Human Rights Treaties Division

Background

Function and role of the Division

The human rights treaty bodies are independent committees that have been established under the international human rights treaties. They are composed of experts serving in their personal capacity that are elected by States Parties. Treaty bodies monitor the implementation of human rights treaties through a system that requires the periodic review of reports submitted by States Parties to each treaty. All international core human rights treaties are supplemented by optional protocols or contain optional provisions that enable the committees to accept and consider individual complaints. The treaty bodies also issue recommendations to States Parties, adopt general comments on thematic issues and conduct inquiries regarding allegations of violations. One Committee undertakes visits to States Parties aimed at preventing torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

The Human Rights Treaties Division (HRTD) is responsible for implementing Subprogramme 2 of the Secretary-General’s Strategic Framework entitled Supporting human rights treaty bodies, developed to enhance the work of the 10 treaty bodies that are mandated to monitor the national-level implementation of the international human rights treaties.

The 10 treaty bodies comprise:
- The Human Rights Committee (HR Committee)
- The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR)
- The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD)
- The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW)
- The Committee against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT)
- The Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture (SPT)
- The Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC)
- The Committee on Migrant Workers and Members of their Families (CMW)
- The Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD)
- The Committee on Enforced Disappearances (CED)

The Office also advises States Parties and other stakeholders and conducts training on reporting and the implementation of recommendations. The recommendations of the treaty bodies are used in many other areas of the Office’s work, including as background documentation for the Universal Periodic Review (UPR), reference material for thematic research undertaken by OHCHR and to support the work of the special procedures and activities of OHCHR field presences.

Members of the Human Rights Committee brief the media on the conclusions of the Committee’s 104th session, March 2012.
In addition to supporting the treaty bodies, HRTD is responsible for:

- Continuously updating the Universal Human Rights Index (UHRI) (www.uhri.ohchr.org);
- Administering the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture, the Voluntary Fund on Contemporary Forms of Slavery and the Special Fund under the Optional Protocol to the United Nations Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OP-CAT);
- Reflecting the outputs of the treaty bodies in the documentation for the UPR;
- Promoting the continued improvement and harmonization of the work of the treaty bodies through the annual meeting of treaty body chairpersons and consistent follow-up with the individual treaty bodies.

**Developments in 2012**

Since 2004, the human rights treaty body system has doubled in size with the creation of four new treaty bodies (CMW, CRPD, SPT and CED) and three new procedures for individual complaints (CRPD, ICESCR and CRC). Up until 2000, only three treaty bodies were competent to address individual complaints. After the entry into force of the Optional Protocol to the CRC, article 77 of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families and the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (OP-ICESCR), all treaty bodies (except for the SPT) will be enabled to receive individual communications — representing a significant step forward in improving human rights protection.

The addition of new members to the CRC, CMW, CRPD and the SPT committees brought the total number of treaty body experts in 2012 to 172 (versus 97 in 2000 and 125 at the beginning of 2010). The allocated meeting time of the treaty bodies has also increased (51 weeks in 2000 versus 72 weeks in 2010 and 74 weeks in 2012), and there are a number of pending requests before the General Assembly for additional meeting time.

In June, the consultative process on treaty body strengthening was finalized with the publication of the report of the High Commissioner for Human Rights entitled *Strengthening the Human Rights Treaty Body System* (A/66/860). The consultative process was launched by the HC in November 2009, based on the mandate given to her by General Assembly resolution 48/141, and included the active participation of a wide range of stakeholders, including Member States, treaty body members, civil society organizations, United Nations agencies and national human rights institutions (NHRIs). The report presents a vision for an efficient, effective and timely treaty body system, building on the strengths of the system while also addressing its challenges, in particular insufficient resourcing.

On 23 February 2012, the General Assembly adopted resolution 66/254 which requested the President of the General Assembly to launch an open-ended intergovernmental process to conduct open, transparent and inclusive negotiations on strengthening and enhancing the effective functioning of the human rights treaty body system. Two co-facilitators were appointed to assist in this process. The resolution also noted that the open-ended intergovernmental process should take into consideration the relevant proposals on strengthening and enhancing the effective functioning of the human rights treaty body system, including those contained in the reports of the Secretary-General and the High Commissioner’s report.

In order to promote a multi-stakeholder approach to this process, a civil society forum was held on 4 September 2012 in New York and, through video conference, in Geneva and was moderated by the co-facilitators of the intergovernmental process.

