



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
19 November 2013

Original: English

---

## Sixty-eighth session

Agenda item 125

### United Nations reform: measures and proposals

#### **Letter dated 14 November 2013 from the High Commissioner for Human Rights addressed to the President of the General Assembly**

On behalf of the Secretary-General and pursuant to General Assembly resolution 68/2 on the extension of the intergovernmental process of the Assembly on strengthening and enhancing the effective functioning of the human rights treaty body system, I am pleased to submit to you herewith the requested comprehensive and detailed cost assessment paper to support the ongoing discussions of the intergovernmental process.

The background paper has been prepared with the input of all relevant parts of the Secretariat, in particular the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management, and in consultation with the Office of the Controller in the Department of Management. It addresses the many different proposals under discussion, entailing potentially new costs as well as potential cost savings, many of which are interrelated and mutually influencing. In whatever combination may eventually be decided, the outcome of the intergovernmental process will undoubtedly have far-reaching implications, both in the future effectiveness of the treaty body system as well as its costs.

I would be grateful if the background paper could be circulated to all Member States, in accordance with the resolution's deadline of 15 November 2013, for their reference as the intergovernmental process proceeds.

My Office will be happy to continue to support this process and provide any further information or clarifications that may be required.

(Signed) Navi Pillay  
High Commissioner for Human Rights



## **Background paper in support of the intergovernmental process of the General Assembly on enhancing the effective functioning of the human rights treaty body system**

### *Summary*

In its resolution [68/2](#), the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to provide a comprehensive and detailed cost assessment to provide background context to support the intergovernmental process by 15 November 2013, based on, but not limited to, the report of the co-facilitators ([A/67/995](#)). The present background paper has been prepared in compliance with that request.

## I. Introduction

1. In its resolution [68/2](#) of 20 September 2013, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to provide a comprehensive and detailed cost assessment to provide background context to support the intergovernmental process of the Assembly on enhancing the effective functioning of the human rights treaty body system by 15 November 2013, based on, but not limited to, the report of the co-facilitators ([A/67/995](#)). The present background paper is submitted in compliance with that request.

2. The open-ended intergovernmental process was launched on 23 February 2012, by virtue of General Assembly resolution [66/254](#), under the auspices of the President of the Assembly, who appointed the Permanent Representatives of Iceland and Indonesia to the United Nations in New York as co-facilitators. Their mandate was extended on 17 September 2012 by resolution [66/295](#). In resolution [68/2](#) the Assembly extended the intergovernmental process until the first half of February 2014, in order to finalize the elaboration of an outcome of the process.

3. Measures to improve the effectiveness of treaty bodies were proposed in the report of the Secretary-General submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolutions [65/200](#) and [65/204](#) ([A/66/344](#)). The High Commissioner for Human Rights submitted her report on the strengthening of the United Nations treaty body system in June 2012 ([A/66/860](#)), following a participatory, transparent and inclusive consultation process, based on her mandate, pursuant to Assembly resolution [48/141](#), to rationalize, adapt, strengthen and streamline the United Nations machinery in the field of human rights with a view to improving its efficiency and effectiveness.

4. In the course of the intergovernmental process on treaty body strengthening, a number of measures were put forward to strengthen the treaty body system. The following measures would have additional cost implications: the allocation of additional meeting time and correspondent services to the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the Committee against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Committee on the Rights of the Child, the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women and the Human Rights Committee, strengthened capacity of the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, dual chambers, webcasting, videoconferencing and capacity-building to boost State parties' compliance with reporting obligations. Several measures were also proposed that would involve cost savings, including the introduction of page limits for reports of States parties, page limits on annual reports from treaty bodies, the reduction of languages for issuing documentation, summary records in one language only and travel of experts.

## II. Treaty body system

5. Treaty bodies are custodians of the legal norms established by the core international human rights treaties. The following committees of experts carry out the functions delineated in the treaty and, where relevant, its optional protocols:

(a) The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD), established under the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;

(b) The Human Rights Committee (HRCtee), established under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and invested with functions by the Covenant and its two Optional Protocols;

(c) The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR), mandated by the Economic and Social Council to oversee the implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and invested with functions by its Optional Protocol;

(d) The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), established under the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and invested with functions by the Convention and its Optional Protocol;

(e) The Committee against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT), established under the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment;

(f) The Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC), established under the Convention on the Rights of the Child, invested with functions by the Convention and its three Optional Protocols;

(g) The Committee on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (CMW), established under the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families;

(h) The Subcommittee on the Prevention of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (SPT), established under the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OP-CAT);

(i) The Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), established under the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and invested with functions by the Convention and its Optional Protocol;

(j) The Committee on Enforced Disappearances (CED), established under the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

6. The treaty bodies perform a number of functions aimed at reviewing how the treaties are being implemented by their States parties. All treaty bodies, with the exception of SPT, are mandated to receive and consider reports submitted by States parties detailing how they are applying the treaty provisions nationally. All of the aforementioned Committees, with the exception of SPT, can, in principle, receive and consider complaints or communications from individuals alleging that their rights have been violated by a State party, provided that the latter has accepted this procedure.<sup>1</sup> Six Committees have the competence to conduct country inquiries and/or visits. Although OP-CAT is not a reporting instrument, SPT is part of the

<sup>1</sup> CMW and CRC will have the mandate to consider individual communications once the respective optional procedures have entered into force.

treaty body system. SPT has essentially a preventive function. It carries out visits to places of deprivation of liberty and provides assistance and advice to national preventive mechanisms. In 2012 treaty bodies held a total of 74 weeks of meetings, including pre-sessional working group meetings, other working group meetings and the annual meeting of Chairpersons of the treaty bodies. The number of weeks varies from year to year as a result of the approval of ad hoc requests for additional resources from individual Committees.

7. The treaty body system has grown in an ad hoc, organic manner since the establishment of the first treaty body in 1969. Since 2004, the human rights treaty body system has doubled in size, with the creation of four new treaty bodies (CMW, CRPD, SPT and CED) and five new procedures for individual complaints (CESCR, CRC, CMW, CRPD and CED).<sup>2</sup> There have been increases in membership in CRC, CMW, CRPD and SPT, bringing the total number of treaty body experts in 2013 to 172 (from 97 in 2000).

8. The total number of ratifications under the nine core treaties, the two ratified Optional Protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child and OP-CAT has almost doubled since 2000, from 912 to 1,641. Universal ratification of the nine treaties and the aforementioned optional protocols would equal 2,316 ratifications. Each treaty body currently reviews an average of 20.3 reports per year. In addition, the bodies collectively adopt an average of 140 decisions on the merits of individual communications annually. As at 1 September 2013, 315 States parties' reports are awaiting consideration and over 614 individual complaints are pending review. Costing the backlog requires a determination of the period over which it is attempted to eliminate the backlog; the longer this period, the greater the build-up of new backlog will be, unless sufficient resources are allocated to prevent such a build-up.

9. Following significant increases in ratification, in the period from 2000 to 2013, three Committees (CRPD, CEDAW and CAT) were granted a permanent increase in meeting time by the General Assembly. In the same period, most of the Committees have requested additional meeting time and many of the requests were granted on an ad hoc basis by the Assembly. While additional time may have in some cases addressed an existing backlog, such a measure has not addressed the fundamental issue of increased workload and thus the backlogs have continued to grow. Data on treaty bodies are shown in the tables below, including the year established, the number of States parties and staffing (table 1), meeting time entitlements (table 2), information about reviews of States parties' reports (table 3) and information about reviews of individual communications (table 4).

---

<sup>2</sup> In the case of CRC and CMW, the optional communications procedure is expected to enter into force once 10 States parties have accepted the procedure. This threshold is expected to be reached shortly.

Table 1  
Human rights treaty bodies

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>Year established</i>	<i>Number of States parties in 2000</i>	<i>Number of States parties as at 1 September 2013</i>	<i>Number of members in 2000</i>	<i>Number of members in 2013</i>	<i>Approved Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights staffing<sup>a</sup></i>
CERD	1969	156	176	18	18	1 P-4, 1 P-2
HRCtee	1976	136	167	18	18	2 P-4, 1 P-3, 1 P-2, 1 GS
CESCR	1985 <sup>b</sup>	142	160	18	18	1 P-4, 1 P-3, 1 GS
CEDAW	1981	165	187	23	23	2 P-4, 1 P-3, 1 P-2, 1 GS
CAT	1987	123	153	10	10	1 P-4, 1 P-3, 1 GS
Convention	1990	190	193			
CRC OP (armed conflict)	2002	–	152	10	18	1 P-4, 3 P-3
OP (sale of children)	2002	–	164			
CMW	2003	–	47	–	14	1 P-4, 1 GS
SPT	2006	–	69	–	25	1 P-4, 2 P-3, 2 GS
CRPD	2008	–	133	–	18	1 P-4, 3 P-3, 1 GS
CED	2010	–	40	–	10	2 P-4, 1 P-3, 2 GS
<i>Additional staffing in support of the treaty body system</i>						
Staff covering several treaty bodies <sup>c</sup>	–	–	–	–	–	6 P-3, 2 P-2, 3 GS
Staff covering treaty body Chairpersons meeting/secretariat working methods	–	–	–	–	–	1 P-4, 1 GS
Division management and general support	–	–	–	–	–	1 D-1, 4 P-5, 3 GS
<b>Total</b>	–	<b>912</b>	<b>1 641</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>60</b>

*Abbreviations:* GS: General Service.

