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List of abbreviations

 International Human Rights Treaties

ICERD International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination

ICCPR International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

ICCPR-OP1 Optional Protocol to ICCPR

ICCPR-OP2 Second Optional Protocol to ICCPR

ICESCR International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

ICESCR-OP Optional Protocol to ICESCR

CEDAW Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women

CEDAW-OP Optional Protocol to CEDAW

CAT Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

OP-CAT Optional Protocol to CAT

CRC Convention on the Rights of the Child

CRC-OPAC Optional Protocol to CRC on the involvement of children in armed conflict

CRC-OPSC Optional Protocol to CRC on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography

CRC-OPIC Optional Protocol to CRC on a communications procedure

ICRMW International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families

CRPD Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

CRPD-OP Optional Protocol to CRPD

ICPPED International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance

 Human Rights Treaty Bodies

CERD [Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CERD/Pages/CERDIndex.aspx)

HRCtee [Human Rights Committee](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CCPR/Pages/CCPRIndex.aspx)

CESCR [Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights](http://www.ohchr.org/en/hrbodies/cescr/pages/cescrindex.aspx)

CEDAW [Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women](http://www.ohchr.org/en/hrbodies/cedaw/pages/cedawindex.aspx)

CAT [Committee against Torture](http://www.ohchr.org/en/hrbodies/cat/pages/catindex.aspx)

SPT Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture

CRC Committee on the Rights of the Child

CMW Committee on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families

CRPD [Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CRPD/Pages/CRPDIndex.aspx)

CED [Committee on Enforced Disappearances](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CED/Pages/CEDIndex.aspx)

 Other abbreviations

SP State party

SRP Simplified reporting procedure

COBs Concluding observations

GC General comment

SHP Strategic Heritage Plan

Annex I: Human rights treaty ratifications and declarations 2013 – 2015

Treaty ratifications and declarations enabling communications and inquiries have increased by 5 per cent between 2013 and 2015. The greatest increase in ratifications concerned the Optional Protocols enabling CRC (+ 144%) and CESCR (+ 90%) to examine individual communications and conduct inquiries, followed by the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (+ 24%) and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (+ 15%).

| ***International Human RightsTreaties*** | ***No of States Parties on 31 December 2013 (a)*** | ***No of States Parties on 31 December 2015 (b)*** | ***Change in No of States Parties from 2013 to 2015 (%) (c)*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ICERD** | 176 | 177 | 1 (+1%) |
|  **Declaration art. 14 ICERD** | 55 | 56 | 1 (+1%) |
| **ICCPR** | 167 | 168 | 1 (+1%) |
|  **ICCPR-OP1** | 115 | 115 | 0 |
|  **ICCPR-OP2** | 78 | 81 | 3 (+4%) |
| **ICESCR** | 161 | 164 | 3 (+2%) |
|  **ICESCR-OP** | 11 | 21 | 10 (+90%) |
| **CEDAW** | 187 | 189 | 2 (+1%) |
|  **CEDAW-OP** | 104 | 106 | 2 (+2%) |
| **CAT** | 154 | 158 | 4 (+3%) |
|  **OP-CAT** | 70 | 80 | 10 (+14%) |
|  **Declaration art. 22 CAT** | 66 | 67 | 1 (+1%) |
| **CRC** | 193 | 196 | 3 (+2%) |
|  **CRC-OPAC** | 152 | 162 | 10 (+7%) |
|  **CRC-OPSC** | 166 | 171 | 5 (+3%) |
|  **CRC-OPIC** | 9 | 22 | 13 (+144%) |
| **ICRMW** | 47 | 48 | 1 (+2%) |
|  **Declaration art. 77 CMW** | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| **CRPD** | 139 | 160 | 21 (+15%) |
|  **CRPD-OP** | 79 | 88 | 9 (+11%) |
| **ICPPED** | 41 | 51 | 10 (+24%) |
|  **Declaration art. 31 ICPPED** | 17 | 17 | 0 |
| **TOTAL** | **2,190** | **2,300** | **110 (5%)** |

 Annex II: Reporting compliance by States parties as at 19 January 2016

States parties have an obligation to report periodically under nine core international human rights treaties and two optional protocols. Reporting periodicities vary by treaty (table 1).

On 19 January 2016, 25 of 197 States parties (13 per cent) were fully compliant with their reporting obligations under the relevant international human rights treaties and protocols. Five of these States parties had ratified five or fewer human rights instruments.

98 States parties had one to three reports overdue, 64 States parties had four to seven reports overdue, and 10 States parties had eight or more reports overdue (initial and periodic reports combined).

A breakdown of the overdue reports by treaty (chart 1) demonstrates that the proportion of reports overdue (initial and periodic reports combined) ranged from 23 percent (reports overdue to CRC under the Convention on the Rights of the Child) to 56 percent (reports overdue to CERD).

When disaggregating overdue initial reports by length of time and treaty (chart 2), CRC-OPSC counted the largest number of non-reporting States parties (70 initial reports overdue). Of the core treaties, CRPD had the largest number of overdue initial reports (47). Three treaties counted more than 15 States parties whose initial report was more than 10 years overdue (CAT, ICESCR and CRC-OPSC).

When disaggregating overdue periodic reports by length of time and treaty (chart 3), CERD, HRCtee and CEDAW had the largest number of periodic reports overdue (84, 58 and 44 respectively). They were also the treaty bodies with the largest number of periodic reports that were more than 10 years overdue (23 for CERD, 21 for the HRCtee, and 8 for both CESCR and CRC).

 Table 1: Reporting periodicity, by treaty

| ***Treaty*** | ***Initial report due (following ratification) within*** | ***Periodic reports due thereafter every*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ICERD** | 1 year | 2 years |
| **ICESCR** | 2 years | 5 years |
| **ICCPR** | 1 year | 3, 4, 5 and 6 years |
| **CEDAW** | 1 year | 4 years |
| **CAT** | 1 year | 4 years |
| **CRC** | 2 years | 5 years |
| **ICRMW** | 1 year | 5 years |
| **CRC-OPSC** | 2 years | With next report to the Committee on the Rights of the Child or 5 years if the State party has ratified the Optional Protocol only but not the Convention |
| **CRC-OPAC** | 2 years | With next report to the Committee on the Rights of the Child or 5 years if the State party has ratified the Optional Protocol only but not the Convention |
| **CRPD** | 2 years | 4 years |
| **ICPPED** | 2 years | As requested by the Committee on Enforced Disappearances (art. 29 (4)) |

Chart 1:

Chart 2:

Chart 3:

Chart 4:

 Annex III: State party (SP) reporting 2012 – 2015

Nine treaty bodies review State party reports. The General Assembly, in resolution 68/268, considered the average number of State party reports received annually by each treaty body examining State party reports during the period 2009 to 2012 as a parameter to identify the meeting time required (paragraph 26(a)). The Assembly also decided that, thereafter, the four preceding years for which data were available were to be considered for the biennial review of the meeting time (paragraph 27). For the purpose of this report, the (new) reference period is 2012 – 2015, since 2015 is the last full calendar year prior to the submission of this report. The average numbers of State party reports received in this period allows the General Assembly to identify the amount of meeting time that each treaty body will need in order to keep up with incoming reports in 2018 – 2019.

