

UN TREATY BODY STRENGTHENING:

WHAT STRATEGY AHEAD OF THE 2020 REVIEW?



ISHR

INTERNATIONAL SERVICE
FOR HUMAN RIGHTS



Report of a multi-stakeholder consultation 23-24 May 2017, Geneva



Misión Permanente de Costa Rica
ante la Oficina de las Naciones Unidas
Ginebra



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

Mission permanente de la Suisse auprès de l'Office des Nations
Unies et des autres organisations internationales à Genève

CONTENTS



INTRODUCTION	I
THE SEVEN BUILDING BLOCKS OF TREATY BODY STRENGTHENING	2
TREATY BODY STRENGTHENING THROUGHOUT TIME – PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE	2
What can we learn from previous processes?	2
Where are we at now?	3
Where do we want to go and how?	4
THE ROLE OF KEY ACTORS IN THE STRENGTHENING PROCESS	4
States	4
Treaty bodies	5
Civil society and NHRIs	5
OHCHR	6
RETHINKING THE RELATIONS BETWEEN TREATY BODIES AND OTHER UN HUMAN RIGHTS BODIES	6
Treaty Bodies and the Universal Periodic Review	6
Treaty Bodies and Special Procedures	7
Treaty Bodies and the UN General Assembly	8
Treaty Bodies and the Human Rights Council	8
ANNEXES	9
Agenda of the consultation	9
List of participants	10
Background documents & further reading	12



INTRODUCTION

ISHR has long been involved in Treaty Body Strengthening processes, primarily with a view to support and safeguard their independence, and maintain a high level of openness and co-operation with human rights defenders and rights holders broadly. ISHR also coordinates a group of NGOs working on Treaty Body strengthening, to share information and provide joint inputs, most notably on the occasion of the annual meetings of Treaty Body chairs.

Challenges faced by UN treaty bodies such as the lack of harmonization of working methods or lack of State compliance with reporting and implementation obligations have been thoroughly identified and discussed over the last 25 years. They were documented in various studies and reports such as the 2012 report¹ of the UN High Commissioner (HC) for HR, which stemmed from the so-called Dublin Process². The current framework for treaty body strengthening was established by General Assembly resolution 68/268 of June 2014, which envisages a review of the effectiveness of the measures taken thereunder in 2020. More ambitious proposals such as the 2006 proposal for a unified Treaty Body³ were not included into the last strengthening measures.

In order to prepare for the 2020 review, in line with a recommendation made during the 2015 Wilton Park meeting on Treaty Bodies⁴, and following a proposal on the occasion of the

2015 meeting of treaty body Chairs (UN Doc A/70/302), the Geneva Academy has started regional consultations with an academic network and proposed a range of relevant questions⁵ for academic review.

A major take away from previous reform efforts is that the process leading up to a review is a key moment to propose ideas and gather the necessary support. Challenges and corresponding solutions to the operations of Treaty Bodies have been identified, and what is now

required is a strategy to prompt strong support for progressive solutions by a critical mass of relevant actors including States, NHRIs, civil society, and Treaty Bodies themselves. In order to support the design of such a strategy, ISHR convened a two day multi-stakeholder consultation in Geneva on 23-24 May 2017 with the financial support of the Jacob Blaustein Institute for the Advancement of Human Rights and

co-sponsored by the Permanent Missions of Costa Rica and Switzerland.

The consultation gathered representatives from UN treaty bodies, OHCHR staff, CSOs/ NHRIs, States, and academics (see agenda and list of participants in annex). This report provides a concise summary of the main issues identified with regards to the political strategy of treaty body strengthening. It does not necessarily reflect the views of participants or the co-sponsoring Permanent Missions.