<sup>a</sup> Includes one post at the P-3 level approved for CRPD with effect from 2014, and two General Service posts currently under consideration for abolition in 2014.

<sup>b</sup> The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights did not provide for the creation of a treaty body; rather, it gave the Economic and Social Council a mandate to oversee the implementation of the Covenant. In 1978 the Council created the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the Covenant. In 1985 by virtue of Council resolution 1985/17, the Working Group was renamed the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The Committee, which is treated as a treaty body, first met in 1987.

<sup>c</sup> Following the World Summit, additional staffing was approved in 2006 to assist all treaty bodies. These staff members also manage the Universal Human Rights Index and the treaty body database.

Table 2  
Treaty body meeting time entitlements

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>Annual meeting entitlement (weeks)<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>Meeting time in 2000 (weeks)<sup>b</sup></i>	<i>Meeting time in 2013 (weeks)<sup>b</sup></i>	<i>Projected meeting time in 2014 (weeks)<sup>b</sup></i>	<i>Projected meeting time in 2015 (weeks)<sup>b</sup></i>
CERD	6	7	6	6	6
HRCtee	9 (+3)	9 (+3)	9 (+3)	9 (+3)	9 (+3)
CESCR	6 (+2)	9 (+3) <sup>c</sup>	7 (+2) <sup>d</sup>	7 (+2) <sup>d</sup>	6 (+2)
CEDAW	9 (+5) <sup>e</sup>	6 (+2)	9 (+5)	9 (+5)	9 (+5)
CAT	6	5	8 <sup>f</sup>	8 <sup>f</sup>	6
CRC	9 (+3)	9 (+3)	9 (+3)	9 (+3) <sup>g</sup>	9 (+3) <sup>h</sup>
CMW	3	–	3	3	3
SPT	3	–	3	3	–
CRPD	3	–	3 <sup>i</sup>	5 (+2) <sup>j</sup>	5 (+2)
CED	4	–	4	4	4

<sup>a</sup> Excluding meeting time granted on an ad hoc basis. Pre-sessional and other working groups' meeting time is indicated in round brackets.

<sup>b</sup> Including weeks granted on an ad hoc basis.

<sup>c</sup> Includes 1 extraordinary session of 3 weeks and 1 pre-sessional working group granted on an ad hoc basis (resolution 54/251).

<sup>d</sup> Includes 1 additional week granted on an ad hoc basis (resolution 67/246).

<sup>e</sup> Includes three pre-sessional work group weeks per year and 10 working days for the Working Group on Communications, authorized for an interim period pending the entry into force of the amendment to article 20.1 of the Convention (resolution 62/218). Once this amendment has entered into force, the duration of the meetings of the Committee shall be determined by a meeting of States parties to the Convention, subject to the approval of the General Assembly.

<sup>f</sup> Includes 2 additional weeks granted on an ad hoc basis (resolution 67/232).

<sup>g</sup> In 2014 one week will be held in dual chambers, granted on an ad hoc basis (resolution 67/167).

<sup>h</sup> In 2015 13 working days of the sixty-eighth session of the General Assembly will be held in dual chambers (resolution 67/167).

<sup>i</sup> Includes one additional week granted on an ad hoc basis (resolution 66/229).

<sup>j</sup> Two additional weeks and two pre-session weeks were granted on a permanent basis (resolution 67/160).

Table 3  
Reviews by treaty bodies of reports of States parties

<i>Treaty body<sup>a</sup></i>	(a) <i>Number of reports of States parties examined in 2000</i>	(b) <i>Number of reports of States parties examined in 2013</i>	(c) <i>Average number of reports examined per week in 2013<sup>b</sup></i>	(d) <i>Number of reports of States parties pending review (backlog as at 1 September 2013)</i>	(e) <i>Number of weeks required to clear existing backlog (at 2013 rate) (d ÷ c)</i>	(f) <i>Average number of reports of States parties received per year, 2009-2012</i>	<i>Number of weeks required per year to consider average number of reports received, in order to avoid backlog (at 2013 rate) (f ÷ c)</i>
CERD	24	15	2.5	18	7.20	18	7.20
HRCtee	13	17	1.9	35	18.42	17	8.95
CESCR	14	17	2.4	50	20.83	15	6.25
CAT	17	17	2.1	28	13.33	17	8.10
CEDAW	15	22	2.4	44	18.33	25	10.42
CRC	27	34 <sup>c</sup>	3 <sup>d</sup>	99 <sup>e</sup>	21.50 <sup>f</sup>	40 <sup>g</sup>	12.98 <sup>h</sup>
CMW	–	5	1.7	2	1.18	4	2.35
CRPD	–	4	1.3	35	26.92	12	9.23
CED	–	4	1	4	4.00	4	4.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>2.03</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>141.72</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>69.47</b>

<sup>a</sup> SPT not included, since it does not examine reports of States parties.

<sup>b</sup> Not including pre-session weeks or working groups.

<sup>c</sup> The total includes 17 reports under the Convention and 17 reports under the two ratified Optional Protocols.

<sup>d</sup> As the custodian of two Optional Protocols with reporting requirements, the CRC examines three types of State party reports; since the consideration of reports submitted under the Optional Protocols is more limited in scope, five reports per Optional Protocol can be examined per week. Following the initial State review, periodic reports to CRC under the Optional Protocols are incorporated within the periodic report of the State party under the Convention. Thus, the overall productivity ratio of CRC is higher than that of other Committees.

<sup>e</sup> The total backlog includes 54 State party reports and 45 reports under the Optional Protocols.

<sup>f</sup> The total estimated number of weeks required to clear the existing backlog includes 22.5 weeks for State party reports under the Convention and 9 weeks for reports under the Optional Protocols.

<sup>g</sup> The total includes 23 State party reports under the Convention and 17 reports under the Optional Protocols.

<sup>h</sup> The total estimated number of weeks required per year to avoid a backlog includes 6.05 weeks for State party reports under the Convention and 3.4 weeks of reports under the Optional Protocols.



Table 4  
Review by treaty bodies of individual communications (petitions)

<i>Treaty body<sup>a</sup></i>	(a) <i>Number of communications examined in 2000</i>	(b) <i>Number of communications examined in 2012<sup>b</sup></i>	(c) <i>Number of meetings weeks devoted to examination of communications in 2012</i>	(d) <i>Weekly productivity ratio (communications per week) (b ÷ c)</i>	(e) <i>Number of communications registered in 2012</i>	(f) <i>Number of individual communications pending review as at 1 October 2013<sup>c</sup></i>	(g) <i>Number of meeting weeks required to clear existing backlog (at 2012 rate)</i>	<i>Staff time required to prepare pending communications for review (weeks)<sup>d</sup></i>
CERD	4	1	0.1	10.00	2	6	0.60	12
HRCtee	44	97	1.63	59.51 <sup>e</sup>	103	364	6.12	728
CESCR	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
CEDAW	—	6	0.53	11.32	11	28	2.47	56
CAT	13	46	1.37	33.58	47	123	3.66	246
CRC <sup>f</sup>	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
CMW	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
CRPD	—	3	0.4	7.50	3	12	1.60	24
CED	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>4.03</b>	<b>37.97</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>534</b>	<b>14.45</b>	<b>1 068</b>

<sup>a</sup> SPT not included, since it does not receive individual communications.

<sup>b</sup> Includes complaints which may be discontinued for reasons of non-admissibility.

<sup>c</sup> Individual cases can only be examined once the file is complete, i.e. when the State party has had the opportunity to respond to the allegations made. Therefore, not all pending communications are part of the backlog.

<sup>d</sup> Preparation of a communication for review by the Committees requires an average of 10 working days (2 weeks) of staff time, once the file has been completed and the State party has provided its observations. Technically, even if given additional time, HRCtee and CAT would not be in a position to address the full backlog of communications without additional staff support to complete the review process and prepare the draft views/decisions on those communications.

<sup>e</sup> Approximately 33 per cent of complaints to HRCtee in 2012 were found non-admissible, which explains the high productivity ratio.

<sup>f</sup> The third Optional Protocol to CRC on a communications procedure is very likely to come into force in 2014, as only one more ratification is required; a significant number of communications can therefore be expected.

10. Support for the treaty bodies is provided by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), in particular through its Human Rights Treaties Division. The Division of Conference Management of the United Nations Office at Geneva provides conference services to the treaty bodies, as well as to other clients. The United Nations Information Service prepares and disseminates background and round-up press releases, as well as meeting summaries, in French and English for most public meetings of the treaty bodies. It also produces radio and television programmes on the work of the treaty bodies. The treaty body system is funded from the United Nations regular budget; however, owing to insufficient staff and allocations to adequately support the Committees in their work, OHCHR also allocates extrabudgetary resources to them from voluntary contributions so as to provide additional staff and meet other requirements, including additional meetings for coordination and participation in related events, such as panel discussions that are not part of their fixed meeting calendar. The totals of regular budget and extrabudgetary resources are shown in table 5 below.

