**Discussion paper of the Informal Working Group on COVID-19**

**1. Introduction**

This discussion paper is based on the information shared during the meetings of the informal Working Group on COVID-19 (informal WG) and the discussion held among participants during these meetings. The informal WG was established as the outcome of the informal online Chairpersons’ meeting held from 2 to 5 June 2020. The main objective of the informal WG has been to consider the impact that COVID-19 has had on the modalities of work of the treaty bodies, to gather information on the online activities of treaty bodies during COVID-19 and to review the substantive contributions of treaty bodies to COVID-19 and human rights issues.

The purpose of the informal WG is to identify challenges, obstacles and good practices to inform the 32nd meeting of Chairpersons so as to coordinate the response of treaty bodies and collectively address the common challenges and obstacles to carry out the mandated activities. Focal points for 2020 treaty body review and all interested members of treaty bodies were invited to participate in the informal WG. The informal WG held online meetings on 3, 10 and 17 July 2020 and approximately 28 members from all ten treaty bodies participated in the meetings. While the mandate of the informal WG was broad to cover both substantive and procedural issues related to COVID-19 and the need to monitor and address protection gap was emphasized by many participants, most of the meeting time was devoted to procedural aspect of the work if treaty bodies due to constraint of time. During the meetings, the informal WG also received inputs from the Secretariat on the details of online working methods used by each treaty bodies and briefing on financial issues and the conference services.

In accordance to the purpose of the informal WG, no conclusion has been drawn. Rather, the discussion paper contains information about the variety of experiences and also the different evaluations of the treaty bodies with regard to their experiences working in a digital way. However, participants throughout the meetings reiterated that:

* Treaty bodies cannot carry out core mandated monitoring work online in a satisfactory manner. To discharge mandates, treaty bodies need in person meetings, and where required, the possibility to visit institutions etc. Online work cannot and should not substitute regular way of work.
* Nonetheless, treaty bodies have done and tried various activities online not only to avoid protection gaps but also to identify and address human rights issues related to COVID-19. Some activities and modalities worked and some did not work.
* Some good practices can be taken away and integrated in the working methods in ordinary times, and such represent innovations with regard to working methods. However, measures applied by treaty bodies during this period are exceptional measures used by necessity in exceptional circumstances to ensure continuity of work and shall not be made permanent modality of the work of treaty bodies.
* Challenges and obstacles for online work need to be addressed jointly and urgently with necessary measures in light of ongoing uncertainty of possibility of in person meetings of treaty bodies.

The current document is a summary of discussions and findings of the informal WG to reflect issues discussed and to be presented to the Chairpersons’ meeting. The document reflects those different experiences and inputs that participants shared in their personal capacity, and does not represent the position of their respective treaty bodies. Specific reference to treaty bodies in this discussion paper are merely for illustrative purposes.

**2. Mapping activities of treaty bodies during the COVID-19 pandemic**

Participants shared the information on the activities of their treaty bodies carried out online or remotely during the COVID-19 pandemic and modalities used (see Annex). It was found that treaty bodies despite difficulties faced in working online have been able to implement a number of various activities during the period of the pandemic to ensure that there is no protection gap and to address human rights issues related to COVID-19 under their respective mandates.

Treaty bodies held sessions, pre-sessional working groups, special meeting, Working Groups on Individual Communications (IC), Inquiry, General Comments (GC)/General Recommendations (GR), Enquiry warning and urgent action procedures, special meetings and bureau meetings online and carried out other intersessional activities. The conducted activities include:

* Solemn declaration of new members
* Election of Bureau, appointment of WG members and rapporteurs
* Revision of rules of procedures
* Adoption of statement, guidance and advice on COVID-19 and on other issues
* Adoption of List of Issues (LOIs) and List of Issues Prior to Reports (LOIPRs), adoption of decisions of individual communications
* Adoption of follow up reports on Concluding Observations (COBs)
* Individual communications (IC)
* Adoption of follow-up reports on Views on individual communications
* Interstate communications
* Inquiry
* Early warning
* Urgent actions
* Adoption of the annual/biennial report to GA
* General Comments (GC)/General Recommendations (GR)
* Meeting with States parties
* Meetings with stakeholders (e.g. National Preventive Mechanisms (NPM), Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), NGOs)
* Hearing of testimony of family of victim
* Webinars

The wide variety is observed concerning the types of activities:

* Whether meetings were public or private (closed)
* Whether meetings were among members only or with external participants such as States parties or other stakeholders
* Substantive monitoring activities or procedural or internal activities

It should be highlighted that the meetings held online in the ordinary times such as the opening and closing meetings of the sessions and the general reading of draft GC were held public online meetings webcast. Furthermore, SPT held the opening and closing of the session in a public session which was webcast for the first time in its history.

