|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MINISTERS’ DEPUTIES** | CM Documents | **CM(2021)50-final** | 28 April 2021[[1]](#footnote-1) |

|  |
| --- |
| **131st Session of the Committee of Ministers(Hamburg, Germany, 21 May 2021)**Report on Council of Europe monitoring – strengthening cohesion and synergies |

**Introduction**

1. The Council of Europe member States are individually and collectively responsible for ensuring proper compliance with their obligations as members of the Organisation. Compliance with commitments is a key component of the unique strategic triangle composed of standard setting, monitoring and co-operation activities: the development of legally binding standards is linked to their monitoring by dedicated mechanisms and supplemented by technical co-operation to facilitate their implementation.

2. In her Strategic Framework of the Council of Europe ([SG/Inf(2020)34](https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?Reference=SG/Inf(2020)34" \o "Strategic Framework of the Council of Europe)), the Secretary General makes a number of proposals aimed at further strengthening cohesion and synergies among and between Council of Europe monitoring mechanisms. She mentions among the concrete achievements (deliverables) that she has identified for the four-year period (2022-2025): “*Facilitating reporting obligations under monitoring mechanisms, particularly by aligning monitoring and reporting (similar to the UN practice of a single “core document”) for several monitoring mechanisms with targeted questionnaires between the monitoring cycles. Achievement of enhanced co-ordination (alignment of visits, joint visits etc.) at the level of the Organisation, as well as with respect to the monitoring activities of other international organisations.*”

3. The Ministers’ Deputies have examined these proposals in the light of the decision taken at the Committee of Ministers’ 129th Session (Helsinki, 16-17 May 2019) in the context of item 2: “A shared responsibility for democratic security in Europe - Ensuring respect for rights and obligations, principles, standards and values”, in which the Ministers:

### “9. called for a stronger and more structured co-ordination between the monitoring activities of the Committee of Ministers, the Parliamentary Assembly, the Secretary General, the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities and the Commissioner for Human Rights, as well as of the various specialised monitoring and advisory bodies and mechanisms of the Organisation, without prejudice to their independence.”

### 4. Like the Secretary General, the Ministers’ Deputies underline that solutions must above all ensure that there is no undue interference in the independence and respective mandates of monitoring bodies, while continuing to ensure an objective and impartial monitoring.

**A. Monitoring by the Committee of Ministers**

*Introduction*

5. The 1994 Declaration on compliance with commitments by member States of the Council of Europe ([1994 Declaration](http://rm.coe.int/native/090000168053661f)), adopted by the Committee of Ministers at its 95th Session (10 November 1994), aimed primarily to set up a special mechanism enabling the Committee of Ministers to examine any situation or theme related to the implementation of the statutory obligations by the member States or of specific commitments in the fields of democracy, human rights and the rule of law.

6. In pursuing the aim of monitoring the implementation of the statutory obligations or of specific commitments by some member States, the Committee of Ministers has set up specific modalities to closely follow progress achieved and possible challenges encountered by those member States. In some cases, these monitoring procedures were decided at the time of accession of a new member State to the Council of Europe and were part of the accession procedure. In other cases, the procedure was decided after accession of a member State to the Organisation in reaction to particular situations in the countries or in response to the Parliamentary Assembly’s recommendations.[[2]](#footnote-2)

*Current situation*

7. For several years, country-specific monitoring procedures have been the subject of criticism. It has been said that they are incoherent, as they have been set up on the basis of specific decisions, without a pre-established and uniform format or scheme. They are also criticised for not being sufficiently foreseeable in that they have no defined ending. Furthermore, they concern, or have concerned, only a limited number of countries, which has sometimes led to the impression that they are not applied to other member States with similar problems.

8. Member States subject to a post-accession monitoring procedure have expressed strong reservations about the effectiveness of such procedure. Without calling into question the quality and objectivity of the work of the Secretariat, they argue that, in its current format, it is no longer likely to help them overcome the difficulties they encounter in assessing the implementation of their commitments.