**Table 5**  
**Treaty body resources**

(United States dollars)

<i>Biennium 2012-2013</i>	<i>Regular budget</i>	<i>Voluntary contributions</i>
Conference services (meetings and documentation)	59 447 900	–
Non-staff resources (including travel and daily subsistence allowance of treaty body members)	14 401 900 (84.7 per cent of total)	2 602 300 (15.3 per cent of total)
Staff support (OHCHR)	1 D-1, 4 P-5, 14 P-4, 19 P-3, 5 P-2, 15 GSOL (77 per cent of total)	1 P-4, 15 P-3, 1 P-2, 5 GSOL (23 per cent of total)
Non-staff resources (temporary assistance for the United Nations Information Service)	192 500	–
Staff support (United Nations Information Service)	2 P-4 (63 per cent), 1 P-3 (63 per cent), 1 P-2 (63 per cent), 1 P-2 (10 per cent)	–

*Abbreviations:* GSOL, General Service (Other level).

11. Conference services consist of meeting support and documentation. Meeting support includes simultaneous interpretation, meeting room attendants, summary record drafting, sound technicians and, in the case of CRPD, sign language interpretation and/or captioning. Documentation consists of editing, translation, formatting, printing, distribution and, in the case of CRPD, Braille printing. Documentation represents the highest cost item of the functioning of treaty bodies and includes (a) documents submitted by States parties (reports of States parties, common core documents and replies to the list of issues), which constitute two thirds of the total number of pages submitted, as they are not currently subject to formal page limits by the General Assembly,<sup>3</sup> and (b) documents issued by the treaty bodies (list of issues prior to reporting, list of issues/themes, concluding observations, general comments, interim/admissibility decisions, views/decisions on communications and visit reports), which, with the exception of the annual reports, currently comply with the page limits defined by the Assembly, and summary records of treaty body meetings.

12. In accordance with United Nations rules, treaty body members are entitled to an air ticket in the class immediately below first class at the most economical airfare via a direct route. The daily subsistence allowance for members is provided at the rate of 140 per cent of the normal allowance rates established by the International Civil Service Commission. The costs of treaty bodies are shown in table 6 below.

<sup>3</sup> In 2006 the harmonized guidelines on reporting under the international human rights treaties, including guidelines on a common core document and treaty-specific documents established that “if possible, common core documents should not exceed 60 to 80 pages, initial treaty-specific documents should not exceed 60 pages and subsequent periodic documents should be limited to 40 pages” (HRI/MC/2006/3, para. 19).

**Table 6**  
**Costs of treaty bodies**  
 (Thousands of United States dollars)

Treaty body	Actual annual cost, 2012						Total cost per Committee, 2012
	Conf. services (regular budget)	Non-post (including travel/ daily subsistence allowance)		OHCHR staff <sup>a</sup>		United Nations Information Service staff	
		Regular budget	Extrabudgetary	Regular budget	Extrabudgetary		
CERD	3 384.3	664.7	–	396.2	496.8	–	4 942.0
HRCtee	6 594.1	867.4	–	676.8	–	–	8 138.3
CESCR	2 141.7	551.0	–	532.6	180.2	–	3 405.5
CEDAW	3 915.5	1 101.6	–	892.8	504.6	–	6 414.5
CAT	5 094.6	314.6	–	532.6	360.4	–	6 302.2
CRC	3 233.1	947.1	–	756.6	316.6	–	5 253.4
CMW	1 064.0	258.1	–	352.4	–	–	1 674.5
SPT	1 057.6	896.2	–	849.2	–	–	2 803.0
CRPD	1 713.5	570.9	–	893.0	–	–	3 177.4
CED	654.3	112.2	–	885.0	–	–	1 651.5
General support <sup>b</sup>	871.4	183.9	969.1	4 062.7	1 886.6	378.2	8 351.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>29 724.1</b>	<b>6 467.7</b>	<b>969.1</b>	<b>10 829.9</b>	<b>3 745.2</b>	<b>378.2</b>	<b>52 114.2</b>

<sup>a</sup> Standard salary costs (version 21).

<sup>b</sup> Since the single common core document is used by all treaty bodies, its cost is separated from Committee-specific costs; likewise, 11 staff who provide support to multiple Committees as well as management positions cannot be allocated to individual Committees and are therefore reflected under the general support category.

13. OHCHR provides both Professional and secretarial support to the treaty bodies. Typically, the secretariat of each Committee consists of one Secretary (P-4), one to five Human Rights Officers (P-3/2), depending on the workload of each Committee, and administrative support staff (General Service (Other level)), supervised by a Chief of Section (P-5) under the direction of the Division Director (D-1).

14. The Professional support provided by Human Rights Officers (P-3/2) with respect to the State party review, under the guidance of the treaty body Secretary, entails the following responsibilities: conduct research and analysis; provide assistance with the drafting of lists of issues and concluding observations; liaise with States parties, United Nations system partners, national human rights institutions and civil society organizations; provide assistance to treaty body rapporteurs or country task forces; revise and finalize texts, as appropriate; and provide support for the meetings of the respective treaty body session, as well as follow-up to concluding observations. A Human Rights Officer assigned to a country's review must have in-depth knowledge of the particular human rights treaty. Relevant details about the State party's human rights situation and its past reviews must be compiled from knowledge resources and factored into the analysis. The review of a single State party can require the analysis of as many as 20 supporting documents. Each review, while following a standard procedure, is unique to the State party. The specific expertise is developed by the Human Rights Officer through legal analysis, experience and exposure to the workings of the relevant treaty bodies.

15. On average, one Professional staff member needs six weeks (30 working days) to assist a treaty body with the preparatory review of one State party report. The length of the report does not substantially alter the workload of the staff assigned to a State party review, although in cases of reports which are double (or more than double) the length prescribed in the harmonized guidelines, more than 30 working days may be required. On this basis, presuming the availability of each staff member for 44 weeks per year (taking into consideration official holidays and leave entitlements), one Human Rights Officer can be expected to review seven or eight reports per year.

16. Human Rights Officers (P-4/3/2) who support treaty body work on communications review incoming correspondence related to the case, provide research, conduct a legal analysis of submissions, draft recommendations to the treaty body, assist the body's case rapporteur, provide additional information requested by Committee members, finalize the text of the decision/view, and assist with follow-up procedures, as required.

17. On average, one Professional staff member needs two weeks (10 working days) to assist a treaty body with the examination of one communication which is ready for drafting. On this basis, presuming the availability of each staff member for 44 weeks per year (taking into consideration official holidays and leave entitlements), one staff member can be expected to review 22 individual communications per year.

18. Treaty body Secretaries and Human Rights Officers provide further assistance to the bodies with the preparation of the agenda, notes by the secretariat, general comments, general days of discussion and inquiries, and provide support for the annual meeting of Chairpersons of treaty bodies, preparing correspondence under the complaints procedures not related to registered cases, contribute to updates and newsletters for treaty body members and engage in any other activities in support of the work of the bodies.

19. The preparation of and process leading up to the adoption of one general comment requires, on average, 30 working days of one Professional staff member. The preparation and organization of a day of general discussion requires 30 working days of one Professional staff member. The preparation of one annual/biannual report of a treaty body on average requires 20 working days.

20. Administrative support staff provide assistance in the organization of the meetings of the treaty bodies, in particular the travel of participants, the organization of conference rooms and the accreditation of State party delegations and observers. Administrative support staff also process and archive all correspondence, including notes verbales to States parties and letters to other stakeholders. They update each treaty body's extranet with all relevant documentation for country reviews and communications for treaty body members, and prepare background materials for treaty body meetings. The administrative staff that provide support for the treaty bodies are also focal points for all logistical arrangements pertaining to the meetings and field visits, and liaise with permanent missions on logistics. In addition, they serve as focal points for receiving reports and common core documents, and for formatting them. They also provide support during the meetings. Moreover, they are responsible for keeping the treaty body database and the OHCHR website up-to-date with relevant information regarding the treaty bodies they support. Administrative staff who provide support for the work on communications receive and record close to 10,000 pieces of correspondence annually. They enter cases in the communications

database and record, file and retrieve correspondence. On average, one administrative support staff member (General Service (Other level)) needs four weeks (20 working days) to prepare, provide support for and follow up on one week of treaty body meeting time.

21. A number of Professional (P-2/3) and administrative staff members cover several treaty bodies, that is, they are responsible for providing support to several Committees, rotating among them, as required. Their functions are the same as those described above, although they will work for multiple treaty bodies over the course of the year.

22. The Director, four Senior Human Rights Officers and three administrative support staff ensure the general management and support of the Human Rights Treaties Division.

23. Senior Human Rights Officers (P-5) manage and coordinate the support provided by the respective sections to the treaty body system, under the overall guidance of the Division Director (D-1). They provide consistent and authoritative advice to treaty body members, States, the High Commissioner and other stakeholders, and ensure that the treaty body system operates as a unified system. This activity may include preparing statements by treaty body Chairpersons and senior management on treaty bodies, and liaising with the Chairpersons of treaty bodies in their section. They are further responsible for providing, upon request, advice on substantive and technical matters, such as on harmonizing and streamlining working methods to increase the efficiency and coherence of the system. They may also provide advice on the presentation of ad hoc requests for additional resources to the General Assembly, in close cooperation with the New York Office of OHCHR. In addition, the Senior Human Rights Officers are responsible for managing all the human resources in their respective sections, including recruitment processes, in consultation with the Division Director, training and coaching junior staff, setting performance objectives and undertaking regular reviews of staff performance. Moreover, they draft reports and notes of and for the Secretary-General and the High Commissioner for Human Rights, and develop, manage and oversee the implementation of the Division's programmatic workplan under the overall guidance of the Division Director.

24. General support staff assigned to the Division management provide assistance to the Director in organizing the overall management of the portfolio under the responsibility of the Division. In addition to providing administrative support to the Director and Senior Human Rights Officers, they are responsible for recording new ratifications and for ensuring the communication flow between the Division management and permanent representations of States parties in Geneva, and current and former treaty body members.

