

## **Template for Study on the Impact of the United Nations Human Rights Treaties on the Domestic Level by Heyns and Viljoen**

31 May 2018

*Thank you again for having agreed to serve as a country correspondent for the above-mentioned study. You are expected to write a chapter on your country of no longer than 12 000 words, footnotes included. In doing so, please carefully follow the structure outlined in the template below.*

*You are not expected to do any original research covering the period before 30 June 1999 – in respect of that period you can consult and use the information covered in the book **Heyns and Viljoen The impact of the United Nations human rights treaty system on the domestic level (2001)** (a copy of the relevant chapter has been made available to you). You are expected to do original research covering the following 20 years, up to 30 June 2019. This document gives details on how that research should be done, and how the information should be structured.*

*We highly recommend that, if you wish to get a bird's eye view of the UN human treaty system, you should start by reading one of the introductory sources listed on the website of the Institute for International and Comparative Law in Africa, University of Pretoria:*

<http://www.icla.up.ac.za/research/impact-of-the-un-human-rights-treaties-on-domestic-level>.

*The approach of each chapter should be largely narrative – someone must be able to sit down and read what you present “like a story.” The reason why we are asking people to follow the template closely is to allow ourselves and others to compare the different chapters with ease.*

*In light of the feedback received from you, we pushed back the deadlines so that a draft chapter must be ready on **31 July 2019**, and the final chapter on **30 November 2019**.*

*This document sets out, first in summarized and then in detailed format, what is expected. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you are unsure or have questions about anything.*

## **SUMMARISED CONTENTS OF COUNTRY CHAPTERS**

*The chapter must have the structure and headings set out in the 'box' below:*

- 1 Introduction to human rights in the country**
- 2 Relationship of the country with the international human rights system in general**
- 3 Table of formal engagement of the country with the UN human rights system (we will give you a draft)**
- 4 Role of UN human rights treaties in the country in general**

*(These first four introductory sections should provide a background to the UN human rights treaty system as a whole in your country, and should make up approximately 20% of your chapter.)*

### **5 The impact of the different UN human rights treaties on the domestic level**

*(Part 5 consists of nine separate sections (in essay form), each of which deals with the impact of one of the nine human rights treaties in your country. All of these sections together should make out approximately 75% of the chapter. Please use the name of each one of the nine treaties as the main heading, and in each case use sub-headings (a) to (i), as set out below.)*

#### **5.1 International Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination ICERD 1965, monitored by CERD Cttee**

- (a) Formal acceptance**
- (b) Incorporation and reliance by organs of state**
- (c) Level of awareness**
- (d) Use by non-governmental actors**
- (e) State reporting and its impact**
- (f) Individual communications (if any) and their impact**
- (g) Other measures (if any)**

**(h) Treaty body membership**

**(i) Brief conclusion (in respect of this particular treaty)**

**5.2 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights ICCPR 1966, monitored by HRCttee**

**(a) Formal acceptance**

**(b) Incorporation and reliance by organs of state**

**(c) Level of awareness**

**(d) Use by non-governmental actors**

**(e) State reporting and its impact**

**(f) Individual communications (if any) and their impact**

**(g) Other measures (if any)**

**(h) Treaty body membership**

**(i) Brief conclusion (in respect of particular treaty)**

**5.3 ETC. . . .**

**6 Conclusion**

*(This overall conclusion, which covers the chapter as a whole, should make up approximately 5% of the chapter.)*

## **DETAILED CONTENTS OF COUNTRY CHAPTERS**

***The following four introductory sections should comprise around 20% of the chapter.***

*Here we want to give readers background information on the human rights treaty system as a whole. The focus is on the big picture, not the detail. Footnotes should provide the reader with references to specific information / data / decisions; and additional sources for further reading should be included. The emphasis is on the current practice – if it has changed over time, please describe briefly how it was earlier.*

### **1 Introduction to human rights in the country**

*Here you should write a short narrative overview to provide the reader with a primer on the human rights landscape in the country, e.g., When was the country formed; Was it a colony (and if so comment on the impact of colonialism on human rights in the country); When were human rights introduced into the Constitution; What rights are protected; What are the main domestic institutions responsible for the promotion and protection of human rights; What are the milestones in human rights, e.g., courts holding government accountable; What are the main human rights issues?*

