THE GENEVA HUMAN RIGHTS PLATFORM

WORKING PAPERS

International Treaty-Based Reporting Practices Review Report

A project of the:

GENEVA ACADEMY

Académie de droit international
humanitaire et de droits humains

Academy of International
Humanitarian Law and Human Rights

The Geneva Academy, a Joint Centre of

GENEVA GRADUATE INSTITUTE

INSTITUT DE HAUTES
ÉTUDES INTERNATIONALES
ET DU DÉVELOPPEMENT
GRADUATE INSTITUTE
OF INTERNATIONAL AND
DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

UNIVERSITÉ DE GENÈVE
FACULTY OF LAW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

First introduced in 1919 by the League of Nations and the International Labour Organization,[1] State reporting procedures have been developed to assist States parties to comply with their obligations under many international and regional treaties. Whether they relate to human rights, decent work and social justice, the fight against corruption and transnational organized crime, the environment, health, education or culture, treaties remain aspirational for right-holders if they are not effectively implemented. While each treaty has its own specificity and scope, all reporting procedures share the same goal: recommending steps forward to States parties on the implementation of the concerned treaty.

With the multiplication of treaties and corresponding reporting systems, international organizations and mechanisms have faced similar challenges: how to encourage State compliance with treaty obligations and with the outcome of the reporting procedure? How to optimize efficiency of the procedures for right-holders and duty-bearers? How to reduce the reporting burden for States? How to enhance transparency and visibility? How to streamline and strengthen reporting processes?

To contribute to the discussion, this working paper presents a comparative review of international treaty-based reporting systems and practices.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The analysis is based on two different sources of primary information. The main source is information that is publicly available on the various reporting systems' websites, with the caveat that it is sometimes incomplete. This preliminary research allowed to narrow down the list of reporting mechanisms to be examined. In addition, officers engaged in various reporting mechanisms were consulted to gather inside knowledge and draw lessons from their experience.

REPORTING MECHANISMS EXAMINED

Rather than a comprehensive inventory of all international State reporting procedures and practices, this working paper reviews those that seem most relevant to the current debate on how to streamline and strengthen reporting processes.

This paper was prepared in the context of a collaboration with the International Labour Organization (ILO), hence its State reporting process is not part of the review.

The following mechanisms have been examined:

United Nations (UN) Human Rights System

- Human rights treaty bodies established to monitor the implementation of "core treaties", bearing in mind the specificity of the Committee on Enforced Disappearances;[2]
- Universal Periodic Review undertaken by the Human Rights Council (UPR);[3]

Multilateral Environment Agreements (MEAs)

- Montreal Protocol (1987);
- Basel Convention (1989);
- Aarhus Convention (1998);
- Minamata Convention (2013);

UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) Conventions

- UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC);
- UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC);

---

1   Article 22 Covenant of the League of Nations and article 22 Constitution of the ILO.

2   Unlike other "core treaties", the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance does not provide for a fixed reporting cycle. Instead, States parties are required to provide "additional information" on the implementation of the Convention at flexible intervals, depending on the country situation (article 29-4 of the Convention).

3   Although Charter-based rather than treaty-based, the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) carried out by the United Nations Human Rights Council has been included since many aspects are comparable to other reporting systems and relevant to the analysis.

UNESCO Conventions on education and culture

- Convention against Discrimination in Education (1960);
- Convention on Technical and Vocational Education (1989);
- World Heritage Convention (1972);
- Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (1954) and its two Protocols (1954, 1999);
- Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003);

Council of Europe (CoE) treaties

- European Social Charter;
- Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities;
- European Charter for Minority Languages;
- Child abuse (Lanzarote Convention);
- Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism and its Additional Protocol;
- Convention on cybercrime and its two protocols;
- Convention on the counterfeiting of medical products and similar crimes involving threats to public health (MEDICRIME Convention);
- Convention for Action against Trafficking in Human Beings;
- Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention);

World Health Organization (WHO)

- Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC);
- International Health Regulations (IHRs).

SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH

This research only includes State reporting practices. Other reporting systems, based on reports submitted by independent experts rather than States parties or their representatives have been excluded from the review.

In terms of reporting cycle, the various stages of these processes have been examined. Where applicable, follow-up to the reporting outcome has been included in order to assess the impact of the various mechanisms.

SYSTEMS' FEATURES AND REPORT STRUCTURE

International treaty-based reporting systems have been compared regarding the following aspects:[4]
1. Nature of the monitoring mechanism responsible for reviewing State reports;
2. Periodicity;
3. Thematic and regional prioritization;
4. Input (information from States parties and participation of other stakeholders);
5. Noteworthy features of various reporting processes;
6. Available support from Secretariat;
7. Outcome of the reporting process;
8. Follow-up mechanism, if any;
9. Use of electronic reporting systems;
10. Additional key features and innovative practices.

---

4   See also table presenting an overview of the various features depending on reporting systems in annex.

COMPARATIVE REVIEW

1. SUPERVISORY MECHANISM

The international reporting systems reviewed include two types of supervisory mechanisms mandated to monitor the implementation of the relevant instruments. Supervisory mechanisms are either intergovernmental bodies composed of representatives of States parties,[5] or independent bodies which members are experts who sit in their personal capacity or "serve objectively and in the best interest of the Convention".[6] The UNODC Conventions against Corruption[7] and against Transnational Organized Crime[8] have established a peer review system whereby States are paired in drawing lots prior to each review phase.

2. PERIODICITY

The systems reviewed span a wide variety of reporting cycles, from flexible periodicity to reporting cycles as short as every year or as long as 12 years. Moreover, the cycles' length should be considered in conjunction with the provisions reviewed. Some systems provide for regular comprehensive reviews. Other mechanisms allow for more flexibility, with regard to periodicity as well as the provisions reviewed. These two aspects – periodicity and material scope of the review – are combined differently depending on reporting systems.

2.1 Fixed periodicity

A few systems combine a fixed reporting cycle with a comprehensive review. Thus, States parties are required to report on all relevant provisions at fixed intervals, which can be as short as one year (Montreal protocol, WHO IHRs)[9] or two years (WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control).[10] The UPR mechanism originally provided for a comprehensive review of the situation in all 193 UN Member States every four years.[11] In practice, reviews are undertaken every four and a half years on average.[12]

Other mechanisms provide for a full review within a fixed timeframe, and a more specific, focused review mid-cycle: Minamata Convention,[13] European Charter for Minority Languages,[14] UN Treaty Bodies.

Originally, periodicity depended on the treaty body (as per the relevant treaty) and was recommended to be every 4-5 years, with the exception of SPT that does not undertake reviews of States' implementation based on a reporting mechanism and CED that provides for a reporting mechanism, but no fixed periodicity. In reality, periodicity of reporting is on average every 8 years due to late reporting by States parties.[15] CERD introduced the practice of combining two reports by default, thereby extending the periodicity from 2 years in the Convention to 4 years in practice. Furthermore, throughout the system,

---

5   UPR, Montreal Protocol, UNCAC, UNTOC, UNESCO Conventions, CoE Lanzarote Convention on child abuse, CoE Conventions on terrorism and cybercrime, WHO FCTC and IHRs.

6   UN human rights treaty bodies, European Social Charter, CoE minority instruments, CoE Convention for action against trafficking in human beings and CoE Istanbul Convention.

7   See country pairings for each review cycle: https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption/implementation-review-mechanism.html.

8   See https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/organized-crime/intro/review-mechanism-untoc/drawing-of-lots.html.

9   Article 7 of the Montreal protocol requires States parties to provide data on controlled substances every year. Similarly, under the WHO International Health Regulations, States parties are required to report annually on the implementation of the IHRs with regard to 35 "indicators". The latest available information for 2022 (updated on 1 May 2023) shows that only 12 countries have not complied with their reporting obligations under the IHRs. See: https://extranet.who.int/e-spar/#submission-details (click on "All scores details").

10   At the fourth session of the COP, Parties decided that implementation reports should be submitted at regular, two-year intervals, synchronized with the cycle of the regular sessions of the COP (Decision FCTC/COP4(16)).

11   Human Rights Council Resolution A/HRC/RES/5/1 adopted on 18 June 2007, para. 14.

12   See also https://www.ohchr.org/en/hr-bodies/upr/basic-facts.

13   No reporting periodicity given in the treaty. Article 21 leaves this to the Compliance Committee. Subsequently, the Compliance Committee decided in «MC-1/8 on Timing and format of reporting by Parties» to set the timeline for full reports to four years, with short specific reports every two years, para. 1.

14   From 1 July 2019, following a reform adopted by the Committee of Ministers in November 2018, each State Party must submit a periodical report to the Secretary General every five years, explaining their policies and the action they have taken to fulfil the commitments they have undertaken, and two and a half years thereafter a mid-cycle document containing information on recommendations for immediate action. https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-charter-regional-or-minority-languages/monitoring#:~:text=Monitoring-,Monitoring%20the%20European%20Charter%20for%20Regional%20or%20Minority%20Languages,its%20legislation%2C%20policy%20and%20practice.