25. Given the increases in signatories to the conventions, as well as the many ad hoc approvals of additional meeting time that have not been accompanied with additional staff resources, the total approved level of staffing is insufficient to complete the requisite workload. Accordingly, extrabudgetary resources have been allocated to provide support for the work of the treaty bodies.

26. The permanent and temporary Press Officers are tasked with preparing and disseminating backgrounders and round-up press releases describing the mandates and activities of the treaty bodies and the focus of the specific sessions covered, as well as preparing detailed summaries of discussions in all public meetings. The

Editors plan and supervise their work, and edit the texts to ensure that they comply with United Nations quality standards and terminology.

### **III. Measures proposed in the context of the intergovernmental process requiring additional resources**

27. In the course of the intergovernmental process on treaty body strengthening a number of proposals have been addressed to States parties, treaty bodies and the United Nations system, including OHCHR. This section of the background paper describes those proposals which would require additional resources, namely the allocation of additional meeting time and correspondent services to CRPD, CAT, CERD, CESCR, CRC, CEDAW and HRCtee, strengthened capacity of SPT, dual chambers, webcasting, videoconferencing and capacity-building to boost States parties' compliance with reporting obligations.

#### **A. Additional meeting time**

28. The current allocation of resources for the different treaty bodies has been based on the estimated requirements at the time of their establishment, with some increases approved in subsequent years, either owing to foreseen milestones with planned expansion or through adjustments proposed by the treaty bodies themselves. The current cost per treaty body varies depending on the volume of documentation submitted by States parties in accordance with their reporting obligations, meeting time, membership, number of countries/communications examined, working methods, entitlements and practice of each Committee.

29. An estimated, indicative basic cost of one week of meeting time is included for each Committee in table 7 below. The State party review is central among the responsibilities of the treaty bodies and therefore presented as the standard for calculating one week of meeting time. The cost elements are as follows:

(a) Conference services: meeting support (interpretation, meeting room attendants, summary record drafting, sound technicians and, in the case of CRPD, real-time captioning) and documentation (translation, formatting, printing, distribution and, in the case of CRPD, Braille), based on existing entitlements and current levels of documentation;

(b) Travel costs and/or daily subsistence allowance for treaty body members and, in the case of CRPD, assistants as well; the Geneva budget rate for 2014-2015, including the 40 per cent surplus, is \$580 per day. Given the current configuration of meetings, for some Committees, an increase in meeting time would, in principle, require an increase in the number of annual sessions, thereby also raising travel cost implications;

(c) OHCHR staffing support: at present, OHCHR is obliged to supplement the staffing of the Human Rights Treaties Division with additional staff funded from extrabudgetary resources, in order to adequately support the treaty bodies; indicative costs are based on the requisite staffing, regardless of source of funding;

(d) United Nations Information Service staffing support for public information.

**Table 7**  
**Per-week indicative cost of treaty body meetings (State party review)**  
 (United States dollars)

Treaty body <sup>a</sup>	Indicative basic cost per week <sup>b</sup>						Total indicative cost per Committee for one additional week (at 2.5 reports per week)
	Meeting services		Documentation	Daily subsistence allowance for members <sup>c</sup>	OHCHR staff	United Nations Information Service staff	
	Interpretation	Summary records	Working languages only				
CERD	56 200	135 800	206 300	73 100	62 500	9 700	543 600
HRCtee	73 100	172 600	453 900	73 100	62 500	9 700	844 900
CESCR	56 200	135 800	371 000	73 100	62 500	9 700	708 300
CEDAW	90 000	209 300	625 900	93 400	62 500	9 700	1 090 800
CAT	90 000	209 300	379 700	40 600	62 500	9 700	791 800
CRC	43 600	99 100	294 000	73 100	62 500	9 700	582 000
CMW <sup>d</sup>	56 200	135 800	99 800	56 800	62 500	9 700	420 800
CRPD	77 300	172 600	374 600	125 200	62 500	9 700	821 900
CED	90 000	209 300	218 000	40 600	62 500	9 700	630 100

<sup>a</sup> Does not include SPT, which does not review State party reports.

<sup>b</sup> The indicative cost per week does not include annual reports, common core documents, or session reports.

<sup>c</sup> In general, the extension of meeting time for one additional week would not entail any additional travel costs, apart from the daily subsistence allowance; however, depending on the number of additional weeks that could be added, it may be necessary to schedule an additional session rather than merely adding to an existing session, in which case the cost of travel for the Committee members to attend the session would arise.

<sup>d</sup> CMW has adopted a simplified reporting procedure in the form of a list of issues prior to reporting, under which a list of issues is transmitted to the State party prior to the submission of its periodic report. The State party's response to the list of issues constitutes its periodic report under the Convention; hence, the indicative document translation costs are considerably lower for this Committee.

30. All Committees, with the exception of SPT, can, in principle, receive and consider complaints or communications from individuals alleging that their rights have been violated by a State party, provided that the latter has accepted this procedure.<sup>4</sup> Table 8 below provides the estimated indicative basic cost of one week of meeting time dedicated to individual communications for those Committees which have communications pending review. While the cost elements are the same, some Committees do not avail themselves of summary records when considering communications. The staff cost to support the review of communications is even higher than the staff cost to support the State party review owing to the number of cases reviewed (up to 40 per week) as compared to the number of State party reviews (2.5 reviews per week). In addition, communications are more labour-intensive because a great deal of staff time is dedicated to determining if a piece of correspondence represents a potential case before a Committee. Eventually, while 10,000 pieces of incoming correspondence must be screened and analysed, only approximately 2.5 per cent of all correspondence will be registered, followed and managed as a case.

<sup>4</sup> CMW and CRC will have the mandate to consider individual communications once the respective optional procedures have entered into force.

Table 8  
**Per-week indicative cost of treaty body meetings (communications)**

(United States dollars)

Treaty body <sup>a</sup>	Cases per week <sup>b</sup>	Indicative basic cost per week							Total indicative cost per Committee for one additional week of communications
		Meeting services		Documentation		Daily subsistence allowance for members <sup>d</sup>	OHCHR staff	United Nations Information Service staff	
		Interpretation	Summary records	In working languages <sup>c</sup>	In six United Nations languages				
HRCtee	40	73 100	–	1 322 800	734 900	73 100	287 700	–	2 491 600
CEDAW	11	90 000	–	404 200	202 100	93 400	86 700	–	876 400
CAT	30	90 000	209 300	551 200	551 200	40 600	218 400	9 700	1 670 400
CRPD	7	77 300	–	115 700	128 600	125 200	59 000	–	505 800

<sup>a</sup> Includes only Committees with a backlog of communications.

<sup>b</sup> At current productivity rates, not including complaints which are discontinued for reasons of non-admissibility (see table 4).

<sup>c</sup> The HRCtee and CEDAW require both pre-session and in-session documentation in working languages, whereas CAT and CRPD require only pre-session documentation in working languages.

<sup>d</sup> In general, the extension of meeting time for one additional week would not entail any additional travel costs, apart from the daily subsistence allowance; however, depending on the number of additional weeks that could be added, it may be necessary to schedule an additional session rather than merely adding to an existing session, in which case the cost of travel for the Committee members to attend the session would arise.

31. Should a significant amount of additional meeting time be approved, this may create a challenge for the United Nations Office at Geneva in terms of meeting space capacity and infrastructure.

## B. Dual chambers

32. Meetings in dual chambers allow treaty bodies to significantly increase their output, essentially dividing the Committee into two, thereby entailing no additional travel costs. One week of meeting time in dual chambers requires the following resources:

- (a) Simultaneous interpretation in the working languages of the Committee;
- (b) Document preparation and translation, assuming the same rate of review as the Committee in a single chamber, and summary records;
- (c) In the case of CRPD, capacity for sign language interpretation and/or captioning, and Braille printing;
- (d) Professional staff support for the preliminary review and preparation of reports (at six weeks per report) and during the session (two P-3/4 level staff for the second chamber);
- (e) United Nations Information Service staff for the preparation of, inter alia, press releases;
- (f) Availability of sufficient meeting space; in the case of CRPD, the availability of two simultaneously accessible rooms with real-time captioning facilities.

The per-week indicative cost of meetings in dual chambers is shown in table 9 below.



**Table 9**  
**Per-week indicative cost of meetings in dual chambers**  
 (United States dollars)

Treaty body <sup>a</sup>	Indicative cost per week for dual chambers <sup>b</sup>					Total indicative cost per Committee for one additional week (at 2.5 reports per week)
	Meeting services		Documentation	OHCHR staff	United Nations Information Service staff	
	Interpretation	Summary records	Working languages only			
CERD	56 200	135 800	206 300	70 800	9 700	478 800
HRCtee	73 100	172 600	453 900	70 800	9 700	780 100
CESCR	56 200	135 800	371 000	70 800	9 700	643 500
CEDAW	90 000	209 300	625 900	70 800	9 700	1 005 700
CAT	90 000	209 300	379 700	70 800	9 700	759 500
CRC	43 600	99 100	294 000	70 800	9 700	517 200
CMW	56 200	135 800	99 800	70 800	9 700	372 300
CRPD	77 300	172 600	374 600	70 800	9 700	705 000
CED	90 000	209 300	218 000	70 800	9 700	597 800

<sup>a</sup> Does not include SPT, which does not review State party reports.