### **2 Relationship of the country with the international human rights system in general**

*Provide a short overview, in a few paragraphs and in narrative form, of the extent to which the country is part of the international human rights system – on the UN and regional levels, and the ICC. Highlight noticeable features (e.g., “the ICC has opened investigations in respect of events in the State.”) Highlight the relative weight of the regional human rights system in regions with such systems (e.g., “The main international component of human rights in the country is provided by the European Convention on Human Rights.”)*

*If there have been important comments by officials on this relationship (e.g., the prime minister has said the government is tired of being lectured by the UN; Amnesty International has said the country systematically ignores human rights, etc.); or if there have been threats to leave parts of the international human rights system they should be included here.*

*Also explain the following: What is the status of international human rights law (treaties; customary international law) under domestic law?*

*If sources for further reading are available, they should be referenced in footnotes.*

### **3 Table of formal engagement of the country with the UN human rights system**

*We will provide you with the first draft of this table, and ask you to confirm whether it is accurate. There is no need to work on it now. The aim with the table is to give the reader a visual overview on one page of the extent to which the country has engaged, over time, with key elements of the UN treaty system (ratification, presentation of reports, etc.)*

### **4 Role of human rights treaties in the country in general**

*In the next part – part 5 – we are going to expect you to give detailed information in respect of a number of features of each treaty viewed on its own, separate from the other treaties. For example, when did the State adhere to the treaty in question? We are however worried that, if the readers read only that, they will not get a good understanding of how the system works as a whole. For example, they may not be able to see that most of the treaties were ratified around the same time, when a significant political development took place. Thus, here – in part 4 – we want you to make those links, and to provide the reader with a comprehensive, bird’s eye view in respect of the issues that you will deal with in part 5. We want the reader to get a sense of the role and impact of the treaty system in your country.*

*The purpose of part 4 is to prepare the reader for the detailed, separate discussion of each treaty in part 5. In order to be able to do this, you should write part 5 first, and then part 4.*

*Use terms such as “**all / most / none** of the treaties have been incorporated into domestic law”; “**as a general trend** . . . there is not a high level of awareness of the treaties, except in respect of . . .”; “NGOs **focus mostly on CRC**”; or “**with the exception of** . . . , all the other state reports were submitted late.” Light cross references may be made in this discussion to points dealt with in more detail below, where each of the separate treaties is discussed.*

*Structure your narrative in part 4 broadly using the sequence in which each of the issues is discussed in part 5 below.*

#### **Formal acceptance (approx. one page)**

Be guided by the following questions: Was there a significant time period during which the country joined *most of the treaties*? (If so, why then, and not earlier / later? e.g., one answer can be that it did so after the country became a democracy). Why did it join (part of) the system (and why not the other treaties)? Does the state *generally* adopt optional procedures, such as those allowing

individual communications, urgent actions, inquiry procedures, country visits and actions against reprisals?

***Incorporation and reliance by organs of state (approx. one page)***

Be guided by the following questions: Indicate, in general, to what extent human rights treaties have been incorporated into domestic law (constitution / legislation) and have been used throughout the legal system? (e.g., “While all nine main treaties have been ratified, almost none of them have ever been used by the legislature or the courts. The main exceptions are ...”). Also, are human rights action plans or similar policy documents (if any) grounded in human rights treaties and / or do they make reference to treaty bodies?

***Level of awareness (cross-cutting and holistic analysis across 9 treaties below; approx. two paragraphs)***

What is the level of awareness of the treaties and the treaty system – among government, members of parliament, NGOs, the media, the judiciary and legal practitioners, academics (publications, university curricula), the public?

***Use by non-governmental actors (approx. two paragraphs)***

***State reporting (approx. one and a half page)***

Has the state generally met its reporting obligations (please indicate the total number of reports submitted, and how many months on average the state has been late in submitting reports)? How, if in any way, has this changed over time (e.g., has the situation improved recently)? How are reports prepared? (Who are involved and consulted; Are there coordinating or inter-ministerial committees; Are NGOs involved? Are members of parliament involved? Are NHRIs involved? Has a National Mechanism for Reporting and Follow-up (NMRF) been established and, if so, how has the NMRF affected the preparation of reports?) How thorough and accurate is the state’s reporting? Is it self-critical and frank? What is the level (e.g., ministerial, directorate, a combination) of delegations sent to Geneva to present reports? Are concluding observations published (e.g., how are they published; are they posted on any website; is there a media strategy; are they translated into local languages?) and implemented? How many dialogues have the State had with treaty bodies in the context of presenting its State reports? (*Break down the information for each individual treaty, and then provide the total*)