On the other hand, some activities that have not been carried out to date are dialogues with States parties for periodic review, in situ visits for monitoring and visit for inquiries. For individual communication, some participants raised concern on confidentiality. Nonetheless, CCPR and CEDAW adopted decisions on individual communications and CRC prepared draft decisions by WG on OPIC online. CEDAW evaluated the on-line work of the WG on OPIC as unsatisfactory and formalistic. It is worth noting that that CCPR WG on IC could adopt draft decisions for 45 individual communication cases and 17 decisions in plenary, while CAT decided to postpone its work on individual communications for concerns on confidentiality and difficulties in collegial discussion online until the time the Committee can have a session in person.

The modalities and procedures used are also varied depending on the types of activities:

* Exchange of emails
* Written comments on drafts placed on Extranet
* Written solemn declaration placed on website
* Virtual meetings using online platform with or without interpretation
* Combination of above

**3. Challenges and obstacles and possible solutions**

Participants shared various challenges and obstacles experienced in online work. Some challenges and obstacles are common to all treaty bodies, while some treaty bodies face particular challenges.

**a. Different time zones among members**

Regular office hours for Secretariat supporting the activities of treaty bodies is from 10h00 and 18h00 Geneva time (CET). 10h00 Geneva time means unreasonable starting time in early morning for members residing in Latin America and Caribbean region, US and Canada. 18h00 Geneva time means unreasonable closing time for members residing in East Asia and Pacific region.

Scheduling meetings to accommodate participation of all members residing in different time zones is challenging. For example, CCPR WG on IC held one week WG meetings from 11h00 to 14h00 and 15h00 to 18h00 every day, which meant from 05h00 to 08h00 and 09h00 to 12h00 for one member in the Caribbean and from 18h00 to 21h00 and 22h00 to 01h00 for another member in East Asia. Other treaty bodies who held online meetings of either plenary or working groups, experienced similar challenges imposing unreasonable work time on some members and/or the Secretariat.

Possible practical solutions include scheduling meeting times to limited time slots per day, which accommodate most members within less unreasonable time or working in regional groups. However, working in regional groups would not be a solution for members residing in Asia-Pacific region as suitable working time in Asia-Pacific is always outside the regular working time for Secretariat in Geneva. Possible solutions to overcome this issue would be to make staff in NY or OHCHR regional offices available to support the meetings of regional group meetings and/or plenary.

**b. Online platforms for virtual meetings**

Treaty bodies have used several platforms to hold virtual online meetings including Interprefy, Webex, Skype for Business and Zoom. For meetings with interpretation, Interprefy has been used and Webex or Skype for Business for meetings without interpretation. Participants shared the observation of difficulties in using Interprefy and less difficulties in using Webex and Skype for Business.

Some elements are highlighted as minimum requirement for online platforms usable for treaty body virtual meetings such as quality, security, support for interpretation and accessibility of persons with disabilities. In particular, CRPD members have reiterated the need of platforms with accessibility features for persons with disabilities as indispensable conditions for online meetings of CRPD. Such need is also emphasized by participants of other treaty bodies.

Each platform has different merits and problems such as:

* Interprefy does not support accessibility for persons with visual disabilities, however it does support sign language interpretation, and captioning. It is not easy to use. It needs many technical support staff to support and each meeting costs. However, it supports interpretation and thus meetings in multiple languages.
* Webex and Skype for Business are easy to use and generally considered to be secure. Webex supports accessibility for persons with visual disabilities. The cost is low. However, they do not support interpretation.
* Zoom is easy to use and the quality is comparatively better. It supports interpretation and accessibility features for persons with disabilities. The cost is low. However, its use is prohibited for the UN Secretariat due to security concerns.
* MS Teams is generally considered to be secure and easy to use. The cost is low. It supports accessibility features for persons with disabilities but does not support interpretation. It has not been used by treaty bodies.