<sup>b</sup> The indicative cost per week does not include annual reports, common core documents, or session reports.

33. It should be noted that Committees with limited membership or a small or non-existent backlog, such as CAT, CED and CMW, are unlikely to request dual chambers.

34. The cost of one week in dual chambers would decrease significantly if proposed efficiency measures were to be implemented, such as limitations on pages and languages of documentation, measures related to the reduction of working languages, limits on summary records and, in some cases, modifications to the travel entitlements of treaty body members.

## C. Webcasting

35. New technologies, such as webcasting, offer important opportunities for the treaty bodies in terms of increased visibility and interaction, and in terms of enhancing ownership, impact and, ultimately, the implementation of treaty body recommendations. In order to provide webcasting services to all public meetings of the treaty bodies, resources would be required for the following:

(a) Camera equipment in designated meeting rooms in the Palais des Nations, Palais Wilson and any additional locations;

(b) Functioning connectivity between the location of the meeting rooms and the webcast offices;

(c) Sufficient bandwidth for the simultaneous transmission of multiple events from different locations in the original and other official languages;

(d) Additional staffing for the processing of the webcast footage and preparation for archiving;

(e) Working space and equipment for the additional staff;

(f) Webcast server storage fees and other operating costs;

(g) Means to ensure accessibility for persons with disabilities, additional camera equipment and technicians to film sign language interpretation and/or real-time captioning of the meetings.

36. The estimated costs for webcasting the current schedule of treaty body meetings are provided in table 10 below. Costs are included, for comparison purposes, of webcasting in the original language and English only (as is currently the practice for other bodies) and webcasting in all six official languages.

Table 10

**Webcasting costs of treaty body meetings**

(United States dollars)

		<i>Webcasting in original language and English</i>	<i>Webcasting in all six official languages</i>
Fixed (one-time) cost	Equipment (computers, encoder/servers, printer)	45 500	115 500
Recurrent costs (annual)	Streaming delivery and storage, information technology equipment and software support	40 000	50 000
	Staffing	891 800	2 343 400
<b>Total annual cost</b>		<b>931 800</b>	<b>2 393 400</b>

37. It should be noted that the requirements for webcasting would increase in direct relation to the number of meetings that will be broadcast simultaneously should the treaty bodies opt to meet in dual chambers. Accordingly more rooms, camera equipment, connectivity and bandwidth would be necessary, as well as the staffing and server storage for the additional footage to be archived.

## D. Videoconferencing

38. Videoconferencing would provide the opportunity for States parties' delegations to have additional representatives from their capitals engage with the treaty bodies, which would enhance the ability of States parties to respond in real time to questions posed by the treaty body members. In order to provide videoconferencing services, resources would be required for the following:

(a) Equipment, including cameras, microphones, speakers and screens in designated meeting rooms in the Palais des Nations, Palais Wilson and any additional locations;

(b) Videoconference bridging connections and sufficient capacity for multiple simultaneous meetings;

(c) Staffing by technicians to set up the video connections and assist during transmissions;

## (d) Related operating costs.

Webcasting costs for meetings of treaty bodies are shown in table 11 below.

Table 11

**Vide Conferencing costs of treaty body meetings**

(United States dollars)

		<i>Vide Conferencing for existing meeting schedule, equipping four meeting rooms</i>
Fixed (one-time) cost	Equipment (cameras, microphones, speakers and screens): \$30 000 per room	120 000
<b>Total fixed costs</b>		<b>120 000</b>
Recurrent costs (annual)	Vide Conference bridging connections (\$300 per hour average 5 sessions per week)	66 000
	Staffing (1 technician (GS (OL)))	136 400
<b>Total annual costs</b>		<b>202 400</b>

39. The number of rooms to be equipped with videoconferencing facilities and corresponding services depends on the number of treaty bodies meeting at the same time, as well as whether or not the bodies meet in dual chambers. Accordingly, any decisions to increase meeting time or allow for meetings in dual chambers will require corresponding increases in costs for this service.

**E. Capacity-building**

40. In the course of the intergovernmental process, a number of elements were proposed to build the capacity of States to comply with their treaty obligations. These measures would focus largely on the provision of advisory services, training and the development of tools to assist States in tracking and reporting on implementation activities.

41. The deployment of dedicated human rights capacity-building officers in every OHCHR regional office could provide day-to-day guidance to States and relevant national stakeholders on engagement with the treaty body process and help to build and strengthen national capacity to fulfil obligations under the human rights treaties. Such assistance could include briefing government officials on how to use the Universal Human Rights Index to cluster recommendations by themes, how to collect information for the report, how to draft reports/replies to lists of issues and preparation for the interactive dialogue. OHCHR would collaborate with the Resident Coordinator and the United Nations country team, where they exist, in the provision of such technical assistance, with a view also to developing the capacity of country teams in this area. An annual coordination meeting for the regional human rights capacity-building officers would be convened to exchange good practices, ensure updated knowledge of working methods and rules of procedure of the treaty bodies, new developments and relevant information technology tools, as well as to equip the capacity-building officers with the latest facilitation techniques.

42. The following resources per year would be required to implement this proposal:

(a) Human resources: 12 Human Rights Officers (P-3), based in the OHCHR regional field presences (\$180,200 x 12 = \$2,162,400);

(b) Budget for travel for consultations/collaboration within the region (\$268,000);

(c) Annual coordination meeting (\$17,100).

43. Regional or subregional training-of-trainers workshops could equip staff from regional human rights mechanisms and institutions and regional umbrella organizations of national human rights institutions with the knowledge and skills to provide support to States parties in the region for increased engagement with the treaty bodies. Representatives from States in the region who have been actively involved in the preparation and submission of their State party report and who would be interested in sharing their experience with other States by becoming a trainer would also be invited. Following the regional workshop, trainees would be invited to join the OHCHR roster of experts on treaty body reporting with a view to supporting OHCHR capacity-building efforts at the national level.

44. The following resources per year would be required to implement this proposal:

(a) Human resources: one Human Rights Officer (P-4, 50 per cent) (\$108,000), one Human Rights Officer (P-3) (\$180,200) and one Assistant (General Service (Other level)), 50 per cent) (\$68,200), based in Geneva;

(b) Regional training-of-trainers workshop (two per year, \$217,700 x 2 = \$435,400).

45. A roster of expertise could be developed with profiles of persons who have successfully completed the OHCHR train-the-trainers programme, including staff from regional human rights mechanisms and national experts on treaty body engagement. Current and former treaty body members would also be invited to join the roster. Continuous maintenance would be required to keep the roster up-to-date and to support the network of members, by sharing information and enabling the exchange of good practices and lessons learned.

46. The human resources required per year to implement this proposal would entail one Human Rights Officer/Roster Manager (P-3) (\$180,200).

47. Upon request, direct assistance could be provided to States parties at the national level, drawing on the roster of experts. The first type of direct assistance consists of building institutional capacity for reporting, that is, advisory services, based on research and good practice, would be provided to States parties seeking to establish or improve coordination arrangements for reporting at the national level, taking into account the various modalities for coordination, according to States' national preferences. The second type of direct assistance would be limited to a one-off, ad hoc training session on reporting guidelines at the national level, which would benefit both government representatives and national stakeholders. In selecting beneficiaries for the direct assistance at the national level, priority would be given to States parties with overdue initial reports and States parties with a large number of overdue periodic reports.

48. The following resources per year would be required to implement this proposal:

(a) Human resources: one Human Rights Officer (P-4, 50 per cent) (\$108,000), one Human Rights Officer (P-3) (\$180,200) and one Assistant (General Service (Other level), 50 per cent) (\$68,200), based in Geneva;

(b) Consultant (P-5) on institutional coordination arrangements (3 weeks x 3 countries, \$41,000);

(c) National workshops (6 per year, \$192,500 x 6 = \$1,155,000).

49. Software and other tools could be developed by OHCHR to facilitate State party engagement with treaty bodies. More specifically, an Internet-based follow-up platform to the Universal Human Rights Index could be developed to enable States to record, on a day-to-day basis, their own implementation of recommendations in between reporting dates with the aim of facilitating future periodic reporting. In addition, the development of standard working templates for use by States parties could be explored with a view to easing the reporting burden. In addition, a manual on reporting guidelines could be developed to provide user-friendly, step-by-step guidance for States regarding the reporting process. In addition, more research could be undertaken and a tool could be developed on institutional coordination arrangements for reporting, on the basis of existing national experiences, to assist States that are interested in establishing a standing national mechanism or improving existing coordination arrangements.

50. The following resources per year would be required to implement this proposal:

(a) Human resources: one Human Rights Officer (P-3) (\$180,200), one Programmer/Analyst (P-3) (\$180,200) and one Programming Assistant (General Service (Other level)) (\$136,400), based in Geneva;

(b) Research Consultant (P-5) on national coordination mechanisms (four months, \$45,500);

(c) Validation seminar (\$43,500);

(d) Editing, translation and publication of tools (\$80,000).

## **E. Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment**

51. SPT differs from the other Committees in that its core function consists of field visits as opposed to State party reviews. While the field visits were approved to be funded from the regular budget, the corresponding secretariat staff was not fully approved (see [A/65/500](#) and [A/65/574](#)). As a result, SPT has not been able to undertake the number of field visits it had planned. The increase in ratifications and members has further compounded this challenging situation.