When comparing the two reference periods, the average number of reports received annually increased for the Committee on Enforced Disappearances (+ 50%), the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (+ 33%), the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (+ 5%) and the Human Rights Committee (+ 1%). The average number of reports received annually decreased for all other treaty bodies, and most for the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (- 38%) and the Committee on the Rights of the Child (- 42 %).

|  | ***No of SP reports received in 2012*** | ***No of SP reports received in 2013*** | ***No of SP reports received in 2014*** | ***No of SP reports received in 2015*** | ***No of SP reports received in 2012 – 2015*** | ***Average No of SP reports received / year in 2012 – 2015\**** | ***Change in average No of SP reports received per year from 2009 - 2012\*\* to 2012 - 2015******(+/- %)*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Treaty Body*** | ***(a)*** | ***(b)*** | ***(c)*** | ***(d)*** | ***(e)*** | ***(f)*** | ***(g)*** |
| **CERD** | 25 | 19 | 15 | 17 | 76 | 19 |  from 18 to 19 (+ 5%) |
| **HRCtee** | 27 | 11 | 14 | 17 | 69 | 17.2 |  from 17 to 17.2 (+ 1%) |
| **CESCR** | 13 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 37 | 9.2 |  from 15 to 9.2 (- 38%) |
| **CEDAW** | 21 | 15 | 22 | 33 | 91 | 22.7 |  from 25 to 22.7 (- 9%) |
| **CAT** | 12 | 17 | 14 | 17 | 60 | 15 |  from 17 to 15 (- 11%) |
| **CRC total** | 33 | 28 | 17 | 14 | 92 | 23 |  from 40 to 23 (- 42%) |
|  includes **CRC Convention**  |  17 |  22 |  14 |  7 |  60 |  15 |  from 23 to 15 (- 34%) |
|  includes **CRC-OPAC** |  9 |  2 |  0 |  2 |  13 |  3.2 |  from 9 to 3.2 (- 64%) |
|  includes **CRC-OPSC** |  7 |  4 |  3 |  5 |  19 |  4.7 |  from 8 to 4.7 (- 41%) |
| **CMW** | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 16 | 4 |  from 4 to 4 (no change) |
| **CRPD** | 12 | 15 | 21 | 16 | 64 | 16 |  from 12 to 16 (+ 33%) |
| **CED** | 4 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 24 | 6 |  from 4 to 6 (+ 50%) |
| **TOTAL** | **149** | **121** | **122** | **137** | **529** | **132.2** |  **from 152 to 132.2 (- 13%)** |
| **AVERAGE** (9 TBs) | 16.5 | 13.4 | 13.5 | 15.2 | 58.6 | 14.6 |  from 16.8 to 14.6 (- 13%) |

\* new reference period per paragraph 27 of resolution 68/268

\*\* reference period per paragraph 26(a) of resolution 68/268, data from A/68/779, annex I, column (b)

 Annex IV: Individual communications registered 2012 – 2015

Eight of ten treaty bodies can receive individual complaints. The General Assembly, in resolution 68/268, considered the average number of communications registered per year by each treaty body that examines communications as a parameter to identify the meeting time required (paragraph 26(b)). For the biennial review of the meeting time (paragraph 28), the average numbers of communications received annually in 2014 – 2015 allow the General Assembly to identify the amount of meeting time that the respective treaty bodies need in order to keep up with incoming communications in 2018 – 2019.

The number of individual communications registered increased sharply between 2012 and 2015, from 170 to 307 communications (+ 80%). Compared to the previous reference period, used for resolution 68/268, the average number of communications received per year increased for all treaty bodies that receive individual communications, except the Committee on Enforced Disappearances. The average number of communications registered annually increased most for the Human Rights Committee (+ 117%).

| ***Treaty Body*** | ***No of communications registered in 2012******(a)*** | ***No of communications registered in 2013******(b)*** | ***No of communications registered in 2014******(c)*** | ***No of communications registered in 2015******(d)*** | ***No of communications registered in 2014 – 2015******(e)*** | ***Average No of communications registered / year in 2014 - 2015******(f)*** | ***Change in average No of communications registered per year from 2009 - 2012\* to 2014 - 2015 (+/- %)******(g)*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CERD** | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1.5 |  from 0 to 1.5  |
| **HRCtee** | 104 | 95 | 191 | 196 | 387 | 193.5 |  from 89 to 193.5 (+117%) |
| **CESCR** | - | 1 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 5 |  from 0 to 5 |
| **CEDAW** | 12 | 17 | 15 | 18 | 33 | 16.5 |  from 8 to 16.5 (+106%) |
| **CAT** | 48 | 45 | 68 | 76 | 144 | 72 |  from 41 to 72 (+ 75%) |
| **CRC** | - | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  from 0 to 1 |
| **CRPD** | 3 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 16 | 8 |  from 0 to 8 |
| **CED** | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  from 0 to 0 |
| **TOTAL** | **170** | **170** | **288** | **307** | **595** | **297.5** |  **from 138 to 291 (+110%)** |

\* Data from A/68/779, annex I, column (d)

Annex V: Meeting time in 2015

The meeting time of the treaty body system, based on the mathematical formula comprised in paragraph 26 (a), (b) and (c) of resolution 68/268, consists of the following elements for nine treaty bodies[[1]](#footnote-2):

(a) The meeting time needed for State party reviews (ongoing work as well as addressing the backlog);

(b) The meeting time needed for treaty bodies examining individual communications (ongoing work as well as addressing the backlog) and;

(c) The standard two weeks for other mandated activities.