9. It should also be recalled that the country-specific post-accession monitoring procedures were initiated, for the most recent of them, in the early 2000s. Since then, new conventional monitoring mechanisms have been set up or have undergone significant development. The contribution of these mechanisms to the role of the Committee of Ministers as guarantor of the respect of the commitments undertaken by the member States towards the Organisation has been growing over the years.

10. It can also be observed that the other Council of Europe bodies have stepped up their action in monitoring compliance with member States' commitments. This is the case with the Parliamentary Assembly,[[3]](#footnote-3) the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities[[4]](#footnote-4) and the Commissioner for Human Rights.[[5]](#footnote-5)

*Future situation*

11. In the light of the foregoing, the Ministers' Deputies consider that pursuing the on-going country-specific post-accession monitoring procedures is neither necessary, nor adequate. In reaching this conclusion they take the following elements into account:

- irrespective of the issue of monitoring, all member States are bound by all the commitments they undertook upon becoming members of the Council of Europe, including specific commitments entered into in the context of the accession procedure;

- in order to ensure compliance by member States of their commitments, the Committee of Ministers may continue to act on the basis of the 1994 Declaration, Article 1 of which provides that "The Committee of Ministers will consider the questions of implementation of commitments concerning the situation of democracy, human rights and the rule of law in any member state which will be referred to it either: by member states; by the Secretary General, or; on the basis of a recommendation from the Parliamentary Assembly";

- the Committee of Ministers may also use the thematic monitoring procedure it has developed, which enables it to monitor member States' compliance with commitments in terms of horizontal themes. This procedure, redefined in 2007,[[6]](#footnote-6) is in line with the modalities for the implementation of the 1994 Declaration, adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 20 April 1995,[[7]](#footnote-7) which provide that dialogue and compliance with commitments must be based on the principles of non-discrimination and co-operation.

12. Reference should also be made to the recently established Complementary procedure between the Committee of Ministers and the Parliamentary Assembly in the case of a serious violation by a member State of its statutory obligations, the primary aim of which is to bring a member State, through constructive dialogue and co-operation, to comply with the obligations and principles of the Organisation, hence as far as possible to avoid imposing sanctions.[[8]](#footnote-8)

13. In the spirit of co-operation that has governed the setting-up of the Complementary procedure, and independently of it, the Ministers' Deputies propose to consider the modalities for a dialogue with the Parliamentary Assembly on the wider issue of monitoring of commitments, having regard to their respective mandates. In this context, the Committee of Ministers takes note of Parliamentary Assembly Recommendation 2199 (2021) and its Resolution 2369 (2021) on “The Assembly's vision on the strategic priorities for the Council of Europe”, in which it indicates that “it stands ready to engage in a constructive institutional dialogue on this matter and will evaluate its own monitoring activities.”

**B. Council of Europe monitoring mechanisms**

*Introduction*

14. In addition to the statutory bodies, monitoring is performed by specialised entities and monitoring mechanisms set up by specific treaties or Committee of Ministers’ resolutions. Over the years they have significantly contributed to improving law and practice of member States.[[9]](#footnote-9)

15. The strength of Council of Europe monitoring bodies often derives from the fact that their activities also build on the European Convention on Human Rights as interpreted by the European Court of Human Rights. Many of these bodies have also over time developed a considerable corpus of standards, findingsand good practices of their own, specific to their field of activity. Their work is technical and highly valued, frequently referred to by the European Court of Human Rights, and they are an important part of the Organisation’s acquis. Through their monitoring of Council of Europe standards, they are an important link to and impetus for the co-operation activities offering member States assistance in the implementation of standards.

16. The monitoring bodies are a relatively heterogenous group, set up over time by the member States to respond to different concerns related to the Council of Europe’s core objectives of promoting respect for human rights, democracy and the rule of law. The conventions and resolutions through which they have been established indicate their respective mandates and also the methods by which they are to conduct their monitoring activities. The latter may vary depending on which substantive areas, rights or issues they are to monitor. Whereas some monitoring bodies are composed of independent experts, others are composed of government appointed experts and based on a system of peer review. A common feature for all these bodies is their constant dialogue with the member States.

