



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
26 July 2024

Original: English

---

## Human Rights Council

Fifty-seventh session

9 September–9 October 2024

Agenda items 2 and 10

**Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner  
for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the  
High Commissioner and the Secretary-General**

**Technical assistance and capacity-building**

### **Implementation of resolution 51/33 on promoting international cooperation to support national mechanisms for implementation, reporting and follow-up**

#### **Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights**

##### *Summary*

The present report, submitted pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 51/33, provides a summary of the exchanges that took place during the one-day intersessional seminar held on 23 June 2023 in Geneva, as well as information on other developments relating to the establishment and strengthening of national mechanisms for implementation, reporting and follow-up since the adoption of Council resolution 51/33. The report provides conclusions and recommendations.



## I. Introduction

1. In its resolution 51/33, the Human Rights Council requested the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) to organize a one-day intersessional seminar in 2023 and a one-day intersessional seminar in 2024, both to be held in Geneva, to consider further the experiences and good practices shared during the five online regional consultations relating to the establishment and development of national mechanisms for implementation, reporting and follow-up.
2. The Human Rights Council also requested OHCHR to establish and maintain a virtual knowledge hub for national mechanisms, in collaboration with States and relevant stakeholders, to share good practices and facilitate the exchange of experiences.
3. By its decision 55/115, the Human Rights Council postponed the organization of the intersessional seminar foreseen for 2024 and the launch of the virtual knowledge hub to 2025, owing to the liquidity crisis affecting the United Nations Secretariat.

## II. Background

4. National mechanisms for implementation, reporting and follow-up are national public structures mandated to coordinate the preparation of reports to, and engage with, international and regional human rights mechanisms and to facilitate national follow-up and implementation of human rights treaty law obligations and the recommendations emanating from those mechanisms.<sup>1</sup>
5. The establishment of national mechanisms was a key recommendation of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in her report on the strengthening of the treaty bodies in 2012.<sup>2</sup> The recognition of the importance for States of establishing and strengthening national mechanisms is reflected by the inclusion of specific recommendations on those mechanisms in many resolutions adopted by intergovernmental bodies<sup>3</sup> and by the advocacy of the Group of Friends on national implementation, reporting and follow-up at the Human Rights Council.
6. In 2021, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 42/30, OHCHR organized five regional consultations for States and other stakeholders to exchange experiences and good practices relating to the establishment and development of national mechanisms and their impact on the effective implementation of human rights obligations and commitments, in consultation with relevant stakeholders. The conclusions drawn and recommendations made at the regional consultations were presented to the Council in June 2022 in a report of OHCHR,<sup>4</sup> which in turn led to the adoption by the Council of resolution 51/33.

## III. Process and the methodology

7. The first intersessional seminar foreseen in Human Rights Council resolution 51/33 was held on 23 June 2023 in Geneva in a hybrid format. It aimed to foster exchanges on the key characteristics of institutional set-ups and mandates that facilitate effective national mechanisms. The progress made in the development of the virtual hub on national mechanisms requested by the Human Rights Council was also presented.
8. The seminar gathered 184 participants, half of whom attended in person. More than half of the participants were female. There were 90 participants from Member States among the attendees. In addition, Hynd Ayoubi Idrissi, member of the Committee on the Rights of the Child, Nicole Ameline, member of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, Santiago Manuel Fiorio Vaesken, member of the Committee on Economic,

---

<sup>1</sup> See <https://www.ohchr.org/en/treaty-bodies/national-mechanisms-implementation-reporting-and-follow>.

<sup>2</sup> A/66/860.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, General Assembly resolution 68/268 and Human Rights Council resolutions 30/25, 34/16, 36/29, 39/6, 39/17, 42/30, 51/12 and 54/28.

<sup>4</sup> A/HRC/50/64.

Social and Cultural Rights, Miloon Kothari, member of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and Israel and former Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context, and Maria Virginia Bras Gomes, former member of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, participated in the event as experts. Other participants included members of civil society organizations, national human rights institutions, members of academic institutions and representatives of United Nations agencies.

9. The seminar consisted of three sessions: one devoted to the institutional set-up of national mechanisms; the second to their mandates; and the third to a live demonstration by OHCHR of the mock-up version of the virtual knowledge hub. States and other stakeholders were invited to address the first two topics based on their experience in terms of best practices, challenges and lessons learned. Participants were asked to focus their interventions on the link between the institutional set-up chosen and the mandates and the impact they had on: (a) coordination among ministries and other State institutions; (b) enhancing national dialogues and concrete contributions from non-government stakeholders into the reporting and follow-up processes; and (c) States' engagement with international human rights mechanisms (United Nations special procedures, treaty bodies and the universal periodic review process) and the implementation of their recommendations.

10. The report summarizes the practices and experiences shared during the seminar as well as practices shared in other forums that complement or support the conclusions reached during the seminar. The practices shared in the report revolve around the three main themes outlined in annex 1 of the report of OHCHR:<sup>5</sup> (a) institutional set-up and mandates of national mechanisms; (b) coordination and consultation capacities; and (c) coherence with other implementation and follow-up processes at the national level. These categories are maintained in the present report. The report presents other recent developments linked to the implementation of Human Rights Council resolution 51/33 (sect. VII) as well as conclusions and recommendations to be considered by the Human Rights Council.

## **IV. Institutional set-up and mandates of national mechanisms for implementation, reporting and follow-up**

### **Institutional set-up of national mechanisms**

11. Discussions during the 2023 seminar<sup>6</sup> confirmed the conclusion of the 2021 regional consultations on the importance of a strong legal basis for national mechanisms.<sup>7</sup> While such a legal basis may form part of the legislative document defining the mandates of specific ministries that coordinate engagement with international human rights mechanisms, a separate enactment outlining the mandates and the interministerial composition of national mechanisms has been found to be a good practice by many States. Thailand, for example, explained that the legal creation of its National Committee on Driving Forward Human Rights Work had helped to rationalize reporting efforts and to overcome the lack of coordination and weak institutional memory. Prior to the establishment of its standing national mechanism, Thailand had relied on ad hoc drafting task forces for each ratified treaty, which would be dismantled once the report was submitted.