Some participants suggested exploring the possibility of using Zoom. CRC WG on GC had private online meetings using Zoom hosted by members with the account of institutions (university, law office) host members belong to. While the use of Zoom is currently prohibited by the UN Secretariat for security reason, there are many examples where other UN bodies and agencies have been regularly using Zoom (UN Women, UNICEF, UNDP and ILO) or allow its use on exceptional cases upon special requests and special authorization from the chief of IT (UNODC). UNHCR recommends to its staff the use of Webex and Teams as the officially supported platforms but the use of Zoom is not prohibited and actually observed.[[1]](#footnote-1) Furthermore, it is worth noting that as an example of the use of Zoom by UN human rights mechanisms, the WG on Business and Human Rights will hold a virtual public meeting using Zoom set up with the account of the institution (university) a member (Chair) belongs to.[[2]](#footnote-2)

While the security concern about Zoom has been raised, use of safeguard measures to avoid access by uninvited third parties are suggested such as: setting meetings with password; sending the link and password to participants close to the meetings with the request not to share those with others; and using waiting room to allow only registered participants to enter into the meeting. Also it is generally advised not to share sensitive information in the meetings on Zoom. However, a concern on confidentiality of information shared in the Zoom meetings may not apply to the public meetings of treaty bodies. In light of the merits of Zoom in terms of user friendly features, quality of virtual meetings, interpretation and accessibility features and the low costs, the procedure and conditions for enabling interested treaty bodies to use Zoom for public meetings and private meetings with less security concerns (e.g., meetings for discussion on procedural matters or meetings with stakeholders who consent to the use of Zoom) should be clarified and necessary actions should be taken to make the use of Zoom available as an option.

Some participants note that the technological conditions of accessibility, connectivity, confidentiality and interpretation let alone the time differences among countries of residence of members, have impacted the quality of work, the efficiency of decision-making processes and the overall quality of interaction among members of the Committee, which resulted in the operational difficulties and the impossibility to hold a constructive dialogue with States Parties and to maintain a fruitful and crucial dialogue with civil society.

**c. Connectivity and equipment to access and participate in the online meetings**

Another common challenge experienced concerning online work is difficulties for some members in participating in virtual online meeting because of poor internet connection, expensive cost of high speed and big data capacity to participate in video meetings and technical problems faced during video meetings. Also some members experienced technical problem in accessing Extranet. Such technical problems experienced include the problems caused to the equipment of the members such as webcam not functioning, solution for which requires the provision of technical support or equipment compatible for online meetings.

**d. Lack of interpretation**

Language issues have created serious problems. Provision of official interpretation of three working languages has been very limited. As a result, most of the private meetings and remote work through exchange of emails and use of Extranet have been conducted in English only, undermining not only the principle of multilingualism of the UN but also equal and effective participation of non-English speaking members.

When official interpretation and translation are not provided, members had to use online translation tools, rely on support from Secretariat or hire private interpreters at their own expenses. Even when interpretation is provided, it is limited to up to two segments of two hours with one and half or two hour break.

The main reason for insufficient provision of interpretation is explained by conference services to be due to the necessary preparation time, extremely stressful and intense work for interpreters which cannot be continued longer than two hours and the cost of Interprefy due to necessary heavy technical support needed. It was clarified that maximum of two hours for one segment with one and half or two hour break cannot be changed but three segments per day would be possible (i.e. 10h00-12h00, 13h30-15h30, 17h00-18h00, which means possible five hour meeting time with interpretation per day, provided that the financial resources are available. It was also clarified that interpretation services can be provided for the meetings using Zoom if the use of Zoom is permitted, which will substantially reduce the cost for the meetings with interpretation. One working method used to overcome the issue of interpretation was to work in regional groups, along languages (LAC group in Spanish, African group in French, others in English).

**e. Costs for online work**

Another commonly experienced challenge is lack of financial support or compensation for: specialized assistance required for members with disabilities; extended time spent for mandated activities during sessions, pre-sessional working groups and WG on IC and Inquiry covered by Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) in regular time; and cost for connectivity or equipment necessary to participate in online meetings. Specialized assistance for members with disabilities, (e.g., personal assistant) and connectivity and equipment are pre-requisite for members to participate in online meetings just like travels to Geneva to participate in sessions, pre-sessional working groups and WG on IC or Inquiry.