In 2015, the meeting time devoted by the treaty bodies to reviewing State party reports by far exceeded the meeting time dedicated to examining individual communications (66.3 weeks versus 6.3 weeks). The total meeting time of the nine treaty bodies that review State party reports amounted to 92.6 weeks.

The Subcommittee for Prevention of Torture meets for three weeks each year in Geneva. The treaty body Chairs meet annually for one week. In order to provide the full picture of the meeting time of the treaty body system, the meeting time of the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture and of the Chairs were added to the table below, bringing the total meeting time in 2015 to 96.6 weeks.

One treaty body (CRC) further benefited from meeting time previously granted as a result of an ad hoc request. As a result, the total meeting time of the treaty body system in 2015 was 99.2 weeks.

|  | ***No of weeks for SP reviews in 2015 per res. 68/268******(incl. 15% margin)*** | ***No of weeks for individual communications in 2015 per res. 68/268******(incl. 15% margin)*** | ***No of weeks for other mandated activities in 2015 per res. 68/268*** | ***No of weeks for SPT*** | ***No of weeks for annual Chairs’ meeting*** | ***Total meeting time entitlement in 2015, in weeks*** | ***Ad hoc meeting time in 2015, in weeks*** | ***Total meeting time granted in 2015, in weeks*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Treaty body*** | ***(a)*** | ***(b)*** | ***(c)*** | ***(d)*** | ***(e)*** | ***(f)*** | ***(g)*** | ***(h)*** |
| **CERD** | 8 | 0 | 2 | n/a | n/a | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| **HRCtee** | 8.5 | 4.2 | 2 | n/a | n/a | 14.7\* | 0 | 14.7\* |
| **CESCR** | 8 | 0 | 2 | n/a | n/a | 10\*\* | 0 | 10\*\* |
| **CEDAW** | 11 | 0.3 | 2 | n/a | n/a | 15.3\*\*\* | 0 | 15.3\*\*\* |
| **CAT** | 7.7 | 1.8 | 2 | n/a | n/a | 11.5 | 0 | 11.5 |
| **CRC** | 13 | 0 | 2 | n/a | n/a | 15\*\*\*\* | 2.6 | 17.6\*\*\*\* |
|  includes **Convention** |  9.6 |  n/a |  2 |  n/a |  n/a |  11.6 |  2.6 |  14.2 |
|  includes **CRC-OPAC** |  1.7 |  n/a |  n/a |  n/a |  n/a |  1.7 |  0 |  1.7 |
|  includes **CRC-OPSC** |  1.7 |  n/a |  n/a |  n/a |  n/a |  1.7 |  0 |  1.7 |
| **CMW** | 1.6 | n/a | 2 | n/a | n/a | 3.6 | 0 | 3.6 |
| **CRPD** | 6.5 | 0 | 2 | n/a | n/a | 8.5 | 0 | 8.5 |
| **CED** | 2 | 0 | 2 | n/a | n/a | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| **SPT** | n/a | n/a | n/a | 3 | n/a | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| **Chairpersons** | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| **TOTAL** | **66.3** | **6.3** | **18** | **3** | **1** | **96.6** | **2.6** | **99.2** |
| **AVERAGE** (9 TBs only, excludes SPT & Chairs’ meeting) | 7.3 | n/a | 2 | n/a | n/a | 10.7 | n/a | n/a |

\* includes 3 weeks of working groups.
\*\* includes 2 weeks of working groups.
\*\*\* includes 3 + 2 weeks of working groups (the latter 2 were excluded from calculations in res. 68/268).
\*\*\*\* includes 3 weeks of working groups.

 Annex VI: State party (SP) reviews per year and per week in 2013 and 2015

Nine treaty bodies review State party reports and adopt concluding observations. To determine the meeting time needs of the treaty bodies, the General Assembly, in resolution 68/268, took an assumed attainable rate of review of 2.5 State party reports per week and 5 State party reports under the optional protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child[[2]](#footnote-3) as a parameter (paragraph 26(a)).

In 2013, prior to the adoption of resolution 68/268, the treaty bodies adopted a total of 137 concluding observations. In 2015, they adopted 173 concluding observations, representing a 26% increase. On average, the treaty bodies met the objective of 2.5 State party reviews per week under core treaties and exceeded the objective of 5 State party reviews under the CRC optional protocols.

|  | ***No of SP reviews in 2013*** | ***Average No of SPs reviewed per week in 2013*** | ***No of SP reviews and concluding observations adopted in 2015*** | ***No of weeks dedicated to SP reviews in 2015 (data from Annex V, column (a))*** | ***Average No of SPs reviewed per week in 2015*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Treaty Body*** | ***(a)*** | ***(b)*** | ***(c)*** | ***(d)*** | ***(e) = (c):(d)*** |
| **CERD** | 15 | 2.5 | 20 | 8 | 2.5 |
| **HRCtee** | 17 | 1.9 | 20 | 8.5 | 2.3 |
| **CESCR** | 17 | 2.4 | 17 | 8 | 2.1 |
| **CEDAW** | 22 | 2.4 | 27 | 11 | 2.4 |
| **CAT** | 17 | 2.1 | 19 | 7.7 | 2.4 |
| **CRC total** | 34 | 3.7 | 45 | 13 (+ 2.6 ad hoc) | 3.9 |
| Includes **CRC Convention + all periodic reports** |  17 |  2.4 |  25 |  9.6  |  2 |
|  Includes **CRC-OPAC** |  8 |  5 |  10 |  1.7 |  5.8 |
|  Includes C**RC-OPSC** |  9 |  5 |  10 |  1.7 |  5.8 |
| **CMW** | 5 | 1.7 | 8 | 1.6 | 5 |
| **CRPD** | 4 | 1.3 | 14 | 6.5 | 2.1 |
| **CED** | 4 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2.5 |
| **TOTAL** | **137** | **n/a** | **173** | **66.3 (+ 2.6 ad hoc)** | **n/a** |
| **AVERAGE** (9 TBs) | 15.2 | 2 for core treaties and 5 for CRC-OPAC & OPSC | 19.2 | 7.3 (excludes time granted through ad hoc requests) | 2.5 for coretreaties and 5.8 for CRC-OPAC & OPSC |

Annex VII: Final decisions on communications adopted in 2013 and 2015

Eight of ten treaty bodies can receive individual complaints and adopt decisions or views. To determine the meeting time needs of the treaty bodies, the General Assembly, in resolution 68/268, took 1.3 hours of meeting time as the assumed rate of examination per communication (paragraph 26(b)).