***Individual communications (if any) (cross-cutting and holistic analysis across 9 treaties below; approx. two to three paragraphs)***

How many communications in total have been decided by the committee? (give the information for each individual treaty, and then provide the total); How does the state generally respond to views? Are they as a rule implemented? Which institution is in charge of implementation? What is the general level of engagement with the outcome of the follow-up procedures and inquiries, where applicable? If there are

outstanding examples of the impact of the treaty system (e.g., the views of a treaty body on a specific individual communication has led to significant reform), this should be highlighted here. Again the detail with regard to each individual treaty will be dealt with below. Also, are there any other follow-up activities related to concluding observations and views that are organized with / by UN field presences, NHRIs, NGOs, etc.?

***Other measures (early warning measures and urgent procedures, inquiries, visits by SPT) (if any) (approx. two paragraphs)***

***Treaty body membership (approx. one paragraph)***

***Additional (approx. one or two paragraphs):***

Provide any information available on the extent to which the human rights provisions of the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights have had an impact in the legal system of the country (e.g., citation in the constitution, in legislation, or by courts).

## ***5 The impact of the different UN human rights treaties on the domestic level***

*In this section, which should be roughly 75% of your chapter, please cover the following nine main human rights treaties and their protocols one by one. Cover the first treaty completely, then move on to the second, then the third, etc. If a particular treaty is not adhered to by the State in question, state the reason(s), and indicate whether the treaty has nevertheless had an impact.*

### **5.1 International Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, ICERD, 1965, monitored by CERD Cttee**

[Reminder: Individual communications are allowed if a declaration pursuant to art 14 has been made.]

### **5.2 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, ICCPR, 1966, monitored by HRCttee**

[Reminder: Individual communications are allowed if OP1 has been adhered to. OP2 provides for the abolition of the death penalty.]

### **5.3 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights ICESCR 1966, monitored by CESCR Cttee**

[Reminder: Individual communications are allowed if ICESCR-OP has been adhered to.

Inquiries may be undertaken, unless the country opted out under art 11 of ICESCR-OP.]

### **5.4 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, CEDAW, 1979, monitored by CEDAW Cttee**

[Reminder: Individual communications are allowed if CEDAW-OP has been adhered to.

Inquiries may be undertaken, unless the country opted out under art 8 of CEDAW-OP.]

### **5.5 Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, CAT, 1984, monitored by CAT Cttee**

[Reminder: Individual communications are allowed if a declaration pursuant to art 22 has been made.

Inquiries may be undertaken, unless the country opted out under art 20.]

OPCAT created the Sub-Committee Against Torture (SPT), which is a treaty body in its own right.

The SPT may visit any place under the jurisdiction of a State Party where persons may be being deprived of their liberty (e.g., police stations, prisons, detention centers and mental health and social care institutions.)

[<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/OPCAT/Pages/Brief.aspx>]

### **5.6 Convention on the Rights of the Child, CRC 1989, monitored by CRC Cttee**

[Reminder: Individual communications are allowed if OP-IC has been adhered to.

Inquiries may be undertaken, unless the country opted out under art 13 of CRC-OP-IC.

OP-AC

OP-SC]



### **5.7 International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families, ICMW, 1990, monitored by CMW Cttee**

[Reminder: Individual communications will be allowed if a declaration pursuant to art 77 has been made; however, the individual complaints procedure under ICMW is not yet in force.]

### **5.8 International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, CPED, 2006, monitored by CED Cttee**

[Reminder: Individual communications are allowed if a declaration pursuant to art 31 has been made.

Reminder: Inquiries may be undertaken under art 33 of CED (no opt-out possibility).]

### **5.9 Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities CRPD 2006, monitored by CRPD Cttee**

[Reminder: Individual communications are allowed if CRPD-OP has been adhered to.

Reminder: Inquiries may be undertaken, unless the country opted out under art 6 CRPD-OP.]

## Questions to be addressed on each of the treaties listed above:

*Please write an essay on each of the above-mentioned treaties covering the list of issues below. Please use the following headings (“a” to “i” below) as the sub-headings under the name of each treaty. The same structure is to be followed for each individual essay covering each of the different treaties.*

### **a Formal acceptance** [approx. half a page]:

- When was the treaty adhered to? Why was this particular treaty adhered to at that time (or never adhered to)?
- Were reservations entered: if any, context / reasons; if withdrawal of reservations, context / reasons?
- Were optional mechanisms (individual complaints; inquiries) accepted? Why was this optional mechanism adhered to at that time (or never adhered to)?
- Did the state opt out of the inquiry procedure by making a declaration that they do not recognize the competence of the Committee in question to undertake inquiries (in terms of art 28 CAT; art 10 of CEDAW-OP; art 8 of CRPD-OP; art 13(7) of OP-IC to CRC; art 11(8) of ICESCR-OP)? If so, when, and why?

