



**Convention on the Rights  
of Persons with Disabilities**

Distr.: General  
5 November 2014

Original: English

---

**Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities**

**Report of the Committee on the Rights of Persons  
with Disabilities on its twelfth session  
(15 September–3 October 2014)**

GE.14-19868 (E)



\* 1 4 1 9 8 6 8 \*

Please recycle A small recycling symbol consisting of three arrows forming a triangle.



## Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. States parties to the Convention and the Optional Protocol thereto .....	1	3
II. Opening of the twelfth session of the Committee .....	2–3	3
III. Membership of the Committee.....	4	3
IV. Working methods .....	5	3
V. Activities related to general comments .....	6–8	3
VI. Activities related to the Optional Protocol .....	9–12	3
VII. Other decisions.....	13	4
VIII. Future sessions .....	14	4
IX. Accessibility of the Committee's meetings .....	15	4
X. Cooperation with relevant bodies.....	16–24	4
A. Cooperation with other United Nations organs and specialized agencies.....	16–21	4
B. Cooperation with non-governmental organizations and other bodies.....	22–24	5
XI. Consideration of reports submitted in accordance with article 35 of the Convention .....	25	5
XII. Conference of States parties to the Convention.....	26	6
<b>Annexes</b>		
I. Decisions adopted by the Committee during its twelfth session .....		7
II. Guidelines on the procedure for follow-up to concluding observations.....		9
III. Summary of decisions adopted by the Committee in relation to communications submitted under the Optional Protocol .....		11
IV. Statements adopted by the Committee.....		13
V. Outcome of the meeting between the Committee and national human rights institutions and independent national monitoring mechanisms.....		16

## **I. States parties to the Convention and the Optional Protocol thereto**

1. As at 3 October 2014, the closing date of the twelfth session, there were 151 States parties to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and 85 States parties to the Optional Protocol thereto. The lists of States parties to these instruments are available on the website of the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs.

## **II. Opening of the twelfth session of the Committee**

2. The twelfth session opened in a public meeting with welcoming remarks by the Chairperson of the Committee. The opening statement of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) was delivered by the Chief of the Indigenous Peoples and Minorities Section, and is available on the Committee's website.

3. The Committee reviewed and adopted the provisional agenda and tentative programme of work for the twelfth session (CRPD/C/12/1).

## **III. Membership of the Committee**

4. The list of members of the Committee as at 3 October 2014, indicating the duration of their terms of office, is available on the Committee's website.

## **IV. Working methods**

5. The Committee discussed various issues related to its working methods and adopted several decisions, which are included in annex I to the present report.

## **V. Activities related to general comments**

6. The working group on women and girls with disabilities (art. 6) reported back to the Committee on the progress made in the preparation of the draft general comment on article 6.

7. The Committee decided to establish a working group for the preparation of a draft general comment on article 19 (independent living) and article 24 (education).

8. The Committee welcomed the proposal of the Government of New Zealand to produce an easy-to-read version of general comment No. 1 (2014) on equal recognition before the law.

## **VI. Activities related to the Optional Protocol**

9. The Committee adopted Views on communication No. 5/2011, *Jungelin v. Sweden* (CRPD/C/12/D/5/2011), and an inadmissibility decision on communication No. 10/2013, *S.C. v. Brazil* (CRPD/C/12/D/10/2013). Summaries of those decisions are available in annex III to the present report.

10. The Committee adopted the note by the Secretary-General on submissions received between the eleventh and twelfth sessions, a period during which the Committee had

received 33 submissions. As at the start date of the session, the Committee had registered 23 communications, of which 8 have been examined.

11. The Committee adopted its interim follow-up report with regard to the Views adopted in *H.M. v. Sweden* (CRPD/C/7/D/3/2011), *Nyusti and Takács v. Hungary* (CRPD/C/9/D/1/2010) and *Bujdosó et al. v. Hungary* (CRPD/C/10/D/4/2011). It considered that the measures adopted concerning communication No. 3/2011 were not satisfactory and decided to discontinue the corresponding follow-up activities. The Committee considered that additional measures remain necessary to implement the Views in relation to the latter two above-mentioned communications, with regard to which the follow-up dialogue is ongoing.