17. The added value of several of the monitoring mechanisms often lies in the cyclical nature of their work. They perform a periodic, thorough assessment of member States, in line with their mandates and well-established standards and procedures. Their specialised work, which is complex, requires continued political and financial support to be efficient. It also requires confidence, respect, accuracy, consistency, coherence and non-politicisation.

*Challenges*

19. Despite their success, there are challenges facing the monitoring mechanisms. There is a need for them to respond to evolving circumstances and adapt their working methods. They should for example make use of modern technologies to increase their efficiency and visibility as well as to facilitate the dialogue with member States and their reporting. They also need to avoid inconsistency and duplication where topics are monitored by more than one monitoring body, to deliver well-reasoned and accurate findings and to react rapidly to emerging situations. They need to take into account the relevant characteristics, including the legal system, of the member States.

20. Some monitoring bodies have been criticised for the inconsistent interpretation and application of the instrument they monitor, or for going beyond the provisions of the legal instrument. Concerns have also been raised about the recurrence of cases where the opinions and recommendations of monitoring bodies have been ignored.

*Coordination within the Council of Europe*

21. In response to these challenges, several monitoring mechanisms have taken action to coordinate and inter-act with other mechanisms to identify best practices with respect to working methods and procedures.

22. This has been facilitated by the yearly meetings between presidents and executive secretaries of monitoring and advisory bodies organised since 2013 by the Secretary General. These coordination meetings have provided a possibility for monitoring mechanisms to discuss challenges as well as possibilities for enhanced co-operation and coordination and to evaluate initiatives that have already been taken. An example of the result of these meetings was the development by the large majority of monitoring mechanisms of possibilities to react rapidly to emerging problematic situations in member States. Another subject that has been discussed is to make best use of the “strategic triangle” between standard-setting, monitoring and co-operation and how monitoring mechanisms play an important role in this relationship.

23. In her Strategic Framework, the Secretary General proposes in particular to examine how reporting obligations under monitoring mechanisms can be facilitated, particularly by aligning monitoring and reporting for several monitoring mechanisms with targeted questionnaires between the monitoring cycles. Other points that are mentioned relate to the achievement of enhanced coordination in organising country visits at the level of the Organisation, as well as with respect to the monitoring activities of other international organisations.

24. The Ministers’ Deputies attach great importance to well-functioning and coordinated monitoring. This ensures quality results and facilitates the task of member States. They agree with the Secretary General about the importance of enhanced coordination and consider that constant efforts should be made in this respect, notably in relation to bodies covering similar topics and including through an increased use of information and communications technology (ICT).

*Recent and ongoing reform work*

25. An overview made by the Ministers’ Deputies of Council of Europe monitoring mechanisms showed that many of them had recently undergone important reform or that reform was underway.

26. A striking example of recent reform work that has resulted in enhanced coordination and efficiency gains concerns the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. As a result, their respective reporting periods have been aligned to five years, with information on the implementation of recommendations for immediate action contained in the Charter evaluation reports two and a half years thereafter, and their respective secretariats have been joined into one division (in May 2020) to ensure a solid basis for enhanced synergies. It is furthermore envisaged to strengthen their dialogue with States Parties through various means and the reform, which is gradually implemented since January 2020, also provides for faster publication of evaluation results and for new means to address reporting delays. These measures are already producing positive results in terms of the efficiency and effectiveness of these monitoring mechanisms, while the distinctive character of the two mechanisms was maintained.