### **b Incorporation and reliance by organs of state** [approx. one page]:

- Has the treaty (or treaty provisions) been incorporated into domestic law (constitution / legislation)? If so, please give details. Was the treaty cited directly or was the reliance indirect? Where applicable, please provide references (e.g., in Parliamentary debates, legislation itself)
- Has a compatibility study / program of domestic legal reform been embarked upon to give effect to the treaty?
- Policies based on / related to treaty (explicit reference / indirect reliance)?
- Institutional reform related to treaty provisions / requirements, e.g. new national mechanism established?
- Resource allocation: additional allocation / budgetary re-allocation / adjustment in light of treaty requirements?

- Has the treaty (and treaty body interpretations in e.g. General Comments and jurisprudence) been relied upon by domestic courts? (also indicate whether domestic court disagreed / distinguished / followed treaty body; if relevant, compare with reliance on other international law – e.g., regional treaties, jurisprudence)

**c Level of awareness** [*approx. half a page*]:

- Level of awareness (government officials, various levels). What is the level of awareness of the treaty and the findings of the treaty body in question among government, members of parliament, NGOs, the media, the judiciary and legal practitioners, academics, and the public? Please explain the reasons for your assessment.
- Perception of treaty monitoring body (among government officials and others); legitimacy, authority
- Has the treaty or any information on the system been translated into local languages?
- Media coverage of treaty, including ratification, reports, findings of treaty bodies (evidence in media reports – structured search of main newspapers; other media)
- General training, teaching: school / tertiary curricula, especially law schools, also other: Does the international human rights system form part of the university (or school) curricula, and, if so, give a brief description.
- Do local researchers and NGOs generally cite the treaties in their work?

**d Use by non-governmental actors** [*approx. one page*]:

- Use of treaty by legal profession – attitude towards; included in professional training; extent of reliance on treaty provisions in arguments before courts
- Use of treaty by NGOs – role in campaigns (comparison of use of / reliance on domestic, regional, UN)
- Use of treaty by researchers / academics (law, non-law) – outputs

**e State reporting and its impact [approx. one page]:**

***[It is important to consult the formal follow-up procedures (see note entitled “Follow-up Procedures” at the end of this document) conducted by each individual treaty body on this issue – If the state gives reasons for decision to implement or not to implement, cite where appropriate.]***

- Extent of reporting (how often / regularly); any delay (average of delay); non-reporting (reasons for delays, non-reporting) (How often has the state reported under this treaty? How many months, on average, has the state been late in reporting under this treaty?)
- Process of reporting: lead government department / government’s “ownership” of process; collaboration / coordination; who consulted; NGOs, NHRI role; use of consultant.
- Did NHRI submit own report under this treaty? How often?
- Has a National Mechanism for Reporting and Follow-up (NMRF) been established and, if so, how has the NMRF affected the preparation of reports?
- Quality of report (How thorough is the reporting? How critical; frank; formulaic?)
- Alternative / complementary reports by civil society / NGOs (process; quality; number; comprehensive or thematic)
- Presentation of report in Geneva (level of delegation; high-level / experienced delegation?) What is the participation by civil society?
- Have there been reports of cases of reprisals against human rights defenders engaging in the reporting process?
- How many dialogues have the State had with treaty bodies in the context of presenting its State reports? Give the years.
- Concluding Observations (COBs) (which were the most pertinent issues that the COBs were directed at?); process to ensure domestic implementation; publication / dissemination (Have COBs been published? If so, how are they published? Have COBs been made easily accessible on public websites? Is there a media strategy? Are they translated into local languages?)

- Are key recommendations (or recommendations selected for follow-up) of COBs implemented?
- Extent of domestic implementation / legal reform as result of COBs (factors inhibiting / preventing a particular course of action) (e.g., parliamentary questions; draft legislation as result of COBs). Which main COBs have not been implemented, and why?
- What has the level of engagement been of the State with the outcome of the follow-up procedures (where applicable)?
- Has the State agreed to make reports by the Sub-Committee Against Torture (SPT) public?