15   As at 31 December 2021, only 14% of States parties has no overdue reports, A/77/279, para. 14.

States parties started to combine several periodic reports to deal with late reporting, submitting several periodic reports at once. In 2019, the Human Rights Committee became the first Treaty Body to adopt a predictable review cycle, with reviews of State parties conducted every 8 years. In 2022, following the 34th meeting of Chairpersons of the Human Rights Treaty Bodies, it was agreed to "establish an eight-year review cycle for full reviews with follow-up reviews in between. Generally, the reporting compliance rate by States parties is very low: 14% according to the latest report by the Secretary-General on the treaty body system.[16]

For its part, the European Social Charter reporting system adjusts periodicity to country profiles depending on whether States parties have accepted the Collective Complaints procedure or not. States having accepted the Collective Complaints procedure can submit a simplified report every two years rather than every year.[17]

Another model consists of fixed periodicity, combined with a review of implementation that gradually follows different chapters of the Convention[18] or covers different thematic clusters:[19] UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime,[20] European Social Charter,[21] Council of Europe Convention for Action against Trafficking in Human Beings,[22] Istanbul Convention.[23]

2.2 Flexible periodicity

The UN Committee on Enforced Disappearances (CED) is the only treaty body that does not review State reports according to a fixed schedule. As the newest established treaty body in the UN human rights system, lessons could be learned from other mechanisms' experience to alleviate the "reporting burden" on States parties. Rather than regular periodic reviews, the treaty[24] provides for a flexible reporting mechanism according to which, once they have submitted an initial report, States parties are required to provide "additional information" on the implementation of the Convention. In order to review the "additional information" along a predictable cycle of reviews alongside the other treaty bodies, the Committee has devised a flexible and nimble procedure that allows for reviews over periods of 2, 4 or 8 years depending on the specific situation of the State party concerned.[25] In practice, the Committee requests States to submit additional information as a follow-up to the previous review to assess how much progress has been made in implementing the Convention regarding a few main themes. This is different from the follow-up procedure according to which the State party is requested to submit information on various issues within a year of the review. Instead, "additional information" is requested within a 2 to 8-year flexible cycle depending on the country profile. States parties are generally satisfied with this flexible approach to periodicity. A good indicator is their timeliness in submitting such "additional information". A non-exhaustive survey of State re-

---

16   See the latest **Status of the human rights treaty body system, Report of the Secretary-General**, A/77/279 - Annexes, Annex II, "Reporting compliance by States parties, as at 31 December 2021", Table 1, p. 6: "As at 31 December 2021, 28 of the 197 States parties (14%) had no overdue reports under the relevant international human rights treaties and protocols. Compared to the previous reporting period there were 38 States parties (19%) with no overdue reports."

17   See **https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-social-charter/reporting-system**.

18   UN Convention against Corruption: 2 cycles of 5 years, each covering different chapters of the Convention. See **https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption/implementation-review-mechanism.html**.

19   For more details on thematic prioritization, see infra Section 3 "Regional approach".

20   Gradual 12-year process consisting of one preparatory phase (years 1 and 2) and four subsequent review phases (years 3–12) covering four thematic clusters. See timeline: **https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/organized-crime/intro/review-mechanism-untoc/timeline.html**.

21   The review of the implementation of the European Social Charter is divided into 4 thematic groups: **https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-social-charter/reporting-system**.

22   4-year reporting cycle divided into rounds. First round: overview of implementation. Following rounds focus on specific provisions. See **https://www.coe.int/en/web/anti-human-trafficking/monitoring-mechanism**.

23   First assessment, followed by evaluation rounds. 5-year reporting cycles between the time the questionnaire is sent to the State and the adoption by the Committee of the Parties of the conclusion on implementation of recommendations, **https://rm.coe.int/provisional-timetable-for-the-1st-thematic-evaluation-round-procedure-/1680aa0e4c**. It takes 18 months for GREVIO to complete the full procedure, from sending the questionnaire to publishing the GREVIO report. **https://www.coe.int/en/web/istanbul-convention/steps-in-the-first-baseline-evaluation-procedure**.

24   Article 29 of the International Convention for the Protection of all Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

25   See Committee on Enforced Disappearances, Contribution to the annual meeting of treaty body Chairpersons, June 2022, **https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2fCHAIRPERSONS%2fGED%2f34%2f34036&Lang=en**.

ports submitted under this procedure shows that the "additional information" requested by the Committed is generally submitted on time, even in cases where the deadline is at the shorter end of the spectrum (two years).[26] Furthermore, of all the UN human rights treaty bodies, the CED is the Committee with the lowest number of overdue reports.[27]

Various Council of Europe treaties combine flexible reporting cycles with reviews of all States parties in rounds dedicated to specific provisions or themes: the Lanzarote Convention on child abuse,[28] the Convention on the prevention of terrorism,[29] the Cybercrime Convention[30] and the Convention on the counterfeiting of medical products and similar crimes involving threats to public health.[31] In such cases, the length of the reporting cycle is determined in light of the theme selected and corresponding provisions. The Lanzarote Committee has also held two "urgent monitoring rounds" to address specific challenges as they were arising i.e., to protect children affected by the refugee crisis[32] and asylum-seeking children in the transit zones at the Serbian-Hungarian border[33] in 2016-2017.

2.3 Synchronized reporting cycles for an overview of implementation status

Synchronized reporting cycles, whether organized at fixed or flexible intervals, provide an overview of the status of implementation in all States parties at the same time. This in turn allows supervisory mechanisms to identify trends, good or "advanced" practices, gaps and challenges in the implementation of the treaty, which are presented in a synthesis report.

The WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control and International Health Regulations require all States parties to provide comprehensive information every two years and every year respectively. On this basis, the Secretariat prepares a global report.[34] Likewise, States parties to the Aarhus Convention are requested to submit a comprehensive report on implementation before every Meeting of the Parties i.e., every 3 to 4 years, on the basis of which the Secretariat prepares a synthesis of the national implementation reports.[35] The reporting compliance rate shows regional variation, but was globally at around 80% in the 2021 reporting cycle.

Similarly, review mechanisms relating to the Council of Europe Lanzarote Convention (child abuse), Convention on the prevention of terrorism, Cybercrime Convention and Medicrime Convention, review all States parties at the same time on a specific theme. The aim is to have a comparative overview and create a momentum around a specific theme in all Parties at the same time, which in turn fosters exchange of promising practices and encourages the identification of inadequacies or difficulties. These are presented in a thematic assessment report on implementation prepared by the Secretariat.[36] The reporting compliance rate under such systems is uneven. Whereas all States required to report under the Lanzarote Convention did so in the second mon-

---

26   See, for example, **Additional information submitted by Mexico under article 29(4) of the Convention**, 3 February 2022, CED/C/MEX/AI/2 (after two years). For a longer delay (six years), see, for example, **Additional information submitted by Germany under article 29(4) of the Convention**, CED/C/DEU/AI/1, 19 October 2020; **Additional information submitted by France under article 29(4) of the Convention**, CED/C/FRA/AI/1, 24 July 2019

27   See the latest **Status of the human rights treaty body system, Report of the Secretary-General**, A/77/279 - Annexes, Annex II, "Reporting compliance by States parties, as at 31 December 2021", Table 4, p. 8.

28   See https://www.coe.int/en/web/children/monitoring1.

29   See https://www.coe.int/en/web/counter-terrorism/consultation-of-parties-cop-#{%2224579702%22:[5]} and Consultation of the Parties, **Rules of Procedure**, Rule 15-1.

30   See https://www.coe.int/en/web/cybercrime/assessments and Cybercrime Convention Committee (T-CY) **Rules of Procedure**, Rule 2-1.

31   See https://www.coe.int/en/web/medicrime/monitoring-themes and Medicrime Committee **Rules of Procedure**, Rule 25-1.

32   See https://www.coe.int/en/web/children/1st-monitoring-round.

33   See https://www.coe.int/en/web/children/urgent-monitoring2.

34   See global progress reports for the FCTC: https://fctc.who.int/who-fctc/reporting/global-progress-reports. See also latest report available on the implementation of IHRs: https://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/WHA74/A74_17-en.pdf.

35   See the latest 2021 synthesis report which presents some regional trends and a thematic review of implementation: https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2021-10/ECE_MP.PP_2021_6_E.pdf.

36   See 2022 Lanzarote Committee **implementation report on the second monitoring round**; COP Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism and its Additional Protocol 2020 **summary of the thematic assessment report on the implementation of article 3 Additional Protocol**; for example Cybercrime Convention Committee 2017 **assessment report on the implementation of article 13 of the Budapest Convention**. The first round of monitoring by the Medicrime Committee is not complete yet (questionnaires were due by November 2021) and therefore the first assessment report is not available.

itoring round,[37] States parties to the Medicrime Convention are not as diligent.[38]

2.4 Combined Treaty Bodies' reviews and coordination on cross-cutting issues

An interesting new practice was trialled by the human rights treaty bodies to rationalize reporting processes when the same State party is due to be reviewed by several Treaty Bodies over the same period. In 2019 and 2021, the Human Rights Committee and the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights combined their reviews of Senegal and Finland respectively.[39] Combined reviews present two main advantages. Firstly, the State party does not have to come to Geneva multiple times over the same period to engage with the Committees in the "constructive dialogue". Secondly, cross-cutting issues relating to several treaties can be coordinated, thereby avoiding unnecessary duplication and overlap and ensuring consistency. In that particular instance, lists of issues and concluding observations were coordinated thanks to the Secretariat. It has been suggested that "treaty bodies could build on recent successful precedents of coordination of lists of issues prior to reporting before carrying out combined reviews of the same country by two different treaty bodies. To avoid unnecessary duplication in both recommendations and lists of issues prior to reporting, the Chairs could discuss the possibility for treaty bodies to extend the practice of prioritizing issues, rights or different aspects of the same cross-cutting theme that have not been reviewed by another mechanism."[40]

It was found that coordinated reviews, while improving the reporting process thanks to the coordination of cross-cutting issues, were more labour-intensive for the Secretariat due to the additional coordination work. However, it was acknowledged that coordination could be enhanced with digital tools such as a common repository of recommendations on cross-cutting issues. At the institutional level, it was also mentioned that more regular meetings to discuss these issues would facilitate coordination amongst the secretariats.

3. THEMATIC AND REGIONAL PRIORITIZATION

A significant number of reporting systems operate according to a thematic approach to narrow down the number of provisions reviewed during each cycle. Another interesting model developed by UNESCO regarding conventions on cultural heritage is to follow a regional approach.