“ THE MEETING WAS A GREAT OPPORTUNITY TO EXCHANGE IDEAS, ESTABLISH NEW CONTACTS, CLARIFY MISUNDERSTANDINGS, STRENGTHEN COLLABORATION ”

1 <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/HRTD/docs/HCTreatyBodyStrengthening.pdf>
2 <http://www.ishr.ch/news/treaty-body-reform-dublin-process>
3 <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/icm-mc/docs/HRI.MC.2006.2.pdf>
4 <https://www.wiltonpark.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/WPI375-Report.pdf>
5 <https://goo.gl/aHK06U>



SEVEN BUILDING BLOCKS OF TREATY BODY STRENGTHENING

1	Be collaborative, involve all relevant stakeholders in the process and foster consensus and a strong sense of ownership.
2	The perspectives and needs of rights holders and victims of human rights violations should be paramount.
3	Avoid least common denominators and be ambitious and open to change.
4	Identify a consensual and talented leader or leaders able to leverage support from a critical mass of relevant decision makers.
5	Identify good practices within Treaty Bodies and support adaptation and implementation across all of them.
6	If and when possible, avoid over-politicization of the strengthening process.
7	Be prepared and have a strategy to counter proposals aimed at curtailing the independence and effectiveness of Treaty Bodies.

TREATY BODY STRENGTHENING THROUGHOUT TIME – PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

What can we learn from previous processes?

- ① Challenges facing the Treaty Body system have been identified and diagnosed as far back as in the late 80s, notably with a series of reports from Philip Alston⁶. Some of the challenges which had been identified then, such as poor State reporting compliance and difficulties relating to complex and diverse working procedures, remain unresolved after nearly 30 years.
- ② Numerous measures to foster the replication and harmonization of good practices among Treaty Bodies were equally identified during the 90s and 2000s as part of previous treaty Body strengthening processes⁷. Although some of them such as the simplified reporting procedure have been implemented, the majority haven't, for a variety of reasons.
- ③ The 2006 Arbour proposal⁸ for a unified Treaty Body comprehensively addressed several of the challenges and also integrated many of the proposed remedies. Nonetheless, the proposed reform lacked broad ownership and did not garner support from a large base of relevant actors and decision makers. The proposal had not been sufficiently consulted with Treaty Body members, States and NGOs, and most ended up rejecting it. In addition, it was put forward at a time when the UN Commission on Human Rights was being replaced by

⁶ E.g. see UN Doc A/44/668

⁷ Now available on the following OHCHR webpage: http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRTD/Pages/TREATY_BODIESTrengthening.aspx

⁸ UN Doc HRI/MC/2006/2



the Council, and the UPR was emerging. The time and energy necessary to pursue such an ambitious Treaty Body reform was not available when most of the UN human rights community was focussed on the establishment of the Human Rights Council.

- ④ A key lesson learnt from the last process leading up to the adoption of GA Resolution 68/268 is that States who come up with proposals first have a “first mover advantage” and therefore, they may be better placed to impose their agenda on the rest. This was the case with proposals made by a group of States which identified as the Cross-Regional Group (CRG) and came up with proposals such as codes of conduct for Treaty Body members which were clearly aimed at limiting the effectiveness of Treaty Bodies and curtailing their independence. States with a more progressive agenda for Treaty Bodies were either less vocal or found themselves in a largely defensive position, which made them less influential in the process, considerably weakened the GA process as a Treaty Body strengthening opportunity and ended with a resolution which was arguably based on a set of least common denominators.

Where are we at now?

- ⑤ The current thrust of the strengthening process is provided by GA Res. 68/268, which envisages a review in 2020. An academic platform to foster reflections on future reforms of the Treaty Body system has been established and is currently undertaking a series of regional and international academic consultations. Many of the proposals aimed at a consolidation of Treaty Bodies made in the past have been reformulated and/or updated as part of the academic platform⁹.
- ⑥ NGOs regularly meet as part of the NGO group on Treaty Body strengthening, an open and informal group which integrates NGOs from all regions working on a regular basis with Treaty Bodies. Various joint initiatives are undertaken through this and other NGO networks. Most notably, joint NGO submissions to annual meetings of Treaty Body Chairs in recent years have spelt out a number of substantial strengthening measures immediately actionable across all Treaty Bodies. While some of these have been upheld, such as with the 2014 San José Guidelines on reprisals, most have yet to be endorsed by Treaty Bodies.
- ⑦ A group of States from all world regions coordinated by Costa Rica are occasionally meeting and sharing information on the Treaty Body strengthening process. The role of this group could be crucial in preparation of the 2020 review, given the likelihood of a new political process at the General Assembly and in light of the difficult political climate at the UN. States with a progressive vision for Treaty Bodies should work to strengthen this group in order to be well prepared to support ambitious, innovative and rights-oriented reforms ahead of the 2020 review.
- ⑧ The Treaty Bodies and OHCHR have taken various steps to implement GA Res. 68/268, which provides short term fixes to some of the most pressing needs, notably more meeting time for Treaty Bodies. Some Treaty Body members and OHCHR are involved in the consultations of the academic platform but OHCHR have so far not taken a position on the proposals made through the platform. Some individual Treaty Body members have made submissions to the platform with ambitious proposals for reform¹⁰.