12. The Committee considered matters related to inquiry proceedings pursuant to articles 6 and 7 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention.

## **VII. Other decisions**

13. The full list of the decisions adopted by the Committee is available in annex I to the report.

## **VIII. Future sessions**

14. The thirteenth session of the Committee is scheduled to take place from 25 March to 17 April 2015 and will be followed by the third meeting of the pre-sessional working group, from 20 to 24 April 2015.

## **IX. Accessibility of the Committee's meetings**

15. Captioning was provided at all public and private meetings, while International Sign language interpretation was provided during all public meetings, in addition to national sign language interpretation during the dialogues with Belgium, Ecuador, Mexico and New Zealand.

## **X. Cooperation with relevant bodies**

### **A. Cooperation with United Nations organs and specialized agencies**

16. The Committee met with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Disaster Risk Reduction and discussed with her the road map to the World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, which will take place in Sendai, Japan, in March 2015, particularly the inclusion of persons with disabilities and their representative organizations in the preparatory process and the conference itself, and of their views in the outcome document of that conference. The Committee decided to appoint a focal point to further engage the Committee in the process.

17. The Chair and two experts of the Committee met with the Chair and three experts of the Committee on the Rights of the Child in order to identify topics of mutual interest, to explore possibilities to carry out joint activities and to further harmonize their jurisprudence. The meeting was sponsored by OHCHR and United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). As a result of the meeting, the Chair of the Committee on the Rights of

the Child addressed the plenary of the Committee and reiterated the importance of increasing the interaction between the two treaty bodies.

18. At the opening meeting of the session, representatives of the following United Nations agencies, departments and programmes made statements: OHCHR, UNICEF, the International Labour Organization (ILO), the World Intellectual Property Organization and the Implementation Support Unit of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction.

19. The Committee met with representatives of OHCHR and ILO to discuss matters related to the right to independent living. It also met with representatives of OHCHR and UNICEF to discuss matters related to the right to education.

20. The Committee met with the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General on Disability and Accessibility to discuss matters related to the coordination of the mandate of the Special Envoy with that of the Committee.

21. The Committee met with the Chief of the Meeting Management Section of the United Nations Office in Geneva and the Task Force on Accessibility for Persons with Disabilities of the Human Rights Council to discuss matters related to the accessibility of the United Nations Office in Geneva to persons with disabilities.

## **B. Cooperation with non-governmental organizations and other bodies**

22. The Committee was addressed by representatives of the Council of Europe, the International Coordination Committee on National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, the International Disability Alliance, the World Network of Users and Survivors of Psychiatry, the World Federation of the Deaf and Disability Council International.

23. The Committee met for the very first time with national human rights institutions and independent national monitoring mechanisms of the Convention in a one-day meeting to discuss ways in which monitoring activities at the international and national level can be mutually reinforced. The meeting was supported by the International Telecommunications Union, which facilitated remote participation, and it was co-organized with the International Coordinating Committee of National Human Rights Institutions and sponsored by OHCHR, the United Nations Office in Geneva and the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General on Disability and Accessibility. The main outcomes of that meeting are included in annex V to the present report.

24. The Committee and the Council of Europe co-organized an art exhibition to promote the expression in art of persons with psychosocial disabilities.

## **XI. Consideration of reports submitted in accordance with article 35 of the Convention**

25. The Committee considered the initial reports of Belgium (CRPD/C/BEL/1), Ecuador (CRPD/C/ECU/1), Denmark (CRPD/C/DNK/1), Mexico (CRPD/C/MEX/1), New Zealand (CRPD/C/NZL/1) and Republic of Korea (CRPD/C/KOR/1). The Committee adopted concluding observations on those reports, which are available from the Committee's website.

## **XII. Conference of States parties to the Convention**

26. The Chairperson reported on the participation of the Committee at the seventh session of the Conference of States Parties to the Convention.