3.1 Thematic approach

3.1.1 All States parties reporting on same provisions/issues

According to this reporting model, States parties are requested to report on the implementation of the same provisions/issues over the course of the monitoring round. In addition to the aforementioned synchronized thematic cycles,[41] the thematic approach prevails in the following reporting systems: UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, European Social Charter, Council of Europe Istanbul Convention and Convention for Action against Trafficking in Human Beings.

The thematic approach presents several advantages. Firstly, States parties are not required to present a comprehensive report, which lightens the reporting burden. Secondly, this allows to focus and draw attention to one or a few areas, thereby allowing for a more thorough exchange and comparative review. The resulting thematic assessment reports identify trends, promising practices, gaps and steps that States parties could take to improve the implementation of the corresponding provisions.

---

37   See: https://www.coe.int/en/web/children/state-replies-of-the-2nd-monitoring-round#{%2230636014%22:[]}.

38   See state of play of the replies to the 1st monitoring round and state of play of the replies to the questionnaire on falsification of medical products for veterinary use.

39   The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights held the constructive dialogue with Senegal on 7 and 8 October 2019 and the Human Rights Committee on 14 and 15 October. See CESCR Concluding observations, E/C.12/SEN/CO.3 and Human Rights Committee Concluding Observations, CCPR/C/SEN/CO/5. For Finland, see CESCR Concluding observations, E/C.12/FIN/CO/7 and Human Rights Committee Concluding observations, CCPR/C/FIN/CO/7.

40   For example because a State party has not ratified other treaties. OHCHR, Progress made on the alignment of working methods and practices of the treaty bodies, HRI/MC/2022/3, 18 March 2022, para. 13.

41   See Section 2.3. Mechanisms relating to the Council of Europe Lanzarote Convention (child abuse), Convention on the prevention of terrorism, Cybercrime Convention and Medicrime Convention.

3.1.2 State-specific list of issues

By contrast, the UN human rights treaty bodies prepare a "list of issues prior to reporting" (LOIPR) that is tailored to the situation in the State under review.[42] The State party's replies constitute its periodic report. This modality was introduced to address the reporting burden, guide States in preparing their reports and focus on certain aspects depending on the country.

According to the OHCHR Manual on reporting, "[t]he aim of a LOIPR is to provide an outline for the review of a State party so as to make it more focused and effective. In general, a LOIPR requests that State parties provide information on a) the follow-up and implementation of the previous concluding observations of the relevant Treaty Body; b) the adoption of other measures and recent developments relating to implementation of the treaty; and c) specific human rights issues identified by the Treaty Body and relating to implementation of the relevant treaty".[43]

In practice, the lists of issues, although not covering all treaty provisions, remain wide-ranging.

3.2 Regional approach

State reporting regarding UNESCO World Heritage Convention and Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage follows a regional approach. Each year of the reporting cycle,[44] States parties of one of the five regions submit their report: Africa, Arab States, Asia and the Pacific, Europe and North America, Latin America and the Caribbean.[45] The latest data available on the third reporting cycle on the World Heritage Convention shows a high compliance rate: all Arab States (19/19) and all but one African States (46/47) have complied with their reporting obligations.[46]

The regional approach aims to promote regional collaboration and be able to respond to the specific characteristics of each region. This allows the Secretariat to prepare an analytical overview identifying common trends, challenges and opportunities, and priority areas across each region. Good practices in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention are highlighted in the analytical regional overview prepared by the Secretariat. These are presented in a thematic (as opposed to a geographic) way.[47] However, regional action plans seem to aim to address common challenges and achieve common goals identified rather than extend good practices. For the purpose of developing tailored action plans based on State reports, some regions have been divided into sub-regions to take into account their cultural and geographical diversity, as well as their physical scale. For example, two distinct action plans have been prepared regarding the Asia-Pacific region's second reporting cycle: an action plan for the Pacific and another for Asia.[48] The Pacific World Heritage Action Plan (2026-2020) thus identifies challenges (large geographic areas, isolation, impact of climate change etc.) and goals that are common to Pacific States concerning the implementation of the Convention and specific activities to achieve these goals at the sub-regional were designed accordingly.

---

42   The LOIPR is also treaty-specific. In addition to the LOIPR, States parties submit a "common core document" containing general information that is of relevance to all treaty bodies (land, population and political structure; general framework for the protection and promotion of human rights; and non-discrimination and equality issues, including effective remedies). The common core document was introduced to lighten the reporting burden and avoid unnecessary duplication.

43   OHCHR, Manual on Reporting to the United Nations Human Rights Treaty Bodies, p. 59.

44   The reporting cycle lasts for 6 years i.e., one year for each region and the last year is dedicated to a "reflection period". See more detail on this interesting feature in Section 5 "Noteworthy features of reporting processes".

45   For the World Heritage Convention, see: https://whc.unesco.org/en/periodicreporting/. For the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, see https://ich.unesco.org/en/submissions-and-deadlines-00861.

46   For Arab States, see: https://whc.unesco.org/en/arabstates/. For African States, see: https://whc.unesco.org/en/africa/.

47   Good practices are identified and classified by "topic" rather than country. See, for example, Report on the results of the Third Cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise in the Arab States, 21 June 2021, pp. 41 and 84; Report on the results of the Third Cycle of Periodic Reporting exercise in Africa, 21 June 2021, pp. 38 and 65.

48   Progress report on the implementation of the Second Action Plan(s) for the Second Cycle of Reporting in all regions, 4 June 2021, p. 2.

4. INPUT

The content of States' submissions to the reporting process depends on the material scope of the review, whether it is comprehensive or focused on a number of issues/provisions. Besides, State reports vary with regard to their format and the modalities for the participation of other stakeholders.

4.1 Information from States parties

States parties generally provide information either in a report or by answering a questionnaire. In one particular case regarding the Montreal Protocol, States parties are required to provide national statistical data on the production of ozone depleting substances.[49]

4.1.1 State report

A significant number of systems still rely on the submission by States parties of a "traditional" report: the UN human rights UPR, Treaty Bodies; the UNESCO Conventions on education; the Aarhus Convention and London Protocol; the Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and European Charter for Minority Languages, and the European Social Charter. All provide an "outline" to State party reports as guidance ("list of issues" in the case of UN Treaty Bodies).

In general, this practice corresponds to a comprehensive implementation assessment. The only exceptions are the European Social Charter, which reviews are divided into four thematic groups, and the UN Treaty Bodies, which simplified reporting procedure is based on a "list of issues".

Additionally, this format is not associated with online submission platforms. Interestingly, this

practice is not combined with modern IT tools that are generally available in systems in which States fill out questionnaires.

4.1.2. Self-assessment questionnaire

To address the reporting burden and receive more targeted information, most systems operate on the basis of a self-assessment questionnaire: Basel Convention, Minamata Convention, UN Conventions against corruption and against transnational crime, UNESCO Conventions on cultural heritage and the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict, Council of Europe Lanzarote Convention, Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism, Cybercrime Convention, Medicrime Convention, Convention against Trafficking in Human Beings, Istanbul Convention, and the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control and International Health Regulations.[50]

Various interesting practices should be noted. Firstly, two supervisory mechanisms have introduced some flexibility in the information requested from States parties in the questionnaires i.e., the mechanisms reviewing the implementation of the Medicrime Convention and the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control. In addition to "mandatory" or "core" questions, States have the possibility to answer "additional questions".[51] This aims to facilitate the voluntary submission of information by States parties. However, the reporting rate remains quite low. According to the latest update available, 8 out of 18 States parties to the Medicrime Convention had sent their replies regarding the first monitoring round.[52] As for the WHO FCTC, the list of submitted reports for the latest reporting cycle shows that only 17 out of 182 States parties submitted a report on "additional questions".[53]

---

49   Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer.

50   See, for example, core questionnaire 2023 and additional questions to report on the WHO FCTC, questionnaire in the Reporting format for the Minamata Convention on Mercury, self-assessment questionnaire on the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.

51   See Medicrime Committee questionnaire for the first thematic monitoring round, in which questions are clearly marked "mandatory" or "optional", with a different colour code. See also the "core questionnaire" and "additional questions" or optional module for the WHO FCTC 2023 reporting cycle: https://fctc.who.int/publications/m/item/who-fctc-core-questionnaire-2023.

52   See state of play of the replies to the 1st monitoring round.

53   See WHO FCTC and Protocol reporting status May-August 2021.

Another noteworthy practice developed by two other mechanism consists in defining clear indicators to allow the collection, compilation and publication of statistical data. Thus, the UNESCO Committee for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, indicates that the State questionnaire is composed of two types of questions: open-ended and closed-ended questions. The purpose of the open-ended questions is to obtain detailed information on implementation, whilst closed-ended questions aim to facilitate the collection and compilation of statistical data by the Secretariat.[54]

At a more advanced stage, the WHO reporting system on the International Health Regulations is entirely based on clear and gradual indicators. The questionnaire consists of 15 capacities and 35 indicators.[55] For each indicator, States are requested to describe their progress by selecting a level from 1 to 5.[56] This practice allows the collection and publication of information in real time, with a transparent dashboard providing on overview of the implementation status globally and easily searchable by "capacity", "country", "year". IHR capacities are measured and compared to global, regional and country averages. The main challenges and progress made in the past two years (2021-2023) are also presented.[57]

Another advantage of having all reported information easily accessible is that it seems to encourage good reporting practices and diligence from States.

4.2 Participation of other stakeholders

Most reporting systems encourage or have formalized the participation of other stakeholders. Depending on systems, different stakeholders may provide their input in various forms and at different stages of the reporting process.

