recommendations between different transitional justice issues? and (3) How specific, useful, and measurable were the recommendations?

* 1. **The frequency of reference to transitional justice measures**

An important indicator when determining the value of the UPR for a particular rights issue is the frequency in which the human rights issue is referenced by UPR state recommendations. In 2016, the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights raised concerns on the quantity of recommendations made in the UPR process on socio-economic rights, viewing the limited attention given to socio economic rights as an indication states attached limited value to the right.[[71]](#footnote-72) However, Judith Bueno De Mesquita found that recommendations on the right to health has been more prominent in the UPR process that previous findings indicated, and represented 22% and 25% of the total recommendations made during the first two cycles of the UPR.[[72]](#footnote-73) Other studies have engaged in examining the quantity of recommendations made by states in the UPR process to gauge the prominence and level of engagement by states with particular human rights issues.[[73]](#footnote-74) This paper makes the first attempt to undertake a similar analysis in relation to transitional justice.

UPR recommendations were classified as ‘transitional justice related’ if they addressed Criminal Accountability (including prosecutions and engagement with the ICC); Truth Commissions or Commission of Inquiry; Return and Reintegration; Reparations; Constitutional, Legal and Institutional Reform; and Peace and Reconciliation. An additional category was created titled ‘General Reference to transitional justice and others’ to capture recommendations that called for the implementation of transitional justice more generally, without referring to any specific transitional justice measure. Fourteen recommendations were coded twice as they reference two of the transitional justice measures. For example South Africa recommended for South Sudan to ‘[e]xpedite the establishment and the operationalization of the Hybrid Court for South Sudan and the Commission for Truth, Reconciliation and Healing to ensure justice, accountability and healing.’[[74]](#footnote-75)- This recommendation was tagged as both ‘Criminal Accountability’ and ‘Truth Commission’. Only recommendations that clearly called for prosecution, punishment, cooperation with the ICC, ratification of ICC statute were tagged under ‘Criminal Accountability’. Recommendations only calling for investigations were not included. Recommendations were extracted directly from the relevant report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review.

During the first cycle of the UPR, at least 26% (13/51) of the recommendations made to Burundi (see Figure 1) were on transitional justice. This number dropped significantly to 18% (31/171) during the second cycle and then increased to 22% during the third cycle (54/242). Recommendations on transitional justice are prominent in the UPR for Burundi. While there has been a significant increase in the number of UPR recommendations to Burundi across the three cycles,[[75]](#footnote-76) there has not been an equal increase in the number of recommendations on transitional justice. The waning prominence of UPR recommendations on transitional justice to Burundi is an indication that states are not focusing on the increasing challenges of implementing transitional justice in Burundi. The Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Burundi, Fortuné Gaétan Zongo, criticised the limited progress by the government of Burundi on the implementation of transitional justice measures, in particular accountability, reparations, restitution, and security and judicial reform.[[76]](#footnote-77) Findings in the 2017 Report by the Commission of Inquiry on Burundi indicated that the alleged perpetrators of human rights violations during the conflict have not been prosecuted and the government of Burundi is ‘neither willing nor able genuinely to investigate or prosecute those violations.’[[77]](#footnote-78) The absence of a meaningful attempt by the government to hold perpetuators accountable or establish the truth has enabled denial and impunity to fester. According to David Taylor, in the ‘absence of insistence and follow-through in ensuring that the government fulfils its national and international commitments’, transitional justice in Burundi will remain elusive.[[78]](#footnote-79) The UPR can play an important role by reinvigorating its focus on recommendations targeting implementation of the transitional justice measures in Burundi.

A similar pattern on the frequency of recommendations can be observed in the case of South Sudan. Only four (12%) of the 33 recommendations made to South Sudan during the first cycle was related to transitional justice and predominantly focused on a general reference to the peace agreement (CPA). The low number of recommendations was because the review session took place in May 2011 whereas South Sudan only obtained independence in November 2011. The review took place in view of the pending political arrangement under the CPA between Sudan and South Sudan. Recommendations made to South Sudan where clustered separately.[[79]](#footnote-80) However, recommendations on transitional justice were very prominent in the second and third cycles of South Sudan’s review, accounting for at least 28% of the overall recommendations (65/233) during the second cycle and 22% during the third cycle. The level of attention placed on the issue of transitional justice by states within the context of the UPR is consistent with the pressure from other international mechanisms and civil society who have criticised delays by the South Sudanese government in implementing the transitional justice measures in the peace agreements. In 2021, before South Sudan’s third cycle, 34 South Sudanese, regional and international rights organizations urged the African Union to help establish the hybrid court for South Sudan to prosecute perpetrators of serious human rights abuses during the conflict.[[80]](#footnote-81) In 2015, the US committed $5 million to the AU for justice and accountability in South Sudan but the AU did not use the majority of the funds.[[81]](#footnote-82) In 2018, the African Commission called for the government of South Sudan to implement all the transitional justice measures outlined in the CPA.[[82]](#footnote-83) Transitional justice was prioritised in several NGO reports submitted for South Sudan’s second and third cycles of the UPR.[[83]](#footnote-84) There was therefore an appropriate alignment between state and NGO priorities, which focused on the issue of transitional justice and constituted 1/5 of the total recommendations made to South Sudan in the second and third cycles of the UPR.