⁹ See documents of the Academic Platform and reports of the consultations at <https://www.geneva-academy.ch/Treaty-Body-review-2020/documents>.

¹⁰ Some of these proposals are reflected in the report of the San José consultation of the academic platform, and their submission to the 2017 meeting of Treaty Body chairs, both of which are available on the above-mentioned webpage.



- ⑨ Leadership in the process is fundamental. While previous High Commissioners such as Navi Pillay and Louise Arbour have taken a prominent role in prompting and supporting Treaty Body strengthening processes, a clear and sturdy leadership is currently missing. While there does not seem to be consensus around who should lead in Treaty Body strengthening, some of the potential candidates include the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the UN Secretary General, and Treaty Body chairs.

Where do we want to go and how?

- ⑩ Some of the fundamental challenges which need to be addressed as part of the strengthening process include: lack of predictability of state reviews, poor state compliance with reporting and implementation obligations, low visibility of Treaty Bodies and their recommendations notably at the national level, multiplicity and complexity of working procedures, and lack of coordination or complementarity with other UN human rights bodies, especially the UPR. These challenges are resulting in a growing state and civil society disengagement from Treaty Bodies, notably as other avenues such as Special Procedures and the UPR are increasingly favoured by human rights defenders and activists.
- ⑪ Despite the large consensus around the need to tackle the more profound challenges facing Treaty Bodies, the risks associated with a new political process are high, and avenues to tackle challenges without resorting to such a political process should be pursued.
- ⑫ The perspective and needs of rights holders is critical to the effective functioning of Treaty Bodies. The strengthening process is conducted by insiders with limited participation of civil society and human rights defenders. Their participation and ownership taking is essential to enhance the legitimacy and impact of the Treaty Body system.
- ⑬ Despite the fact that Treaty Bodies report annually to the General Assembly in New York, their visibility is generally lower in New York than in Geneva. Yet the annual meetings of Treaty Body Chairs are now taking place in New York, which is also where the General Assembly meets. Good coordination of State and NGO initiatives between Geneva, New York and beyond is essential in preparation for the 2020 review.

THE ROLE OF KEY ACTORS IN THE STRENGTHENING PROCESS

States

- ⑭ As duty bearers, funders and the subjects of reviews, recommendations and views, States have an interest in an expert, effective, efficient and sustainable Treaty Body system.
- ⑮ States have de facto had the upper hand in Treaty Body strengthening through the UN General Assembly. Their focus is currently on implementation of GA Res 68/268. There is a sense that preparedness if key as a new inter-governmental process could be launched as early as in late 2017.
- ⑯ New York diplomats negotiate GA resolutions, but they need the knowledge base from Geneva on Treaty Body strengthening. Communication and coordination between Missions is key.



- ⑪ The need for states to look for common ground should not result in consensus around the least common denominator. States with a clear and ambitious vision on how to meaningfully strengthen Treaty Bodies should coordinate and draw a line on what is acceptable, and what is not.