12. The participants also underlined that the choice of an institutional set-up and mandate influences the political leverage of a national mechanism not only to coordinate information collection for the purpose of reporting but also to ensure follow-up and implementation. Given the importance of a multidimensional and government-wide approach to advance human rights, many participants in the 2021 regional consultations agreed that national mechanisms would gain from a higher level of political support, as is the case for the

<sup>5</sup> A/HRC/50/64.

<sup>6</sup> Interventions were made in this regard by the Niger, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova and Thailand.

<sup>7</sup> A/HRC/50/64, para. 54.

coordination bodies on the Sustainable Development Goals. The latter are often attached to the office of the head of State or to the cabinet, an arrangement which has proven particularly effective in promoting the mainstreaming of the Sustainable Development Goals in national development and sectoral policies.

13. Participants during the 2023 intersessional seminar shared their experiences in this regard. For example, the Republic of Moldova reported that its National Human Rights Council is chaired by the Prime Minister and that the members of the Council sit at the ministerial level. The Philippines relayed that the head of the secretariat of the Presidential Human Rights Committee has the rank of a vice-minister, a high-level position, which, in the opinion of the representative of the Philippines, reflected the importance accorded by the Government to human rights reporting and follow-up. Similar practices were mentioned by participants from Angola, Kiribati and Tunisia. Portugal shared that its national mechanism had two focal points from each ministry represented: one at a higher – political or senior official – level, and another at a more technical level: senior level membership helped ensure that requested information was provided in a timely manner and decisions were made promptly while technical-level focal points were knowledgeable on the substance in detail and were able to ensure regular follow-up on requests for inputs. A participant from Thailand mentioned that its National Committee on Driving Forward Human Rights Work was chaired by the Deputy Prime Minister, who facilitated engagement with Parliament to raise awareness on human rights issues and the adoption of national policies to enhance human rights promotion and protection in Thailand.

14. The participation of planning entities in respective ministries, coupled with the involvement of the Prime Minister’s Office, was considered by Tonga as a success factor for visibility and mainstreaming human rights into the sectoral plans of relevant ministries. Samoa spoke to the importance of ensuring that the members of national mechanisms also sit on the coordination bodies for the Sustainable Development Goals to reduce the reporting burden and increase implementation coherence. While noting that it shared the common challenges faced by countries with limited resources in managing competing priorities, Tonga added that the size of small island developing States may also play to their advantage for effective coordination. In that context, Tonga emphasized the need to: adopt a realistic and strategic approach, tap into existing national systems, utilize available resources and networks and benefit from technical assistance and support available at regional and international levels. Mr. Fiorio Vaesken considered it crucial for national mechanisms to adopt this holistic approach to avoid duplication and increase coherence.

15. The importance of a secretariat of a national mechanism was mentioned, especially in a context of high turnover in ministries. Kiribati explained that the existence of a functioning secretariat specifically tasked with coordinating reporting and follow-up and managed by the Human Rights Division of the Ministry of Justice helped ensure business continuity. For Burkina Faso, institutional memory could be retained thanks to a combination of factors such as the standing nature of the national mechanism, its network of standing focal points designated for each line ministry and institution and the existence of a shared digital platform to facilitate collaboration among contributors. To counter the negative impact of staff turnover, several participants considered that the provision of regular training and capacity-building sessions for civil servants in secretariats of national mechanisms and ministerial and other focal points was needed.<sup>8</sup>

16. Portugal shared that a major improvement brought about by the formal creation of its National Human Rights Committee was the adoption of clear terms of reference,<sup>9</sup> which had enhanced information flows, facilitated daily interactions between focal points and increased understanding among ministerial focal points on the expectations related to reporting and follow-up.

17. In terms of financial resources, the Philippines reported that its mechanism had become fully operational only when its budget was incorporated into that of the Office of the

<sup>8</sup> Participants from Guyana and the Philippines and Mr. Fiorio Vaesken spoke to the issue.

<sup>9</sup> Danish Institute for Human Rights, “Report on the international seminar on national mechanisms for implementation, reporting and follow-up in the field of human rights” (2023).

President, 15 years after its creation by a presidential order in 2006. Malawi also mentioned that having a dedicated budget to fulfil the mandate of the national mechanism had helped it to meet its reporting obligations. In the majority of cases, participants reported that the lack of funding and of a dedicated budget for daily operations of national mechanisms was a major challenge.<sup>10</sup> This, coupled with the lack of inclusion in the terms of reference of a focal point for reporting and follow-up, undermines the ability of the mechanism to plan, compile and process information in a timely manner. Such constraints can also limit the visibility of such mechanisms, a challenge which was mentioned by Kenya and Paraguay.

## Mandates of national mechanisms

18. Many participants confirmed that the mandates of their national mechanisms extended to the broader engagement with all international human rights mechanisms as well as to regional mechanisms, where applicable.<sup>11</sup> For example, in the Republic of Moldova, the National Human Rights Council approves both reports on the implementation of international human rights treaties as well as written submissions to United Nations special procedures.

19. With regard to implementation and follow-up, the Danish Institute for Human Rights referred to a recent study carried out in five country contexts where the mandates of national mechanisms included following up on views adopted on individual complaints and mainstreaming of recommendations in national policies.<sup>12</sup> Among its responsibilities, the National Human Rights Council of the Republic of Moldova submits proposals to the Government on the implementation of international recommendations. More generally, the processes relating to responding to individual communications submitted to international and regional human rights mechanisms and the follow-up to international decisions on individual cases was only alluded to during the 2023 seminar and deserved further analysis as practices vary significantly from one country to the other.<sup>13</sup>

20. The representative of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) spoke about the support provided to States to integrate human rights recommendations into their national development frameworks and pertinent sectoral policies and programmes more effectively, noting that national mechanisms provide a platform that both mainstreams and enhances accountability for the implementation of human rights recommendations and other global, regional and national commitments.<sup>14</sup> As such, the representative underlined, they have the potential to build ownership at community and national levels, contributing to the realization of the vision expected to be spelled out during the upcoming Summit of the Future, for innovative solutions and stronger institutions to tackle global challenges.

21. Ms. Bras Gomes emphasized that the increasing role of some national mechanisms in mainstreaming human rights into sectoral policies should be encouraged. She added that as national mechanisms had representatives from line ministries, they were well positioned to achieve that result in a concerted, coherent and coordinated manner.