**Results**

**Ratification (EA 2)**

- In 2012, a total of 70 new ratifications and accessions were deposited with the Secretary-General (as opposed to 54 in 2011). This number includes the ratification of treaties, optional protocols and acceptance of articles relating to individual communication procedures. OHCHR advocates for the ratification of human rights treaties and the withdrawal of reservations through public statements by the
High Commissioner, press articles and bilateral meetings with governments and by highlighting recommendations and encouragements issued during the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) and by human rights treaty bodies and special procedures. These efforts contributed to Bolivia’s ratification and Burkina Faso’s signature of the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

State engagement with human rights mechanisms (EA 6)

- HRTD continued to support the work of the 10 human rights treaty bodies, which met for a combined total of 74 weeks. The treaty bodies with a State Party reporting procedure received a total of 107 State Party reports, including 17 common core documents.
- The treaty bodies adopted concluding observations on approximately 130 State Parties. In addition, the committees of CAT, CEDAW, CERD and the Human Rights Committee examined and adopted final decisions on 140 communications and issued close to 50 requests for interim measures of protection for alleged victims at risk of irreparable harm.
- Through capacity-building activities, HRTD contributed to increased reporting by States Parties under the international human rights treaties. Support from OHCHR included training sessions requested by States Parties on the common core document and treaty specific guidelines, reporting, individual communications and follow-up to recommendations and were carried out in: Angola, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chad, Ecuador, Georgia (regional workshop), Kyrgyzstan (regional workshop), Morocco (regional workshop), Seychelles, Swaziland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia and Vietnam. Participants included government officials, representatives of National Human Rights Institutions and civil society organizations and colleagues of United Nations Country Teams (UNCTs).
- Following Swaziland’s request for technical assistance in discharging its reporting obligations and discussions in the context of Swaziland’s review by the UPR Working Group in October 2011, HRTD, in collaboration with the UNCT, held a three-day training workshop (31 January to 2 February 2012) on reporting under the ICCPR and ICESCR. At the end of the workshop, participants adopted a roadmap for reporting under a treaty, a copy of which was submitted to the Minister of Justice.
- The SPT carried out five country visits to Argentina, Honduras, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova and Senegal. OHCHR provides substantive and organizational secretariat support to the Subcommittee during country visits.
- OHCHR and Microsoft developed a Memorandum of Understanding to report on the potential for videoconferencing the sessions of the treaty bodies, primarily the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, with the aim of assessing the accessibility of committee meetings and improving accessibility processes and practices at Palais Wilson and Palais des Nations. The Accessibility team consists of representatives from Microsoft, OHCHR, UNOG, Middlesex University (professors qualified in research and development of accessibility practices) and AbilityNet (a UK based national charity helping disabled adults and children use computers and the internet by adapting and adjusting technology). It is anticipated that this analysis will contribute to increased awareness among units and departments in Geneva servicing CRPD meetings, and other meetings attended by persons with disabilities, regarding challenges and opportunities related to accessibility to physical premises, information, communication and technology.

Civil Society engagement with human rights mechanisms (EA 7)

- Engagement of civil society and other stakeholders with the treaty bodies is well established. The treaty bodies receive over
1,000 written submissions from civil society, NHRRIs and UN entities each year. In 2012, OHCHR continued to develop and use online systems to facilitate the management of civil society participation in the sessions of some mechanisms. It also supported and encouraged colleagues in the use of existing systems (CSO Net) that have been developed by other parts of the UN to manage the accreditation for sessions of the CEDAW and the Human Rights Committee.

On 6 March, OHCHR officially launched the upgraded Universal Human Rights Index. The Index now allows for the retrieval of specific recommendations and full documents issued by the treaty bodies, the special procedures and the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process. It therefore facilitates access to information and enables users to consider recommendations coming from the three pillars of the UN human rights system and cluster them by thematic issues and groups of persons affected. The UHRI database was first launched in 2006 and is now under the stewardship of OHCHR. This upgrade and redesign was undertaken in 2012 to promote the comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to all recommendations issued by the UN human rights mechanisms. Accessibility to the database has been improved, including for persons with disabilities, and new functionalities have been developed.

International and regional laws and institutions (EA 8)

OHCHR supports the progressive development of international human rights law, notably through studies and consultations and by supporting human rights mechanisms in elaborating guiding principles and general comments. General comments adopted by treaty bodies are authoritative statements that provide States Parties with detailed and expert clarification of treaty provisions in order to enhance their understanding of treaty provisions and assist them in the implementation of their treaty obligations.