## Annexes

### Annex I

#### Decisions adopted by the Committee during its twelfth session

1. The Committee adopted concluding observations in relation to the initial reports of the following countries: Belgium (CRPD/C/BEL/1), Ecuador (CRPD/C/ECU/1), Denmark (CRPD/C/DNK/1), Mexico (CRPD/C/MEX/1), New Zealand (CRPD/C/NZL/1) and the Republic of Korea (CRPD/C/KOR/1).
2. The Committee adopted Views on communication No. 5/2011, *Jungelin v. Sweden* (CRPD/C/12/D/5/2011), and an inadmissibility decision on communication No. 10/2013, *S.C. v. Brazil* (CRPD/C/12/D/10/2013). It also adopted the note by the Secretary-General on submissions received between the eleventh and twelfth sessions, and its interim follow-up report with regard to Views under the Optional Protocol (CRPD/C/12/3).
3. The Committee considered matters related to its inquiry procedure pursuant to articles 6 and 7 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention.
4. On the treaty body strengthening process, the Committee adopted the following decisions: (a) the Committee decided to prepare draft guidelines on the simplified reporting procedure; (b) it endorsed annex I (guidelines on the structure of the dialogue with States parties) and annex II (framework of the concluding observations) to the report of the 2014 annual meeting of Chairpersons of treaty bodies; (c) it appointed a focal point on reprisals; and (d) it decided that English, French, Spanish and, on exceptional basis, Arabic would be its working languages, a decision to be reviewed in April 2015.
5. The Committee decided that its thirteenth session would be held from 25 March to 17 April 2015 and that it would be followed by the third meeting of the pre-sessional working group, from 20 to 24 April 2015.
6. With regard to countries to be considered at its thirteenth session and country rapporteurs, the Committee decided that the following countries would be considered at its thirteenth session: Germany (Diane Mulligan), Croatia (Theresia Degener), Czech Republic (Damjan Tatic), Turkmenistan (Laszlo Lovaszy), Dominican Republic (Silvia Quan), Mongolia (Hyug Shik Kim), and Cook Islands (Diane Mulligan). It also decided to adopt lists of issues in relation to the following countries/regional integration organizations at its third pre-sessional working group: Brazil, Gabon, Kenya, Mauritius, Qatar, Ukraine and the European Union.
7. The Committee adopted a statement on disability inclusion in the third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction and beyond, and a statement on article 14 of the Convention. It also appointed a focal point to follow up on the process leading to the above-mentioned Conference.
8. The Committee decided to establish a working group on article 19 and a working group on article 24, and entrusted them with the task of preparing draft general comments on the respective articles.
9. The Committee appointed two experts to develop draft guidelines on the participation of national human rights institutions and independent national monitoring mechanisms in the proceedings of the Committee.
10. The Committee decided to hold a day of general discussion on the right to education during its thirteenth session in April 2015.

11. The Committee decided to adopt guidelines on the follow-up procedure to its concluding observations.
12. The Committee adopted the report of the twelfth session.



## Annex II

### **Guidelines on the procedure for follow-up to concluding observations**

The following guidelines supplement paragraphs 19 and 20 of the working methods of the Committee (CRPD/C/5/4).

#### **Role of the country rapporteur and the rapporteur on follow-up**

1. The rapporteur on follow-up, supported by the country rapporteur of the concerned country, should analyse all information submitted, propose an assessment to the Committee and ask for further information, if required, from the State party.

#### **Criteria for identifying recommendations for follow-up**

2. The Committee will consider the following criteria in order to identify recommendations for follow-up:

- (a) Whether the recommendation can be implemented in the short, medium or long term;
- (b) Whether the issues identified in the recommendation constitute a major obstacle to persons with disabilities for the enjoyment of their human rights and would therefore constitute a major obstacle for the implementation of the Convention as a whole;
- (c) Whether the implementation of the recommendation is feasible and measurable;
- (d) The seriousness of the issues and the feasibility for adopting implementation measures within a calendar year;
- (e) The feasibility of establishing short-term policies to overcome the selected concerns.