4.2.1 Participation to the supervisory mechanism as observers, advisers and for consultation

Several reporting systems have institutionalised the participation of other stakeholders to the supervisory mechanism in an advisory capacity. Thus, in addition to delegations representing States parties, the T-CY Committee, mandated with the monitoring of the Council of Europe Cybercrime Convention, is also comprised of representatives of other committees or bodies of the Council of Europe and representatives of international organisations engaged in related work who sit as observers. Stakeholders may also be invited on an ad hoc basis to specific meetings to address specific questions or share experience.[58] Similarly, the Medicrime Committee comprises representatives of the relevant Council of Europe bodies "in order to contribute to a multisectoral and multidisciplinary approach". Representatives of relevant international bodies, official bodies of the States parties and civil society may also be admitted as observers.[59]

For their part, the UNESCO Conventions on the protection of cultural heritage and cultural property in armed conflicts provide for the participation of other intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations with similar objectives in an advisory capacity, as observers or on an ad hoc basis for consultation on particular issues.[60]

---

54   See **Model report on the implementation of the 1954 Hague Convention and its two (1954 and 1999) Protocols**.

55   See **State Party Self-Assessment Annual Reporting Tool**, questionnaire from p. 12.

56   Level 1: Policies and strategies for the IHR capacity are not yet in place, under elaboration, or available on an ad hoc basis. On the other end of the scale, Level 5 means that policies and strategies are being revised and updated regularly.

57   See **https://extranet.who.int/e-spar/#submission-details**.

58   Rule 3.3 **Rules of Procedure of the T-CY**.

59   **Medicrime Convention**, article 24.

60   Rules 6-8 Rules of Procedure of the **World Heritage Committee**; Rules 6-8 **Rules of Procedure** of the Intergovernmental Committee for the the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural heritage; Rules 6-8 **Rules of Procedure** of the Committee for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

4.2.2 Contribution to the reporting process

Preparation of State report

Consultation of other stakeholders is encouraged in the preparation of State reports submitted under the WHO International Health Regulations[61] and the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control.[62] The UN human rights Treaty Bodies consistently recommend that States parties consult with NHRIs and NGOs in the national reporting preparation.[63] States parties to the Aarhus Convention are also requested to prepare their reports through a transparent and consultative process involving the public.[64]

The Council of Europe GRETA Committee recommends that stakeholders and civil society representatives "should be effectively consulted in the preparation" of the reply to the national self-assessment questionnaire.[65]

Submission of additional information

Stakeholders may also contribute to several reporting processes by submitting additional information to the supervisory mechanism. The particularity of the UN UPR mechanism is to be based on reports from three actors. In addition to the State report, the review is also based on a compilation of UN information compiled by OHCHR and a Summary of Stakeholders' information prepared by OHCHR.[66] NHRIs and CSOs can also directly contribute to the Treaty Body reporting process by submitting "shadow reports" or "alternative reports" and by presenting or written information to the Treaty Bodies at various stages of the reporting cycle (drafting and adoption of lists of issues, constructive dialogue between the Committee and the State party, follow-up procedure).[67]

Most Council of Europe reporting systems reviewed also provide for the submission of additional information from stakeholders. Under the European Social Charter, certain organisations are entitled to submit comments and information alongside State reports to the European Committee of Social Rights.[68] Similarly, additional information may be provided by a variety of relevant stakeholders in the reporting processes related to the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities,[69] the European Charter for Minority Languages,[70] the Medicrime Convention,[71] the Istanbul Convention,[72] and the Convention for Action against Trafficking in Human Beings.[73] In addition to civil society, child participation is encouraged under the Lanzarote Convention reporting system.

---

61 Two questions of the questionnaire concern the sectors involved in compiling the information, including civil society, and the consultative process modalities (face-to-face meeting, virtual meeting, e-mail or other). See State Party Self-Assessment Annual Reporting Tool, questionnaire from p. 9.

62 "Involving Partners outside the Government in Report Preparation" is listed as a good practice in the WHO FCTC review of good practices in data collection, preparation and submission of FCTC implementation reports, good practice No. 11.

63 See also Manual on Reporting to the United Nations Human Rights Treaty Bodies, op. cit., p. 68.

64 Report of the first meeting of the Parties, ECE/MP.PP/2/Add.9, Decision I/8, Reporting requirements, para. 3.

65 GRETA Questionnaire for the evaluation of the implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings by the Parties, Third evaluation round, p. 2.

66 The compilation of UN information contains the reports of treaty bodies, special procedures, including observations and comments by the State concerned, and other relevant official United Nations documents in the context of human rights in that particular country. The summary of information from stakeholders is also prepared by OHCHR on the basis of additional, credible and reliable information. These two reports should not exceed 10 pages. See UPR info website: https://www.upr-info.org/en/upr-process/what-upr/introduction-brief-history. See also UNHRC Resolution A/HRC/RES/5/1 establishing the UPR, adopted on 18 June 2007, para. 15.

67 Manual on Reporting to the United Nations Human Rights Treaty Bodies, op. cit., pp. 68-70.

68 Articles 23 (1) and 27 (2) of the 1961 Charter as amended by the Turin Protocol of 1991. These include relevant international NGOs, organisations, institutions and entities, as well as relevant international organisations of employers and trade unions. See: https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-social-charter/ingos-engagement-with-ecsr#{%2258046116%22:[1]}.

69 In addition to State reports, the Committee "makes use of a wide variety of written sources of information from state and non-state actors". See https://www.coe.int/en/web/minorities/monitoring.

70 In addition to State reports, the Committee "examines any further information submitted by associations and other bodies legally established in the state concerned and with an interest in the application of the Charter". See https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-charter-regional-or-minority-languages/monitoring.

71 Rule 26-4 Rules of Procedure of the Medicrime Committee under which the Committee may receive information from NGOs and civil society "involved in preventing and combating the counterfeiting of medical products and similar crimes involving threats to public health".

72 Rules 35 and 36 Rules of Procedure of the GREVIO Committee which provide that the Committee may invite NGOs and other civil society actors "active in the areas of concern to GREVIO, in particular women's organisations" to provide it with information (Rule 35). Additionally, GREVIO "shall take into due consideration the existing information available from other regional and international instruments and bodies in areas falling within the scope of the Convention" (Rule 36).

73 Rule 8 Rules of Procedure of GRETA Committee: "GRETA may decide to address the questionnaire (...) or any other request for information to specific non-governmental organisations, other relevant organisations and members of civil society of the parties, which shall be invited to respond to it within the time limit set by GRETA. They shall be active in the field of action against trafficking in human beings".

Besides the common practice of submission of written information, several reporting systems also provide for the possibility to hold oral hearings or consultations to gather information from stakeholders. Thus, NHRIs and NGOs may submit information to the UN human rights Treaty Bodies during oral hearings.[74] The Council of Europe GRETA Committee conducts in-country visits as part of its reporting process, during which it holds hearings with various actors, such as NGOs, trade unions, lawyers, researchers as well as representatives of other international organisations.[75] Its rules of procedure also mention the possibility of having "recourse to the assistance of experts or consultants".[76]

Preparation of outcome document

Various reporting systems provide for the less common participation of stakeholders to assist the relevant supervisory mechanisms in the preparation of the outcome document. For example, the UNESCO World Heritage Convention mentions three "Advisory Bodies" to advise the Committee in its deliberations.[77] These Advisory Bodies contribute to the collaborative development of regional action plans as a result of the reporting process.

For its part, the Council of Europe Medicrime Committee may resort to the assistance of independent experts to assist it in the preparation of implementation reports.[78]

Follow-up

Stakeholders may engage in several follow-up mechanisms. NHRIs and civil society actors may contribute to the follow-up mechanism before the UN Treaty Bodies by submitting written information.[79]

Relevant NGOs and associations may also be involved in the follow-up dialogue under the Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities[80] and European Charter for Minority Languages.[81]

4.2.3 General contribution on ways to improve implementation

The UNTOC provides for the contribution of stakeholders, including NGOs. However, their contribution does not concern the review of particular States parties. Rather, their contributions relates more broadly to ways to improve the implementation of the Convention and the overall objective of combating transnational organized crime and promoting and improving the implementation of the Convention. Stakeholders and NGOs may provide such input during "constructive dialogues" that are convened following the conclusion of the working groups of the Conference of parties to promote fruitful engagement in the review process.[82]

5. NOTEWORTHY FEATURES OF VARIOUS REPORTING PROCESSES

Rather than describe in detail the different stages of all the reporting processes reviewed, it seemed more interesting to highlight a few noteworthy features. Most of these characteristics are part of the reporting cycle and appear between the provision of input stage and the publication of the outcome document. Interestingly, these features are generally found within the same reporting systems: the UN human rights system, the UN-

---

74   Manual on Reporting to the United Nations Human Rights Treaty Bodies, op. cit., pp. 68-70.

75   See, for example, GRETA Report on the implementation of the Convention by Switzerland, Second round, para. 7.

76   GRETA Rules of Procedure, Rule 10.

77   These are the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), two international NGOs, as well as the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), an intergovernmental organization. See https://whc.unesco.org/pg.cfm?cid=168.

78   Rules of Procedure of the Medicrime Committee, Rule 27-2.

79   Manual on Reporting to the United Nations Human Rights Treaty Bodies, op. cit., pp. 68-70.

80   The following actors may participate: "representatives of national minorities including young people and practitioners (e.g. teachers, journalists); ombudspersons and/or equality bodies; relevant civil society organisations; researchers". See https://www.coe.int/en/web/minorities/follow-up-dialogue.

81   Associations of minorities may be involved in follow-up meetings in the State under review. See https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-charter-regional-or-minority-languages/monitoring.

82   See Procedures and rules for the functioning of the UNTOC review mechanism, para. 53 and https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/organized-crime/intro/review-mechanism-untoc/constructive-dialogues.html.