22. Monitoring of implementation is another aspect of the mandate of some national mechanisms, such as the National Human Rights Committee of Portugal. In the Republic of Moldova, the National Human Rights Council monitors the application of international

<sup>10</sup> This challenge was specifically mentioned by Lebanon.

<sup>11</sup> El Salvador, Guyana, Kenya, Malawi, Mexico, Morocco and Tonga spoke to this issue.

<sup>12</sup> See Lorion, S. and Murray, R., *Interactions between National Human Rights Institutions and National Mechanisms for Implementation, Reporting and Follow-up: Research and Recommendations*, Human Rights Research Papers, No. 2023/2 (Copenhagen, Danish Institute for Human Rights, 2023).

<sup>13</sup> See Principi, K. F., "Implementation of decisions under treaty body complaints procedures – Do States comply? How do they do it?", sabbatical leave report, January 2017, available at <https://hr.un.org/sites/hr.un.org/files/editors/u4492/Implementation%20of%20decisions%20under%20treaty%20body%20complaints%20procedures%20-%20Do%20states%20comply%20-%202015%20Sabbatical%20-%20Kate%20Fox.pdf>; and Murray, R and Long, D. eds., *Research Handbook on Implementation of Human Rights in Practice* (Edward Elgar, 2022).

<sup>14</sup> See [https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/board-documents/main-document/Annex%20-QCPR\\_FINAL.pdf](https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/board-documents/main-document/Annex%20-QCPR_FINAL.pdf); [https://esaro.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/unfpa\\_committee\\_triangular\\_cooperationfinal\\_1\\_1.pdf](https://esaro.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/unfpa_committee_triangular_cooperationfinal_1_1.pdf).

human rights treaties by public authorities and institutions and their compliance with the recommendations of human rights mechanisms.

23. The 2021 regional consultations revealed that the role of many national mechanisms has expanded beyond reporting and follow-up,<sup>15</sup> and that trend was confirmed at the 2023 intersessional seminar.<sup>16</sup> Portugal mentioned that the tasks of its National Human Rights Committee included making proposals of measures, including legislative measures, sharing best practices at the international level and promoting human rights at the national level. As mentioned during the 2021 regional consultations<sup>17</sup> and at other recent forums,<sup>18</sup> such an extensive mandate had helped Portugal to enhance the mechanism's visibility and outreach to stakeholders, thus improving the quality of reporting and the implementation of recommendations from human rights mechanisms. Morocco made the same assessment with regard to its national mechanism. Guyana reported that its national mechanism is also in charge of human rights education, capacity-building and awareness-raising, which has helped to build trust and improved its ability to collect data and foster participation. The Philippines shared information on the role of its national mechanism in human rights advocacy and awareness-raising as a key enabler.

24. It is observed that the location of the national mechanism in the institutional infrastructure often affects the scope of its mandate. For example, in the Republic of Moldova, the National Human Rights Council is responsible for the coordination of the implementation of State policy in the field of human rights. It submits proposals to the Government aimed at ensuring respect for human rights; supervises the development, implementation and evaluation of documents on human rights policy; assesses the degree of respect for human rights; and interacts with international human rights mechanisms. In Portugal, since the national mechanism is part of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, its tasks also include the coordination of State positions on human rights issues in international forums and the proposal of international instruments on human rights for ratification.

25. While the broadening mandates of national mechanisms was seen as a positive trend by many participants, some highlighted the importance of ensuring that the mechanisms must first fulfil their primary mission, that is, reporting to the national human rights mechanism and following up on recommendations.<sup>19</sup> This issue was raised by Mr. Fiore Vaesken, who alerted participants to the high rate of long overdue reports under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights despite the existence of national mechanisms in many countries.<sup>20</sup> Mr. Kothari also emphasized that whichever mechanism is in place, the main indicator of its efficiency must ultimately be its capacity to contribute to an improvement in the enjoyment of human rights through the implementation of human rights recommendations.

## V. Coordination and consultation capacities

### Coordination capacity

26. Coordination among different parts and levels of government is instrumental in ensuring that human rights reports cover relevant information and are coherent and that the recommendations from international human rights mechanisms reach the relevant ministries and different branches of the State. This is achieved primarily through the composition of the membership of national mechanisms. Most participants reported that, in addition to focal points from line ministries, their national mechanisms included representatives of parliament,

<sup>15</sup> A/HRC/50/64, para. 53.

<sup>16</sup> Participants from Burkina Faso, Italy, Kiribati, Malawi, Mauritius, Morocco, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova and Thailand spoke to the issue.

<sup>17</sup> A/HRC/50/64, para. 24.

<sup>18</sup> See, inter alia, Danish Institute for Human Rights, *Report on the international seminar on national mechanisms for implementation, reporting and follow-up in the field of human rights*, 2023.

<sup>19</sup> Participants from Morocco and Portugal spoke to this issue in several forums.

<sup>20</sup> As at 31 December 2023, 143 States (72.6 per cent) had a total of 483 reports overdue (208 initial and 275 periodic) across all treaties.

the judiciary and national statistical offices. When these entities were not standing members of national mechanisms, participants reported that established institutional lines of coordination were established with them.<sup>21</sup> Some also emphasized the importance of including representatives of local and regional governments to contribute to implementation, reporting and follow-up of the international obligations of the State.<sup>22</sup>

27. Morocco reported that the evolution in the membership of its Interministerial Delegation for Human Rights had had a direct impact on the implementation of the State's international human rights obligations: (a) firstly, human rights were increasingly considered in the development of public policies; and (b) secondly, owing to the establishment of a follow-up system, there was greater involvement by various entities in the implementation of recommendations and their follow-up. Further, State reports are presented to the two chambers of Parliament before being submitted. The national mechanism is also working towards territorial ownership of reporting and follow-up processes. Tonga indicated that coordination among focal points, coupled with the comprehensive mandate of the mechanism (including follow-up to the recommendations of human rights mechanisms), had helped ensure coherence in the implementation of recommendations across sectors.