**f Individual communications (if any) and their impact** *[length will vary depending on number of communications; but aim for not more than approx. two pages]:*

***[It is important to consult the follow-up procedures (see note entitled “Follow-up Procedures” at the end of this document) of each individual treaty body on this issue – if the state gives reasons for decision to implement or not to implement, cite where appropriate]***

- How many individual communications and inquiries, respectively, have been lodged under this treaty (where applicable)? (extent of communications submitted: if so, number and nature of decisions; decisions: outcome; if violation found, what was / is required at domestic level?)
- How did the state respond to views? Are they implemented?
- Did the state cooperate during the procedure? If interim measures were adopted, did the state implement them?
- Have there been reports of cases of reprisals against victims or their representatives involved in the submission of an individual communication or in the implementation of views?
- If decision(s): publicity / dissemination of decision(s) – medium, language, simplified version
- Process to implement: which government institutions involved; what process followed

- Status / follow-up on implementation / individual redress and broader legal reform as result of views
- Any domestic issues ripe for submission to treaty body not previously submitted (if possible to do so); if so, why?
- What has been the level of engagement of the State with the outcome of the follow-up procedures (where applicable)?

**g Other measures (if any) [approx. half a page, if applicable]:**

- Early warning measures and urgent procedures (ICERD): Ever used in respect of the country? If so, its impact; media coverage; legal or other measures adopted in response?
- Inquiries undertaken (ICESCR, CAT, CEDAW, CRC, CRPD, CPED): Ever used in respect of the country? If so, its impact; media coverage; legal or other measures resulting from inquiry?
- Visits by SPT (CAT-OP): Ever used in respect of the country? If so, its impact; media coverage; legal or other measures resulting from visit?

**h Treaty body membership [approx. one paragraph, if applicable]:**

- Is there a national process for nomination that is transparent and open to stakeholders, including civil society? Has the country had members on the treaty body? Has that had a noticeable impact on the role of the treaty on the domestic level in the country?

**i Brief conclusion in respect of particular treaty [approx. one page]:**

- Summary of impact: How did the State generally respond to views and concluding observations?
- Influence and main factors enhancing impact of particular treaty
- Variance over time
- Factors specific to this treaty body?
- Trends – getting better / improvement?

- Patterns – compared to other treaties?

## 6 (Overall) **Conclusion**

*This part, which covers the research on the country as a whole, should comprise approximately 5% of the chapter.*

- On the basis of the specific treaty analyses, a general, more overarching, concluding part, summarizing and bringing together, identifying general trends, and general conclusions; follow basically the headings above
- It is, one may say, a conclusion of conclusions – building on the mini-conclusions of the specific treaty body reports / parts
- What are the main lessons to be learned from the above about the impact of the treaty system as a whole in the country in question?
- Do they point to reforms that may be needed on the domestic or the UN level?
- In this ultimate concluding part, the following additional information should feature:
  - influence of UN Charter and Universal Declaration on the legal system.
  - How do you believe it would affect the impact of the human rights treaties if the treaty bodies met on occasion outside of Geneva, for example, in your country or region?

### **Methodology:**

Include at least the following in your research:

- **Documents** (e.g., follow-up reports of treaty bodies to COBs procedure; follow-up reports of treaty bodies to the complaints procedure]
- **Databases** (eg on OHCHR web site:  
<http://ap.ohchr.org/Documents/gmainec.aspx>;  
[http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/\\_layouts/treatybodyexternal/TBSearch.aspx?Lang=en](http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/TBSearch.aspx?Lang=en) )
- **The parliamentary record** – Hansard – scrutinize for reasons given by State why something was done or not done
- **Media** – consult at least 2 major newspapers of different political leanings

- **NGO web sites**
- **Interviews** should be conducted with the following respondents/interviewees:

High-ranking government officials who are directly responsible for / involved in the preparation of reports, representing the government as part of its delegation to sessions of the treaty bodies in Geneva, interacting with the NHRI and NGOs on treaty body-related issues (report preparation and implementation issues), and implementation of recommendations and decisions.

High-ranking staff at the NHRI who are directly responsible for / involved in preparation of reports, interacting with the government on treaty body-related issues, and implementation of recommendations and decisions.

Staff and elected representatives of the country's parliament or other legislative body who are directly involved in drafting domestic legislation in response to decisions of and recommendations by the treaty bodies

Staff at treaty body-related NGOs who are directly involved in completing complimentary reports, interacting with government and the NHRI with regard to report preparation, as well as implementation of recommendations and decisions.