In 2013, prior to the adoption of resolution 68/268, the treaty bodies adopted final decisions on 116 communications. In 2015, they adopted final decisions on 183 communications, representing an increase of almost 58 %.

| ***Treaty Body*** | ***No of final decisions on communications adopted in 2013\*******(a)*** | ***No of final decisions on communications adopted in 2015\*******(b)*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CERD** | 2 | 3 |
| **HRCtee** | 72 | 101 |
| **CESCR** | - | 1 |
| **CEDAW** | 7 | 9 |
| **CAT** | 32 | 65 |
| **CRC** | - | 1 |
| **CRPD** | 3 | 3 |
| **CED** | 0 | 0 |
| **TOTAL** | **116** | **183** |

 \* Includes communications which may be discontinued.

Annex VIII: Backlog of State party reports

From 2013 to 2015, the backlog of State party reports decreased from 304 to 255 State party reports pending review, representing a 15 per cent decrease. The decrease of the backlog was greatest for CERD (- 51%) and CESCR (- 49%). CRC significantly reduced its backlog of initial reports submitted under the two Optional Protocols, CRC-OPAC (- 73%) and CRC-OPSC (- 47%).

With 57 State party reports pending review on 31 December 2015, CRC still held the largest number of reports in the backlog, followed by CRPD and CEDAW with respectively 52 and 44 State party reports pending review. Together, these three treaty bodies accounted for 60 per cent of all State party reports pending review.

In spite of the overall reduction of the backlog of State party reports, three treaty bodies (CED, CRPD and CEDAW) registered an increase in State party reports pending review.

| ***Treaty Body*** | ***No of State party reports pending review on 31 Dec. 2013*** | ***No of State party reports pending review on 31 Dec. 2015*** | ***Change in No of State party reports pending review from 2013 to 2015 (+/- %)*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CERD** | 35 | 17 | -18 (-51%) |
| **HRCtee** | 28 | 26 | -2 (-7%) |
| **CESCR** | 39 | 20 | -19 (-49%) |
| **CEDAW** | 42 | 44 | 2 (+5%) |
| **CAT** | 22 | 22 | 0 |
| **CRC total** | 83 | 57 | -26 (-31%) |
|  includes **CRC Convention + all periodic reports** |  44 |  42 |  -2 (-5%) |
|  includes **CRC-OPAC** |  22 |  6 |  -16 (-73%) |
|  includes **CRC-OPSC** |  17 |  9 |  -8 (-47%) |
| **CMW** | 8 | 7 | -1 (-12%) |
| **CRPD** | 39 | 52 | 13 (+33%) |
| **CED** | 8 | 13 | 5 (+62%) |
| **TOTAL** | **304** | **258** | **-46 (-15%)** |

Annex IX: Communications pending review

From 2013 to 2015, the number of individual communications in the backlog increased by 31 per cent, from 584 to 769 communications pending review. With the exception of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the Committee on Enforced Disappearances, the trend was the same for all treaty bodies that receive individual complaints.

On 31 December 2015, the backlog of individual communications was greatest for the HRCtee (536 communications pending review), followed by CAT (150 communications pending review). Together, these two treaty bodies accounted for 89 per cent of all communications in the backlog.

| ***Treaty Body*** | ***No of communications pending review on 31 Dec. 2013******(a)*** | ***No of communications pending review on 31 Dec. 2015******(b)*** | ***Change in No of communications pending review from 2013 to 2015 (+/- %)******(c) = (b) – (a)*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CERD** | 6 | 4 | -2 (- 33%) |
| **HRCtee** | 394 | 536 | 142 (+ 36%) |
| **CESCR** | 1 | 10 | 9 (+ 90%) |
| **CEDAW** | 25 | 40 | 15 (+ 60%) |
| **CAT** | 140 | 150 | 10 (+ 7%) |
| **CRC** | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| **CRPD** | 17 | 27 | 10 (+ 59%) |
| **CED** | 1 | 1 |  0 |
| **TOTAL** | **584** | **769** | **185 (+ 31%)** |
| **AVERAGE** (8 TBs) | 73 | 96 |  n/a |

Annex X: Core meeting time requirements per year in 2018 – 2019 (ongoing workload, no consideration of backlog)

For ease of reference, the meeting time needed to enable the treaty bodies to address the expected ongoing workload is denominated ‘core’ meeting time. It does not include the meeting time to address the backlog (margin meeting time) referred to in paragraph 26 (c) of resolution 68/268. The core meeting constitutes the baseline for the calculation of the margin meeting time for the backlog.

The following parameters are applied to determine the core meeting time needs for 2018 – 2019, in accordance with resolution 68/268 (paragraphs 26 (a) and (b)):

1. The average number of State party reports received per year in the previous four years (2012 – 2015)

2. An assumed rate of 2.5 State party reviews per week (5 under CRC optional protocols)

3. The average number of individual communications registered per year (2014 – 2015, since several communications procedures only recently entered into force)

4. A rate of 1.3 hours of meeting time to examine one communication

5. Two weeks of standard meeting time per treaty body for other mandated activities

6. The non-reduction of the number of weeks allocated to a treaty body on a permanent basis prior to the adoption of resolution 68/268 (paragraph 27).

Thus calculated, the core meeting time needs of the treaty body system in 2018 – 2019 are 88.8 weeks per year. This excludes the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture and the mandated annual treaty body Chairs’ meeting, since no periodic State party reports are reviewed or individual communications examined during their meetings. The request of the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture for an additional week of meeting time to prepare field visits is addressed separately in the report.