28. Kenya highlighted that coordination with all levels of governance and the active involvement of the national statistical office and the judiciary had contributed to data diversity and had had a direct impact on the quality and the accuracy of reports produced by the Government. In Portugal, the increasing involvement of Statistics Portugal in the work of the national mechanism had improved its understanding of the types of data expected for its human rights reporting. Repeated recommendations made by treaty bodies to Portugal to collect data on ethnicity had led to a decision by Statistics Portugal, in December 2023, to publish the results of the survey on the conditions, origins and trajectories of the resident population. The survey, which is the first-ever statistical operation carried out in Portugal that gathers disaggregated data on ethnic origin and racial discrimination,<sup>23</sup> closed an important data gap and thus enhanced the State's capacity to meet its reporting obligations.

29. Some States spoke to the benefits of involving parliament, especially when it comes to the implementation of recommendations from human rights mechanisms.<sup>24</sup> The Republic of Moldova explained that its National Human Rights Council included three representatives from Parliament: the Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee for Human Rights and Interethnic Relations; the Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee on Legal Affairs, Appointments and Immunities; and the Head of the Legal General Department of the Secretariat of Parliament. Kiribati explained that its National Human Rights Task Force regularly engaged with Parliament through meetings at the beginning of each parliamentary term. In case of new developments, the Task Force calls for ad hoc meetings. Such meetings ensured regular conversations with parliamentarians on the international human rights commitments of Kiribati and provided an opportunity for advocacy. In Italy, the Interministerial Committee for Human Rights reports annually to Parliament.

30. The Uzbek national mechanism, the National Human Rights Centre, presents the national reports on human rights to a parliamentary commission before submitting them to the international human rights mechanisms. The Centre also organizes debriefing sessions for the parliamentary commission and cooperates on the follow-up process by preparing

<sup>21</sup> Participants from Angola, Guyana, Mauritius, Morocco, the Niger, the Philippines, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Samoa and Uzbekistan spoke to this issue.

<sup>22</sup> Republic of Moldova, Serbia and Thailand include representatives of the business sector as members of their national mechanisms.

<sup>23</sup> A participant from Portugal shared the results of the survey during the Expert Round table on Data Planning and Collection by National Mechanisms for Implementation, Reporting and Follow-up, held on 18 April 2024 in Bologna, Italy, and mentioned it in its follow-up report to the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (see CERD/C/PRT/FCO/18-19). Reference to the survey can be found at [https://www.ine.pt/xportal/xmain?xpid=INE&xpgid=ine\\_destaquas&DESTAQUESdest\\_boui=625453580&DESTAQUESmodo=2](https://www.ine.pt/xportal/xmain?xpid=INE&xpgid=ine_destaquas&DESTAQUESdest_boui=625453580&DESTAQUESmodo=2).

<sup>24</sup> Participants from Italy, Kenya, Kiribati, Morocco, Paraguay, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Serbia, Thailand, Tunisia and Uzbekistan. Burkina Faso and Malawi mentioned the need for the State to improve coordination with parliament and parliamentary committees.

national action plans for the implementation of recommendations. Conversely, a specific procedure has been established by Parliament whereby legislative bills related to the human rights agenda are discussed with the national mechanism. In addition, both the parliamentary commission and the national mechanism organize awareness-raising events, conduct studies on human rights issues and actively participate in the World Programme for Human Rights Education. The National Human Rights Centre is building capacity of the parliamentary commission and State agencies to work within the National Recommendations Tracking Database provided by OHCHR.

31. With regard to the involvement of the judiciary in national mechanisms, the Republic of Moldova shared that the membership of the National Human Rights Council included the President of the Superior Council of Magistracy; the President of the Superior Council of Prosecutors; and the Deputy General Prosecutor. Participants from Guyana, Italy, Kenya, Kiribati and Paraguay also reported that their national mechanisms included representatives of the judiciary.

32. The involvement of local and regional governments in human rights processes, either as members of their national mechanisms or through a direct engagement with human rights mechanisms, which is an emerging practice, was discussed. The Global Cities Hub referred to a coalition it had launched in 2021, along with OHCHR, the United Nations Human Settlements Programme, the Geneva Human Rights Platform, the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung Foundation, Geneva, and UPR Info, to support the participation of local and regional governments in the universal periodic review process. One of its outputs has been the publication of a leaflet providing information to local and regional governments to enhance their engagement with the universal periodic review.<sup>25</sup> The Global Cities Hub believed that including different levels of governance in the work of national mechanisms could help ensure their involvement in the implementation of human rights. The assessment was shared by many other participants, including participants from Italy, Kenya, the Republic of Moldova, Thailand and Serbia, which have representatives of local and regional governments as members of their national mechanisms. Paraguay noted that its tracking tool “SIMORE Plus” can also facilitate contributions from local authorities.

33. The Republic of Moldova explained that its National Human Rights Council included, at the central level, the President of the Congress of Local Authorities of the Republic of Moldova, who coordinated inputs from municipal and regional commissions for human rights in the country’s 35 localities. The local structures are responsible, inter alia, for the implementation of national policies for the protection of human rights; the elaboration of related local plans and programmes; and the monitoring of the enjoyment of human rights at the local level. They are also in charge of the elaboration of biannual reports on the enjoyment of human rights at the local level and their submission to the National Human Rights Council.

34. The representative of Italy explained that the National Association of Italian Municipalities, the Union of Italian Provinces and the Conference of Regions and Autonomous Provinces of Italy were standing members of the Interministerial Committee for Human Rights. Local and regional governments are regularly consulted on reporting, as well as on follow-up activities. For instance, the submission of the mid-term report for the third cycle of the universal periodic review in November 2021 included an annex on good practices from local and regional governments, as well as on training sessions carried out. Italy has also developed a national action plan based on the matrix stemming out of the universal periodic review that engage all entities, including from regional and local levels. The plan links recommendations with corresponding Sustainable Development Goals and targets.