To elaborate the General Recommendation on women in conflict and post-conflict situations, the CEDAW Committee held four regional consultations with the support of OHCHR and UN Women. The purpose of the General Recommendation is to provide appropriate and authoritative guidance to States Parties to the Convention on the measures to be adopted to ensure full compliance with their obligations to respect, protect and fulfil women’s human rights during times of conflict and in all peace-building processes, including in the immediate aftermath of conflict and throughout long-term post-conflict reconstruction. The consultations took place in Bangkok (27-28 March 2012), Addis Ababa (12-13 April 2012), Istanbul (11 May 2012), and Guatemala (29-30 May 2012). First-hand information was thus obtained from a variety of regional stakeholders from Africa, Eastern Europe and Central Asia, Latin America and South-East Asia and the Pacific to ensure that the General Recommendation accurately reflects women’s realities on the ground. The participants included regional experts, government authorities, academics, activists and representatives of national women’s machineries and national human rights institutions, as well as UN agencies.

The CERD Committee held a day of general discussion focusing on the theme of Racist Hate Speech on 28 August 2012. The discussion aimed at enhancing the understanding of the causes and consequences of racist hate speech and will assist the Committee on in the possible preparation of a general recommendation.

The CRC Committee held a day of general discussion on the theme of The rights of all children in the context of international migration on 28 September 2012. Participants stressed that in the context of migration, all children, regardless of their immigration status, should be treated as children first and foremost, highlighted the numerous challenges faced by children in international migration situations and identified measures for protection and promotion of children’s rights.

The Human Rights Committee held a day of general discussion on 25 October 2012 in preparation for a new General Comment on article 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights on the right to liberty and security of persons.

The CAT adopted its General Comment No. 3 on the implementation of article 14 by States Parties on 19 November 2012. It explains and clarifies the content and scope of State Party obligations with regard to providing redress for victims of torture.

The CMW drafted its General Comment No. 2 on the rights of migrant workers in an irregular situation and members of their families. The draft was posted on the CMW website to invite relevant stakeholders to submit their comments and observations by the end of January 2013.

During its 48th session, the CESCRC Committee endorsed the text of an Open Letter by the Chair addressed to all States Parties of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, in relation to the protection of the Covenant rights in the context of the economic and financial crisis. The letter stressed that, in accordance with their obligations under the Covenant, States Parties should at all times avoid
taking decisions which might lead to the denial or infringement of economic, social and cultural rights. It highlighted that the Covenant provides important guideposts which can help States Parties adopt appropriate policies in the context of an economic downturn while also respecting economic, social and cultural rights.

Also during its 48th session, the CESCR Committee adopted a statement on the *Green Economy in the Context of Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication* in anticipation of the Rio+20 Conference. In the statement, the Committee emphasized the need to integrate the green economy within the broader concept of sustainable development in light of its close linkages with economic, social and cultural rights.

The CEDAW Committee adopted a statement on 24 July 2012 during its 52nd meeting on the need for a gender perspective in the Arms Trade Treaty. The Committee recalled that the arms trade has specific gender dimensions and direct links to discrimination and gender-based violence against women with far-reaching implications for efforts to consolidate peace and to ensure security, gender equality and development.

The CEDAW Committee also adopted a statement on girls’ right to education, during its 53rd meeting, in October 2012, which indicated that illiteracy continues to be a feminized phenomenon. The Committee called on States Parties to take all necessary actions, including the dismantling of patriarchal barriers and entrenched gender stereotypes, to guarantee and ensure that girls are able to enjoy their basic human right to education in every region of the world.

On 30 November 2012, during its 49th session, the CESCR Committee endorsed the text of an open letter by the Chair on behalf of the Committee to all States parties to the Covenant, in respect of the elaboration of the United Nations’ post-2015 development agenda. The letter underlined the importance of the link between the post-2015 development agenda and human rights, including economic, social and cultural rights. It considered that linking development with human rights will enhance equality and development-for-all, while reducing social and political tensions driven by deprivation, discrimination and inequality.

Participants at the final expert workshop on the prohibition of incitement to hatred, held in Rabat, Morocco, adopted the Rabat Plan of Action on the prohibition of advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence. The Plan of Action contains recommendations to better guide all stakeholders in implementing the international prohibition of incitement to national, racial or religious hatred. This event, organized by OHCHR with the support of the Kingdom of Morocco on 4-5 October 2012, was the culmination of a two-year initiative and series of expert workshops held in various regions of the world.