Treaty Bodies

- ⑫ Treaty body members and chairs have a major potential to bring about significant and lasting change, as evidenced by a number of precedents such as the adoption of the simplified reporting procedure or the adoption of the San José Guidelines on reprisals. They also played a key role to push back some of the negative proposals during the lead up to GA Res 68/268. Nonetheless, they have very limited incentive or obligation to align or coordinate their work with other Treaty Bodies, resulting in a confusing plethora of different policies and working methods across the ten Treaty Bodies.
- ⑬ The current set-up of annual meetings of chairs provides a forum for discussion and exchange between the Treaty Bodies. However it is not a decision making body and, with a few notable exceptions, it has proved unable to prompt actions readily applicable across all Treaty Bodies.
- ⑭ As mentioned above, some Treaty Body members and chairs have been publicly opposed to some strengthening proposals in the past. Consulting and involving them in the strengthening process is essential. Likewise, Treaty Body members and chairs should always assess strengthening proposals through the perspective of relevant stakeholders, and especially rights holders and victims.
- ⑮ Treaty Bodies can and should play a key role to improve the visibility of their work. Some of the avenues to do so, identified in joint NGO submissions to recent annual meetings of chairs, include accepting invitations to undertake outreach and dissemination activities at the national level, proactively reaching out to the national and international media following state reviews and/or the adoption of views, or making use of social media.

Civil society and NHRIs

- ⑯ NGOs have a vital role to play and some of them have played a historic and critical role in the establishment of Treaty Bodies, as well as supporting their ongoing functioning. NGOs have also proved to be able to foster major strengthening measures such as the adoption of innovative and far-reaching follow up procedures by Treaty Bodies and the webcasting of Treaty Body sessions.
- ⑰ Although NGOs have been historically very involved in the process of Treaty Body strengthening, this has been much less so recently. The NGO group on Treaty Body strengthening continues to be active but the global levels of funding for NGO work with treaty bodies and on Treaty Body strengthening have considerably decreased in recent years. This is negatively impacting on the NGO capacity to support the process.
- ⑱ NHRIs have come to play a major role in the work of Treaty Bodies, as well as Treaty Body strengthening. A number of initiatives on strengthening NHRI engagement with Treaty Bodies



are taking place in 2017¹¹, a positive development which it is hoped will lead to a common Treaty Body approach to engaging with NHRIs.

OHCHR

- (25) The OHCHR provide in practice much more than the purely Secretariat role they are supposed to fulfil for Treaty Bodies. Yet, despite some limited improvements brought about by GA Res 68/268, their resources to cater for the needs of Treaty Bodies have been historically insufficient. They are particularly scarce for the petitions unit, which deals with hundreds of individual petitions to Treaty Bodies on a weekly basis. Any strengthening measure must duly take into account the limited available resources and the ongoing demands from donors to cut down on budgets.
- (26) As the institution which has overall visibility on the work of Treaty Bodies, there is a lot of expectation that the OHCHR could be more proactive in mapping and facilitating the replication, adaptation and alignment of good practices among Treaty Bodies. The OHCHR could also proactively foster a better coordination between Treaty Bodies on a thematic and/or country basis, both between Treaty Bodies themselves, but also with other UN human rights mechanisms.
- (27) As mentioned above, the role of High Commissioner in the strengthening process can be pivotal. Some see it as essential in the absence of a clear leadership. The current High Commissioner does not seem to have made Treaty Body reform a priority so far.

RETHINKING THE RELATIONS BETWEEN TREATY BODIES AND OTHER UN HUMAN RIGHTS BODIES

Treaty Bodies and the Universal Periodic Review

- (28) The UPR and Treaty Bodies have fundamental differences in scope, approach, purpose and method, but they were meant to be complementary. The UPR is universal and state driven. It produces numerous recommendations, which States can decide to accept or note, frequently around easier human rights issues. Treaty bodies are expert led, and each produce less recommendations which often address harder issues and serious human rights violations.
- (29) During the first and second UPR cycle, the dominating paradigm was that UPR recommendations should not quote Treaty Body recommendations, as it opened a risk that States would reject recommendations binding under international human rights treaties. Yet this view is increasingly challenged, as States de facto reject recommendations either related to international standards, and/or directly mentioned by Treaty Bodies. References to Treaty Bodies in UPR reviews can not only strengthen the relevance and coherence of UPR recommendations, but it can also increase the visibility and outreach of treaty Body recommendations at the national level, as States are obliged to consider the recommendations and position themselves.