|  | ***No of weeks of CORE meeting time entitlement in 2015 (excludes 15% margin) - (data from A/68/779, Annex I, column (i))*** | ***Average No of State party reports received per year (2012 – 2015 is the new reference period) – (data from Annex IV, column (f))*** | ***Average No of individual communications registered per year (2014 – 2015 is the new reference period) – (data from Annex V, column (f))*** | ***No of weeks per year required to review average No of State party reports (at 2.5 reviews per week for core treaties and 5 reviews per week for OPs-CRC) in 2018 – 2019*** | ***No of weeks per year required to examine average No of individual communications registered (at rate of 1.3 hours per communication) in 2018 – 2019*** | ***No of weeks per year required for (other) mandated activities in 2018 – 2019*** | ***No of CORE meeting weeks per year required in 2018 – 2019 (excludes 5 % margin)*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Treaty body*** | ***(a)*** | ***(b)*** | ***(c)*** | ***(d) = (b):2.5 or 5*** | ***(e) =((c) x 1.3):30*** | ***(f)*** | ***(g) = (d) + (e)+ (f)*** |
| **CERD** | 9.2 | 19 | 1.5 | 7.6 | 0.1 (1.9 hours) | 2 | 9.7 |
| **HRCtee** | 12.7 | 17.3 | 193.5 | 6.9 | 8.4 (251.5 hours) | 2 | 17.3 |
| **CESCR** | 8 | 9.2 | 5 | 3.7 | 0.2 (6.5 hours) | 2 | 8 (5.9\*) |
| **CEDAW** | 14.3 | 22.7 | 16.5 | 9.1 | 0.7 (21.5 hours) | 2 | 14 (11.8\*) |
| **CAT** | 10.6 | 15 | 72 | 6 | 3.1 (93.6 hours) | 2 | 11.1 |
| **CRC** | 14.6 | 23 | 1 | 7.5 | 0.1 (1.3 hours) | 2 | 12 (9.6\*) |
|  includes **Convention** |  11.2 |  15 |  1 |  6 |  0.1 (1.3 hours) |  2 |  10.5 (8.1\*) |
|  includes **CRC-OPAC** |  1.7 |  3.2 |  - |  0.6 | - |  n/a |  0.6 |
|  includes **CRC-OPSC** |  1.7 |  4.7 |  - |  0.9 | - |  n/a |  0.9 |
| **CMW** | 3.6 | 4 | - | 1.6 | - | 2 | 3.6 |
| **CRPD** | 7 | 16 | 8 | 6.4 | 0.3 (10.4 hours) | 2 | 8.7 |
| **CED** | 4 | 6 | 0 | 2.4 | 0 | 2 | 4.4 |
| **TOTAL** | **82** | **132.2** | **297.5** | **51.2** | **12.9** | **17** | **88.8\*** |

\* The meeting time requirement has been adjusted for CRC, CESCR and CEDAW to avoid a reduction in the number of weeks allocated to these treaty bodies on a permanent basis prior to the adoption of resolution 68/268, pursuant to operative paragraph 27 of that resolution.

Annex XI: Total and new meeting time requirements per year in 2018 – 2019 (core + margin meeting time)

Annex X yielded an annual core meeting time of 88.8 weeks per year for the treaty bodies in 2018 – 2019. The Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture and the mandated annual treaty body Chairs’ meeting are not included, since no periodic State party reports are reviewed or individual communications examined during their meetings. The request of the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture for an additional week of meeting time to prepare field visits is addressed separately in the report.

Pursuant to paragraph 26 (c) of resolution 68/268, a margin of 5% additional meeting time (5% of 88.8 weeks = 4.4 weeks) is to be applied to the core meeting time at the beginning of each biennium as of 2018. The margin meeting time is allocated among the treaty bodies in function of the expected workload.

Together, the core meeting time (88.8 weeks) and the margin meeting time (4.4 weeks) constitute the total annual meeting time required (93.2 weeks) in 2018 - 2019. Since the current meeting time entitlement is 92.6 weeks of meeting time per year, an additional 0.6 weeks will be needed. The inputs for one week of meeting time include travel expenses of treaty body members, conference services (documentation, interpretation, summary records and other meeting services), press releases / meeting summaries, and professional and general service staff for OHCHR.

Within the 93.2 weeks of meeting time per year, there will be shifts among treaty bodies due to the changed workload. The annual meeting time of the HRCtee will increase from 14.7 to 19.8 weeks and the meeting time of CRPD will increase from 8.5 to 10 weeks per year. The meeting time of CRC will decrease from 15 to 12 weeks and the meeting time of CESCR will be reduced from 10 to 8 weeks annually.

The shift in meeting time among the treaty bodies primarily has implications for documentation, meeting services, and travel of treaty body members (including the possibility of separate sessions, as required).

|  | ***No of weeks of meeting time entitlement in 2015******(includes 15% margin; excludes ad hoc meeting time) -******(data from Annex III, column (f))*** | ***No of weeks of CORE meeting time required per year in 2018 – 2019 (no margin) – (data from Annex X, column (g))*** | ***No of weeks of MARGIN meeting time required per year in 2018 – 2019******(= 5% of 88.8 weeks of core meeting time, excluding SPT and Chairs’ meeting = 4.4 weeks)*** | ***TOTAL No of weeks of meeting time required per year in 2018 – 2019*** ***(core + 5 % margin)*** | ***No of NEW weeks required per year in 2018 - 2019 as compared to (existing) meeting time entitlement in 2015*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Treaty body*** | ***(a)*** | ***(b)*** | ***(c)*** | ***(d)= (b)+(c)*** | ***(e)= (d)- (a)*** |
| **CERD** | 10 | 9.7 | 0 | 9.7 | -0.3 |
| **HRCtee** | 14.7 | 17.3 | 2.5 | 19.8 | 5.1 |
| **CESCR** | 10 | 8  | 0 | 8 | -2 |
| **CEDAW** | 15.3 | 14  | 0 | 14 | -1.3 |
| **CAT** | 11.5 | 11.1 | 0 | 11.1 | -0.4 |
| **CRC** | 15 | 12 | 0 | 12 | -3 |
| **CMW** | 3.6 | 3.6 | 0 | 3.6 | 0 |
| **CRPD** | 8.5 | 8.7 | 1.3 | 10 | 1.5 |
| **CED** | 4 | 4.4 | 0.6 | 5 | 1 |
| **TOTAL** | **92.6** | **88.8** | **4.4** | **93.2**  | **0.6** |

Annex XII: Annual meeting time in 2018-2019 by type of activity

Annex XI yielded the total meeting time needed by the treaty bodies per year in 2018 – 2019 (93.2 weeks). The meeting time thus obtained is broken down by type of activity: State party reviews, communications, and (other) mandated activities, since the type of activity has implications with respect to documentation and staffing requirements. One week of meeting time to review State party reports, for example, requires 15 weeks of professional staff support, whereas one week of communications requires 70 weeks of professional staff time, because individual communications are more labour intensive than State party reviews.