Leading academics in the fields of public international law, international human rights law, political science and international relations.

Legal practitioners who have relied on treaty body decisions and recommendations in their cases in court, and, if training of legal practitioners include the UN human rights system, members of the legal profession's governing body(ies) responsible for such training.

Victims / complainants who have submitted communications to a UN treaty body.

Journalists and editors of traditional print/online/radio/television news resources who have reported on decisions and recommendations of treaty bodies.

Member of treaty bodies from the country you are studying.

For some general guidelines and strategies with regard to qualitative interviews, please see

[http://sociology.fas.harvard.edu/files/sociology/files/interview\\_strategies.pdf](http://sociology.fas.harvard.edu/files/sociology/files/interview_strategies.pdf)



### ***A note on causality:***

In a qualitative study such as this, a direct causal link between the UN human rights treaty system and legislative / legal / policy reforms on the domestic level might be difficult to establish conclusively. Nevertheless, because this study is investigating impact, it would be important that you keep the issue of causality in mind in your research and interviews. For example, to the extent that it is clear that the UN human rights treaty system was the main driver for domestic reforms (e.g., a treaty is cited in the preamble of new domestic legislation as the main point of reference) a clear case of causality can be made. On the other hand, if it appears that some driver other than the UN human rights treaties led to the domestic reforms (e.g., a court cases where a specific human right is recognized cites to the European Convention or the African Charter, and only passing reference is made to UN treaties); or that the main driver for domestic reforms were UN mechanisms other than the human rights treaties (e.g., UPR), the relatively weak evidence of causality should also be indicated. If it appears that the UN treaties play a very weak or no role at all in major human rights development in the country, this larger trend should also be noted.

### **Useful background information for country researchers on the UN human rights treaty system**

#### ***General on-line information on the treaty system:***

The following two sources provide an excellent overview of the UN human rights treaty system and might be a good starting point:

Fact sheet on the UN human rights treaty system

<http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/FactSheet30Rev1.pdf>

Handbook for Human Rights Treaty Body Members

[http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/HR\\_PUB\\_15\\_2\\_TB%20Handbook\\_EN.pdf](http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/HR_PUB_15_2_TB%20Handbook_EN.pdf)

You may also want to sign up for OHCHR's *Weekly Update: News and Events in the UN Human Rights Treaty Body System*. It is issued every Monday and covers the proceedings of the previous week. The *Weekly Update* focal point is:

Ms Elena Kountouri Tapiero

Tel: +41 22 917 96 72

E-mail: [tbs@ohchr.org](mailto:tbs@ohchr.org)

The link to this project, and some additional resources, on the website of the Institute for International and Comparative Law in Africa, University of Pretoria, is:  
<http://www.icla.up.ac.za/research/impact-of-the-un-human-rights-treaties-on-domestic-level>

### ***Follow-up Procedures:***

The follow-up procedures of the various treaty bodies is an invaluable resource in gauging impact, because one will often find explicit statements by States during those processes on whether they have implemented views of COBs.

The documents produced by the treaty bodies can be accessed at:  
<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/Pages/TreatyBodies.aspx>

Particularly useful for follow-up to COBs under the ICCPR, and thus also for the question of causality is:  
[http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/\\_layouts/TreatyBodyExternal/FollowUp.aspx?Treaty=CCPR&Lang=en](http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/TreatyBodyExternal/FollowUp.aspx?Treaty=CCPR&Lang=en)

For an enlightening discussion of the implementation by States of the decisions of the Treaty Bodies (particularly the HRCttee), please see the following article:  
Principi, KF “Implementation of Decisions under the UN Treaty Body Complaint Procedures – How Do States Comply? / A Categorized Study Based on 268 Cases of ‘Satisfactory’ Implementation under the Follow-Up Procedure, mainly regarding the UN Human Rights Committee” (2017) 37 *Human Rights Law Journal* 1.

There have been studies on impact (such as that by Kate Fox Principi). However, these studies are based upon the formal follow-up procedures. For example, Kate Fox Principi’s research indicates that the implementation rate for the combined good responses from all of the treaty bodies is approximately 23%.

*We ask that you independently research the implementation rates for adverse decisions from all the treaty bodies with respect to your country from 30 June 1999 to 30 June 2019. Specifically, we request that you point to information to indicate whether the implementation rate for the formal follow-up procedures is reliable – for example, in some cases implementation may not have occurred, while in others there may have been implementation but it was not reported.*