52. Since its establishment, the Subcommittee's mandate has been supported by a core secretariat of three staff (1 P-4, 1 P-3, 1 General Service (Other level)). When the number of ratifications of the Optional Protocol surpassed 50, the membership of the Subcommittee increased from 10 to 25 members and the secretariat was increased by two staff (1 P-3, 1 General Service (Other level)) as from 1 January 2011. As at 1 September 2013, there were 69 States parties to the Optional Protocol, with the corresponding increases in workload.

53. Under its mandate, in addition to its three weeks of meetings in Geneva, the Subcommittee conducts different types of field visits, including regular visits, visits to provide advice on national preventive mechanisms and follow-up visits. The number of visits has increased from three in 2011 to six in 2013 and eight visits are projected in both 2014 and 2015 owing to increased ratifications of the Optional Protocol, of which four will be regular visits under articles 11 (a) and 13.1 of the Optional Protocol; three will be visits under article 11 (b) to provide advice on national preventive mechanisms and one will be a follow-up visit under article 13.4.

54. The staffing support for the Subcommittee requires on average 39 weeks of Professional staff time for the three annual sessions or 13 weeks per session/week, including the preparation of the background documents, the servicing of the meetings and the post-session work; 26 weeks per regular visit (under articles 11 (a) and 13.1 of the Optional Protocol), including preparatory work, in-country support and report drafting; 23 weeks per advisory visit (under article 11 (b) of the Optional Protocol), including preparatory work, in-country support and report drafting (one report to the State and one to the national preventive mechanism); 5 weeks per follow-up visit (under article 13.4 of the Optional Protocol), including preparatory work, in-country support and report drafting. In order to fully support the work of the Subcommittee, a total of 226 weeks of Professional staff are required per year. Given the current staffing, the increasing number of ratifications, which call for more field visits, and the increased membership of the Subcommittee, two additional Professional staff (1 P-3, 1 P-2, \$324,400 per year) would be required in the short term to allocate the appropriate secretariat support to the Subcommittee.

55. With respect to the field visits, which constitute the bulk of the work of the Subcommittee, the supporting staff conduct research on the countries to be visited; liaise with the State authorities concerned, United Nations entities and other stakeholders in preparation of the visit; arrange the logistics for the visits; and provide assistance to the experts in the conduct of the visits, the drafting of the visit reports and follow-up with State authorities and other stakeholders on the conclusions of the visits. In addition to the field-oriented work, the staff supporting the Subcommittee provide technical and substantive assistance prior to and during its three annual sessions in Geneva and the follow-up to those sessions. The secretariat also drafts letters and undertakes follow-up to the Subcommittee's decisions taken during the sessions. The staff further provide substantive and technical assistance to the Subcommittee in its interaction with the national preventive mechanisms. To this end, the staff draft and review documentation on the establishment and operation of national preventive mechanisms, and consult with relevant United Nations partners, States parties and civil society actors on the evaluation of the effectiveness of the mechanisms and their needs for technical assistance. In addition, the staff provide technical and substantive support to enable the cooperation between SPT and relevant international, regional and national bodies for the prevention of torture and ill-treatment. This activity entails drafting correspondence, organizing joint meetings during or outside the Subcommittee sessions and facilitating field visits and/or joint initiatives.

#### IV. Measures proposed in the context of the intergovernmental process with cost-saving effect

56. In the course of the intergovernmental process on treaty body strengthening, several proposals have been formulated which would increase the efficiency of the treaty body system and would also have the effect of saving costs in a number of areas. Such proposals include the introduction of page limits for the annual reports from treaty bodies; page limits on State party reports; page limits on treaty body documentation; languages for issuing documentation; summary records in one language only; and modifications to the entitlements for the travel of experts. These savings could offset additional costs incurred in strengthening the treaty body system.

##### A. Page limits on State party documentation

57. Documentation submitted by States parties to the treaty bodies (common core documents, initial reports, periodic reports, replies to lists of issues prior to reporting and replies to the list of issues) constitutes the bulk of treaty body documentation. With the number of documents submitted to the treaty bodies remaining stable and the cost of the processing of one page in the six official United Nations languages being \$1,225, or \$245 for one language, the potential one-year savings derived from the establishment of a page limit could be very significant.

58. No savings are to be expected from the establishment of a page limit for common core documents, since the average length of the 21 such documents submitted in 2012 was 35 pages, using the page count of the final English version as formatted, edited and translated (if the original document is in another language). Annexes to the common core document are not taken into account, as they are currently not translated.

59. The potential savings on initial and periodic reports submitted by State parties to treaty bodies would be based on the average number of reports submitted annually to each treaty body. The average number of initial and periodic reports submitted to each Committee in 2011 and 2012 is included in table 12 below.

Table 12  
Number of State party reports submitted, 2011-2012

Treaty body	2011			2012			Total biennium, 2011-2012	Average per year, 2011-2012
	Initial reports	Periodic reports	Total	Initial reports	Periodic reports	Total		
CERD	–	15	15	1	23	24	39	19.5
HRCtee	2	9	11	8	19	27	38	19
CESCR	–	16	16	5	8	13	29	14.5
CEDAW	3	26	29	2	18	20	49	24.5
CAT	1	12	13	4	14	18	31	15.5
CRC	18	14	32	19	25	44	76	38
CMW	6	–	6	2	–	2	8	4
CRPD	18	–	18	11	–	11	29	14.5
CED	–	–	–	5	–	5	5	2.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>152</b>

60. As a result of the proposed page limits for initial and periodic reports, it is expected that the documentation which would be required each year will be reduced, from the 2011-2012 average of 76 pages for initial reports and 103 pages for periodic reports to an estimated 60 and 40 pages, respectively, per State report. The average length of initial and periodic reports per treaty body is contained in table 13 below, as well as indicative potential savings, based on the existing practice of translation into the official working languages of each Committee.

Table 13  
Potential savings from page limits on State party reports

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>Initial report (average number of pages)</i>	<i>Number of pages exceeding the 60-page limit</i>	<i>Indicative potential savings per initial report (United States dollars)<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>Potential savings for biennium on initial reports (based on 2011-2012 averages) (United States dollars)<sup>b</sup></i>	<i>Periodic report (average number of pages)</i>	<i>Number of pages exceeding the 40-page limit</i>	<i>Indicative potential savings per periodic report (United States dollars)<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>Potential savings for biennium on periodic reports (based on 2011-2012 averages) (United States dollars)<sup>b</sup></i>
CERD	87	27	23 200	23 200	80	40	34 300	1 303 400
HRCtee	138	78	86 000	860 000	96	56	61 700	1 728 700
CESCR	102	42	36 000	180 100	145	105	90 000	2 160 900
CEDAW	49	—	—	—	94	54	66 200	2 910 600
CAT	48	—	—	—	85	45	55 100	1 433 300
CRC	46	—	—	—	116	76	46 600	1 815 500
CMW	69	9	7 700	61 700	—	—	—	—
SPT	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
CRPD	89	29	35 500	1 030 200	—	—	—	—
CED	35	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total potential savings				2 155 200	11 352 400			

<sup>a</sup> Potential savings calculated at the per-page rate of \$245 x the average number of pages above the page limit x the number of working languages (assuming translation from any official language).

<sup>b</sup> Potential biennium savings calculated on the basis of the biennium totals of initial reports indicated in table 12.

61. On the basis of the foregoing, the introduction of page limits to States parties documentation, maintaining the current working languages, could result in savings of approximately \$13,507,600 for a biennium, or \$6,753,800 per year. These savings would also have an impact on the additional costs associated with the expansion of meeting time or use of dual chambers for meetings.

62. It should be noted, however, that any possibility granted to State parties to opt out of the page limits for an individual Committee would have a direct impact on the potential savings, decreasing the amount that may be achieved. On the contrary, a reduction in the number of languages in which the documentation is to be translated would increase the amount of potential savings.

## B. Page limits on treaty body documentation

63. At present, all treaty body documentation is issued in line with the internal United Nations guidelines on word limits, with the exception of the annual reports of treaty bodies. By limiting the length of the annual reports to the approved limit



(10,700 words, or 32 pages at 330 words per page in accordance with document [A/C.5/45/1](#), read in conjunction with General Assembly resolution [45/248 A](#)), which would equally preclude the reproduction of already published documents, considerable savings could be achieved. Annual reports of the treaty bodies are currently translated into the six official languages of the United Nations. As the cost of the processing of one page in the six official languages amounts to \$1,225, the potential savings for one year could reach \$1,909,900 (see table 14 below).

Table 14

**Potential savings from page limits on treaty body documentation**

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>Latest annual report (number of pages)</i>	<i>Biennial report (number of pages)</i>	<i>Number of pages exceeding the limit</i>	<i>Indicative savings from page limit on annual reports (United States dollars)</i>
CERD	117	–	85	104 100
HRCtee	743 (257 + 486)	–	711	871 000
CESCR	127	–	95	116 400
CEDAW	104	–	72	88 200
CAT	566	–	534	654 200
CRC	–	20	–	–
CMW	29	–	–	–
SPT	23	–	–	–
CRPD	–	85	53	65 000
CED	41	–	9	11 000
<b>Total potential savings</b>				<b>1 909 900</b>

64. Any savings derived from the limitation of treaty body documentation would also have an impact on the additional costs associated with an expansion of meeting time or use of dual chambers for meetings. In addition, a reduction in the number of languages in which the documentation is to be translated would increase the amount of potential savings.