* 1. **The quality of transitional justice recommendations – Relevance and Specificity**

No other international mechanism has received as much criticism about the quality of its recommendations than the UPR.[[84]](#footnote-85) According to Subhas Gujadhur and Marc Limon, the quality of UPR recommendation is determinative of the ‘usefulness and effectiveness’ of the mechanism.[[85]](#footnote-86) The quality of a UPR recommendation can impact on the ability of the UPR to promote meaningful and measurable change. However, there is no agreed definition of what a ‘good quality’ recommendation is, although there are some common elements across different definitions used by scholars and practitioners. The notion of SMART UPR recommendations, introduced by UPR Info,[[86]](#footnote-87) has been used by different UN agencies and recommended by the OHCHR.[[87]](#footnote-88) SMART requires recommendations to be Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Result-Oriented and Time-Bound.[[88]](#footnote-89) Specific recommendations are those that calls for a specific action in relation to a particular rights issue. This is generally categorised as Rank 5 recommendations on the UPR Info database.[[89]](#footnote-90) A ‘measurable’ recommendation is one that can be assessed, and an objective determination made on whether it has been implemented or not. A recommendation is ‘achievable’ where it can realistically be implemented by the state and ‘result-oriented’ where it addresses a human rights concern in the state under review and can contribute to improving the human rights situation on the ground. The element of ‘time-bound’ requires the recommendable to be capable of being implemented within the window of implementation before the next review cycle for the state). This approach to a ‘good quality’ recommendation helps to promote specificity, measurability, and relevance in relation to UPR recommendations. This approach has generally guided NGO engagement with the UPR process.

Another approach to a ‘good quality recommendation’ is that of ‘usefulness and measurability’ advanced by Gujadhur and Limon.[[90]](#footnote-91) A recommendation is considered ‘useful’ to the state under review if it objectively captures the main human rights challenges facing the state, shows an overall understanding of the domestic human rights situation, and helps provide guidance for reform to the state under review and domestic stakeholders.[[91]](#footnote-92) Measurability under this approach requires recommendations to provide indicators against which progress on the implementation of the recommendation can be measured. Bueno De Mesquita adopted this approach and applied it in the context of the right to health within the UPR.[[92]](#footnote-93) Several scholars and UPR stakeholders have criticised UPR recommendations that are too general, vague with no means of implementation or measuring outcomes of the recommendations.[[93]](#footnote-94) For example, during South Sudan’s second cycle review, Djibouti recommended South Sudan ‘[f]urther focus on the respect of human rights’[[94]](#footnote-95) and Norway recommended that South Sudan should ‘[i]ncrease the efforts in the field of civil protection in the transition period’.[[95]](#footnote-96) These recommendations do not provide a means to determine implementation, or assess the outcome of the recommendation. The Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights was critical of the recommendations states made on socio-economic rights highlighting that ‘two thirds of the recommendations relating to economic, social and cultural rights called for only general action, as opposed to any specific outcome.’[[96]](#footnote-97) However, I have previously argued that recommendations phrased in general terms are not entirely worthless as they have at times translated to specific action at the implementation stage.[[97]](#footnote-98) McMahon contended that UPR recommendations phrased in general terms and allowed the state the flexibility to determine the mode of implementation, can undermine the utility and impact of the recommendations.[[98]](#footnote-99) This indeed is the case, but it is also plausible that given the lack of human rights expertise informing state recommendations in the UPR process, that flexibility may well be needed by the state where the recommendation (even a specific and measurable one) does not meet the ‘usefulness’ criterion. In such a case, the state may implement the recommendation in a manner that will be most useful and effectively address the human rights concern.