ODC Conventions and several Council of Europe mechanisms. Another interesting stage that was found in one system only is to allow for a "reflection period" period between reporting cycles.

5.1 Direct dialogue with the State under review

Within the UN human rights system, both the Treaty Bodies and the UPR provide for a direct, public dialogue with the State under review as part of the reporting process. Due to their different nature, the State under review engages in a "constructive dialogue" with the relevant Treaty Bodies (composed of independent experts),[83] whereas under the UPR any UN Member State can take part in the discussion with the reviewed States.[84] In both cases, the dialogue is oral and generally happens in person, in Geneva.[85]

The peer review reporting systems established by the UNODC Conventions against corruption and transnational organized crime, provide for a direct dialogue between the State under review and the reviewing States, facilitated by the Secretariat. This dialogue may take several forms. State reviews pursuant to the UNTOC provide for a "constructive dialogue" that may occur in writing, via the secure online portal.[86] Other available technological tools, such as virtual networks, conference calls and videoconferences may also be used as part of the constructive dialogue.[87] Under the UNCAC reporting process, if agreed by the State party under review, the desk review may be complemented with a direct dialogue which may occur during a country visit or a joint meeting at UNODC in Vienna.[88] The latest statistics show that, in practice, a large majority of "direct dialogues" are held during country visits (161 out of 175 direct dialogues).[89]

5.2. In-country visits

In addition to the above mentioned in-country visits organized under the UNCAC reporting process, three Council of Europe mechanisms provide this opportunity. The Advisory Committee monitoring the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities,[90] the Committee of experts supervising the European Charter for Minority Languages and GRETA (group of independent experts action against trafficking) have developed the practice of undertaking in-country visits as part of the reporting process. During these visits, these supervisory mechanisms meet with government officials, parliamentarians, non-governmental organisations, human rights specialised bodies and other relevant interlocutors.[91] In its latest general report on its activities, GRETA notes that "physical visits are indispensable for a proper evaluation of the situation and the preparation of reports".[92]

5.3. The State under review may comment on the outcome document

Five Council of Europe reporting systems provide the possibility for the State under review to comment on the outcome document, either before or after its finalization and publication. Thus, States parties to the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities may comment on the opinion adopted by the Advisory Committee in the four-month interval between its adoption

---

83   Manual on Reporting to the United Nations Human Rights Treaty Bodies, op. cit., pp. 68-70.

84   See Basic facts about the UPR: https://www.ohchr.org/en/hr-bodies/upr/basic-facts.

85   Although due to the pandemic several sessions took place online.

86   A record of the dialogue shall be archived in the designated confidential module in Sharing Electronic Resources and Laws on Crime (SHERLOC). Procedures and rules for the functioning of the UNTOC review mechanism, para. 35.

87   Id., para. 36.

88   In accordance with paragraph 24 of the guidelines and paragraph 29 of the terms of reference of Mechanism for the Review of the Implementation of UNCAC, both enclosed in its Basic Documents.

89   During the first cycle, as of 30 March 2022, 175 direct dialogues had been held (161 country visits and 14 joint meetings). Performance of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, CAC/COSP/IRG/2022/2, 30 March 2022, para. 10.

90   In practice, apart from very few exceptions, all States under review have been visited by the Advisory Committee. See the Convention Monitoring Status : https://rm.coe.int/tableaux-monitoring-status-for-the-website/16809f0346.

91   For the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities see: https://www.coe.int/en/web/minorities/monitoring. For the European Charter for Minority Languages, see: https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-charter-regional-or-minority-languages/reports-and-recommendations#{%2228993157%22:[0]}.

92   11th General report on GRETA's Activities covering the period from 1 January to 31 December 2021, para. 14.

and its publication. The State's comment may also be made public.[93]

By contrast, States under review in accordance with the following Conventions are given the opportunity to comment on the draft outcome document prior to its adoption: the Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism,[94] the Medicrime Convention,[95] the Convention for Action against Trafficking in Human Beings,[96] and the Istanbul Convention.[97] Naturally, such comments should be taken into account when establishing the final version of the outcome document.

5.4. Reflection period between reporting cycles

The reporting cycle established to monitor the UNESCO World Heritage Convention provides for a "reflection period" to assess the reporting mechanism and revise as appropriate before the next reporting cycle starts. Following the previous two cycles (1998-2006 and 2008-2015), the process and format of the exercises were revised and updated in the framework of reflection periods. The most recent of these was carried out from 2015-2017 and has resulted in a fully revised and updated questionnaire as well as reinforced tools and guidance to support reporting on the Convention.[98]

6. AVAILABLE SUPPORT FROM THE SECRETARIAT

In all reporting systems, the Secretariat plays a key role to provide support to both the supervisory mechanisms and the State under review throughout the process.

6.1. Preparation of questionnaires and other documents as a basis for the review

Depending on systems, the Secretariat plays a

more important role in preparing the documents that will serve as a basis for the review. Under the UPR, the Secretariat compiles the three input reports, which involves preparing a 10-page compilation of UN information and a 10-page summary of stakeholders' information from the wealth of information received.[99]

Under the relevant systems, the Secretariat also prepares the lists of issues prior to reporting (UN human rights treaty bodies) and self-assessment questionnaires for their adoption by the corresponding supervisory mechanisms before these documents are sent to the States parties under review. In addition, in preparation of the LOIPR and the constructive dialogue, the Secretariat of the relevant Treaty Body (OHCHR) may prepare a compilation report containing relevant information on the situation in the concerned country from various sources (including its field offices, UN Bodies, NHRIs, NGOs and CSOs, as well as information from inter-governmental agencies such as UNICEF, UNHCR and WHO). The Secretariat may also prepare a country dossier which contains all available data about the country concerned from the UN System and other sources.

6.2. Facilitation of exchanges and dialogue

Generally, the Secretariat facilitates exchanges, communication and dialogue between the supervisory mechanisms and the States parties under review. This can take the form of written communication, the organisation of videoconferences or in-person meetings.

6.3. Provision of technical assistance and advice

Depending on systems, technical support from the Secretariat is available to the reporting State to assist in the preparation of its report and in the implementation of the concerned treaty.

---

93   See https://www.coe.int/en/web/minorities/monitoring.

94   See Rules of Procedure of the Consultation of the Parties, Rule 15-7.

95   See Rules of Procedure of the Medicrime Committee, Rule 27-3-a.

96   See Rules of Procedure of GRETA, Rule 14.

97   See Rules of Procedure of GREVIO, Rule 43.

98   See "Periodic Reporting Reflections", https://whc.unesco.org/en/periodicreporting/.

99   Human Rights Council Resolution A/HRC/RES/5/1, para. 15-b and c.

OHCHR, as the Secretariat of the Treaty Bodies, provides technical training and guidance to States parties throughout the process. The Committees can answer States parties' concerns and requests regarding the reporting procedure or any specific issue related to the implementation of the relevant treaty. Additionally, the Treaty-Body Capacity-Building Programme, established in 2015 by OHCHR, covers both the report preparation and the implementation stages as it aims to support States to meet their treaty reporting obligations and build their capacity to implement them.[100] The Secretariat of the various Treaty Bodies works in close cooperation with the Capacity-Building Programme.

Similarly, the UNESCO Secretariat of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage provides support to States parties in their reporting process through capacity-building activities and ongoing follow-up.[101] With the support of its field offices, the Secretariat of the Convention against Discrimination in Education provides technical assistance including on collection of information and drafting of the report. The UNESCO World Heritage Centre pre-fills the self-assessment questionnaire with information contained in official documents.[102]

The London Protocol Compliance committee has developed an interesting consultation process to assists States parties in developing an accurate analysis of their situation with water and health, enabling them to set targets under the Protocol. Consultations do not have an inquisitive nature and may be initiated by a request from a State party or an invitation from the Committee. Sessions can be held in confidence, if so requested.

Several Secretariats have also developed useful tools such as reporting manuals to assist States in understanding the type of information to be provided and offer guidance regarding the information-gathering process.[103]

6.4. Preparation of outcome document

The Secretariat generally drafts the outcome document for its consideration and adoption by the supervisory mechanism. This exercise varies depending on whether the outcome document is country-specific or presents a synthesis or an analytical progress report on implementation.[104]

7. OUTCOME OF THE REPORTING PROCESS AND TRANSPARENCY/VISIBILITY

7.1. Country-specific or synthesis document

Depending on the reporting systems, the supervisory mechanisms present the conclusions of their assessment either in a country-specific outcome document[105] or as a global synthesis or analysis based on the reports submitted by States parties.[106] The review process of the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime follows both tracks: a general review based on a report prepared by the Secretariat on trends, patterns and best practices identified in the context of the country reviews, as well as country reviews.[107] The Medicrime Committee decides during the early stages of the monitoring round whether it wishes to prepare implementation reports for each Party or a thematic report for all Parties.[108]

---

100   See https://www.ohchr.org/en/treaty-bodies/treaty-body-capacity-building-programme. General Assembly Resolution 68/268 adopted on 9 April 2014 requests OHCHR "to support States parties in building the capacity to implement their treaty obligations and to provide in this regard advisory services, technical assistance and capacity-building", para. 17.

101   See Decision of the Intergovernmental Committee 17.COM 6.b, 2022, para. 7.

102   As indicated: https://whc.unesco.org/en/prcycle3/.

103   See, inter alia, OHCHR Manual on Reporting to the United Nations Human Rights Treaty Bodies; UNEP Manual for reporting under the Basel Convention; WHO IHR guidance document for the State party self-assessment annual reporting tool and the well-made video explaining how to fill the self-assessment questionnaire online; UNODC videos on the UNTOC review mechanism available at: https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/organized-crime/intro/review-mechanism-untoc/overview.html.