As analogous to the payable cost of assistance for members with disabilities and travel expenses as well as DSA for the meetings in Geneva, cost of assistance for members with disabilities, cost of connectivity and equipment for members in place of travel expenses and DSA to cover time spent, local transportation and other personal expenses to participate in the meetings online from the place of their residence should be payable.

DSA is defined as the entitlement of experts including treaty body members for travels required for mandated activities.[[3]](#footnote-3) However, “an expert who resides at the place of the meeting shall receive DSA at 20 per cent of the usual rate for each full day of attendance to cover incidental expenses.”[[4]](#footnote-4) An analogical interpretation of this rule may provide a legitimate basis for the payment of discounted rate of DSA to treaty body members who participate in online meetings.

As to the resources to cover such costs, it is noted that large portion of the regular budget approved for sessions of treaty bodies in 2020 remains unspent because of postponement of many sessions[[5]](#footnote-5). Instead of traveling for in person meetings in Geneva or for in situ visits, treaty bodies have been continuing their work remotely. In this alternative working method, connectivity and equipment is the minimum requirement for the members to “participate in online meetings” in the same way as is the travel and accommodation to participate in the physical in person meetings.

To enable treaty body members to receive appropriate compensation for the costs for special assistance, connectivity and equipment as well as DSA, the following questions need to be further clarified:

* Who has the authority to reallocate the unspent approved budget to other emergency costs which incurred during the budget cycle?
* What is the process for such adjustment?[[6]](#footnote-6)
* Who has the authority to decide the payment of compensation for the cost of assistance for members with disabilities, cost of connectivity and equipment and DSA by applying the same or similar rule for the payment of the discounted rate of DSA to the resident experts to the case of attendance of treaty body members to online meetings.
* Do liquid resources (cash in hand) exist to cover compensation of costs and DSA?
* If sufficient liquid resources are not available, what options OHCHR has to secure resources such as asking special emergency donation from States, private foundations and individuals, or any other sources of funding?

If the payment of DSA is not implemented, the necessary steps for a GA resolution to decide the payment of honorarium should be taken.[[7]](#footnote-7)

**4. Lessons learned, good practices and suggestions**

Participants shared lessons learned, good practices and suggestions including:

* When online meetings were held, the agenda needed to be adjusted to be shorter.
* Preparations for the meeting need to start well in advance, including making drafts for review and adoption available on Extranet. In case of CCPR WG on IC, the drafts were made available on Extranet by Petition unit one week before the WG, which allowed all members to make written comments prior to the meeting and enabled the Rapporteur to focus the presentation on the case on the questions/comments made by other members.
* Treaty bodies have used multiple online communication tool. For example, it was noted in the experience of online meetings of CCPR WG on IC that the inter-personal communication by emails between members and petition unit was an important tool in addition to the function of editing drafts on Extranet to prepare the discussion and anticipate the difficulty raised by some individual cases and a WhatsApp group created by petition unit in order to facilitate the communication in case of Internet problem.
* Based on the experience of CEDAW WG on IC, similar suggestions were made such as: drafts to be circulated ahead of the online session; summary should be prepared by the Rapporteur; need to be very selective on what to do during online meetings; to deal with urgent cases or select “easy cases” only.
* SPT had meetings with NPMs in its regional groups, not only one NPM at the time, but joint meetings with all the NPMs in the regions. This was a new and positive experience hearing the responses and exchanging good practices across the region based on the advice that SPT issued on COVID-19, and in addition, the different mechanisms learned from and inspired each other, and shared concerns.
* Based on the experience of SPT, an observation was shared that while having free, interactive and intensive discussion among members online was difficult, rather formal dialogue with external participants such as States parties and NPMs online worked well.