### C. Languages of translation of treaty body documentation

65. The six official languages of the United Nations are Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish. The annual reports of all treaty bodies are issued in all six official languages, whereas their working documents are issued in the official working languages adopted by the Committee. The cost of producing one page in all six languages is \$1,225, which includes translation from the original language into five languages and printing/distribution in six languages. There is no difference between the languages in the cost of translation, printing, and distribution. Therefore each reduction of a language would save \$245 per page.

66. As a rule, common core documents, concluding observations, decisions and views on individual communications, general comments, annual reports, visit reports and rules of procedure are drafted in one official language and translated into the five other official languages. The documentation produced for and by treaty bodies also includes State party reports, the agenda, notes by the secretariat, general

discussion days documentation, lists of issues prior to reporting, lists of issues/themes, replies to the lists of issues, interim decisions or admissibility decisions on communications, follow-up reports, documents related to meetings of States parties (elections), inquiries, early warning/early action procedures and statements and open letters, all of which are normally translated in the working languages of each Committee. Individual communications are not translated. The list of documents to which the language limitation would apply would thus need to be clearly specified.

67. Table 15 below provides an indication of the potential savings that could arise if the decision is taken to limit the number of languages into which documentation pertaining to the State party review is translated.

**Table 15**  
**Potential savings from the reduction of languages of translation**

(United States dollars)

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>Annual number of pages in six languages</i>	<i>Annual cost for documents in six languages<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>Annual number of pages in working languages</i>	<i>Annual cost for documents in working languages<sup>b</sup></i>	<i>Total indicative annual costs in current languages<sup>c</sup></i>	<i>Total indicative annual costs when translated into two languages<sup>d</sup></i>	<i>Total indicative annual costs when translated into three languages<sup>e</sup></i>
CERD	166	203 350	1 392	1 193 640	1 396 990	763 420	1 145 130
HRCtee	1 104	1 352 400	3 681	4 058 303	5 410 703	2 344 650	3 516 975
CESCR	179	219 275	2 532	2 171 190	2 390 465	1 328 390	1 992 585
CEDAW	78	95 550	4 599	5 633 775	5 729 325	2 291 730	3 437 595
CAT	900	1 102 500	1 860	2 278 500	3 381 000	1 352 400	2 028 600
CRC	65	79 625	3 726	2 282 175	2 361 800	1 857 590	2 786 385
CMW	26	31 850	321	275 258	307 108	170 030	255 045
SPT	—	—	75	45 938	45 938	36 750	55 125
CRPD	99	121 275	1 685	1 857 713	1 978 988	874 160	1 311 240
CED	29	35 525	712	872 200	907 725	363 090	544 635
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 646</b>	<b>3 241 350</b>	<b>20 583</b>	<b>20 668 690</b>	<b>23 910 040</b>	<b>11 382 210</b>	<b>17 073 315</b>

<sup>a</sup> Costs calculated at the per-page rate for all languages of \$1,225 x the number of pages.

<sup>b</sup> Costs calculated at the per-page rate of \$245 x the number of pages x the number of working languages (assuming translation from any official language).

<sup>c</sup> Sum of costs of documents translated into all languages plus documents translated into working languages only.

<sup>d</sup> Indicative costs calculated at the per-page rate of \$245 x the number of pages x two working languages (assuming translation from any official language).

<sup>e</sup> Indicative costs calculated at the per-page rate of \$245 x the number of pages x three working languages (assuming translation from any official language).

68. On the basis of the foregoing, the introduction of limits to the languages of translation for treaty body documentation, providing for translation into only two official languages from the original, could result in savings of approximately \$12,527,800 per year, or \$25,055,600 for a biennium.

69. It should be noted, however, that any possibility granted to States parties to request the translation of the documentation into one additional official language would diminish the potential cost reduction accordingly. Furthermore, any possibility for States to opt out of the page limits for an individual Committee would have a direct impact on the potential savings that may be achieved.

## D. Allocation of working languages

70. Each Committee determines, often based on its membership, the working languages that will be utilized for its meetings, including both interpretation services and translation of certain working documents. The working languages are contained in the rules of procedure of each Committee. In some cases all six official languages are used, whereas in others only three or four languages are required, as reflected in table 16 below. The proposal in the report of the intergovernmental process to allocate a maximum of three working languages for each treaty body would generate some savings, both for interpretation and documentation. However, this proposal would not have an impact on the interactive dialogue with the State party since it may use any of the six official languages. Moreover, this measure would not prevent any State party from submitting the State report and other official documentation in any of the six official languages.

Table 16  
**Working languages of treaty bodies**

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>Working languages</i>
CERD	English, French, Russian, Spanish (4)
HRCtee	Arabic, English, French, Russian, Spanish (5)
CESCR	English, French, Russian, Spanish (4)
CEDAW	Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, Spanish (6)
CAT	Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, Spanish (6)
CRC	English, French, Spanish (3)
CMW	English, French, Russian, Spanish (4)
SPT	English, French, Spanish (3)
CRPD	Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Spanish (5)
CED	Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, Spanish (6)

71. The cost of producing one page in one language is \$245 and the cost per page is the same regardless of the language into which it is translated. Therefore, each reduced working language would save on average \$245 per page. Accordingly, the potential savings for one week of meetings for each Committee would amount to approximately \$885,400, as shown in table 17 below. Multiplied by the number of meetings per year, the potential savings under this provision could reach \$5,928,600. These savings would also have an impact on the additional costs associated with an expansion of meeting time or use of dual chambers for meetings.

72. Table 17 provides an indication of the potential savings that could arise if the decision is taken to limit the number of languages into which the working documents are translated.

Table 17  
**Potential savings from reduction of working languages for document translation**

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>(a) Current working languages</i>	<i>(b) Number of pages of documents translated weekly into working languages only</i>	<i>(c) Indicative weekly cost of translation into current working languages (United States dollars)<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>(d) Indicative weekly cost of translation into three working languages only (United States dollars)<sup>b</sup></i>	<i>Potential weekly savings from reduction to three working languages (United States dollars) (c - d)</i>
CERD	4	232	198 900	142 100	56 800
HRCtee	5	409	450 900	300 600	150 300
CESCR	4	422	361 900	310 200	51 700
CEDAW	6	511	626 000	375 600	250 400
CAT	6	310	379 800	227 900	151 900
CRC	3	414	253 600	—	—
CMW	4	107	91 800	78 600	13 200
SPT	3	25	15 300	—	—
CRPD	5	337	371 500	247 700	123 800
CED	6	178	218 100	130 800	87 300
<b>Total</b>			<b>2 967 600</b>	<b>1 813 500</b>	<b>885 400</b>

<sup>a</sup> Costs calculated at the per-page rate of \$245 x the number of pages x the number of working languages (assuming translation from any official language).

<sup>b</sup> Costs calculated at the per-page rate of \$245 x the number of pages x three working languages (assuming translation from any official language).

73. With regard to interpretation, the cost per language amounts to \$16,900 per week for Arabic and Chinese and \$12,700 per week for the other languages. If the Committees' entitlement to interpretation in all official languages were to be reduced, a cost saving of at least \$12,700 per language could be applied to the basic cost of one week of meeting time. Table 18 below includes data on the interpretation services provided to treaty bodies.

Table 18  
Potential savings from reduction of working languages for interpretation

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>(a) Current number of working languages</i>	<i>(b) Annual meeting time entitlement<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>(c) Indicative weekly cost for interpretation into all current working languages (United States dollars)</i>	<i>(d) Indicative annual cost of interpretation into all current working languages (United States dollars) (b x c)</i>	<i>(e) Indicative annual cost of interpretation into three working languages only (United States dollars)<sup>b</sup></i>	<i>Potential savings from reduction to three working languages (United States dollars) (d - e)</i>
CERD	4	6	50 600	303 500	252 900	50 600
HRCtee	5	9 (+3)	67 400	809 300	505 800	303 500
CESCR	4	6 (+2)	50 600	404 600	337 200	67 400
CEDAW	6	9 (+5)	84 300	1 011 600	505 800	505 800
CAT	6	6	84 300	505 800	252 900	252 900
CRC	3	9 (+3)	37 900	455 200	455 200	–
CMW	4	3	50 600	151 700	126 500	25 200
SPT	3	3	37 900	113 800	113 800	–
CRPD	5	3	71 700	215 000	126 500	88 500
CED	6	4	84 300	337 200	168 600	168 600
<b>Total</b>			<b>619 600</b>	<b>4 307 700</b>	<b>2 845 200</b>	<b>1 462 500</b>

<sup>a</sup> Excludes ad hoc meeting time, but includes pre-sessional and other working group meetings.

<sup>b</sup> Indicative costs for translation into three languages calculated at half the weekly cost for all six languages (\$84,300÷2=\$42,150) x the number of annual meeting weeks.

74. On the basis of the foregoing, the reduction of the working languages employed by the treaty bodies for both interpretation and documentation, providing for a maximum of three official languages, could result in savings of approximately \$1,462,500 per year, or \$2,925,000 for a biennium. Such savings would also have an impact on the additional costs associated with an expansion of meeting time or use of dual chambers for meetings.

75. It should be noted that any possibility for treaty bodies to add working languages on an individual basis would diminish the potential cost reductions accordingly.

## E. Summary records

76. Summary records are the official records of meetings compiled by précis writers who are dispatched by conference management. Summary records are not verbatim records; rather, they are a condensed version of meeting proceedings. A summary record is generally drafted for every half-day meeting, that is, 10 summary records per week. All treaty bodies are entitled to the translation of summary records in all the official languages of the United Nations. The standard cost of issuing summary records in one official language is \$3,675 per record. Over recent years, a significant backlog has occurred in the translation of summary records from 2012 and earlier, as shown in table 19 below.