**Coherence among human rights mechanisms (EA 9)**

- OHCHR organized a consultation on the treaty body strengthening process on 7-8 February 2012. This followed requests from a large number of States to provide more time for the discussions that were initiated during the previous consultation with States in Sion (Switzerland), in May 2011. A similar event was organized in New York on 2-3 April 2012.

- In June 2012, the High Commissioner released her report on the treaty body strengthening process.

- The consultations for States Parties on the strengthening of the human rights treaty bodies, held in New York from 16 to 18 July 2012, marked the beginning of the intergovernmental process established by General Assembly resolution 66/254. The meeting was structured around four main themes: the master calendar; working methods (including the independence of treaty bodies); the reporting process and the capacity to implement. The financial aspect was a cross-cutting issue discussed in each of the four segments.

- A civil society forum on treaty body strengthening was held at the United Nations in New York and, through video conference, in Geneva, on 4 September 2012. The meeting was moderated by the co-facilitators of the treaty body strengthening process and enjoyed the participation of 63 civil society organizations.
Overall, the treaty body strengthening process and the subsequent report issued by the High Commissioner significantly increased the awareness of Member States about the dire situation of the treaty body system which has doubled in size in less than a decade with no matching funding. In 2012, the committees of CESCR, CRC, CAT and CRPD requested the General Assembly to increase their support in order to address the overwhelming backlog of State Party reports and individual communications.

All treaty bodies welcomed the report of the High Commissioner and are considering its numerous proposals. At the annual Meeting of Chairpersons of the human rights treaty bodies held in Addis Ababa (25-29 June 2012), the Chairpersons endorsed the Addis Ababa guidelines on the independence and impartiality of members of treaty bodies. The committees of CRPD, CRC and the SPT have subsequently decided to incorporate the guidelines into their rules of procedures.

The first high-level meeting between judges of the European Court of Human Rights and members of the Human Rights Committee took place in Strasbourg on 29 June 2012 as part of an ongoing effort to strengthen cooperation between the treaty bodies and the European Court, and their respective secretariats. Participants discussed interim measures of protection, prohibition of discrimination as an independent right, disappearances, investigative obligations and recent case law on freedom of religion.

The annual Meeting of Chairpersons was organized outside of Geneva for a second time. Following the 22nd meeting, which was held in Brussels, Belgium in 2010, the 24th meeting was held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia in June 2012. The annual meeting will now be organized every other year in a different region to strengthen synergies between international and regional human rights mechanisms and stakeholders and enhance accessibility and visibility of the treaty bodies, particularly through meetings with civil society. The 2012 meeting facilitated interaction between the Chairpersons and the African human rights mechanisms, namely the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights, the Committee of Experts on the Rights and Welfare of the Child, the African Peer Review Mechanism, the African Court on Human and Peoples’ Rights, the East African Court of Justice, and the ECOWAS Court of Justice, as well as United Nations agencies, national human rights institutions and civil society organizations. The Chairpersons adopted joint recommendations that each treaty body strengthen cooperation with the African human rights mechanisms and stakeholders. The joint recommendations will be annexed to the Chairpersons’ report to the 67th session of the General Assembly.
In 2011, OHCHR held a series of regional expert workshops on the prohibition of incitement to national, racial or religious hatred which aimed at providing a better understanding of legislative patterns, judicial practices and policies in this area and illustrated human rights compatible responses to such important issues. On 4 and 5 October 2012, OHCHR organized a wrap-up expert meeting in Rabat, Morocco, which marked the culmination of this process. The Rabat event brought together the conclusions and recommendations from the earlier expert workshops and resulted in the adoption of a Plan of Action by the experts.

The Rabat Plan of Action is part of an effort to provide all stakeholders with practical recommendations and tools to effectively reflect the international prohibition of advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence (as outlined in article 20 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights) while fully respecting the freedom of expression. It has the potential to facilitate intergovernmental discussions and initiatives in this regard and can also bolster the implementation of relevant international human rights law at the national level. Among the key factors identified in the Rabat Plan of Action are the collective responsibility of public officials, religious and community leaders, the media and individuals and the need to nurture social consciousness, tolerance, mutual respect and intercultural dialogue. The Plan of Action also contains a six-part threshold test for expressions which are criminally prohibited.