The SMART approach and the ‘usefulness and measurability’ approach are not mutually exclusive. Several elements of the SMART approach are captured in the ‘usefulness and measurability’ approach. For example, the more specific a recommendation is the more useful and measurable it can be. As part of the analysis quality of transitional justice recommendations, I deployed the ‘usefulness’ criterion to determine how relevant the recommendations were and the extent to which they addressed the key transitional justice issues in Burundi and South Sudan. I then considered the specificity of the recommendations using UPR Info classification[[99]](#footnote-100) to determine how actionable the recommendations were.

* 1. **Usefulness and Specificity of Transitional Justice Recommendations to Burundi and South Sudan**

One of the significant findings from data on Figure 1 and 2 above is that there was a significant focus on justice/criminal accountability and truth commissions/commissions of inquiry, and very little focus on other transitional justice measures. The majority of the recommendations on transitional justice made to Burundi during the last three UPR cycles focused equally on justice/criminal accountability (24%) and Truth Commissions/Commissions of Inquiry (24%). There were no recommendations on return and reintegration or on reparations during the second and third cycles of the review. There was only one recommendation to Burundi in the second and third cycles of the review in the category of ‘constitutional, judicial and institutional reform’.[[100]](#footnote-101) The two issues prioritised here by states can be considered useful as they objectively showed an understanding of the human rights situation, and captured the transitional justice challenges facing Burundi. They reinforced some of solutions the state agreed to in the 2000 Arusha agreement and reiterated by UN Security Council Resolution,[[101]](#footnote-102) UN Special Rapporteurs,[[102]](#footnote-103) ACHPR[[103]](#footnote-104) and SFPB.[[104]](#footnote-105) In particular, the recommendations called for the establishment of a Truth Commission, and establishment of tribunal to hold accountable/prosecute perpetrators of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and other related crimes committed during the conflicty. This renewed visibility given to the transitional justice measures in Burundi was much needed considering the several years of delays in implementing the measures since the Arusha agreement was signed in 2000.

In the case of South Sudan, there were only few broad references to transitional justice in the first cycle of the UPR focusing on peace and pending constitutional arrangement that led to South Sudan’s independence. The majority of transitional justice recommendations made during the second and third cycles of the review focused on justice and criminal accountability (25%) compared to 3% on Truth Commission/Commissions of Inquiry, 2% on reparations, 2% on return and reintegration, and 2% on reform. It was useful for states to recommend justice and criminal accountability through the prosecution of perpetrators of human rights atrocities during the conflict in South Sudan. This is consistent with the ARCSS, R-ARCSS, UN Security Council Resolution 2625, and recommendations from the Human Rights Council, as highlighted earlier on in this chapter. It is also in line with authoritative interpretations of the ICCPR requiring states to prosecute, and punish certain serious violators of international human rights law.[[105]](#footnote-106) The majority of the state recommendations to South Sudan on this issue called for the establishment of the hybrid tribunal and the prosecution of perpetuators of atrocity crimes, including conflict related sexual violence. The delays in the establishment of the hybrid tribunal for South Sudan and the need to prosecute perpetuators of atrocity crimes during the conflict was an issue raised in several NGO submissions to South Sudan’s UPR.[[106]](#footnote-107) Recommendations on this issue were therefore useful and the UPR provided renewed visibility to these recommendations.

It is evident that addressing impunity and prosecuting perpetrators of serious human rights violations during the respective conflicts in Burundi and South Sudan gained prominence in state recommendations. These recommendations were useful. However, the limited or no reference to many other important transitional justice measures meant the full domestic situation was not captured in the overall quality of transitional justice recommendations made by states. Whereas the foundational documents for transitional justice in both Burundi and South Sudan captures a range of other measures, states within the UPR have focused primarily on criminal accountability through prosecution and truth commissions. For example, establishing a Remembrance Day and a national monument for victims was given equal importance to prosecution in the Arusha Agreement but was never mentioned in the UPR recommendations to Burundi. There was very little focus on reparations, and the return and reintegration of victims, despite constituting and important aspect of the transitional justice process in both Burundi and South Sudan. The predominant focus on prosecution and truth commission means those UPR recommendations on transitional justice focus more on the needs of the state and less on the needs of the victims. Simon Robin argues that the predominant focus on prosecution and truth commissions is failing victims and that other transitional justice measures can better address the needs of individual victims.[[107]](#footnote-108) There were no recommendations on reparations to Burundi and very few recommendations on this issue to South Sudan, despite the fact that this is a well-enshrined principle in human rights law for victims of gross human rights violations,[[108]](#footnote-109)and was part of the transitional justice framework for the states. While the focus on criminal accountability is important, states need to give equal attention in their recommendations to other transitional justice measures that address the needs of victims. The skewed distribution of the recommendations to Burundi and South Sudan on transitional justice compromises the quality of the recommendations and undermines the growing consensus for a more holistic approach to transitional justice.[[109]](#footnote-110) Given the complex challenges post-conflict societies face in addressing gross human rights violations, UPR recommendations on this issue need to promote a more holistic approach to transitional justice given recognition and prominence to a broader range of transitional justice measures. The transitional justice recommendations made by states to Burundi and South Sudan tended to promote more of the transitional justice measures prioritised by the international community (prosecution and truth commissions) and paid very little attention to local indigenous reconciliation and justice processes.