#### **Number of recommendations for follow-up**

3. The number of recommendations identified for follow-up should not exceed two per country.

#### **Assessment of follow-up replies**

4. The Committee can consider the replies provided by the State party to be: (a) satisfactory; (b) partially satisfactory; and (c) unsatisfactory.

##### **(a) Satisfactory replies**

In the case that the Committee considers that the reply is satisfactory, the follow-up procedure shall be discontinued and the secretariat of the Committee shall inform the Permanent Mission of the State party concerned accordingly.

##### **(b) Partially satisfactory replies**

If the Committee considers that the reply is partially satisfactory, when the State party's reply indicates that some measures have been adopted and the Committee considers that the State party could benefit from the technical advice of the Committee, the Committee may offer support to the State party under its capacity-building mandate (art. 37, para. 2, of the Convention). In the case that the State party accepts to avail itself of the Committee's

advisory role under its capacity-building mandate, the follow-up procedure shall be discontinued and the situation shall continue to be addressed under the capacity-building mandate.

(c) Unsatisfactory replies

If the Committee considers that the State party's reply is not satisfactory, that the measures taken are insufficient or that no change has taken place at all, the Committee may indicate in a formal reply that more needs to be done to achieve implementation and may invite the Permanent Mission of the State party concerned to a private meeting with the rapporteur on follow-up, to explore ways in which the country can move ahead with implementation.

A second follow-up meeting can be arranged; if after this second meeting no progress has been made, the Committee may discontinue its follow-up procedure. The Committee will inform the State party of the discontinuance of the proceedings, indicating that the follow-up replies were not satisfactory and that the issue will continue to be under scrutiny under the reporting procedure

**Reminders**

5. A reminder will be sent to any State party that has not provided follow-up information within the deadline.
6. If non-cooperation persists after a reasonable period of time, the rapporteur on follow-up may decide to contact the Permanent Mission of the country concerned.

**Public nature of the follow-up procedure**

7. States parties' replies will be posted on the Committee's web page.
8. Organizations of persons with disabilities, civil society organizations, national human rights institutions and independent monitoring mechanisms can make submissions on follow-up and their contributions shall be posted on the Committee's web page. United Nations agencies can also provide follow-up information to the Committee.

**Length of follow-up submissions**

9. States parties' as well as other stakeholders' submissions should not exceed 3,300 words.

**Content and structure of the report on follow-up**

10. The rapporteur on follow-up will prepare a draft report which it will submit to the Committee for its consideration once a year.
11. The follow-up report will contain the following:
  - (a) A summary of the recommendations identified for follow-up;
  - (b) A summary of the State party's replies;
  - (c) A summary of other stakeholders' comments;
  - (d) A proposal to the Committee of an assessment.

The report will be adopted by the Committee in its plenary meetings and will be posted on the Committee's web page. A summary of the report will be included as an annex to the Committee's biennial report to the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council.

## Annex III

### Summary of decisions adopted by the Committee in relation to communications submitted under the Optional Protocol

#### *S.C. v. Brazil, communication No. 10/2013*

1. The Committee adopted its decision declaring inadmissible communication No. 10/2013, *S.C. v. Brazil*. The author of the communication, a Brazilian national, had been working for Banco do Estado de Santa Catarina (BESC) since 2004; the BESC was purchased by Banco do Brasil (BdB) in 2009. After several motorcycle accidents, the author had to take medical leave in 2009. She was informed that under the BdB internal policy, she was required to return to work within three months in order to retain her position as a teller. Because of her medical problems, the author only returned to work after six months. Upon her return, she was informed that she had been demoted from her position as a teller, and remained employed without a defined job function.