104   See next section.

105   UPR, Treaty Bodies, MEAs apart from Aarhus Convention, UN Convention against Corruption, European Social Charter, Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, European Charter for Minority Languages, Lanzarote Convention, Medicrime Convention, Convention for Action against Trafficking in Human Beings, Istanbul Convention.

106   Aarhus Convention, UNESCO World Heritage Convention and Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, CoE Cybercrime Convention and Convention for the Prevention of Terrorism (thematic assessment reports on implementation), WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control and International Health Regulations (global progress report).

107   See https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/organized-crime/intro/review-mechanism-untoc/overview.html.

108   Rules of Procedure of the Medicrime Committee, Rule 27-3.

7.1.1 Country-specific document

Generally, country-specific outcome documents present conclusions/findings and corresponding recommendations. For example, the Treaty Bodies adopt "Concluding Observations" as an outcome to the reporting process. Concluding observations presents "positive aspects" of a State party's implementation of a treaty as well as "areas of concern" on which the Treaty Body makes recommendations on action and measures that should be taken by the State.[109]

In some Council of Europe reporting systems, the conclusions and recommendations formulated by the independent supervisory mechanism are transmitted to an intergovernmental body, which in turn endorses the recommendations. For example, the Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (ACFC) adopts a country-specific "opinion" at the end of each reporting cycle, in which it presents article-by-article findings as well as recommendations.[110] The opinion is then transmitted to the Committee of Ministers, which adopts a resolution endorsing the ACFC's recommendations and inviting the State party to take the relevant measures to improve the implementation of the Convention.[111] Similarly, GRETA prepares and publishes country evaluation reports at the end of each thematic evaluation rounds, which are communicated to the Committee of the Parties (CoP). The CoP then adopts a "recommendation" in which it recommends that the State party take the measures recommended by GRETA in its report.[112]

By contrast, the European Committee of Social Rights does not formulate recommendations but adopted "Conclusions" in which, having examined the State report, it concludes whether the situation in the reporting State is in conformity with the provisions of the European Social Charter or not. The Committee also explains on which grounds it has reached such conclusion.[113]

7.1.2 Global synthesis/analysis of State reports

Following their regional approach to reporting, the UNESCO World Heritage Committee and Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage produce synthesis and analysis reports for each of the five world regions at the end of each monitoring rounds. Based on State replies to the relevant questionnaires, the Secretariat prepares an analytical overview identifying common trends, challenges and opportunities, and priority areas across the region.[114] The World Heritage Committee also designs action plans and formulates recommendations to States parties at the regional level.[115]

For its part, the WHO prepares global reports based on all the reports submitted by States parties to the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control and the International Health Regulations (IHRs). The latest global report on the implementation of the FCTC (2021) is extremely detailed and provides a comprehensive overview of the implementation of the Convention in the States parties.[116] By contrast, the latest global report on the IHRs is much shorter and more focused on the Secretariat's activities to support implementation.[117]

---

109   See, for example, CEDAW recent Concluding observations on Bahrain, 2 March 2023, in which the Committee notably recommends that the State party ratify several ILO Conventions. See also Human Rights Committee Concluding observations on Sri Lanka, 24 March 2023.

110   See, for example, ACFC Fifth Opinion on Italy, adopted on 5 October 2022 and Fifth Opinion on Denmark, adopted on 7 November 2019.

111   See the corresponding Resolutions adopted by the Committee of Ministers on Italy on 5 April 2023 and on Denmark on 21 October 2020.

112   See, for example, GRETA Evaluation Report on Denmark on its third evaluation round, 17 March 2021 and the corresponding Recommendation adopted by the Conference of the Parties on 4 June 2021.

113   See, for example, European Committee of Social Rights 2021 Conclusions on Albania, in which "it concludes that the situation in Albania is not in conformity with Article 11§3 of the Charter on the grounds that:...."; 2021 Conclusions on Norway: "Pending receipt of the information requested, the Committee concludes that the situation in Norway is in conformity with Article 30 of the Charter".

114   See, for example, World Heritage Committee, Report on the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in the Arab States, 15 June 2010; Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage latest report on Europe and its corresponding Decision endorsing the overview, 8 November 2022 (click on link to the report in first paragraph).

115   See, for example, Framework Action Plan for the Arab States Region based on the Third Cycle of reporting (2021-2027); see also regarding the previous reporting cycle: "Recommendations for an action plan" in Report on the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in the Arab States, op. cit., pp. 65-67.

116   2021 global progress report on implementation of the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control.

117   International Health Regulations, Report by the Director-General, 12 May 2021.

7.2 Prioritization of recommendations

Several reporting systems that operate on a country-specific basis prioritize some recommendations in their outcome document. For example, the UN Treaty Bodies ask the reporting State to provide information on the action taken regarding three or four recommendations as matter of priority, usually within one year to two years.[118] There does not seem to be a well-established practice regarding how recommendations are prioritized. For example, in its latest conclusions on Georgia, the CEDAW Committee prioritized some recommendations but not others that are considered "a matter of priority" or should be "prioritize[d]".[119] As an outcome to its latest review of Egypt, the Human Rights Committee prioritized three recommendations, two of which are related to issues that were not the most discussed during the constructive dialogue. While these were mentioned by several NGOs in alternative reports, other equally serious concerns were raised without being prioritized in the recommendations.[120] In terms of impact, the latest "Status of follow-up to the concluding observations" submitted by States at the request of the Human Rights Committee shows that this information is received by the deadline or soon after in a large majority of cases.[121] The Meeting of Parties to the Aarhus Convention also prioritize a few recommendations in its decisions "as a matter of urgency" and requests the reporting State to provide "detailed progress reports" on the measures taken within two to three years.[122]

Likewise, the Council of Europe Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, in its opinions, differentiates between "Recommendations for immediate action" and "Further recommendations".[123] The Committee of the Parties of the CoE Convention against trafficking, in its recommendations, also identifies measures "for immediate action" in relation to priority issues.[124]

7.3 Transparency and visibility

For reporting processes to be efficient and impactful, transparency and visibility are essential. Through transparent processes, States parties can benefit from the experience of their peers, thereby being part of a community of practice. Transparency and visibility also facilitate stakeholder contribution to the processes and more generally to the implementation of the relevant treaties.

In that regard, the use of information and communication technologies greatly enhances visibility of the outcome of the reporting processes and therefore facilitates stakeholder engagement and dissemination of information. The recently developed digital human rights tracking tools and databases are part of a promising trend to strengthen monitoring and implementation of international treaties.[125]

The outcome of the reporting process is generally publicly available. The only exception to this rule is presumed to be related to the sensitive nature of the issues reviewed. Thus, the Secretariat of the Consultation of the Parties to the CoE Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism prepares

---

118   See for example, the latest **Human Rights Committee Concluding observations on Egypt**, 24 March 2023, para. 54 (within one year); **CEDAW Concluding observations on Georgia**, 2 March 2023, para. 48 (within two years).

119   **CEDAW Concluding observations on Georgia**, 2 March 2023. "The Committee recommends that the State party prioritize strengthening the Public Defender's Office" (para. 20) but this is not one the priority recommendations in para. 48. Likewise, the Committee recommends that the State party "[a]s a matter of priority, intensify efforts for the prevention of gender-based violence against women, in particular femicide, including by making training programmes for behaviour change compulsory for offenders, and strengthen capacity-building for judges and law enforcement officers on risk assessments" (para. 26(c)). This recommendation is not prioritized either although a similar structural recommendation aiming at harmonizing national legislation with the recommendations of the Committee is.

120   **Human Rights Committee Concluding observations on Egypt**, 24 March 2023, para. 54. See also the summary records of the constructive dialogue and the information submitted by NGOs. For example, death penalty and liberty and security of the person are two of the three issues prioritized but it is not clear why, when other similarly serious issues like enforced disappearances and the use of torture have also been raised by NGOs and during the constructive dialogue.

121   With some States being more diligent than others. See **Status of follow-up to the concluding observations adopted by the Human Rights Committee** since the 105th session (2012) up until March 2023.

122   See, for example, **MoP Decision VII/8f on compliance by the EU with its obligations under the Convention**, 21 October 2021, paras 2 and 11(b); **MoP Decision VII/8p on compliance by Spain with its obligations under the Convention**, 21 October 2021, paras 2(a) and (d).

123   See, for example, **ACFC Fourth Opinion on Albania**, adopted on 11 October 2018, pp. 39-40; **Fifth opinion on Norway**, adopted on 2 February 2022, p. 6.

124   See, for example, **Recommendation on the implementation of the Convention by Denmark**, adopted on 4 June 2021, A; **Recommendation on the implementation of the Convention by Portugal**, adopted on 17 June 2022, A.

125   See Geneva Academy, **The Emergence of Digital Human Rights Tracking Tools and Databases**, 20 March 2023.

a public summary of the assessment report, without explicit references to the Parties.[126]

Depending on systems, the information is more or less accessible and user-friendly. Outcome documents are publicly available on the respective supervisory bodies' websites. Some of them make an effort to increase the visibility of the process and their output.
Public sessions of the UN human rights bodies' sessions are webcast.[127] These bodies communicate in real time on social media to announce the adoption and publication of outcome documents.[128] Their Chairpersons also hold press conferences to inform the media. A very user-friendly digital platform is that developed for the WHO International Health Regulations. Its transparent dashboard provides a clear overview of the implementation status globally and is easily searchable.[129]

8. FOLLOW-UP

To ensure that their reporting processes are efficient and their recommendations followed, most systems have established follow-up procedures. These vary depending on the body that is mandated and how this function is performed.