11 E.g. see UN Doc. HRI/MC/2017/3.



UN TREATY BODY STRENGTHENING: WHAT STRATEGY AHEAD OF THE 2020 REVIEW?

- 30 The development of Treaty Bodies' prioritization of some recommendations, and the emergence of follow-up and grading systems constitute very relevant developments which could be better reflected in the UPR. For instance, States could make use of and mention the grades on implementation of Treaty Body recommendations in the UPR.
- 31 As suggested as part of previous Treaty Body strengthening processes¹² and in the Academic platform on Treaty Body strengthening¹³, more attention and thought should be given to a proposal of staggering Treaty Body and UPR reviews. In such a scenario, consolidated Treaty Body reviews would be taking at any predictably given moment (all Treaty Bodies reviews would be clustered one after the other by a range of Treaty Bodies (chambers), and 2 or 3 years afterwards the UPR would be used primarily as a mechanism for States to check-in and report on their compliance with the Treaty Body recommendations.
- 32 It is important to ensure that reforms aimed at synchronizing and staggering States' reviews by the Treaty Bodies and the UPR do not have the effect of significantly reducing the frequency with which States' human rights records are reviewed.

Treaty Bodies and Special Procedures

- 33 Treaty Bodies and Special Procedures also have fundamental differences in scope, approach, purpose and method. The latter are more flexible, reactive and they are not bound by periodicity, nor limited by whether a State has ratified a given treaty. However, their recommendations are not systematically based on binding international norms.
- 34 Treaty Bodies and Special Procedures cooperate and coordinate their work through various existing good practices such as joint statements on issues or cases of common concern¹⁴ or periodic meetings around thematic issues such as torture, enforced disappearances or disability. There have also been some precedents of Special Procedures providing direct and public inputs to Treaty Body processes such as the preparation of General Comments¹⁵. Special Procedures have also briefed Treaty Bodies on recent country visits in cases where that State is subsequently to be reviewed by the Treaty Body¹⁶.
- 35 Despite these existing good practices, more should be done to replicate them in a systematic way. For instance, it appears that some Treaty Bodies such as CEDAW do not have formal mechanisms for discussion and coordination with the Special Procedures focusing on gender issues. The Treaty Body chairs could meet occasionally or periodically with the Coordination Committee of Special Procedures to identify areas of common concern and discuss joint tactics.
- 36 While recognizing the value of repeating similar requests and recommendations from various sources, joint initiatives and statements should be more regularly considered, with support from the OHCHR which acts as the Secretariat of both bodies.

12 E.g. see report of the conference "The Universal Periodic Review Process and the Treaty Bodies: Constructive Cooperation or Deepening Divisions?" 25 November 2011, Maastricht, The Netherlands <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/HRTD/docs/ReportMaastrichtSeminar.doc>.

13 Report of the November 2016 consultation in San José, Costa Rica <https://goo.gl/KUimxf>.

14 E.g. "Mexico: UN rights experts strongly condemn killing of human rights defender and call for effective measures to tackle impunity" 19 May 2017. <https://goo.gl/UYqQWo>.

15 E.g. submissions by the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances and the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention to the draft 12 Revised General Comment on the implementation of article 3 of the Convention against Torture in the context of article 22.

16 For example, the Special Rapporteur on Migrants gave a briefing to CESCR on his recent country visit to Australia to assist the Committee in preparing for the May 2017 review of that country.



Treaty Bodies and the UN General Assembly

- 37 There is a general sense that although the General Assembly should remain the main overarching body for Treaty Bodies, the poor visibility and presence of Treaty Bodies in New York is problematic. Treaty Bodies could and should play a leading and visible role in adopting ambitious and far-reaching strengthening measures to avoid the politicisation and risks associated with the GA taking over the strengthening process.
- 38 Elections of Treaty Body members, which mostly take place in New York, require an urgent reform. Initiatives aimed at promoting open, fair, transparent and gender inclusive processes should be supported and replicated across the board for all Treaty Bodies and member States. It is primarily a States' duty to uphold commitments on gender inclusiveness and transparency to the elections of Treaty Body members. One potential way to improve the transparency and gender inclusiveness of Treaty Body members would be to relocate elections in Geneva (as is the case for CAT and SPT elections), where there is more knowledge and third party engagement and lobbying with and around Treaty Bodies.