Table 19  
**Summary records of treaty bodies: backlog and cost of completing translation**  
 (United States dollars)

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>Backlog of summary records (in pages)</i>	<i>Indicative cost of completing summary record translation<sup>a</sup></i>
CERD	565	138 425
HRCtee	319	78 155
CESCR	176	43 120
CEDAW	–	–
CAT	201	49 245
CRC	853	208 985
CMW	14	3 430
SPT	339	83 055
CRPD	53	12 985
CED	–	–
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 520</b>	<b>617 400</b>

<sup>a</sup> Indicative costs calculated at the per-page rate of \$245 x the number of pages in backlog.  
 Pending translations are for one outstanding language only.

77. The proposed decision not to translate the backlog of summary records would generate a one-time savings of \$617,400 considering there are currently 2,520 pages of summary records pending translation. Going forward, a decision to authorize the issuance of summary records in one language only, with no translation, would generate annual savings of \$7,791,000, as shown in table 20 below. Similarly, such a decision would reduce the basic weekly cost of additional meeting time for each Committee.

Table 20  
**Potential savings from non-translation of summary records**  
 (United States dollars)

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>Working languages</i>	<i>Total annual meeting weeks<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>Total summary records issued</i>	<i>Translation costs per summary record<sup>b</sup></i>	<i>Total potential savings from non-translation of summary records</i>
CERD	4	6	60	11 025	661 500
HRCtee	5	9	90	14 700	1 323 000
CESCR	4	6	60	11 025	661 500
CEDAW	6	9	90	18 375	1 653 750
CAT	6	6	60	18 375	1 102 500
CRC	3	9	90	7 350	661 500
CMW	4	3	30	11 025	330 750
SPT	3	3	30	7 350	220 500
CRPD	5	3	50	14 700	441 000
CED	6	4	40	18 375	735 000
<b>Total</b>					<b>7 791 000</b>

<sup>a</sup> Excludes pre-sessional and working group meetings as well as meetings approved on an ad hoc basis.

<sup>b</sup> Assumes that summary records are issued in one of the working languages and translated into the others; costs are calculated at the standard rate of \$3,675 per record per language x the remaining working languages.

78. It should be noted, however, that any possibility to request the translation of the summary record in another official language would diminish the potential savings for each language added.

## F. Travel of experts

79. The proposal to reduce the travel entitlement for treaty body members so as to replicate the entitlements granted to United Nations staff members would generate savings in terms of reduced airfares for meetings in Geneva or New York and, potentially, some field visits, where relevant.

80. The entitlements for official travel undertaken by members of treaty bodies are outlined in Secretary-General's bulletin [ST/SGB/107/Rev.6](#), which provides for all members of organs and subsidiary organs of the United Nations to travel in the class immediately below first class, regardless of the duration of the journey, and to receive daily subsistence allowance at 140 per cent of the applicable rate for the destination. The standard of accommodation for staff members of the United Nations below the level of Assistant Secretary-General undertaking official travel is economy class for all direct flights under 9 hours or 11 hours for a multi-leg journey. No United Nations staff member at any level receives more than the applicable rate of daily subsistence allowance for the destination. Table 21 below provides an indication of the total potential savings for travel to the annual meeting sessions, on the basis of the current membership and meeting time entitlements of the treaty bodies.

Table 21  
Travel of treaty body members

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>Number of sessions per year</i>	<i>Number of members</i>	<i>Current daily subsistence allowance (at 140 per cent, United States dollars)</i>	<i>Number of members affected by reduced entitlement</i>	<i>Estimated cost of business class travel per year (United States dollars)</i>	<i>Estimated cost of economy class travel per year (United States dollars)</i>	<i>Potential savings from reduced entitlement (United States dollars)</i>
CERD	2	18	459 400	11	118 300	85 700	32 600
HRCtee	3	18	718 600	12	127 900	103 100	24 800
CESCR	2	18	479 100	10	113 800	89 500	24 300
CEDAW	3	23	901 300	14	219 100	172 800	46 300
CAT	2	10	332 900	8	54 700	32 400	22 300
CRC	3	18	718 600	11	149 800	109 300	40 500
CMW	2	14	170 500	10	97 400	63 500	33 900
SPT	3	25	269 700	15	214 600	171 000	43 600
CRPD <sup>a</sup>	2	18	374 200	–	228 600	228 600	–
CED	2	10	162 400	6	64 200	51 300	12 900
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>4 586 700</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>1 388 400</b>	<b>1 107 200</b>	<b>281 200</b>

<sup>a</sup> Includes the costs for travel of assistants to CRPD members with disabilities; owing to the demands of reasonable accommodation for their disabilities, it is assumed that exceptions would apply to their travel, resulting in limited or no potential savings for the Committee.

81. Should a decision be approved to bring the entitlement to business class travel of treaty body members in line with United Nations staff members, savings of \$281,200 per year could be achieved. It must be noted, however, that this depends upon the locations of the actual membership of the Committees and the destinations for their travel.

## V. Conclusion

82. The many proposals contained in the report of the co-facilitators, individually or collectively, could have a serious impact on the functioning of the treaty body system as it continues to grow and mature. Some proposals will require initial investments and modest ongoing costs, while others will necessitate a sustained allocation of resources. While some of the proposed measures would stand alone in achieving potential savings, many of the cost-saving proposals are intrinsically interlinked, with repercussions across the spectrum of cost factors in the work of the treaty body system, though they are substantially weakened by open “opt-out” clauses. In this regard, the many interacting variables preclude a simple comprehensive summary of total potential savings, as the individual measures presented in the present report cannot be merely added together. It is, however, possible to determine the impact of the application of all savings measures on the indicative weekly costs of the individual treaty bodies, which can be contrasted with the present weekly costs to provide a sense of the magnitude of potential combined savings.



83. Tables 22 and 23 below show the indicative costs of one week of meetings for each treaty body (which would equally apply to the weekly costs of dual chambers) and a comparison of the two totals, with an estimate of the resulting weekly savings per treaty body.

Table 22

**Per-week indicative cost of treaty body meetings, with all proposed savings measures applied**

(United States dollars)

Treaty body <sup>a</sup>	Indicative basic cost per week with all relevant savings measures applied <sup>b</sup>						Total indicative cost per Committee for one additional week (at 2.5 reports per week)
	Meeting services		Documentation	Daily subsistence allowance for members	OHCHR staff	UNIS staff	
	Interpretation	Summary records	Three working languages only				
CERD	47 800	25 600	104 100	73 100	62 500	9 700	322 800
HRCtee	47 800	25 600	149 200	73 100	62 500	9 700	367 900
CESCR	47 800	25 600	148 200	73 100	62 500	9 700	366 900
CEDAW	47 800	25 600	255 500	93 400	62 500	9 700	494 500
CAT	47 800	25 600	162 900	40 600	62 500	9 700	349 100
CRC	47 800	25 600	160 300	73 100	62 500	9 700	379 000
CMW	47 800	25 600	52 400	56 800	62 500	9 700	254 800
CRPD	47 800	25 600	132 900	125 200	62 500	9 700	403 700
CED	47 800	25 600	121 100	40 600	62 500	9 700	307 300

<sup>a</sup> Does not include SPT, which does not review State party reports, for which the only potential savings, given its current working languages, would be in respect of non-translation of summary records.

<sup>b</sup> The indicative cost per week does not include annual reports, common core documents or session reports. Savings measures include establishment of page limits for State party reports, reduction of interpretation to three languages, reduction of translation of documentation to two additional languages and the non-translation of summary records.

Table 23  
**Indicative potential annual savings for treaty body meetings**  
 (United States dollars)

<i>Treaty body</i>	<i>(a) Indicative current cost per week</i>	<i>(b) Indicative cost per week with all savings measures applied</i>	<i>(c) Net potential savings per week per treaty body (a - b)</i>	<i>(d) Annual current meeting time entitlement (weeks)</i>	<i>Total potential annual savings (c x d)</i>
CERD	543 600	322 800	220 800	6	1 324 800
HRCtee	844 900	367 900	477 000	9	4 293 000
CESCR	708 300	366 900	341 400	6	2 048 400
CEDAW	1 090 800	494 500	596 300	9	5 366 700
CAT	791 800	349 100	442 700	6	2 656 200
CRC	582 000	379 000	203 000	9	1 827 000
CMW	420 800	254 800	166 000	3	498 000
CRPD	821 900	403 700	418 200	3	1 254 600
CED	630 100	307 300	322 800	4	1 291 200
<b>Total</b>	<b>6 434 200</b>	<b>3 246 000</b>	<b>3 188 200</b>		<b>20 559 900</b>

84. The treaty body system faces the triple challenge of a significant backlog, chronic underresourcing and late reporting on the part of a significant number of States or non-reporting in the case of some. As reporting levels increase, this situation will worsen considerably. All these challenges require comprehensive and sustainable measures both in terms of increasing efficiencies as well as empowering the treaty bodies to discharge their responsibilities fully. Moreover, the built-in evolving nature of the system, as a result of continuing increases in ratification as well as increases in individual communications, will require a periodic review of the resourcing of the treaty body system in future, to ensure that the capacity of the system matches its workload and the treaty bodies are enabled to effectively implement their legal mandates.