Within the total meeting time of 93.2 weeks, there will be an important shift from time currently dedicated to State party reviews to time for communications. As of 2018, 16 weeks per year are needed for individual communications, as compared to the 8.3 weeks currently granted. On the other hand, 52.2 weeks per year will be used for State party reviews as compared to the current 66.3. The time granted for other mandated activities would remain the same, pursuant to paragraph 26 (b) of resolution 68/268.

The Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture and the mandated annual treaty body Chairs’ meeting are not included, since no periodic State party reports are reviewed or individual communications examined during their meetings. The request of the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture for an additional week of meeting time to prepare field visits is addressed separately in the report.

|  | ***No of weeks per year for SP reviews (incl. 5% margin) in 2018 – 2019 (data from annex X, column (d) + 1.3 week of margin time allocated to SP reviews)*** | ***No of weeks per year for individual communication (incl. 5% margin) in 2018 - 2019 (data from annex X, column (e)+ 3.1 weeks of margin time allocated to communications)*** | ***No of weeks per year for other mandated activities in 2018 – 2019*** | ***Total No of weeks of annual meeting time in 2018-2019 – (data from annex XI, column (d))*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Treaty body*** | ***(a)*** | ***(b)*** | ***(c)*** | ***(d)*** |
| **CERD** | 7.6 | 0.1 | 2 | 9.7 |
| **HRCtee** | 6.9 | 10.9 | 2 | 19.8 |
| **CESCR** | 5.8\* | 0.2 | 2 | 8\* |
| **CEDAW** | 11.3\* | 0.7 | 2 | 14\* |
| **CAT** | 6 | 3.1 | 2 | 11.1 |
| **CRC** | 9.9\* | 0.1 | 2 | 12\* |
|  includes **Convention** |  8.4\* |  0.1 |  2 |  10.5\* |
|  includes **CRC-OPAC** |  0.6 |  n/a |  n/a |  0.6 |
|  includes **CRC-OPSC** |  0.9 |  n/a |  n/a |  0.9 |
| **CMW** | 1.6 | n/a | 2 | 3.6 |
| **CRPD** | 7.1 | 0.9 | 2 | 10 |
| **CED** | 3 | 0 | 2 | 5 |
| **TOTAL** | **59.2\*** | **16** | **18** | **93.2\*** |

\* The meeting time for State party reviews has been adjusted for CESCR, CEDAW and CRC to avoid a reduction in the number of weeks allocated to these treaty bodies on a permanent basis prior to the adoption of resolution 68/268, pursuant to operative paragraph 27 of that resolution, thereby impacting on the total meeting time.

Annex XIII: Inquiries in 2014 - 2015

Six treaty bodies may initiate inquiries if they receive reliable information containing well-founded indications of serious, grave or systemic violations of the conventions in a State party. Inquiries have different workload implications depending on whether a visit is conducted and/or a report is adopted. Hence, a distinction is made between (1) inquiries received, (2) inquiries without a visit but with a report and (3) inquiries with a visit and a report.

On average in 2014 – 2015, five inquiries were received per year by the treaty body system, 0.5 inquiries per year resulted in a report and 1 inquiry visit was undertaken.

On average, one professional staff member needs 15 working days for an inquiry without visit or report, 30 days for an inquiry without a visit but with a report and 55 days for an inquiry with a visit and a report. General service staff members need on average 1, 2 and 5 days respectively to support the treaty bodies on inquiries.

|  | ***No of requests for inquiries received in 2014*** | ***No of requests for inquiries received in 2015*** | ***No of inquiries with a report******in 2014******(no visit)*** | ***No of inquiries with a report******in 2015******(no visit)*** | ***No of inquiries with visit and report in 2014*** | ***No of inquiries with visit and report in 2015*** | ***Total No of requests for inquiries received in 2014 - 2015*** | ***Total No of inquiries with a report in 2014 – 2015******(no visit)*** | ***Total No of inquiries with visit and report in 2014 - 2015*** | ***Average No of requests for inquiries received per year in 2014 - 2015*** | ***Average******No of inquiries with a report per year in 2014 – 2015******(no visit)*** | ***Average No of inquiries with visit and report per year in 2014 - 2015***  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Treaty Body*** | ***(a)*** | ***(b)*** | ***(c)*** | ***(d)*** | ***(e)*** | ***(f)*** | ***(g) = (a) +(b)*** | ***(h) = (c)+(d)*** | ***(i) = (e) +(f)*** | ***(j) = (g) ÷ 2*** | ***(k) = (h)÷ 2*** | ***(l) = (i) ÷ 2*** |
| **CESCR** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **CEDAW** | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 |
| **CAT** | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0  | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| **CRC**  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| **CRPD** | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.5 |
| **CED** | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 |
| **TOTAL** (6 TBs**)** | **7** | **3** | **0** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **10** | **1** | **2** | **5** | **0.5** | **1** |

Annex XIV: Simplified reporting procedure (SRP)

Paragraph 1 of resolution 68/268 encouraged the treaty bodies to offer the simplified reporting procedure to State parties for consideration and to set a limit on the number of questions (in the list of issues prior to reporting). Paragraph 2 of the resolution encouraged States parties to avail themselves of the simplified reporting procedure.

The modalities of the simplified reporting procedure in the various treaty bodies are described in the table below which reflects the situation on 31 December 2015. Five treaty bodies (HRCtee, CESCR, CEDAW, CMW and CRPD) limit the number of questions in the list of issues prior to reporting to less than 30 questions.