35. Participants at the expert meeting on enhancing capacity-building for local governments to incorporate human rights into all their work, held in Geneva, on 28 August 2023, pursuant to Council resolution 51/12, also came to the conclusion that involving local and regional governments can be seen as an opportunity to: improve human rights implementation at all levels as a shared responsibility; strengthen the dialogue and

<sup>25</sup> Tips for local and regional governments wishing to participate in the universal periodic review can be found at <https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/documents/hrbodies/upr/leaflet-tips-role-lrgs-upr.pdf>.



coordination between them and the central government; and enhance transparency, accountability and public trust. This led to the recommendations to include the participation of local and regional governments in the national mechanisms for implementation, reporting and follow-up.<sup>26</sup>

### Consultation capacity

36. On the consultation capacity of national mechanisms, most participants agreed on the importance of the involvement of national human rights institutions, including as key enablers for the meaningful participation of stakeholders.<sup>27</sup> As pointed out by the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions, in some cases, national stakeholders originally advocated for the creation of those national mechanisms.<sup>28</sup> Some State representatives confirmed that they included independent institutions as members of their national mechanisms.<sup>29</sup> Others reported that their national human rights institutions held observer status,<sup>30</sup> which was seen as important in order to ensure the independence of national human rights institutions. The need to consult national human rights institutions while respecting their independence was seconded by the Danish Institute for Human Rights, Ms. Ameline and Ms. Bras Gomes.

37. The Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions pointed out that national human rights institutions can support the work of national mechanisms in reviewing and evaluating the progress made by States in implementing their human rights obligations as they can provide authoritative and evidence-based information on the human rights situation and advise on appropriate evaluation and planning processes. For example, national human rights institutions can participate in the development of human rights implementation plans, data and indicator frameworks and follow-up and review processes, thus providing the required level of objectivity to assessments.<sup>31</sup>

38. Serbia explained that the work of its National Mechanism for Human Rights Council was based on the principles of inclusion and transparency. The expertise and recommendations provided by independent institutions, including the ombudsman and the commissioner for the protection of equality, are important elements of its work. Consultation of civil society organizations was initiated with the signature of a memorandum of cooperation with a platform that currently includes 21 organizations. Recommendations made through the platform helped shape the methods of work of national mechanisms, including the organization of meetings on thematic issues suggested by members of the platform. The practice also helped improve the capacity of civil society organizations to present alternative reports to the international human rights mechanisms. Morocco confirmed that the increased level of consultation with civil society organizations throughout the reporting cycle had had a significant impact, with a concomitant increase in the number of alternative reports submitted by the organizations. The importance of consulting a variety of civil society organizations was also referred to by, inter alia, Mauritius, Paraguay and Tunisia.<sup>32</sup>

39. Serbia reported that the involvement of a variety of actors in the development and monitoring of national implementation plans had shown itself to be a key enabler in achieving change on the ground. Members of the civil society platform had been associated with the elaboration and adoption of the national plans for the implementation of recommendations, which included commonly agreed indicators. Mauritius also shared that a participatory

<sup>26</sup> A/HRC/56/32, paras. 59 and 60 (c).

<sup>27</sup> Serbia and the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions spoke to this issue.

<sup>28</sup> See also Lorion, S. and Murray, R., *Interactions between National Human Rights Institutions and National Mechanisms for Implementation, Reporting and Follow-up: Research and Recommendation*.

<sup>29</sup> Participants from Burkina Faso, Mauritius, Portugal, Serbia and Thailand spoke to this issue.

<sup>30</sup> Participants from Portugal and the Republic of Moldova mentioned this aspect.

<sup>31</sup> A participant from Serbia also spoke to this issue; see also research carried out in Denmark, Mauritius, Portugal, the Republic of Korea and the Republic of Moldova.

<sup>32</sup> A participant from Mauritius stated that a total of 50 representatives of civil society were among its members. A participant from Paraguay also mentioned the inclusion of an extensive network of civil society organizations in the work of its national mechanism.

approach to implementation had been created through the formation of task forces to work on concrete legislative instruments to implement specific recommendations. The task forces included representatives of civil society organizations. Participants from Burkina Faso and Kenya highlighted that they systematically organize dissemination sessions with civil society and in the regions on the recommendations received from human rights mechanisms as a starting point for the next reporting cycle.<sup>33</sup> Brazil, which is in the process of establishing its national mechanism, is looking specifically at how the formalization of a mechanism will help the Government translate the work of regional and national human rights mechanisms into concrete results on the ground through innovative and participatory processes at the local and national levels.

40. The Danish Institute for Human Rights agreed that involving civil society and independent institutions in tracking the implementation of recommendations improved transparency and accountability.<sup>34</sup> This can also be facilitated through digital tracking tools put in place by the State or simply by the development of a website where information such as the legal basis for the national mechanism, its terms of reference, annual workplans and annual reports<sup>35</sup> are made accessible.<sup>36</sup> Paraguay explained that their digital tracking tool, SIMORE Plus, enabled civil society organizations to contribute, by registering and providing comments on progress. Accountability is also increased when national mechanisms are required to report regularly to parliament. Mr. Fiorio Vaesken and Ms. Ayoubi Idrissi encouraged national mechanisms to follow recent examples of national mechanisms that have launched internal self-assessment processes to measure their own performance.<sup>37</sup>

41. The Pacific Community shared that the efforts to develop, at the regional level, the so-called Pacific Principles of Practice of National Mechanisms for Implementation, Reporting and Follow-Up<sup>38</sup> had contributed to a broader shared understanding of how to effectively establish and strengthen national mechanisms for implementation, reporting and follow-up. While admitting that there was no “one-size-fits-all” approach to the development of national mechanisms, the Universal Rights Group, together with some stakeholders, noted that there should be universal guidance framework on the establishment and development of national mechanisms based on collated good practices from all regions.<sup>39</sup>

## VI. Information management and promotion of coherence with other implementation and follow-up processes at the national level

42. While the subject matter presented below is to be covered at the second intersessional seminar to be organized in 2025, some participants nevertheless took the occasion to share good practices on the following issues.

### Information management

43. Building on the increasing consensus that effective information management is instrumental to monitor progress on the implementation of States’ human rights obligations,

<sup>33</sup> This aspect was also mentioned by the representative of Kenya.

<sup>34</sup> Participants from Paraguay and Serbia shared their experiences in this regard.

<sup>35</sup> Practice in Italy, Portugal and Serbia. This issue was strongly encouraged by Ms. Ayoubi Idrissi, member of the Committee on the Rights of the Child.