27. With respect to the European Social Charter, a process initiated by the Committee of Ministers resulted in a report by the Steering Committee for Human Rights (CDDH) containing proposals for improving the implementation of social rights.[[10]](#footnote-10) This was followed up by the European Committee of Social Rights (ECSR) when taking concrete steps to streamline some aspects of its procedures, making reporting more targeted and strategic. The ECSR also adopted a “position paper” setting out its priorities for the reform process. Moreover, the Governmental Committee of the Social Charter (GC) provided an outline of plans to review its working methods, confirming its commitment to simplifying and rationalising the reporting mechanisms, to strengthening the follow-up to all conclusions of non-conformity, and to enhancing the dialogue with other stakeholders. In addition, the Secretary General has informed the Deputies about her intention to submit a report to the Committee of Ministers ahead of its 131st Session.

28. The Committee of the Parties to the Convention on the Protection of Children against Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse (Lanzarote Committee) is presently reflecting on how to improve its effectiveness and capacity to respond to States Parties’ needs and expectations by reviewing its working methods. This follows from a rapid increase in ratifications, an increase in sexual violence against children and the high priority given to this work by most member States.

29. The Ministers’ Deputies consider that the possibilities for further reform must be examined carefully and take into account the specific features of each monitoring mechanism. They note that the heterogenous nature of the Organisation’s mechanisms make it difficult to propose the same measures for all of them but note that there may be groups of mechanisms with respect to which further synergies could be identified. However, in this context the Deputies also underline the importance of evaluating the results of reforms already undertaken.

*- Rapid reaction capacity*

30. As mentioned above, the large majority of monitoring bodies have increased their capacity for rapid reaction and/or ad hoc action, thereby becoming more flexible.

31. An example of this is the possibility for the Group of Experts against Trafficking in Human Beings (GRETA), if it receives reliable information about a situation requiring immediate attention to prevent or limit the scale or number of serious violations of the Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings, to make an urgent request for information to any Party or Parties to the Convention and, if necessary, to carry out a visit to the Party or Parties concerned.

32. For its part, in cases of serious or persistent violence covered by the Convention, the Group of Experts on Action against Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (GREVIO) may initiate a special inquiry procedure.

33. With respect to the Group of States against Corruption (GRECO), its evaluation cycles and compliance procedures are also complemented by an ad hoc procedure allowing for urgent reactions to issues in member States that potentially may lead to serious violations of anti-corruption standards.

34. In recent years, the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture (CPT) has further increased its capacity to organise rapid reaction visits; and a number of such visits have been carried out, in particular, as regards immigration detention and the Covid-19 pandemic.

*- Follow-up procedures*

35. In parallel to the development of rapid reaction capacities or as a means of ensuring more effective implementation, most monitoring mechanisms have also developed follow-up procedures.

36. Whenever there are situations of persistent lack of implementation of important recommendations, GRETA has initiated the practice of “high-level dialogue” bilaterally with the State concerned in order to facilitate implementation. The same goes for GRECO, which, in addition to its comprehensive post-evaluation compliance procedure in respect of all members, may use “high-level visits” to provide additional pressure when compliance with its recommendations is lacking.

37. The European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) has also introduced an interim follow-up mechanism, in the context of which it reviews the implementation of its priority recommendations two years after the publication of each country report. Likewise, the Committee of Experts of the Language Charter has shorter reporting periods for their recommendations for immediate action.

38. Follow-up is an important feature of monitoring and should be intrinsically linked to the possibility of establishing co-operation and technical assistance activities.

*- Reporting*

39. Reports from the States Parties are the basis for the work of several monitoring mechanisms such as the European Social Charter, GRECO, the Framework Convention and the Language Charter. As Council of Europe member States often mention the burden that it represents for their administrations to produce State reports, solutions for facilitating reporting obligations should be examined. The UN operates with a single “core document”, a solution that may be impracticable in the Council of Europe because of the heterogenous nature of the monitoring bodies. There may, however, be solutions for facilitating reporting, including digital solutions where appropriate, and for replying to questionnaires that could also be more targeted.

40. Further streamlining the elaboration of State reports may also lead to efficiency gains in the drafting of country review reports, conclusions and opinions and may improve their quality and consistency.