Treaty Bodies and the Human Rights Council

- 39 The Human Rights Council has no organic, formal, or de facto engagement whatsoever in Treaty Body strengthening. Both the GA and HRC are political fora where the effectiveness of the Treaty Body system is not necessarily a high priority. Yet Treaty Bodies should engage with both due to their political leverage.
- 40 Although the HRC should not be overseeing the work of Treaty Bodies, complementarity and coordination between the two mechanisms is seen as crucial and should be addressed as part of the Treaty Body strengthening process and institutional strengthening processes of the HRC (such as the one envisaged between 2021 and 2026¹⁷) and its mechanisms. For instance, Treaty Bodies should be able to inform and brief HRC member States periodically and at least annually. Treaty Bodies should be invited or requested to provide inputs to substantial studies and resolutions of the HRC relevant to Treaty Body mandates. Finally, the HRC could play a role in contributing to the follow up and assessment of the implementation of Treaty Body recommendations, for instance by considering the Treaty Body grades on States compliance with concluding observations and views, notably on the occasion of HRC elections.

17 GA Res 65/281 of 2011 specifies that it will "consider again the question of whether to maintain (the current HR Council) status at an appropriate moment and at a time no sooner than ten years and no later than fifteen years".



ANNEXES

Agenda of the consultation

TUESDAY 23 MAY	
08.30 – 9.00	REGISTRATION OF PARTICIPANTS
09.00 – 09.30	WELCOME - OPENING REMARKS Ambassador Valentin Zellweger (PM of Switzerland to the UN) Ambassador Elayne G. Whyte Gómez (PM of Costa Rica to the UN) Ibrahim Salama (Human Rights Council and Treaties Division, OHCHR) Phil Lynch ISHR Director
09.30 – 10.30	2020 REVIEW OF TREATY BODIES: WHAT DO WE WANT TO ACHIEVE AND HOW? Panelists Ibrahim Salama / Human Rights Council and Treaties Division, OHCHR Felice Gaer / member of the UN Committee against Torture Lucy McKernan / Geneva representative, Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights Moderation Patricia Schulz / member of the UN Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women
10.30 – 11.00	COFFEE BREAK
11.00 – 12.30	TREATY BODY STRENGTHENING: WHERE ARE WE AT? AN OVERVIEW OF THE STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF GA RES 68/268 AND THE ACADEMIC PLATFORM ON TREATY BODY REVIEW Panelists Christen Broecker / Deputy Director, Jacob Blaustein Institute for the Advancement of Human Rights Paulo David / Human Rights Council and Treaties Division, OHCHR Felix Kirchmeier / Manager of Policy Studies, Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights Moderation Patricia Schulz / member of the UN Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women
12.30 – 14.00	LUNCH
14.00 – 15.30	OVERVIEW OF PREVIOUS TREATY BODY STRENGTHENING PROCESSES: WHAT CAN WE LEARN? Panelists Penny Parker / Geneva for Human Rights/The Advocates for Human Rights Peter Splinter / former Geneva representative of Amnesty International Petter Wille / Chair of the Norwegian Human Rights Institution Moderation Ligia Bolívar / Director of the Human Rights Centre of the Catholic University Andrés Bello (Venezuela)
15.30 – 16.00	COFFEE BREAK
16.00 – 17.30	DISCUSSIONS IN GROUPS THE ROLE OF STATES IN THE 2020 REVIEW Moderation Krista Oinonen / Finland Ministry of Foreign Affairs THE ROLE OF TREATY BODY MEMBERS IN THE 2020 REVIEW Moderation Anastasia Crickley / Chair of the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination THE ROLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY & NHRIS IN THE 2020 REVIEW Moderation Ariela Peralta / Chair of the Uruguay National Human Rights Institution THE ROLE OF OHCHR IN THE 2020 REVIEW Moderation Jyotsna Poudyal / Human Rights Council and Treaties Division, OHCHR