<sup>36</sup> Participants from Portugal and Serbia shared their experiences on this matter. The Human Rights Tracker in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is an example of a digital tracking tool available to the public to track progress on the implementation of recommendations by the Government (see <https://humanrightstracker.com/en/>).

<sup>37</sup> Morocco and Senegal are developing this practice.

<sup>38</sup> See <https://pacificdata.org/data/dataset/367fdc9c-235a-4d87-912a-6c1acf6e0a81/resource/5ae950bc-daa7-46da-93c3-fd6ecd53684a/download/pacific-principles-of-practice.pdf>.

<sup>39</sup> See Universal Rights Group, *The Emergence and Evolution of National Mechanisms for Implementation, Reporting and Follow-up: A First Global Survey of National Human Rights Implementation and Reporting Systems* (April, 2024).

States, the United Nations system, including OHCHR, and other stakeholders have invested in the development of digital tracking tools and databases.<sup>40</sup> This trend is consistent with two recommendations presented in the 2022 report of OHCHR, which encouraged the continued development of the digital infrastructure of the human rights mechanisms and initiatives aimed at strengthening the information management capacity of national mechanisms, including through the acquisition of digital information management tools, such as the National Recommendations Tracking Database.<sup>41</sup>

44. Ecuador explained that its digital platform (SiDerechos (Sistema de Información sobre Derechos Humanos)), not only enabled the tracking of the implementation of recommendations but also helped to enhance coordination among focal points for the preparation of reports and to improve access to official information on human rights, including through a report library and a search engine. The reactivation of the platform in 2018 enabled Ecuador to submit its reports to international and regional human rights mechanisms in a timely manner. While Ecuador does not yet have a standing mechanism, the digital platform is considered to be an important step towards its establishment.

45. Paraguay explained that SIMORE PLUS, its online tracking tool, enabled collaboration between the executive, legislative and judiciary branches of government. The platform was designed to address coordination challenges related to the compilation of information and data by the national mechanism. The tool has helped to address information inconsistencies by aggregating existing data into a common framework for tracking the status of implementation, thereby allowing better comparison and analysis across different sources and time periods.<sup>42</sup> The importance of aligning methodologies on data planning and collection to facilitate engagement of national statistical offices and local and regional governments was also raised during the Expert Roundtable on Data Planning and Collection by National Mechanisms for Implementation, Reporting and Follow-up, organized on 18 April 2024 in Bologna, Italy, by the Geneva Human Rights Platform of the Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights and the Department of Legal Studies of the University of Bologna.<sup>43</sup>

46. The Philippines recently acquired the National Recommendations Tracking Database provided by OHCHR. In addition to the added value of such a tracking tool to monitor the implementation of recommendations, the Philippines saw it as a platform to promote a human rights culture among civil servants. Participants from Serbia, Thailand and Uzbekistan also spoke about their experiences using the database. Several countries shared that all digital tracking tools needed to be supported by a human component to increase the efficiency of national mechanisms.

## Coherence with other processes at the national level

47. The 2021 regional consultations highlighted that human rights implementation could be scaled up through improved interaction between human rights reporting and follow-up and other related processes at the national level, including those aimed at achieving the Sustainable Development Goals contained in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

48. Human rights and the 2023 Agenda reporting and follow-up processes are mutually reinforcing. The Sustainable Development Goals, which closely mirror many human rights norms and standards, are being increasingly incorporated into national development policies, plans, budgets and projects. Furthermore, there has been significant momentum from governments, cities, local authorities, civil society organizations, the private sector and academia towards realizing the Goals. The human rights mechanisms also stress the need for

<sup>40</sup> See Domenico Zipoli, “The human rights data revolution”, Academy Briefing No. 23 (Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights, 2024), p. 60.

<sup>41</sup> A/HRC/50/64, para. 60 (c) and (d).

<sup>42</sup> See Zipoli, “The human rights data revolution”.

<sup>43</sup> See <https://www.geneva-academy.ch/news/detail/714-expert-roundtable-discusses-role-of-local-and-regional-governments-in-data-collection-for-national-mechanisms>. The outcome document can be found at [https://www.geneva-academy.ch/joomlatools-files/docman-files/Final\\_Bologna%20Expert%20Roundtable\\_Summary%20and%20Takeaways.pdf](https://www.geneva-academy.ch/joomlatools-files/docman-files/Final_Bologna%20Expert%20Roundtable_Summary%20and%20Takeaways.pdf).

human rights-based implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals to ensure the main goal, to leave no one behind.

49. The report of the 2021 regional consultations also suggested that national mechanisms could benefit from the practices developed since 2016 of conducting meaningful consultations with marginalized groups and local communities in voluntary national and local reviews. National mechanisms can help create synergies by promoting and aligning reporting on human rights and the Sustainable Development Goals. Ensuring a regular flow of information between national human rights and Sustainable Development Goals coordination bodies would help to link up the dots between distinct yet closely related processes, reduce the reporting burden of States and accelerate implementation efforts.<sup>44</sup>

50. Coordination between national mechanisms for implementation, reporting and follow-up and coordination structures for the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals could take concrete shape through the organization of regular meetings between the two structures, encouraging their members to take part in each other's report preparation processes. Coordination might also be realized by ensuring that key actors in the fields of data planning, collection and analysis, including representatives of national statistical offices and local and regional governments, sit on both structures. Cross-fertilization efforts may also be enhanced through the use of common digital tracking tools.

51. During the 2023 seminar, Angola and Samoa explained that both their national mechanisms on human rights reporting and follow-up and their Sustainable Development Goals coordination bodies had established institutionalized tracks of communication and collaboration. The Intersectoral Commission on Human Rights Reports of Angola includes focal points who also sit on the Sustainable Development Goals coordination commission under the Ministry of Finance. This practice has enhanced the integration of human rights recommendations into national sectoral policies. The Samoan national mechanism and the Sustainable Development Goals task force are co-chaired by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade and the Ministry of Finance, which organize regular joint meetings that help to promote coherence. When Samoa prepared its voluntary national review in 2020, members of the national mechanism participated in the drafting process. Data collected for the voluntary national review informed the national report to the universal periodic review a year later.