Global Management Outputs

Integrating a gender perspective (GMO 3)

- HRTD ensures that all staff members are fully aware of the Gender Equality Policy, as approved by the High Commissioner in September 2011 through regular sensitization. The Division continued to review recommendations by consultants and the Division focal point on mainstreaming gender in treaty body work, assisted in office-wide elaboration of a gender strategy in relation to treaty bodies, implemented relevant parts of the strategy and trained staff on this implementation. Specifically in relation to the treaty bodies, the Division aimed to integrate a gender perspective in the secretariat inputs into the work of the treaty bodies to ensure that it is reflected in their outputs, such as lists of issues and concluding observations.

- HRTD supported the CEDAW Committee in its elaboration of a General Recommendation on women in conflict and post-conflict situations by holding four regional consultations. The General Recommendation will provide appropriate and authoritative guidance to States Parties to the Convention on the measures to be adopted to ensure full compliance with their obligations to respect, protect and fulfil women’s human rights during times of conflict and in all peace-building processes, including in the immediate aftermath of conflict and throughout long-term post-conflict reconstruction.

Servicing human rights mechanisms (GMO4)

- A questionnaire was sent to solicit feedback from treaty body members on the servicing and support it receives from OHCHR in relation to all treaty body activities. The results showed that 83.7 per cent of respondents rated the secretariat’s overall support as either satisfactory or very satisfactory (the target was 60 per cent). It also demonstrated unanimous satisfaction with the support of the Secretariat in terms of accessibility for persons with disabilities. At the same time, respondents sent a clear message (81.6 per cent of respondents) that the treaty body system is in urgent need of additional resources.

- HRTD continued to publish quarterly newsletters that were shared with all treaty body experts, special procedure mandate-holders, Member States, NHRI, United Nations partners and civil society. HRTD also updated training materials and shared weekly updates with treaty body experts so that each committee is aware of the work of the other nine committees. Numerous stakeholders acknowledged the usefulness of these tools which are essential to ensuring the efficiency and coherence of the treaty body system.

- HRTD continued to improve its working methods to better support the work of the treaty bodies. Following the interdivisional retreat in September 2010, the Division undertook efforts to promote more effective joint planning and the increased visibility of the calendar of upcoming State Party reviews. HRTD continued to focus on increased
engagement with other divisions in support of the treaty bodies and systematically evaluated its cooperation with other divisions prior to, during and in the follow up to treaty body sessions. The Division also initiated the collection of statistics on its interactions with OHCHR field presences, geographic desk officers, and UNCTs. The collection of this information helped in evaluating the level of synergy between OHCHR Divisions and its impact on treaty body work. The pilot project, currently undertaken by four committees, will be extended to all in 2013. The Division drafted and shared a checklist with the geographic division in OHCHR to assist staff in enhancing their interaction with treaty bodies and HRTD.

**Supporting field operations (GMO5)**

- HRTD took advantage of the Office’s annual planning week held in October 2012 to interact with field presences and stimulate synergies between the work of field presences and the output of human rights mechanisms. The Division’s regional and thematic focal points regularly interacted with other parts of the Office to provide treaty body relevant expertise and ensure the integration of a treaty body perspective.

**Increased awareness of and support to OHCHR (GMO 7)**

- Increased awareness, understanding and visibility of the regular work of treaty bodies among Member States, UN partners, NHRIs and civil society organizations was ensured through the organization of 40 briefings on treaty bodies and reporting on the work of the Office. The briefings were targeted to a wide range of actors, such as State Party representatives, regional organizations and mechanisms, civil society organizations, lawyers, academics and students. The briefings included sessions on improved media training and coaching for treaty bodies and the use of Twitter and Facebook to share all meeting summaries and concluding observations of the treaty bodies to ensure greater accessibility of their recommendations and to contribute to their follow-up and implementation.


9 core international human rights treaties
10 treaty bodies
70 new ratifications and accessions in 2012
125 State Party reports considered annually
320 reports pending consideration at the end of 2012

Around 15,000 pages of documentation processed annually (State Party reports, lists of issues, concluding observations, views and decisions)

Approximately 7,000 recommendations adopted annually

Adopted final decisions on nearly 140 communications
74 weeks in session
172 treaty body experts as of 2012, versus 162 at the end of 2010

On 30 October 2012, the Committee on Enforced Disappearances marked the 20th anniversary of the Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance by participating in an event organized by the Working Group on enforced or involuntary disappearances to explore best practices and challenges to protect women from enforced disappearances.