WEDNESDAY 24 MAY	
09.00 – 10.30	REPORTING BACK FROM GROUPS FROM PREVIOUS DAY IN PLENARY & DISCUSSION
10.30 – 11.00	COFFEE BREAK
11.00 – 12.30	<p>PREPARING FOR THE 2020 REVIEW: WHAT FUTURE RELATIONS BETWEEN TREATY BODIES AND OTHER UN HUMAN RIGHTS BODIES?</p> <p>RELATIONS BETWEEN TREATY BODIES AND THE UNIVERSAL PERIODIC REVIEW Moderation Myriam Tebourbi / Deputy-Secretary of the UPR working group, OHCHR</p> <p>RELATIONS BETWEEN TREATY BODIES AND SPECIAL PROCEDURES Moderation Sarah Cleveland / Member of the UN Human Rights Committee</p> <p>RELATIONS BETWEEN TREATY BODIES AND THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY Moderation Edda Björk Ragnarsdóttir / Permanent Mission of Iceland to the UN</p> <p>RELATIONS BETWEEN TREATY BODIES AND THE HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL Moderation Christian Devos / Open Society Justice Initiative</p>
12.30 – 14.00	LUNCH
14.00 – 15.30	REPORTING BACK FROM GROUPS IN PLENARY & DISCUSSION
15.30 – 16.00	COFFEE BREAK
16.00 – 17.30	NEXT STEPS IN THE TREATY BODIES PROCESS: OVERVIEW AND DISCUSSION ON KEY TIMELINES

List of participants

PARTICIPANTS	CURRENT EMPLOYER
NGOS	
Adrien Claude Zoller	Geneva for Human Rights
Anna-Karin Holmlund	Amnesty International - International Secretariat
Béatrice Schulter	Child Rights Connect
Carin Benninger-Budel	Organisation Mondiale Contre la Torture
Christen Broecker	Jacob Blaustein Institute
Christian De Vos	Open Society Foundations
Juan Perez Bello	International Disability Alliance
Kseniya Kirichenko	ILGA
Laia Evia	International Institute on Race, Equality and Human Rights
Livingstone Sewanyana	Defend Defenders
Lucy McKernan	Global Initiative on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
Namindranasoa Ny Haja	ISHR
Patrizia Scannella	Women International League for peace and freedom
Paulo de Tarso Lugon Arantes	CELS Conectas Humanas Representative
Penny Parker	The Advocates for Human Rights
Peter Splinter	Formerly member of Amnesty International
Phil Lynch	ISHR
Stella Anastasia	OMCT
Taisuke Komatsu	IMADR
Victor Rodriguez	CCPR Centre
Vincent Ploton	ISHR



STATES

Agnieszka Karpinska	<i>Poland</i>
Chang on Lee	<i>Korea</i>
Christoph Spenle	<i>Switzerland</i>
Diana Murillo	<i>Costa Rica</i>
Edda Bjork Ragnarsdottir	<i>Iceland</i>
Elayne Whyte Gomez	<i>Costa Rica</i>
Eunice Sin	<i>Singapore</i>
Guro Camerer	<i>Norway</i>
Hélène Petit	<i>France</i>
Yvette Stevens	<i>Sierra Leone</i>
Kevin Whelan	<i>United States</i>
Krista Oinonen	<i>Finnish MoFA</i>
Laura Schweizer	<i>Switzerland</i>
Laurenz Scheunemann	<i>Germany</i>
Lukas Heinzer	<i>Switzerland</i>
Paul Bjørdal	<i>Norway</i>
Reinhard Mecke	<i>Germany</i>
Thomas Stevens	<i>Belgium</i>
Valentin Zellweger	<i>Switzerland</i>