52. As indicated above, the inclusion of local actors and national statistical offices in both human rights and Sustainable Development Goals processes is an effective approach to enhance national coherence and optimizing resource utilization.<sup>45</sup> Local and regional governments are increasingly involved in voluntary national and local reviews. National statistical offices are pivotal in the nationalization and localization of the Sustainable Development Goals indicators.<sup>46</sup> In addition, data collected for monitoring the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals may be repurposed to track the implementation of human rights treaties.<sup>47</sup> This cross-fertilization enables national mechanisms to promote the integration of a human rights-based approach into the work of national entities involved in data planning and collection who can, in turn, assist national mechanisms in filling data gap.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>44</sup> A/HRC/50/64, paras. 57 and 58. See also OHCHR Regional Office for Southern Africa, "An intersectional approach to socioeconomic data in Southern Africa: leveraging data to leave no one behind" (2023).

<sup>45</sup> See <https://www.geneva-academy.ch/news/detail/714-expert-roundtable-discusses-role-of-local-and-regional-governments-in-data-collection-for-national-mechanisms>. See also OHCHR Regional Office for Southern Africa, "An intersectional approach to socioeconomic data in Southern Africa".

<sup>46</sup> See <https://www.geneva-academy.ch/news/detail/714-expert-roundtable-discusses-role-of-local-and-regional-governments-in-data-collection-for-national-mechanisms>.

<sup>47</sup> OHCHR Regional Office for Southern Africa, "An intersectional approach to socioeconomic data in Southern Africa", p. 21.

<sup>48</sup> The principles of a human rights-based approach to data are: participation, data disaggregation, self-identification, transparency, privacy and accountability. See OHCHR, "A human rights-based approach to data: leaving no one behind in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development" (2018).

53. During the 2023 seminar, Samoa promoted its integrated approach, supported by its digital tracking tool (SADATA), between reporting and follow-up processes on human rights, the Sustainable Development Goals and the Pathway for the Development of Samoa, its national development strategy. Recent research on digital tracking tools and databases by the Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights described SADATA as an effective tool that facilitates easy entry, retrieval and analysis of information and data for government bodies, civil society and other stakeholders in Samoa.<sup>49</sup> The need for an integrated approach is particularly needed in small island developing States, where the pooling of existing resources is critical.

54. Mainstreaming human rights into national policies, development plans and sustainable development visions and strategies has been the subject of several studies and reports.<sup>50</sup> However, the role national mechanisms play in this regard will need to be further discussed and analysed, including during the second seminar foreseen by the Human Rights Council in its resolution 51/33.

## VII. Other developments

### The virtual knowledge hub on national mechanisms

55. The virtual knowledge hub on national mechanisms is an online platform being developed by OHCHR pursuant to Council resolution 51/33. It will serve as a toolbox of resources for States and other stakeholders on the establishment of national mechanisms and the strengthening of their internal capacities to engage with human rights mechanisms, coordinate with other sectors and levels of government, consult with stakeholders and manage information.

56. The hub will have two interfaces: a public interface that will allow users find content; and a private interface, accessible only to registered users, to submit practices on issues related to national mechanisms and exchanges with other users. During the 2023 intersessional seminar, OHCHR presented a prototype version of the hub. Work on the hub has been delayed by the liquidity situation affecting the United Nations Secretariat. Currently, its public launch is expected to take place in 2025.

### Pledges in the framework of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

57. The Human Rights 75 Initiative, which was launched in December 2022, had three main objectives: promoting the universality and indivisibility of human rights; looking to the future; and bolstering the human rights ecosystem. Pledges were encouraged to bring about concrete change towards the greater enjoyment of human rights for all.<sup>51</sup> Some States formulated pledges related to the establishment and strengthening of national mechanisms. OHCHR and other stakeholders committed to work with States to help them transform pledges into a reality.

### Networks of national mechanisms

58. Efforts to foster experience-sharing have led to several initiatives around networks of national human rights focal points or national mechanisms for implementation, reporting and follow-up.

<sup>49</sup> See Zipoli, “The human rights data revolution”, p. 37.

<sup>50</sup> See [A/HRC/41/21](#) and [A/HRC/45/39](#).

<sup>51</sup> All pledges can be found on the Universal Human Rights Index, available at <https://uhri.ohchr.org/en/pledges>. Pledges related to national mechanisms can also be searched in the online platform.

59. In 2023, a network of human rights focal points for Portuguese-speaking countries, was established during the Ordinary Meeting of the Council of Ministers of the Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries in São Tomé and Príncipe.<sup>52</sup> The first meeting of the Network was held in June 2024.

60. In 2023 and 2024, initiatives in the Caribbean<sup>53</sup> and the Pacific<sup>54</sup> led to an agreement to consider the creation of regional networks.

61. At the global level, the international network of national mechanisms for implementation, reporting and follow-up was officially launched through the “Asuncion Declaration” on 9 May 2024, adopted during a meeting organized by Paraguay, attended by a total of 83 participants, including State representatives. The creation of the International Network was the result of a joint pledge by Morocco, Paraguay and Portugal.<sup>55</sup>

## VIII. Conclusion and recommendations

62. **Conclusions drawn from the discussions at the intersessional seminar of 23 June 2023 reiterated those of the regional consultations of 2021, that is, that national mechanisms for implementation, reporting and follow-up play a critical role in enhancing States’ engagement with international and regional human rights mechanisms and in facilitating the implementation of their outcomes at the national and local levels. Strengthening national human rights knowledge and capacities through the national mechanisms optimizes the impact of human rights mechanisms.**

63. **In many States, national mechanisms have become more efficient by setting up standing structures with adequate resources, sufficient political leverage and mandates, robust legal and institutional frameworks and diverse representation and membership.**

64. **Participants at the seminar confirmed that the increasing role of national mechanisms in mainstreaming human rights into sectoral policies should be encouraged. While national mechanisms are well positioned to achieve results in a concerted, coherent and coordinated manner, they would benefit from a higher level of political support. Good practices exchanged suggest establishing national mechanisms at the level of the Office of the President or the Prime Minister, with the active involvement of the ministry or ministerial departments in charge of planning. Securing membership at both political and technical levels was also identified as a good practice to ensure the level of authority required to coordinate, seek and receive information through political-level membership, while maintaining a continuous technical expertise and a degree of institutional memory through technical-level membership.**

65. **The seminar highlighted that clear descriptions of roles and responsibilities of members have also contributed to the effective functioning of national mechanisms. Those constitutive elements have enabled the national mechanisms established by States to meet their reporting obligations by facilitating information and data collection from different ministries and other State actors, such as national statistical offices, parliament, the judiciary and sustainable development and Sustainable Development Goals coordination bodies, as well as local and regional governments. Moreover, consultation of independent bodies, such as national human rights institutions and civil society organizations, have increasingly become a standard feature of national mechanisms.**

<sup>52</sup> See <https://www.cplp.org/id-4447.aspx?Action=1&NewsId=9962&M=NewsV2&PID=10872>.