*- Joint visits*

41. Joint country visits are often mentioned as a means of developing synergies and increasing effectiveness. Some monitoring mechanisms have coordinated the dates of their visits, in consultation with the governments concerned, and held joint (as well as separate) meetings, like the Advisory Committee of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, the Expert Committee of the Charter for Regional and Minority Languages and ECRI. However, the results have not always been conclusive and in practice proposals for joint visits are often turned down by national administrations.

42. While visits of this type are only a practical option when the issues of substance covered by monitoring bodies are very similar or overlapping, this remains a possibility to be considered on a case-by-case basis together with the member States concerned.

*Co-operation with other international organisations*

43. Almost all Council of Europe monitoring mechanisms co-operate with equivalent mechanisms in other international organisations to varying degrees, some examples are indicated below. The Ministers’ Deputies would emphasise that this form of co-operation and coordination is very important to avoid duplication and to create synergies, thereby improving the efficiency of monitoring. The possibilities to enhance such co-operation should continue to be explored and acted upon, taking the respective mandates of the monitoring mechanisms duly into account.

44. Following established practice, the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) is requesting the Council of Europe’s input to the different sessions of the Universal Periodic Review (UPR)[[11]](#footnote-11) on the human rights situation in the Council of Europe member States under review. Contributions from a number of monitoring bodies are of particular relevance and publicly available information is communicated to the OHCHR.[[12]](#footnote-12)

45. A Co-ordination Group between the Council of Europe and the OSCE has been established to encourage co-operation between the two organisations in four priority areas: the fight against human trafficking, the protection of the rights of persons belonging to national minorities, the promotion of tolerance and non-discrimination and the fight against terrorism. The Group takes stock of the co-operation and holds in-depth discussions on two areas at each bi-annual meeting.

46. The Council of Europe also contributes to the European Fundamental Rights Information System (EFRIS) developed by the EU’s Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA) to bring together data and information from existing human rights databases, notably Council of Europe’s HUDOC database. With improved visibility and accessibility of the Council of Europe’s monitoring mechanisms and their findings, EFRIS contributes to a better assessment of fundamental rights in the EU, and thus helps policy-makers at the national and EU levels to undertake reforms and take decisions in the human rights field.[[13]](#footnote-13)[[14]](#footnote-14)

47. The Committee of Experts on the Evaluation of Anti-Money Laundering Measures (MONEYVAL) has a special status with respect to coordination with its global equivalent as a regional body within the AML/CFT Global Network led by the Financial Action Task Force (FATF). As such, MONEYVAL is required to strictly apply the FATF standards, procedures and assessment methodology. It implements concrete measures to avoid duplication and facilitate synergies with other AML/CFT monitoring bodies. This is done through dedicated mechanisms set up by the FATF within the Global AML/CFT Network, including joint training and exchange of evaluators. In addition, twelve international organisations hold observer status with MONEYVAL.

48. GRECO has taken several measures to avoid duplication and facilitate concrete synergies at international level. This is the case as regards the international anti-corruption monitoring bodies of the United Nations, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the Organization of American States (OAS). The respective secretariats meet regularly to discuss operational issues, meetings and evaluation dates are coordinated, information exchanged, and joint events organised where possible. GRECO also carried out a joint visit with its OECD’s counterpart (the Working group on bribery). In 2018, GRECO adopted a document on “Enhancing synergies amongst the international anti-corruption bodies (GRECO, OAS, OECD, UNODC)” to highlight the complementarity of the global and regional bodies and emphasise the specificity and unique added value of GRECO, which also works closely with the OSCE/ODIHR. These organisations, as well as the EU, have observer status with GRECO.