The SRP does not apply to the Subcommittee on prevention of Torture, given that this treaty body does not have a reporting procedure.

|  | ***Offers the SRP for periodic reports*** | ***Offers the SRP for initial reports*** | ***Offers the SRP (for periodic reports) with certain limitations / modalities*** | ***Limits the No of questions in the list of issues prior to reporting*** | ***No of States parties informed of the availability of the SRP on 31 Dec. 2015*** | ***No of States parties that had availed themselves of the SRP after having been invited as at 31 Dec. 2015*** | ***No of States parties that had expressed the wish to continue to report under the traditional reporting procedure as at 31 Dec. 2015*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Treaty Body*** | ***(a)*** | ***(b)*** | ***(c)*** | ***(d)*** | ***(e)*** | ***(f)*** | ***(g)*** |
| **CERD** | Yes | No | Yes [[3]](#footnote-4) | No | 16 | 1 | 1 |
| **HRCtee** | Yes  | No | No | Yes (25 flexible) | 146 | 34 | 3 |
| **CESCR** | Yes | No | Yes[[4]](#footnote-5) | Yes (25 flexible) | 9 | 3 | 0 |
| **CEDAW** | Yes | No | Yes[[5]](#footnote-6) | Yes[[6]](#footnote-7) (25) | 189 | 6 | 0 |
| **CAT** | Yes | Yes[[7]](#footnote-8) | No | No | 129 | 90 | 4 |
| **CRC**  | Yes | No | Yes[[8]](#footnote-9) | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| **CMW** | Yes | Yes[[9]](#footnote-10) | No | Yes  | 48 | 5 | 0 |
| **CRPD** | Yes | No | No | Yes (30) | 33 | 18 | 0 |
| **CED** | n/a[[10]](#footnote-11) | No | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| **TOTAL** | **8** | **2** | **4** | **5** | **570** | **157** | **8** |
| **AVERAGE** (7 TBs) | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 81 | 22 | 1 |

Annex XV: Constructive dialogue

Paragraph 5 of resolution 68/268 encouraged the treaty bodies to align the methodology for the constructive dialogue with States parties. At their 26th meeting, the Chairs made a series of proposals (see A/69/285, paragraphs 94 – 100) and invited the treaty bodies to adopt a guidance note for States parties on the constructive dialogue (A/69/285, annex I), while underlining the need for each treaty body to have flexibility in conducting the dialogue.

The table below reflects the situation on 31 December 2015.

The Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture is not included in this annex, given that this treaty body does not have a reporting procedure.

|  | ***Usually holds dialogue over two consecutive working days (A/68/285, para 96)*** | ***Dialogue as of 2nd State party report focuses on priority issues*** *(as opposed to covering all articles under Convention)****(A/69/285, para 100)*** | ***Has adopted / endorsed the Guidance Note for States parties on the constructive dialogue (A/69/285, Annex I)*** | ***Has posted the Guidance Note on its webpage or shares it with States parties in advance of the dialogue***  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Treaty Body*** | ***(a)*** | ***(b)*** | ***(c)*** | ***(d)*** |
| **CERD** | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| **HRCtee** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| **CESCR** | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| **CEDAW** | No | No[[11]](#footnote-12) | Yes | No |
| **CAT** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| **CRC**  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| **CMW** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| **CRPD** | Yes | n/a[[12]](#footnote-13) | Yes | Yes |
| **CED** | Yes | n/a[[13]](#footnote-14) | Yes | Yes |
| **TOTAL** | **8 (89%)** | **5 (71%)** | **8 (89%)** | **6 (66%)** |

Annex XVI: Concluding observations (COBs)

Paragraph 6 of resolution 68/268 encouraged the treaty bodies to adopt short, focused and concrete concluding observations, reflecting the dialogue with the State party, and to develop common guidelines for the elaboration of such concluding observations. At their 26th meeting, the Chairs made a series of proposals to the treaty bodies in this regard (see A/69/285, paragraphs 102 – 106) and invited them to adopt a framework for concluding observations, while underlining the need for each treaty be able to apply the framework flexibly (A/69/285, annex II).

The table below reflects the situation on 31 December 2015.

The Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture is not included in this annex, given that this treaty body does not adopt concluding observations.

| ***Treaty Body*** | ***Average length of concluding observations in 2015, in printed pages*** *(330 words per page****)******(a)*** | ***Has adopted / endorsed the framework for concluding observations******(b)***  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CERD** | 8 | Yes |
| **HRCtee** | 8 | No |
| **CESCR** | 10 | Yes |
| **CEDAW** | 9 | Yes |
| **CAT** | 10 | No |
| **CRC**  | 19 | Yes |
| **CMW** | 10 | Yes |
| **CRPD** | 9 | Yes |
| **CED** | 8 | Yes |
| **TOTAL** | **n/a** | **7 (78%)** |
| **AVERAGE** (9 TBs) | 10 *(3,300 words)* | n/a |

Annex XVII: General comments

Paragraph 14 of resolution 68/268 encouraged the treaty bodies to develop an aligned consultation process for the elaboration of general comments. At their 27th meeting, the Chairs endorsed elements for the elaboration of and consultation on general comments and recommended their generalization among all treaty bodies that issue general comments (see A/70/302, paragraph 91).

The table below reflects the situation on 31 December 2015.

|  | ***No of general comments adopted since the establishment of the treaty body*** | ***No of general comments under development*** | ***Has already adopted / endorsed the elements for the elaboration of and consultation on general comments observations endorsed by the Chairs in June 2015 (A/70/302, para 91)*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Treaty Body*** | ***(a)*** | ***(b)*** | ***(c)*** |
| **CERD** | 35 | 0 | Yes |
| **HRCtee** | 35 | 1 | No |
| **CESCR** | 23 | 3 | Yes |
| **CEDAW** | 34 | 3 | Yes |
| **CAT** | 3 | 1 | No |
| **CRC**  | 18 | 4 | Yes |
| **CMW** | 2 | 1 | Yes |
| **CRPD** | 2 | 2 | Yes |
| **CED** | 0 | 0 | Yes |
| **TOTAL** | **152** | **15** | **7 (78%)** |
| **AVERAGE** (9 TBs) | 17 | 1.7 | n/a |

 Annex XVIII: Gender composition of treaty bodies on 1 January 2016

Paragraph 13 encouraged States parties to give due consideration, during the election of treaty body experts, to equitable geographic distribution, representation of different forms of civilization and legal systems, balanced gender representation and participation of experts with disabilities in the membership of the treaty bodies.