8.1 Follow-up by the same supervisory body

The follow-up to various reporting procedures is ensured by the same supervisory body that has undertaken the assessment and issued corresponding conclusions/recommendations. The UN human rights bodies have developed follow-up procedures as an integral part of the reporting process. On the one hand, reviewed States are requested to present follow-up information regarding prioritized recommendations in a report to the Treaty Bodies within one to two years of the review.[130] Concerning the UPR, States may submit mid-term reports on a voluntary basis.[131] On the other hand, after the initial review, the Human Rights Council and the Treaty Bodies have integrated the follow-up to their recommendations to the subsequent reviews. Stakeholders may also provide follow-up information.

The CoE Cybercrime Convention Committee (T-CY) and the Medicrime Committee request States parties to provide information on progress made in the implementation of its recommendations within 18 and 24 months respectively.[132] On this basis, the Secretariat prepares an assessment report on follow-up.[133] As per the follow-up procedure established to monitor the implementation of the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, reporting States are "encouraged" to share information with the Conference of the Parties on "any measures planned or undertaken".[134]

8.2 From expert to intergovernmental body

Under several Council of Europe reporting processes that are undertaken by independent expert bodies, an intergovernmental body is mandated with the follow-up. The follow-up to conclusions of the European Committee of Social Rights is carried out by the Committee of Ministers.[135] The Committee of Ministers adopts a resolution by a majority of two-thirds of those voting. The resolution closes each supervision cycle and

126   Rules of Procedure of the CoP to the CoE Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism, Rule 15-9.

127   The Human Rights Council UPR sessions can be followed at https://media.un.org/en/search/categories/meetings-events/human-rights-council/universal-periodic-review. Treaty Bodies' sessions are also webcast on UN Web TV: https://media.un.org/en/webtv.

128   See the UN Human Rights Council and Treaty Bodies Twitter accounts: @UN_HRC and @UNTreatyBodies. So also the Twitter account of the Aarhus Convention Secretariat @UNECEAarhus.

129   See https://extranet.who.int/e-spar/#submission-details.

130   See examples supra, note 106.

131   See "UPR Mid-term reports". As at 10 March 2023, a total of 87 States submitted UPR mid-term reports on a voluntary basis.

132   See Rules of Procedure of the Cybercrime Convention Committee, Rule 2-1-g and Medicrime Committee Rules of Procedure, Rule 27-6.

133   See, for example, T-CY Assessment report on Mutual Legal Assistance, Follow up given by Parties and Observers, 28 November 2017. The first monitoring round on the Medicrime Convention is still under way.

134   Procedures and rules for the functioning of the Mechanism for the Review of the Implementation of the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocols thereto, para. 46.

135   Its work is prepared by the Governmental Committee of the European Social Charter and European Code of Social Security, comprising representatives of the States party to the Charter and assisted by observers representing European trade unions and employers' organisations: European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC), Business Europe (ex UNICE) and International Organisation of Employers (IOE). See https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-social-charter/reporting-system.

may contain individual recommendations to the State party concerned.[136] The Committee of Ministers also ensures the follow-up to the reports of the Committee of Experts monitoring the European Charter for Minority Languages and makes recommendations to the State party concerned.[137] The follow-up to GRETA and GREVIO reports is ensured by the respective Committee of the Parties, which make recommendations concerning the measures to be taken to implement the conclusions of GRETA and GREVIO.[138]

The Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee is the only MEA review mechanism with a clearly defined follow-up procedure. If it adopts findings of non-compliance, it invites the State party to provide progress reports on its implementation of the Committee's findings and recommendations. Depending on the information provided by the State, the Committee prepares a draft decision for the Meeting of the Parties to either welcome the State party's actions to come into compliance or, on the contrary, to recommend that the State party take specific measures to come into compliance with the Convention.[139] Its decisions aim at a good legal standard. As an example, it has forced changes in EU's access to justice by members of the public.[140]

8.3 Follow-up dialogue/meeting

The follow-up to the reporting process under the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities takes the form of a dialogue. The follow-up dialogue is an integral part of the reporting cycle and systematically organised in the countries reviewed. This process brings together all the actors concerned by the implementation of the Framework Convention – both

governmental and non-governmental – and examine ways to put into practice the results of the monitoring.[141]

Following the publication of an evaluation report by the Committee of Experts that monitors the European Charter for Minority Languages, the Council of Europe may also decide to organise an in-country meeting. Such meetings aim to discuss among government representatives and associations of minorities to find concrete measures for the implementation of the Committee of Ministers' recommendations. However, this does not seem to be a common practice since one follow-up meeting only appears to have been organized in 2009 in Serbia.[142]

8.4 Follow-up performed by the Secretariat and capacity-building

The UNESCO World Heritage Centre, as the focal point and coordinator for the World Heritage Convention, coordinates and follows upon the action plans developed at the regional level following each reporting round. Thus its follow-up reports present activities undertaken in the various regions to implement action plans, such as training workshops and other capacity-building and awareness-raising activities.[143] These reports are then transmitted to the World Heritage Committee, which adopts decisions acknowledging the progress accomplished encouraging States parties to continue their efforts in the implementation of the recommendations.[144] Based on this model, the Committee for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (Hague Convention and its two Protocols) has recommended that, as a follow-up to the 2017-2020 reporting cycle, implementation of action plans

---

136   If a State takes no action, the Committee of Ministers, on a proposal from the Governmental Committee, may address a Recommendation to that State, asking it to change the situation in law and/or in practice.A two-thirds majority of those voting is required. Id.

137   See "Committee of Ministers recommendations to States Parties and follow-up": https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-charter-regional-or-minority-languages/monitoring.

138   For follow-up to GRETA reports, see: https://www.coe.int/en/web/anti-human-trafficking/committee-of-the-parties; follow-up to GREVIO reports, see "Step 6 – Follow-up to the GREVIO report": https://www.coe.int/en/web/istanbul-convention/steps-in-the-first-baseline-evaluation-procedure#{%2221392012%22:[5]}.

139   UNECE Guide to the Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee, paras 204-210.

140   See https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document/EPRS_BRI(2021)679078.

141   See "Follow-up dialogue": https://www.coe.int/en/web/minorities/follow-up-dialogue.

142   See "Committee of Ministers recommendations to States Parties and follow-up": https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-charter-regional-or-minority-languages/monitoring.

143   See, for example, Follow-up to the second cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise for all regions, 27 May 2016.

144   See the corresponding World Heritage Committee Decision 40 COM 10 B.3 regarding follow-up for Arab States region and Decision 40 COM 10. B.4 regarding the Latin American and the Caribbean region for example.

should be assessed.[145] Since the reporting system under the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage transitioned to a regional cycle from 2020, the Committee has not had to exercise these functions yet.[146]

In several reporting systems, the Secretariat offers technical assistance and capacity-building support as part of the follow-up. Under the UN Transnational Convention against Organized Crime follow-up procedure, States parties may also request "technical assistance based on the specific needs identified in the review process with a view to improving the capacity of the State party to effectively implement the Convention".[147] The Treaty Bodies offer similar support to reporting States.[148]

9. USE OF ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS

Supervisory mechanisms make use of electronic systems in two ways: to make their output publicly available and to facilitate the submission of information by stakeholders.

9.1 Online access to supervisory mechanisms' output

All review mechanisms publish the results of their reporting process on their websites.[149] In that regard, the digital platform developed by WHO to present the information regarding the implementation of the International Health Regulations stands out. Its transparent dashboard provides a clear overview of the implementation status globally and is easily searchable by indicator, country and year, with clear charts and measures of progress year-on-year.

Furthermore, human rights bodies have recently developed digital tools to process this wealth of information and make it more accessible and "useable" by stakeholders.[150] These information

management tools are developed and administered by different international and national stakeholders, including UN agencies, national mechanisms for implementation, reporting and follow-up (NMIRFs), national human rights institutions (NHRIs), civil society organizations (CSOs), academia as well as national statistical offices and public-private partnerships. The introduction of digital human rights tracking tools and databases may facilitate human rights implementation in various ways, including by:

1. Tracking and thematically clustering recommendations and decisions by the international and regional human rights mechanisms;
2. Linking specific recommendations to the Sustainable Development Goals;
3. Identifying responsible government ministries and/or agencies for their implementation;
4. Developing follow-up plans, including timelines with all relevant domestic actors, to facilitate a coordinated monitoring of implementation; and
5. Managing information regarding the implementation of treaty provisions and recommendations.

For instance, OHCHR has developed its own tracking tool, the National Recommendations Tracking Database (NRTD). The NRTD is a country-specific tracking database to support national follow-up to recommendations. It aims to offer all functionality that is typically required in the process of follow-up and reporting:

- Contains complete record of observations and recommendations (via another OHCHR-administered database, the Universal Human Rights Index);
- Clustering of recommendations by themes, groups, and SDGs;
- Planning of follow-up activities to implement recommendations;

145   Committee for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, Follow-up to the periodic reporting cycle (2017-2020), para. 17.

146   See the planned reporting schedule: https://ich.unesco.org/en/submissions-and-deadlines-00861.

147   Procedures and rules for the functioning of the Mechanism for the Review of the Implementation of the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocols thereto, para. 45.

148   See supra, 6.3. "Provision of technical assistance and advice".

149   See also supra, "Transparency and visibility".

150   See Geneva Academy, The Emergence of Digital Human Rights Tracking Tools and Databases, 20 March 2023 as part of the ongoing one year research project on Digital Human Rights Tracking Tools and Databases.

- Designation of lead institutions charged with implementation;
- Status tracking of implementation progress, including statistics;
- Drafting reports to human rights mechanisms.

UNODC has also developed a portal for sharing electronic resources and laws on crime (SHER-LOC),[151] which provides several data bases (treaties, legislation, case law, strategies) as well as secure module to share information with the supervisory mechanism, thus facilitating the flow of information both ways.