49. The CPT is a monitoring mechanism with unique methods and procedures. At the global level, the CPT and the UN Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture (SPT) co-operate and consult each other on the practical organisation of their work with a view to avoiding duplication and to enhancing the effectiveness of their work, in a manner that respects and reflects their respective strengths and values, as provided for in their founding instruments. In this respect, the SPT has special responsibilities regarding the establishment and operation of national preventive mechanisms (NPM), while the primary task of the CPT is to carry out field visits.**[[15]](#footnote-15)**

50. GRETA and GREVIO participate in the UN-based networks of international and regional monitoring systems in the respective areas (ICAT for GRETA and EDVAW for GREVIO), which ensure regular synergies and exchanges of information amongst relevant international partners, and regularly consult with the international partners in preparation of the country evaluation reports, including those active in the field, with whom meetings are organised as appropriate in the context of country visits.

51. The Monitoring Group of the Anti-Doping Convention (T-DO) established a dynamic institutional partnership with the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) on compliance monitoring. This partnership allows to ensure complementarities and develop synergies between the monitoring of the implementation of the Council of Europe Anti-Doping Convention and the compliance with the World Anti-Doping Code (ensured by WADA). It includes permanent information exchange, development of common reporting tools (questionnaires), organisation of joint monitoring visits, co-ordination of the follow-up work in the members States as well as many other activities.

**Conclusions**

52. The Ministers’ Deputies welcome the proposals made by the Secretary General to set in motion a reflection on monitoring within the Council of Europe.

53. The Deputies see a need to reconsider the Committee of Ministers’ monitoring and refer in this respect to Chapter A, paragraph 11, above. Since presently, there are useful alternatives to actively pursuing the Committee’s country-specific post-accession monitoring, the Deputies consider that the Committee’s ongoing country-specific monitoring procedures should be ended. Furthermore, a dialogue with the Parliamentary Assembly on the wider issue of its monitoring of commitments should be undertaken. In this context, the Committee of Ministers takes note of the Parliamentary Assembly’s Recommendation 2199 (2021) and its Resolution 2369 (2021) on “The Assembly's vision on the strategic priorities for the Council of Europe”, in which it indicates that “it stands ready to engage in a constructive institutional dialogue on this matter and will evaluate its own monitoring activities.”

54. The monitoring performed by specialised mechanisms set up by treaties or Committee of Ministers’ resolutions has over the years contributed to significant improvement in member States’ law and practice. Their work is highly valued, and they are an important part of the Organisation’s acquis. Through their monitoring of the implementation of the standards agreed by the member States, they are also an important link to the co-operation activities offering member States assistance in the implementation of standards.

55. There are nevertheless a number of challenges facing these monitoring mechanisms and a need for them to evolve and adapt their working methods to continue to ensure quality results while facilitating the task of member States.

56. In particular, the Ministers’ Deputies would stress the importance of enhanced coordination and they consider that constant efforts should be made in this respect. This concerns coordination between Council of Europe mechanisms, but also between these and equivalent mechanisms in other international organisations, within the mandates given to them. The report gives examples of good practice in this respect and further efforts could be made.

57. The importance of reform of the European Social Charter mechanism has been stressed on many occasions in recent years. It has now entered a new dynamic phase and should be given priority in the coming year. It will be followed closely and supported by the Deputies.

58. More generally, the Ministers’ Deputies consider it vital that Council of Europe monitoring mechanisms make full use of modern technologies to increase their efficiency and visibility as well as to facilitate their dialogue with member States and the reporting of the latter. They consider this to be an avenue to be explored further in the coming years. In particular, consideration could be given to creating a monitoring portal on the Council of Europe website that functions as a “one-stop shop” to facilitate access to the websites of the various bodies.

59. To conclude, the Deputies would welcome pragmatic proposals for enhancing the coordination, effectiveness and impact of monitoring mechanisms, and would invite all the stakeholders, in particular the mechanisms themselves, to contribute. They propose to invite the Secretary General to coordinate these efforts and to report back in time for the 132nd Ministerial Session in May 2022.