* 1. **Specificity of UPR recommendations on Transitional Justice to Burundi and South Sudan**

I noted earlier that the more specific a recommendation is, the more useful and measurable it can be to the state under review. Figures 3 and 4 below provide a representation of the specificity of transitional justice recommendations made to Burundi and South Sudan.



A qualitative review of the transitional justice recommendations made to Burundi and South Sudan reveal two key findings. First, the percentage of specific recommendations on transitional justice has significantly increased across the first three cycles of the UPR with a corresponding decrease in the number of general recommendations. In the case of Burundi, the proportion of specific recommendations on transitional justice increased by 31% between the first and third cycles (See Figure 3 above). An increase of 28% was observed in the case of South Sudan between the first and third cycles (see Figure 3 above). Some scholars have made a similar observation that the number of specific recommendations made by states have increased across the three cycles of the UPR.[[110]](#footnote-111) Second, the specific recommendations made to Burundi and South Sudan largely focused on criminal accountability, ratification of the ICC Statute, establishment of a truth commission or other mechanisms advanced in the relevant peace agreement. The outcome of these recommendations can be easily measured. For example, it would be easy to determine whether South Sudan has established the hybrid court, and truth commissions or ratified the Rome Statute of the ICC as recommended by states during the second and third cycles of the UPR.

Nevertheless, a significant proportion of the recommendations were general recommendations. For example, 43% and 36% of the transitional justice recommendations made to South Sudan during the second and third cycle of the review respectively, were general recommendations. Several relevant recommendations on reparations, return and reintegration of displaced persons, and reforms, were too general and at times vague. For example, Saudi Arabia recommended that South Sudan ‘[u]ndertake fundamental reforms to resolve the dispute in South Sudan’[[111]](#footnote-112) and Uganda recommended that South Sudan should ‘[i]ntensify efforts to carry out necessary reforms in the security sector’.[[112]](#footnote-113) Neither of these recommendations provide specific means to determine the action needed to implement the recommendation. Even though these recommendations are useful and highlight the need for reforms to be implemented in South Sudan, they do not meet the measurability requirement. For recommendations on transitional justice to have the most impact at the domestic level, they have to be specific, useful and measurable.

1. **Conclusion**

The analysis in this chapter has provided an opportunity to assess the relation between the UPR and transitional justice. The UPR can play an important role in helping post-conflict states achieve the goals of transitional justice by recommending and reinforcing recommendations on transitional justice measures needed at the domestic level. This can contribute to sustainable peace and to the promotion and protection of human rights in post-conflict societies. Transitional justice has a prominent position in state UPR recommendations. The UPR mechanism is therefore valuable to transitional justice and can play a meaningful role to the promotion of transitional justice in post-conflict societies. However, it was observed that the prominence of these recommendations appeared to be waning over time. Therefore, increasing focus need to be placed on implementation and follow-up of UPR recommendations without which the realisation of transitional justice goals will remain elusive in these states.

UPR recommendations have given renewed visibility to transitional justice measures enshrined in relevant peace agreements. There was evidence that many of the UPR recommendations on transitional justice had previously been made by other human rights mechanisms. The ability of the UPR to reinforce those recommendations gives the recommendations renewed visibility, and provide the state an opportunity to respond to them is a positive aspect of the process. This is particularly helpful in cases like Burundi where several years have passed since there was a meaningful recommendation on transitional justice by an international human rights mechanism.

While the transitional justice recommendations have been relevant and increasing specific, there are still a significant number of recommendations that are general and therefore do not satisfy the measurability requirement. In addition, there is a need for greater focus on implementation given the findings on the usefulness and measurability of many of the UPR recommendations on transitional justice. However, the overwhelming focus on criminal accountability and truth commissions undermines the ability of the UPR to promote other transitional justice measures. The UPR needs to promote a more holistic approach to transitional justice looking beyond prosecution and truth commissions, promoting other measures that address the needs of victims, including local indigenous reconciliation and justice processes.
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