The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, in partnership with the Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie, held a high-level panel discussion entitled *Promoting and protecting women’s rights in situations of conflict and post-conflict: the case of French-speaking Africa* to mark the 30th anniversary of the Committee, on 18 October 2012. Discussions focused on experiences in Francophone Africa, as well as future prospects for the promotion and protection of women’s rights to reinforce peace.

CEDAW held a panel discussion on Women’s Political Participation and Leadership, to mark the 30th anniversary of its establishment, on 9 July 2012.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treaty</th>
<th>No. of States Parties</th>
<th>No. of weeks in session annually</th>
<th>Periodicity of obligation to report</th>
<th>Reviews, reports and issues recommendations to States Parties</th>
<th>Considers individual complaints</th>
<th>Conducts visits to countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CESCR        | 160                   | 8                                | 5 years                            | Articles 16-17  
Number of reports examined per year: 10  
Number of reports pending examination: 49  
(estimated backlog of nearly four years) | Optional Protocol  
(not yet entered into force) | Article 11 Optional Protocol  
Confidential inquiries on systematic violations (not yet entered into force) |
| HR Committee | 167                   | 12                               | 3, 4 or 5 years as per Committee's decision | Article 40  
Number of reports examined per year: 15  
Number of reports pending examination: 32  
(estimated backlog of nearly two years) | Optional Protocol  
Number of registered communications pending examination: 360  
Average time between registration and final decision on merits: 3½ years | No |
| CERD         | 175                   | 8                                | 2 years                            | Article 9  
Number of reports examined per year: 22  
Number of reports pending examination: 22  
(estimated backlog of less than one year) | Article 14  
Number of registered communications pending examination: 6  
Average time between registration and final decision on merits: 1½ years | No |
| CEDAW        | 187                   | 14                               | 4 years                            | Article 18  
Number of reports examined per year: 20  
Number of reports pending examination: 48  
(estimated backlog of two years) | Optional Protocol  
Number of registered communications pending examination: 17  
Average time between registration and final decision on merits: 2 years | Articles 8-10 Optional Protocol  
Confidential inquiries on systematic violations |
| CRC          | 193                   | 12                               | 5 years                            | Article 44  
Number of reports examined per year: 30  
(including OPAC and OPSC reports)  
Number of reports pending examination: 107  
(including OPAC/OPSC reports)  
(estimated backlog of over three years) | Optional Protocol  
(not yet entered into force) | Articles 13-14 Optional Protocol  
Confidential inquiries on systematic violations (not yet entered into force) |
| CAT          | 153                   | 8                                | 4 years                            | Article 19  
Number of reports examined per year: 17  
Number of reports pending examination: 24  
(estimated backlog of nearly two years) | Article 22  
Number of registered communications pending examination: 100  
Average time between registration and final decision on merits: 2½ years | Article 20 Confidential inquiries on systematic violations |
<p>| SPT          | 65                    | 3                                | N/A                                | N/A | N/A | Articles 11-16 Subcommittee visits places of deprivation of liberty and communicates its recommendations by confidential report |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treaty body</th>
<th>No. of States Parties</th>
<th>No. of weeks in session annually</th>
<th>Periodicity of obligation to report</th>
<th>Reviews, reports and issues recommendations to States Parties</th>
<th>Considers individual complaints</th>
<th>Conducts visits to countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMW</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Articles 73-74</td>
<td>Article 77 (not yet entered into force)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of reports examined per year: 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of reports pending examination: 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(estimated backlog of one year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of reports examined per year: 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of reports pending examination: 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(estimated backlog of one year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPD</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Articles 35-36</td>
<td>Optional Protocol</td>
<td>Article 6 Optional Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of reports examined per year: 4</td>
<td>Number of registered communications pending examination: 7</td>
<td>Confidential inquiries on systematic violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of reports pending examination: 32</td>
<td>Average time between registration and final decision: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(estimated backlog of 8 years)</td>
<td>(Committee has yet to adopt its first decision)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of reports examined per year: 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of reports pending examination: 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(estimated backlog of 8 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CED</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>As per Committee’s decision</td>
<td>Article 29</td>
<td>Article 31</td>
<td>Article 33 Visit on serious violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of reports examined per year: 0 in 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of reports pending examination: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>