**Appendix**

**Monitoring mechanisms of the Council of Europe referred to in**

**this report and their acronyms**

The European Committee for the Prevention of Torture (CPT)

The European Committee of Social Rights (ECSR)

Governmental Committee of the European Social Charter (GC)

The Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM)

The Committee of Experts of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages

The European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI)

The Group of Experts Against Trafficking in Human Beings (GRETA)

The Group of States against Corruption (GRECO)

The Committee of Experts on the Evaluation of anti-Money Laundering Measures and the Financing of Terrorism (MONEYVAL)

The Group of Experts on Action against Violence against Women and Domestic Violence

(GREVIO)

The Committee of the Parties to the Convention on the Protection of Children against Sexual

Exploitation and Sexual Abuse (Lanzarote Committee)

1. This document has been classified restricted until examination by the Committee of Ministers. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For a complete overview of the monitoring procedures under the responsibility of the Committee of Ministers, see [DPA/Inf(2012)3](https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?Reference=DPA/Inf(2012)3" \o "Overview of the monitoring procedures under the responsibility of the Committee of Ministers) and [GR-DEM(2016)15](https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?Reference=GR-DEM(2016)15" \o "Update on the overview of the country-specific monitoring procedures under the responsibility of the Committee of Ministers - Information document prepared by the Directorate of Political Affairs ). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. [Link to PACE monitoring](https://pace.coe.int/en/pages/committee-4/AS-MON) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. [Link to Congress monitoring](https://www.coe.int/en/web/congress/work) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. [Link to Commissioner for Human Rights website](https://www.coe.int/en/web/commissioner/country-monitoring) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. [CM/Del/Dec(2007)999/2.2-app2](https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?Reference=CM/Del/Dec(2007)999/2.2-app2" \o "Committee of Ministers' thematic monitoring procedure: New modalities (Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 5 July 2007 at the 999th meeting (in camera) of the Ministers' Deputies)) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. [CM/Del/Dec(95)535/2.4-app7](https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?Reference=CM/Del/Dec(95)535/2.4-app7" \o "Procedure for implementing the Declaration of 10 November 1994 on compliance with commitments accepted by member states of the Council of Europe) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. [CM/Del/Dec(2020)1366/1.7-app](https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?Reference=CM/Del/Dec(2020)1366/1.7-app" \o "Complementary procedure between the Committee of Ministers and the Parliamentary Assembly in response to a serious violation by a member State of its statutory obligations) [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. [Practical impact of the Council of Europe monitoring](https://rm.coe.int/09000016806d22c8) [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Report identifying good practices and making proposals with a view to improving the implementation of social rights in Europe ([CM(2019)106](https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?Reference=CM(2019)106" \o "Steering Committee for Human Rights (CDDH) – Report identifying good practices and making proposals with a view to improving the implementation of social rights in Europe [1351bis meeting])). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. The Universal Periodic Review (UPR) is a unique process which involves a review of the human rights records of all UN member States. The UPR is a State-driven process, under the auspices of the Human Rights Council, which provides the opportunity for each State to declare what actions they have taken to improve the human rights situations in their countries and to fulfil their human rights obligations.

The documents on which the reviews are based are: 1) information provided by the State under review, which can take the form of a “national report”; 2) information contained in the reports of independent human rights experts and groups, known as the Special Procedures, human rights treaty bodies, and other UN entities; 3) information from other stakeholders including national human rights institutions and non-governmental organisations. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. ECRI: country reports and interim follow-up conclusions; FCNM: Advisory Committee opinions and CM resolutions; ECRML: country reports; GRETA: country reports; GREVIO; Lanzarote Committee; CPT: reports on visits and Government responses; ECSR: conclusions and factsheets; GRECO: evaluation and compliance reports. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The monitoring bodies included in EFRIS are: ECSR, CPT, ECRI and GRECO. The inclusion of GRETA and GREVIO is underway. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. The information provided to EFRIS concerns EU member States and candidate countries with observer status at FRA (North Macedonia, Serbia and Albania) and is publicly available on the Council of Europe websites, including HUDOC. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. It is understood that such co-operation between the CPT and the STP takes into account the fact that not all Council of Europe member States have signed or ratified the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)