**5. Options and remaining challenges and questions for planning activities for Sep-Dec 2020 and beyond**

Participants found that treaty bodies have carried out various activities online or remotely by using various modalities in flexible and innovative ways. There was a general view that online work was carried out as an exceptional modality by necessity and in no means can or should replace the usual in situ work in regular time. However, if needed due to continuation of the situation where in situ meetings is not possible, it was made clear that there are many options on the type of activities and the modalities used to learn from each other’s experiences. As to what types of activities to be carried out, there are both common and different approaches and views among treaty bodies and participants shared such as:

* Some treaty bodies decided not to work on individual communications online and some participants expressed concern about confidentiality for online work on individual communications. But there are treaty bodies that have worked on individual communications online, and there are different experiences here. In particular CEDAW expressed that there had been some major problems, whereas other found that preparing cases for IC worked better. Urgent communications including interim measures and inquires need to be addressed.
* Some participants also expressed concern about confidentiality for meeting with stakeholders online, there are treaty bodies that had or offered online closed meeting with CSOs and other stakeholders. It was suggested that the appropriateness of online working methods (virtual meetings on online platforms, email exchanges and phone calls) for private (confidential) meetings and communications with stakeholders need to be assessed on case by case basis taking into consideration such elements as the type of information shared, the level of security concern, the risk of reprisals, consent of stakeholders to use of online methods and the type of online tools used.
* Adoption of LOIs/LOIPRs and work on GC/GR are relatively less challenging
* Thematic meetings with States parties and stakeholders and/or webinars on COVID-19 and human rights are possible activities online.
* So far no treaty body has reviewed States parties reports online. Many participants were of the view that dialogue with States parties for consideration of initial/periodic reports cannot be carried out online. On the other hand, some participants, suggested that whereas online reviews , can never be of the same quality, they nevertheless proposed that treaty bodies can have some type of dialogue with States focusing on limited items to ensure that there is no protection gap.

Some questions were raised and ideas were shared which are relevant for planning activities for Sep-Dec 2020 and for year 2021 but were not fully discussed in the meetings of the informal WG, which include:

* Can treaty bodies review States parties reports if required conditions for online work are met?
* Is a modality of hybrid meeting (some members attending in person in Geneva and others attending online) be a good option for on-line meetings?[[8]](#footnote-8) It was suggested by conference services that hybrid meetings may be less cumbersome than complete online meetings. However, it was also pointed out that the same challenges such as time zone differences, accessibility for persons with disabilities, connectivity and costs incurred for members to participate online remain.
* Can treaty bodies have longer sessions in 2021 to review the backlog of States parties which were postponed?

**6. Substantive contributions of Treaty Bodies to COVID-19 related human rights issues**

**a. Activities of treaty bodies**

Treaty bodies have carried out several substantive activities in response to the COVID-19 pandemic situation including:

* Issued a joint statement and the mandate-specific statements, advice and guidance to States and other stakeholders on a human-rights based response to the COVID-19, which are available on the dedicated OHCHR webpage on COVID-19 and Treaty Bodies[[9]](#footnote-9) as well as their respective webpages.
* Held meetings with States parties and stakeholders or webinars to share experiences, learn good practices and address COVID-19 and human rights issues.
* Systematically included standard and/or country specific questions on COVID-19 in the LOIs/LOIPRs adopted.

**b. Toolkit prepared by Secretariat**

The Secretariat has prepared a Toolkit of treaty law perspectives and jurisprudence in the context of COVID-19, which is available on the dedicated OHCHR webpage on COVID-19 and Treaty Bodies.[[10]](#footnote-10) This is a living document that is designed to be regularly updated by HRTB teams in collaboration with treaty body focal points. This can form an entry point for Committees to initiate joint webinars and other on-line updates to stakeholders, follow up activities with civil society actors and government officials. The toolkit can also provide opportunities for thematic discussions and joint views among treaty body experts on cross-cutting issues to clarify aspects of treaty law as they relate to COVID-19 developments and enhance the visibility and added value of treaty body guidance.

**7. Points for consideration by Chairpersons’ meeting**

Based on the discussions and findings summarized above, the following points are presented to the Chairpersons’ meeting for their consideration:

* There are many examples of activities online using various modalities and working methods, which can be used for planning activities by treaty bodies. Lessons learned and suggestions can be useful for optimizing the future activities where treaty bodies need to continue to work online. It is up to the decision of each treaty body to choose activities and modalities depending on the priority, concerns and needs.
* In case that treaty bodies are required to continue to work online, there should be urgent and joint action taken by Chairpersons to overcome common challenges and obstacles so that required conditions for online work are fulfilled.
* Chairpersons should put forward a request for compensation to treaty body members for costs incurred for online work including for special assistance for members with disabilities, time spent and connectivity to both co-facilitators for 2020 treaty bodies review and the Chair of the GA Third Committee, so that a proposal can be presented by Member States to the GA Third Committee under the framework of 2020 treaty bodies review and/or independently, leading to the adoption of the necessary GA resolution, and assessment of financial implications by the Secretariat. It should be noted that the review of the Secretary-General’s budget proposal for 2021 is already in process and a request to be placed in the existing budget proposal is a matter of urgency.
* Chairpersons should also inquire and based on the acquired information take necessary action so that unspent budget for treaty bodies sessions in 2020 are reallocated to compensate treaty body members for costs incurred for online work including for special assistance for members with disabilities, time spent and connectivity within the year 2020 budget cycle as a necessary and legitimate adjustment of the budget due to the change in working method due to COVID-19 pandemic.
* Chairpersons should gather information on the available resources to cover online work with interpretation for Sep-Dec 2020 so that treaty bodies can plan activities well in advance accordingly.
* Chairpersons should explore possibilities of securing resources to cover online work with interpretation for Sep-Dec 2020 in consultation with the OHCHR including seeking emergency voluntary contributions from States, private foundations and individuals, or any other sources of funding.
* Chairpersons should inquire and based on the acquired information take necessary action so that interested treaty bodies can use Zoom as online platform.
* Sharing and leaning from experiences of activities among treaty bodies and coordinated responses to COVID-19 should be continued and made available among treaty bodies as well as for States parties, CSOs and other stakeholders so that the continuing work of treaty bodies is visible.

----------------

1. This is unofficial information collected by Rapporteur of the informal WG through inquiry to staff of UN bodies and agencies. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Business/Eventson20and23July.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. A daily subsistence allowance (DSA) is payable for each required overnight stay away from the residence of the expert. This includes “travel time” -nights spent on the plane for either outward or inward journeys or both; and weekends between meeting weeks. DSA is paid to cover meals, accommodation, local transportation, gratuities and any other personal expenses, such as personal telephone calls (OHCHR, administrative arrangements for experts, para. 14). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Ibid. para. 16. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. For sessions of ten treaty bodies scheduled in 2020, total of 7,826,300 US$ was approved from regular budget to cover travel expenses and DSA (A/74/6 (Sect. 24), Table 24.11). As of 15 July 2020, 104 Member States have paid their regular budget assessments in full and the total of received resources is 1,825,290,414 US$, which constitutes 59.3% of the approved regular budget for 2020. If the received resources are portioned to all the departments and within departments, about 4,640,000 US$ should have been allocated in cash for the sessions of treaty bodies. Due to COVID-19, so far treaty bodies held total of four sessions using about total of 1,368,700 US$ from the regular budget and remaining about 6,457,600 US$ is not used. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. It is explained that during the budget cycle, adjustments may be requested and the GA usually adopted and an additional resolution at the end of the first year of the biennium after reviewed by the CPC, ACABQ and Fifth Committee during biennial budget cycles. <https://research.un.org/en/docs/budget2020/programmebudget>

   However, how adjustments may be possible during the current annual budget cycle is not clear. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. GA resolution 2489 (XXIII) (21 December 1968), para. 3(b) indicates that experts don’t normally receive the payment of honorarium either in a form of fee or any other remuneration in addition to travel expenses and DSA at a standard rate but para. 3 (c) also indicates that payment of honorarium is possible as an exception by General Assembly resolution after prior examination by the Fifth Committee. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Chairpersons’ joint letter to High Commissioner for Human Rights dated 29 June 2020 mentioned “mixed mode” meaning hybrid meetings and suggested that “We believe that such options should be explored for human rights treaty bodies meetings in the latter part of 2020” because of ongoing travel restrictions. As of 20 July 2020, travellers from 29 countries to Switzerland are required to go through ten day quarantine with the sanction of fine up to CHF 10,000 for violation of the rule. <https://www.bag.admin.ch/bag/en/home/krankheiten/ausbrueche-epidemien-pandemien/aktuelle-ausbrueche-epidemien/novel-cov/empfehlungen-fuer-reisende/quarantaene-einreisende.html#1918240392>

   It is not clear if treaty body members arrive in Switzerland ten day in advance to be able to participate in sessions, costs incurred for accommodation and other expenses are compensated. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/Pages/COVID-19-and-TreatyBodies.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)