NHRIS

Ariela Peralta	<i>Chair of the Uruguay NHRI</i>
Katharina Rose	<i>GANHRI</i>
Peter Wille	<i>Chair of the Norwegian NHRI</i>

ACADEMICS

Felix Kirchmeier	<i>Geneva Academy</i>
Kamelia Kemileva	<i>Geneva Academy</i>
Ligia Bolivar	<i>UCAB - Venezuela</i>

TREATY BODIES

Anastasia Crickley	<i>CERD</i>
Felice Gaer	<i>CAT</i>
Olivier de Frouville	<i>HR Ctte</i>
Patricia Schultz	<i>CEDAW</i>
Sarah Cleveland	<i>HR Ctte</i>

OHCHR

Ibrahim Salama
Jyotsna Poudyal
Myriam Tebourbi
Paulo David
Waseela Adam



Background documents & further reading

① **PANEL**

2020 Review of Treaty Bodies: What do we want to achieve and how?

“Reinforcing Rights: Strengthening UN Human Rights Treaty Monitoring at a Time of Crisis”. [OxHRH Blog](#), 2 May 2017

② **PANEL**

Treaty body strengthening: Where are we at? An overview of the status of implementation of GA Res 68/268 and the Academic Platform on Treaty Body review

GA Resolution 68/268, February 2014

Latest [reports on the status of implementation](#) of GA res 68/268 and State responses to an OHCHR survey

Academic platform / [Concept note](#)

Academic platform / [Research questions](#)

③ **PANEL**

Overview of previous Treaty Body strengthening processes: What can we learn?

2006 HC [proposal](#) for a unified standing treaty body

2012 HC report “[Strengthening the UN human rights treaty body system](#)”

“The outcome of the General Assembly’s Treaty Body strengthening process: An important milestone on a longer journey”. [URG policy brief](#), June 2014

“More ambition required to reform UN Treaty Bodies”.

[Open Global Rights blog](#), July 2014

Detailed information and background on the “[Dublin process](#)”

④ **GROUP DISCUSSION**

The role of different actors in the review process: States

Information on the [inter-governmental process](#) leading up to the adoption of GA Res 68/268

⑤ **GROUP DISCUSSION**

The role of different actors in the review process: Treaty Bodies

General Assembly [resolution 49/1785](#) of December 1994 which defines the mandate of the annual meetings of Treaty Body Chairs

“The development of grading systems on the implementation of UN Treaty Body recommendations and the potential for replication to other UN human rights bodies”.

[Submission to the Academic platform on Treaty Bodies](#), March 2017.



⑥ **GROUP DISCUSSION**

The role of different actors in the review process: Civil Society and NHRIs

[Coalition of NGOs submission](#) to the 2016 meeting of Treaty Body Chairs

[Coalition of NGOs submission](#) to the 2015 meeting of Treaty Body Chairs

[Note by the Secretariat](#) of the 2017 meeting of Treaty Body Chairs on a “Common approach to engagement with national human rights institutions”

NHRIs & UN Treaty Bodies: [GANHRI background paper](#), May 2016

⑦ **GROUP DISCUSSION**

The role of different actors in the review process: OHCHR

[Public call](#) for the High Commissioner to get involved in the current Treaty Body strengthening process

⑧ **GROUP DISCUSSION**

What future relations between Treaty Bodies and the UPR?

[Report of the San José consultation](#) on Treaty Body strengthening, November 2016

⑨ **GROUP DISCUSSION**

What future relations between Treaty Bodies and Special Procedures?

Treaty Body strengthening, [Dublin II Meeting outcome document](#), November 2011 (esp. §127)

⑩ **GROUP DISCUSSION**

What future relations between Treaty Bodies and the UN General Assembly?

[Treaty Body Reform: The Intergovernmental Process](#), 2013.

[Addis Ababa guidelines](#) on the independence and impartiality of Treaty Body members. (inc. para. 6 on elections). June 2012.

⑪ **GROUP DISCUSSION**

What future relations between Treaty Bodies and the UN Human Rights Council?

[The missing link: What kind of relationship should there be between the Treaty Bodies and the Human Rights Council?](#) June 2016.