2. In November 2009, the author requested to be transferred to a bank's office closer to her home to facilitate her commuting. BdB refused her transfer request, citing an excess of staff in the referred office. The author's health declined and she had to take additional leave in 2010. In February 2011, the author filed a complaint against BdB before the Regional Labour Court, alleging that the BdB policy was discriminatory. During the court hearings, BdB asserted that the author had voluntarily accepted to be bound by the bank's policy, that demotion after more than three months of medical leave applied to all employees without distinction, and that it was authorized to effect promotions and demotions as needed. Her complaint was rejected. The author appealed before the Superior Labour Court, a procedure for which legal representation is compulsory. The author requested legal aid, but her request was denied for lack of merits, and the private attorney she contacted refused to represent her. In July 2011, the author filed her appeal without representation and her appeal was therefore rejected. In March 2012, the author was diagnosed as having a partial rupture of a shoulder tendon associated with fibromyalgia, an illness causing predisposition to muscle cramps and inflammation brought on by stress. The doctor stated that she was permitted to work with certain restrictions, and the bank therefore assigned her to different positions on two occasions.

3. The author claimed violations of her rights under articles 3 (b) and (e) and 5 (paras. 1 and 2) of the Convention, in that the measures taken by her employer and endorsed by domestic courts aim to limit the opportunities of persons with disabilities and are thus discriminatory. She also claimed a violation of her rights under article 4, insofar as the internal policy of BdB promotes discrimination based on disability by calling for the demotion of any staff member who remains on medical leave for more than three months. She finally argued her rights under article 27 of the Convention were violated, insofar as the discrimination she suffered is linked to her employment and working conditions.

4. The Committee considered that the difference between illness and disability is a difference of degree and not a difference of kind. A health impairment which initially is conceived of as illness can develop into an impairment in the context of disability because of its duration or its chronic development. A human rights-based model of disability requires taking into account the diversity of persons with disabilities as well as the interaction between individuals with impairments and attitudinal and environmental barriers. The Committee therefore considered that it was not precluded from considering that the author's physical impairment in interaction with barriers did actually hinder her

from fully and effectively participating in society on an equal basis with others, as covered under article 1 of the Convention.

5. The Committee however held the author's claim inadmissible for lack of exhaustion of domestic remedies as the author did not substantiate that there were no other options for her to be legally represented before the Superior Labour Court and therefore have her claim examined on the merits.

*Jungelin v. Sweden, communication No. 5/2011*

1. The Committee considered the merits of communication No. 5/2011. The author of the communication, a Swedish national, has had severe sight impairment since birth. She holds a Bachelor of Laws degree. In May 2006, she applied to the Social Insurance Agency to work as an assessor/investigator of sickness benefit and sickness compensation applications. At a recruitment interview in June 2006 she explained that she had sight impairment, and that her visual ability was severely limited. She also explained about the aids available and pointed out that the Rehabilitation Department of the Public Employment Service had promised her that it would inquire about adjustments of the computer programmes used by the Social Insurance Agency. In August 2006, the author was informed that although she fulfilled the competence, experience and reference requirements, she had not been considered for the vacant post because the Social Insurance Agency's internal computer systems could not be adapted for her sight impairment. The author reported the case to the Swedish Disability Ombudsman. In March 2008, the Ombudsman filed an application at the Labour Court on behalf of the author. On 17 February 2010, the Labour Court dismissed the Ombudsman's claims.

2. The author argued that the decision by the Social Insurance Agency to discard her candidature for the investigator/assessor post constitutes a violation of articles 5 and 27 of the Convention.

3. As to the merits of the claim, the Committee considered that, when assessing the reasonableness and proportionality of accommodation measures, States parties enjoy a certain margin of appreciation, and that it is generally for the courts of States parties to the Convention to evaluate facts and evidence in a particular case, unless it is found that the evaluation was clearly arbitrary or amounted to a denial of justice. The Committee considered that the Labour Court thoroughly and objectively assessed all the elements submitted by the author and the Social Insurance Agency before reaching the conclusion that the support and adaptation measures recommended by the Ombudsman would constitute an undue burden. It further considered that the author did not provide any element which would enable it to conclude that such an assessment was manifestly arbitrary or amounted to a denial of justice. The Committee therefore concluded that the facts before it do not disclose a violation of the Convention. Several members of the Committee appended a dissenting opinion to the Committee's Views.