9.2 Online submission of information

Apart from the UN human rights Treaty Bodies and the Council of Europe review mechanisms, all systems have developed online platforms to simplify reporting. They also provide models and templates for reports and questionnaires. Some also offer guidance in the form of reporting manuals and videos.[152]

Some are more advanced than others. What makes the WHO International Health Regulations Electronic State Parties Self-Assessment Annual Reporting Tool (e-SPAR)[153] so efficient and user-friendly is that the information has been divided into 35 indicators to assess the implementation of the IHRs.[154] For each of the 15 capacities, one to three indicators are used to measure the status of each capacity. Indicators are further broken down to a few elements called "attributes", which further define the indicator at each level. This in turn allows the information submitted by States parties to be readily available in real time.

Other systems use simpler reporting platforms: WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control, the UNESCO Culture Conventions, the UN

Convention against Corruption,[155] the Basel Convention.[156]

For its part, the UPR has an online submission system dedicated to stakeholders.[157]

10. ADDITIONAL KEY FEATURES AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICES

In light of challenges relating to reporting compliance and efficiency in the handling of the reviews, organizations have introduced the following key features and innovative practices in their reporting systems in order to lighten the reporting burden, make the reports and dialogues more focused and meaningful:[158]

Periodicity

- Flexible periodicity allowing to adapt to country situations (CED).
- Combined review and coordination on cross-cutting issues (TBs).

Prioritization

- Thematic prioritization to narrow down the number of provisions reviewed during each cycle.
- Regional approach to promote regional collaboration and respond to regional challenges.

Input

- Flexibility in the input requested from reporting States: "additional" or "optional questions" to encourage voluntary submission of information by States parties.
- Break down the information requested in indicators to facilitate the collection, compilation and publication of data.
- Contribution of stakeholders encouraged at all

---

151   See https://sherloc.unodc.org/cld/en/st/home.html.

152   See supra, "Provision of technical assistance and advice" from the Secretariat.

153   https://extranet.who.int/e-spar#about.

154   For each indicator, States are requested to describe their progress by selecting a level from 1 to 5. Level 1: Policies and strategies for the IHR capacity are not yet in place, under elaboration, or available on an ad hoc basis. On the other end of the scale, Level 5 means that policies and strategies are being revised and updated regularly.

155   Omnibus Survey Software : https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CTOC/omnibus-tool.html.

156   http://www.basel.int/Countries/NationalReporting/ElectronicReportingSystem/tabid/3356/Default.aspx.

157   https://uprdoc.ohchr.org/Account/Login.aspx?ReturnUrl=%2f.

158   See also table in annex. For more detail and background, please refer to the relevant section of this document.

stages of the reporting process, as well as to reflect on ways to improve implementation (UNTOC).

Noteworthy steps in the process

- Direct dialogue with the State under review.
- In-country visits as part of the reporting process and follow-up.
- The State under review may comment on the outcome document either before or after its adoption and publication.
- Reflection periods between reporting cycles to assess and revise the process as appropriate.

Available support from the Secretariat

- Support from the Secretariat at all stages of the process: preparation of questionnaires, facilitation of exchanges and dialogue, provision of technical assistance and advice, preparation of outcome document, coordination of follow-up.

Outcome

- Prioritization of recommendations in outcome document.
- Use of new information and communication technologies to enhance transparency and visibility: webcast, communication on social media, human rights digital tracking tools and databases.

Transparency and visibility

- Digital tracking tools and databases to strengthen monitoring and implementation (human rights)
- Digital implementation overview of dashboard that is user-friendly and easily searchable (WHO IHRs)

Follow-up
- Institutionalized follow-up to ensure efficiency of reporting procedure
- In-country follow-up dialogue bringing all actors together to discuss implementation
- Provision of technical assistance and capacity-building support by the Secretariat to implement the conclusions/recommendations/action plans

Use of electronic systems
- Use of electronic systems to facilitate the flow of information both ways: 1) Enhance visibility of review mechanisms' output, thus encouraging good practices and diligence in reporting and facilitating engagement of stakeholders and; 2) Simplify online submission of information via secure portals.

	Review Mechanism		Periodicity				Prioritization	
	Independent experts	Intergovern-mental	Fixed	Flexible	Synchronized reviews	Combined reviews	Thematic/ Provisions	Regional
Treaty Bodies	✓		✓			✓		
CED specificity	✓			✓				
UPR		✓	✓					
Montreal Prot.		✓	✓		✓		✓	
Basel Conv.		✓	✓		✓		✓	
Aarhus Conv.	✓		✓		✓		✓	
Minamata Conv.			✓					
London Prot.	✓		✓					
Escazu Agr.	✓							
UNCAC		✓		✓				
UNTOC		✓		✓			✓	
Discrimination in Education		✓	✓					
Technical Education		✓	✓					
World Heritage		✓	✓					✓
Hague Conv.		✓	✓					
Cultural Heritage		✓	✓					✓
European Social Charter	✓		✓				✓	
FCPNational Minorities	✓		✓					
Charter Minority Languages	✓		✓					
Lanzarote		✓		✓	✓		✓	
Prevention of Terrorism		✓		✓			✓	
Cybercrime		✓		✓	✓		✓	
Medicrime		✓		✓	✓		✓	
Trafficking	✓		✓				✓	
Istanbul	✓			✓			✓	
FCTobacco		✓	✓		✓			
Int. Health Reg°		✓	✓		✓			

ANNEX: INTERNATIONAL REPORTING PRACTICES (2/4)

	Input			Noteworthy steps			
	Report	Questionnaire	Stakeholder participation	Dialogue	Visits	Comments	Reflection period
Treaty Bodies	✓	+ List of issues	✓	✓			
CED specificity	✓	+ List of issues	✓	✓			
UPR	✓			✓			
Montreal Prot.		Stats data					
Basel Conv.		✓					
Aarhus Conv.	✓		✓				
Minamata Conv.		✓					
London Prot.	✓						
Escazu Agr.							
UNCAC		✓		✓	✓		
UNTOC		✓	✓	✓			
Discrimination in Education	✓						
Technical Education	✓						
World Heritage		✓	✓				✓
Hague Conv.		✓	✓				
Cultural Heritage		✓	✓				
European Social Charter	✓		✓				
FCPNational Minorities	✓		✓		✓		
Charter Minority Languages	✓		✓		✓	✓	
Lanzarote		✓	✓				
Prevention of Terrorism		✓				✓	
Cybercrime		✓	✓				
Medicrime		✓	✓			✓	
Trafficking		✓	✓		✓	✓	
Istanbul		✓	✓			✓	
FCTobacco		✓	✓				
Int. Health Reg°		✓	✓				

	Outcome			Follow-up			
	Country-specific	Synthesis/analysis	Prioritization of recos	Same body	From expert to intergov.	Dialogue/meeting	Coord. by Secretariat/Capacity-building
Treaty Bodies	✓		✓	✓			✓
CED specificity	✓			✓			✓
UPR	✓			✓			
Montreal Prot.	✓						
Basel Conv.	✓						
Aarhus Conv.	✓		✓		✓		
Minamata Conv.	✓						
London Prot.	✓						
Escazu Agr.	✓						
UNCAC	✓						
UNTOC	✓			✓			✓
Discrimination in Education	✓						
Technical Education	✓						
World Heritage		✓					✓
Hague Conv.		✓					
Cultural Heritage		✓					
European Social Charter	✓				✓		
FCPNational Minorities	✓		✓			✓	
Charter Minority Languages	✓				✓	✓	
Lanzarote	✓						
Prevention of Terrorism		✓					
Cybercrime		✓		✓			
Medicrime	✓	✓		✓			
Trafficking	✓		✓		✓		
Istanbul	✓				✓		
FCTobacco	✓						
Int. Health Reg°	✓						

	Electronic systems	
	Input (Online submission platforms)	Output (Other than outcome doc. publicly available on website)
Treaty Bodies		Digital tracking tools and databases
CED specificity		
UPR	✓	
Montreal Prot.	✓	
Basel Conv.	✓	
Aarhus Conv.	✓	
Minamata Conv.	✓	
London Prot.	✓	
Escazu Agr.	✓	
UNCAC	✓	
UNTOC	✓	
Discrimination in Education	?	
Technical Education	?	
World Heritage	✓	
Hague Conv.	✓	
Cultural Heritage	✓	
European Social Charter		
FCPNational Minorities		
Charter Minority Languages		
Lanzarote		
Prevention of Terrorism		
Cybercrime		
Medicrime		
Trafficking		
Istanbul		
FCTobacco	✓	
Int. Health Reg°	✓	Digital platform (overview dashboard easily searchable)

THE GENEVA ACADEMY

The Geneva Academy provides post-graduate education, conducts academic legal research and policy studies, and organizes training courses and expert meetings. We concentrate on branches of international law that relate to situations of armed conflict, protracted violence, and human rights protection.

THE GENEVA ACADEMY HUMAN RIGHTS PLATFORM

The Geneva Human Rights Platform (GHRP) provides a dynamic forum in Geneva for all stakeholders in the field of human rights - experts, practitioners, diplomats and civil society - to discuss and debate topical issues and challenges. Relying on academic research and findings, it enables various actors to become better connected, break down silos and, ultimately, advance human rights.

DISCLAIMER

The Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights is an independent academic centre, the publications of which seek to provide insights, analysis and recommendations, based on open and primary sources, to policymakers, researchers, media, the private sector and the interested public. The designations and presentation of materials used, including their respective citations, do not imply the expression of any opinion on the part of the Geneva Academy concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its boundaries. The views expressed in this publication represent those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Geneva Academy, its donors, parent institutions, governing board or those who have provided input or participated in peer review. The Geneva Academy welcomes the consideration of a wide range of perspectives in the pursuit of a well-informed debate on critical policies, issues and developments in international human rights and humanitarian law.