On 1 January 2016, out of 172 treaty body members, 44 per cent were women. Without CEDAW, the representation of women in the membership of the treaty bodies is 31 per cent.

| ***Treaty Body*** | ***No of treaty body members*** | ***No of female members*** | ***No of male members*** | ***Percentage of female members*** | ***Percentage of male members*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CERD** | 18 | 7 | 11 | 39 % | 61 % |
| **HRCtee** | 18 | 5 | 13 | 28 % | 72 % |
| **CESCR** | 18 | 3 | 15 | 17 % | 83 % |
| **CEDAW** | 23 | 22 | 1 | 96 % | 4 % |
| **CAT** | 10 | 4 | 6 | 40 % | 60 % |
| **CRC**  | 18 | 9 | 9 | 50 % | 50 % |
| **CMW** | 14 | 5 | 9 | 36 % | 64 % |
| **CRPD** | 18 | 6 | 12 | 33 % | 67 % |
| **CED** | 10 | 2 | 8 | 20 % | 80 % |
| **SPT** | 25 | 13 | 12 | 52 % | 48 % |
| **TOTAL** | **172** | **76** | **96** | **44 %** | **56 %** |

Annex XIX: Accessibility

 A. The Strategic Heritage Plan (SHP)

One of the main objectives and priority of the Strategic Heritage Plan is to render the Palais des Nations in Geneva fully accessible and eliminate barriers that prevent persons with disabilities from making use of the premises while respecting the principles of universal design for the existing buildings. The following are the main areas that will be addressed:

1. Physical access:

Currently there are 18 elevators (out of a total of 45 elevators) that are fully accessible across all the different buildings. Eleven elevators are equipped with Braille keys, and 6 of the 11 elevators also with audio, announcing floors in two languages (English, French).

At the conclusion of the SHP there will be 28 main elevators which will be fully code compliant with greater space, door width, appropriate control panel height, Braille keys and audio announcing the floors.

There will also be 18 main stairs with improvements that include tactile and contrasted marking and handrails.

8 entrances will be made fully accessible (upgrade of existing or additional entrance) with accessible sidewalks, tactile paving, ramp, handrails, contrast strips, automatic doors, intercoms, signage, etc.

2. Access inside the premises:

Improvements that will be made on main hallways and corridors include indoor paths and a guiding system in 9 different zones, new intercoms (visual/audio), removal of obstacles, installation of lighting and signage.

3. Facilities on premises:

Restrooms: There will be 27 new fully accessible restrooms / accessibility upgrades in 8 accessible restrooms including maneuvering space, easy to open doors

4. Supporting disabled staff in the work place:

Improvements will be made to office space as well as individual workstation for disabled persons to include maneuvering space, legible information on the door, adjustable desk heights, electrical sockets and switches, as well as sufficient door passage and easy-to- open doors.

Currently there are 190 interpretation booths out of which only 16 (8%) are accessible. Upon completion of the Strategic Heritage Plan, there will be a total of 203 booths and 47 (23%) will be accessible.

 B. Providing reasonable accommodation for treaty body experts with disabilities to ensure their full and effective participation

The Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD):

At each meeting, CRPD is accorded accessible services including closed captioning, international sign interpretation, as well as availability of hearing loops. Closed captioning is generally provided in English. However, during the dialogue with State parties under review, captioning is also provided in the language of the country under consideration, if the official language of the country falls within the six official languages of the United Nations, upon condition that a captioning vendor in that language has been identified. To date, closed captioning has been provided in English, French, Spanish and Russian, some of them simultaneously.

Braille documentation has been provided upon request in English and Spanish to accommodate the needs of the treaty body members. Whilst sign language is country-specific, efforts are made to identify and recruit national sign interpreters from the State party under review for the constructive dialogue.

Annex XX: UN Webcasting and video-archiving of treaty body meetings

Thanks to extra-budgetary resources for a pilot project, the United Nations was able to purchase and install webcasting and video-archiving equipment in 3 room used by the treaty bodies. The project will end in June 2017, at which point UN webcasting will be discontinued unless resources are provided.

From September 2016 to June 2017, public meetings of the treaty bodies will be webcast by the UN in the language of the speaker (‘floor’) and in English. CRPD meetings will be webcast with sign language and captioning. Webcast meetings will be streamed live and archived on UN WEB TV[[14]](#footnote-15) in a searchable and secure manner.

To continue webcasting treaty bodies’ public meetings beyond the pilot project, the following items are required:

* Webcasting in two[[15]](#footnote-16), three or four languages[[16]](#footnote-17): Annual cost bandwidth, storage, and associated costs (webtv.un.org): **USD 70,000**
* Staffing (minimum 250 days of public meetings per year, with a majority of meetings taking place simultaneously in two or three rooms – see treaty body meeting calendar):

  1 Multimedia Producer (Webcast) (P-3) at **USD 262,909** per year (including installation and related non-recurring costs, no dependants)

  2 Webcast Assistants (GS-5) at **USD 143,800** each per year (local recruitment, related standard common service costs, no dependants)

  Basic equipment, including furniture and computers, and office space per staff: **USD 6 500**

* Yearly maintenance costs:

  Room A (Palais Wilson): **CHF 16,510**

  Room B (Palais Wilson): **CHF 16,093**

  Room XVI (Palais des Nations): **CHF 9,515**

  Technician: **CHF 5,670**

1. The Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture does not review State party reports or examine individual communications. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. As the custodian of two Optional Protocols with reporting requirements, the CRC examines three types of State party reports. Since the consideration of reports submitted under the Optional Protocols is more limited in scope, more reports can be examined per week. Following the initial State party review, periodic reports to the CRC under the Optional Protocols are incorporated within the periodic report of the State party under the Convention. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. CERD is implementing the SRP gradually by offering it to the States parties whose periodic reports are more than five years overdue and by prioritizing those that are more than 10 years overdue. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. CESCR offers the SRP on a pilot basis, from the third periodic report onwards. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. CEDAW offers the SRP on a pilot basis for periodic reports that are overdue, on the condition that a common core document was submitted in the past five years or less in case of significant political and/or socioeconomic changes. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. CEDAW limits the number of questions in the list of issues prior to reporting to 25. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. In the case of initial reports, CAT offers the SRP when these reports are long overdue and bearing in mind the Secretariat capacity (2 States per year) [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. CRC has adopted the SRP in principle and will offer it to States parties after having reduced the backlog of State party reports. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. CMW may use the SRP for overdue initial reports, regardless of whether the State party has accepted the procedure or not, and may proceed to review a State party in the absence of a report. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. CED has not yet reached the stage of requesting additional information to States parties under article 29 (4) of the Convention. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. CEDAW reviews State party compliance with all articles of the Convention. In doing so, it may grant more attention to some issues than others. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. CRPD will start considering periodic reports only in 2017. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. CED has not yet reached the stage of the dialogue with States parties under article 29 (4) of the Convention. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. http://webtv.un.org [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. UN WEB TV currently provides webcasting in two languages (floor and English). [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. As decided under paragraph 30 of resolution 68/268, the treaty bodies are entitled to maximum three languages with a fourth language provided on an exceptional basis. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)