## Annex IV

### Statements adopted by the Committee

#### Statement on disability inclusion in the third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction and beyond

The Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities has been attentively following the preparatory process of the third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction to be held from 14 to 18 March 2015 in Sendai, Japan.

The Committee sees that process as presenting both challenges and opportunities to promote and protect all human rights and fundamental freedoms of persons with disabilities, who are often at most risk of all forms of discrimination and exclusion, and are often “the first to be forgotten and the last to be remembered” of all marginalized groups.

Through its reviewing of the States parties’ reports, the Committee, since its inception, has given high priority to article 11 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which requires that States parties ensure the protection and safety of persons with disabilities in situations of risk resulting from natural disasters, armed conflict and other humanitarian crises.

For the past few years, the Committee has worked with several relevant parties in ensuring that disaster relief measures can reach persons with disabilities, and has released statements concerning particular crises.

The Committee welcomes all initiatives and the genuine efforts of all parties, particularly those of the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction, to ensure that the disability perspective is not omitted from the agenda of the process, including the substantive part of revising the framework for action (Hyogo Framework for Action: HFA2), taking into account that persons with disabilities must not only be recipients of help and assistance, but can actively contribute to greater success of disaster risk reduction efforts.

In its general comment No. 2 (2014) on accessibility, the Committee reiterated the great attention it gives to this matter, as shown in paragraph 36 of the general comment, which states:

Ensuring full access to the physical environment, transportation, information and communication, and services open to the public is indeed a vital precondition for the effective enjoyment of many rights covered by the Convention. In situations of risk, natural disasters and armed conflict, the emergency services must be accessible to persons with disabilities, or their lives cannot be saved or their well-being protected (art. 11). Accessibility must be incorporated as priority in the post-disaster reconstruction efforts. Therefore, disaster risk reduction must be accessible and disability-inclusive.

The Committee notes with great concern that, even after the unprecedentedly successful process of proposing, drafting, negotiating, adopting, ratifying and monitoring of implementation of the Convention, persons with disabilities still face great difficulty and unnecessary restrictions when participating in the process of mainstreaming development.

The Millennium Development Goals are coming to an end in 2015. Their developmental results are ambiguous and, despite a reduction in overall poverty figures, the Goals have not achieved a sustainable improvement in the living conditions of the poorest of the population, including persons with disabilities. The recommendations of both the High-level Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly on the Millennium Development Goals in

2010 and the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) in 2012 initiated an inclusive process to develop both a set of sustainable development goals and a global development agenda beyond 2015. There was broad agreement that the two processes should be closely linked and ultimately converge in one global development agenda. The two processes are informed by the United Nations consultations with major groups. The concept of the major groups arose from the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, with a view to incorporating civil society inputs into a sustainable development process. However, persons with disabilities have been absent from the outset.

The Committee sees the need for much improvement in order for both the process and substance of disaster risk reduction to be truly accessible to and inclusive of all, particularly persons with disabilities. This could serve as a significant indicator of a successful human rights and sustainable development agenda.

The Committee calls upon all States parties, the United Nations and all agencies within the United Nations system and the international community to:

1. Ensure that all processes of the third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction and any relevant conference on post-2015 sustainable development are accessible to persons with disabilities, in accordance with the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and other internationally recognized accessibility standards and guidelines;
2. Ensure that persons with disabilities, their representative organizations and relevant parties can fully and effectively participate in all aspects of any preparatory process and all consultations, including during the conference;
3. Ensure disability inclusion in the final outcome of the World Conference, leading to true disability-inclusive disaster risk reduction which will serve as model of best practice for a disability-inclusive human rights-based sustainable development agenda;
4. Reconsider, through a General Assembly resolution, the more open and participatory structure of the United Nations engagement in any consultation with civil society organizations by either creating an additional major group for persons with disabilities, or, to revisit the entire major group structure so that it become more accessible, transparent and open to the full participation of all persons.

#### **Statement on article 14 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities**

Liberty and security of the person is one of the most precious rights to which everyone is entitled. In particular, all persons with disabilities, and especially persons with mental disabilities or psychosocial disabilities, are entitled to liberty pursuant to article 14 of the Convention.