<sup>53</sup> Caribbean regional workshop on United Nations human rights treaty bodies and national mechanisms, Bridgetown, Barbados, October 2023 (see <https://easterncaribbean.un.org/en/249832-caribbean-regional-workshop-un-human-rights-treaty-bodies-and-national-mechanisms-concludes>).

<sup>54</sup> Pacific regional capacity-building workshop on treaty body reporting and strengthening of national mechanisms for implementation, reporting and follow-up, Nadi, Fiji, 9–11 May 2024 (see [https://production-new-commonwealth-files.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/2024-05/human-rights-outcome-document.pdf?VersionId=tYdcQEmR\\_SwIpQ6y2swIXxXvtguiTpA5](https://production-new-commonwealth-files.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/2024-05/human-rights-outcome-document.pdf?VersionId=tYdcQEmR_SwIpQ6y2swIXxXvtguiTpA5)).

<sup>55</sup> See <https://www.mre.gov.py/index.php/ii-seminario-internacional-sobre-mecanismos-nacionales-de-implementacion-informes-y-seguimiento-asuncion-el-8-y-9-de-mayo-de-2024>.

66. With regard to information collection and management, some national mechanisms referred to the added value of using digital tracking tools and platforms and shared practices as part of efforts to build coherence with other national processes. The second intersessional seminar mandated by Council resolution 51/33, to be organized in 2025, will provide a space for more in-depth discussions on monitoring and evaluation, including through human rights digital tools and platforms.

67. Difficulties facing national mechanisms were highlighted during the seminar and in other forums. Good practices as well as ways to overcome challenges would therefore need to be further unpacked. These include, but are not limited to, the following issues:

(a) Coordination practices that concretely enhance the capacity of national mechanisms to report to human rights mechanisms and ensure follow-up to recommendations, including through written contributions from members of national mechanisms and the effective use of digital tracking tools and databases;

(b) Practices of national mechanisms that operate in federal systems;

(c) Consultation practices of national mechanisms to enable meaningful participation of civil society actors, including marginalized groups;

(d) Practices to mitigate the impact of staff turnover, strengthen institutional memory and ensure retention of skills and knowledge;

(e) The role of national mechanisms in ensuring that the data needed for human rights reporting, including when recommended by human rights mechanisms, is collected, respecting the principles of the human rights-based approach to data;

(f) The role of local and regional government actors and of national statistical offices in the work of national mechanisms;

(g) Systematic and sustained coordination and collaboration between Sustainable Development Goals coordination bodies and national mechanisms for implementation, reporting and follow-up;

(h) Implementation and follow-up practices around prioritization, human rights mainstreaming in sectoral policies and plans, adoption of plans for the implementation of recommendations or national human rights plans;

(i) Practices to respond to individual communications and follow-up to decisions on individual communications by human rights mechanisms;

(j) Cost-effective means for national mechanisms to discharge their daily functions and to carry out specific activities, such as consultations or the validation of reports, as lack of resources always remains a challenge.

68. From the intersessional seminar of 2023, as well as from recent developments, it may be concluded that while there are no “one-size-fits-all” solutions on national mechanisms for implementation, reporting and follow-up, States have shown interest in learning from one another on the set-up, structure and ways of operating that best fit the primary purpose of reporting and follow-up on their international human rights obligations.

69. In the light of the conclusions of the 2023 seminar, and bearing in mind other significant developments observed since 2022, it is recommended that the Human Rights Council explore ways of:

(a) Supporting further peer-to-peer exchanges and identifying and documenting related good practices, including through the international network for national mechanisms for implementation, reporting and follow-up and other networks, as well as through workshops, expert meetings and publications on the topics outlined above;<sup>56</sup>

<sup>56</sup> See para. 67.

(b) Further supporting the acquisition of human rights digital tracking tools and databases to enhance the implementation of recommendations and foster the participation of actors involved in data planning and data collection, including through the roll-out of the OHCHR National Recommendations Tracking Database in the countries that so request;

(c) Capturing in a report all the developments since the publication of the present report, including the practices to be shared during the second one-day intersessional seminar in 2025 on information management and the promotion of coherence with other implementation and follow-up processes at the national level.

70. OHCHR invites all United Nations human rights mechanisms, United Nations entities, national human rights institutions, civil society organizations, academia and other stakeholders to promote the messages and takeaways from the Human Rights 75 initiative and to ensure the effective follow-up to their own Human Rights 75 pledges, including those pertaining to the establishment and strengthening of national mechanisms for implementation, reporting and follow-up. The High Commissioner also calls upon United Nations entities to contribute to a future where a continuum of reporting, review and action drives the achievement of more sustainable and equitable results, echoing the vision of the Secretary-General's call to action for human rights and Our Common Agenda.

71. OHCHR also recommends that:

(a) All human rights mechanisms promote national mechanisms as key human rights structures at the national level, including by recommending, where relevant, their establishment and strengthening their outcomes, and engage with them in the preparation and execution of country visits and in the follow-up to such visits;

(b) States support the efforts of the treaty bodies to enhancing predictability, harmonizing working methods and simplifying their methods for stakeholders, bearing in mind that a coherent and effective treaty body system is essential to achieving meaningful engagement by national mechanisms, national human rights institutions, civil society organizations and other actors, as well as for the implementation of recommendations;

(c) The United Nations system, including United Nations country teams, contribute to the strengthening of the capacity of Member States to fulfil their human rights obligations, including through the establishment and strengthening of their national mechanisms for implementation, reporting and follow-up, and the promotion of greater integration between Sustainable Development Goals and human rights processes at the national level.

---