Ever since the Committee began reviewing State party reports at its fifth session in April 2011, the Committee has systematically called to the attention of States parties the need to correctly enforce that Convention right. The jurisprudence of the Committee on article 14 can be more easily comprehended by unpacking its various elements as follows:

1. *The absolute prohibition of detention on the basis of disability.* There are still practices in which State parties allow for the deprivation of liberty on the grounds of actual or perceived disability. In that regard, the Committee has established that article 14 does not permit any exceptions whereby persons may be detained on the grounds of their actual or perceived disability. However, the legislation of several States parties, including mental health laws, still provide instances in which persons may be detained on the grounds of their actual or perceived disability, provided there are other reasons for their detention,

including that they are dangerous to themselves or to others. That practice is incompatible with article 14 as interpreted by the jurisprudence of the Committee.

2. *Mental health laws that authorize detention of persons with disabilities based on the alleged danger to themselves or to others.* Through all its considerations of State party reports, the Committee has established that it is contrary to article 14 to allow for the detention of persons with disabilities based on the perceived danger to themselves or to others. The involuntary detention of persons with disabilities based on presumptions of risk or dangerousness tied to disability labels is contrary to the right to liberty. For example, it is wrong to detain someone just because they are diagnosed with paranoid schizophrenia.

3. *Detention of persons unfit to plead in criminal justice systems.* The Committee has established that declarations of unfitness to stand trial and the detention of persons based on that declaration is contrary to article 14 of the Convention since it deprives the person of his or her right to due process and safeguards that are applicable to every defendant.

4. *Reasonable accommodation and prisons.* The Committee is of the view that persons with disabilities who are sentenced to imprisonment for committing a crime should be entitled to reasonable accommodation in order not to aggravate conditions of incarceration based on disability.

## Annex V

### **Outcome of the meeting between the Committee and national human rights institutions and independent monitoring mechanisms**

The Committee held the first ever meeting with national human rights institutions (NHRIs) and national independent monitoring mechanisms (NMMs) appointed under article 33, paragraph 2, of the Convention on 25 September 2015 to discuss ways in which monitoring activities of the Convention at the international as well as the national level can be mutually reinforced. The meeting was co-organized by the Committee and the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights with the support of United Nations Office at Geneva, the International Telecommunications Union and the International Disability Alliance.

The following are the most important outcomes of the meeting:

1. The Committee will develop guidelines on the participation of NHRIs and NMMs at all stages of the Committee's work (the reporting process of the Committee with focus on the involvement of NHRIs and NMMs in the different stages of that process), including the reporting process, namely, before and during the interactive dialogue with the State party, as well as in follow-up and capacity-building activities. Participation of NHRIs and NMMs in the Committee's work (reporting process) through the use of new information and communication technologies will also be considered by the Committee in preparing the guidelines. The Committee will also include in the guidelines practical information on the participation of NHRIs and NMM in other Committee's proceedings, including their participation in days of general discussion and in the process of drafting general comments. The Committee will consider exploring the possibility of adopting in the future a general comment on article 33 of the Convention.
  2. In preparing the guidelines, the Committee will consult with and take into account the views of NHRIs and NMM, the unique role of NHRIs and NMMs in building bridges between the Committee and civil society organizations, as well as the importance of preserving the independence of NHRIs and NMMs, as spelled out in article 33, paragraph 2, of the Convention.
  3. The Committee will continue contributing to the establishment and strengthening of NHRIs and NMMs through the Committee's concluding observations.
  4. NHRIs and NMMs are encouraged to avail themselves of the Committee's role as a capacity-building agent under article 37, paragraph 2, of the Convention. The Committee will explore the possibility of working closely with NHRIs and NMMs in developing core indicators for the monitoring of the Convention. The Committee will also explore other ways of supporting the monitoring activities of NHRIs and NMMs, including by the establishment of a database to exchange information on good practices in monitoring the implementation of the Convention.
  5. The importance of the participation of organizations of persons with disabilities in national monitoring activities was also identified as a matter which requires further attention.
-