

## Revised Fact Sheet No. 26 \*

### The Working Group on Arbitrary Detention

“No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile”

*(Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 9)*

#### Contents

I. INTRODUCTION .....	2
II. ORIGINS OF THE WORKING GROUP .....	2
III. MANDATE AND COMPOSITION OF THE WORKING GROUP.....	3
IV. CRITERIA ADOPTED BY THE WORKING GROUP TO DETERMINE WHETHER A DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY IS ARBITRARY .....	4
V. PROCEDURES FOLLOWED BY THE WORKING GROUP.....	7
A. The procedure involving investigation of individual cases.....	7
B. “Deliberations” of the Working Group .....	8
C. The “urgent action” procedure.....	9
D. Country visits .....	9
VI. THE ANNUAL REPORT .....	10
VII. COOPERATION WITH OTHER BODIES .....	10
A. Cooperation with other human rights protection mechanisms.....	10
B. Cooperation with non-governmental organizations .....	11
ANNEXES .....	11

---

\* DISCLAIMER: this Fact Sheet is only for information purposes and should not be used as a substitute to the official texts of the treaties and the Methods of Work of the Working Group.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Working Group on Arbitrary Detention (Working Group) is one of the so-called [Special Procedures](#) of the [Human Rights Council](#) which is a central element of the United Nations human rights machinery. Under the system in place, the Human Rights Council will designate an individual with special expertise in the matter under consideration (known as “Special Rapporteur” or “Independent Expert”) or a group of experts (“Working Group”) which will investigate the matter and report to the Human Rights Council. Thus the Special Procedures are independent human rights experts with mandates to report and advise on human rights from a [thematic](#) or [country-specific](#) perspective. Therefore the Special Procedures may refer to countries with patterns of violations, or to violations of specific rights (such as freedom of expression and opinion or independence of judges and lawyers), or else to particular forms of human rights violations (enforced disappearances, torture, violence against women, etc.).

Originally established by the former UN Commission on Human Rights on the basis of its resolution No. 1235 (XLII) of 6 June 1967, the system of Special Procedures was assumed by the Human Rights Council, through [Resolution A/RES/60/251](#), when it replaced the Commission in 2006.

The Special Procedures must be differentiated from the so-called [treaty-based bodies](#), the legal basis for which is a human rights treaty (convention or covenant), and whose members are elected through a meeting of the States parties.

## II. ORIGINS OF THE WORKING GROUP

All countries are confronted by the practice of arbitrary detention. It knows no boundaries, and thousands of persons are subjected to arbitrary detention each year:

- either merely because they have exercised one of their fundamental rights guaranteed under international human rights instruments such as their right to freedom of opinion and expression, their right to freedom of association, the right to leave and enter one’s own country, as proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other human rights treaties;
- or because, having been unable to benefit from the fundamental guarantees of the right to a fair trial, they have been imprisoned without an arrest warrant and without being charged or tried by an independent judicial authority, or without access to a lawyer; detainees are sometimes held incommunicado for several months or years, or even indefinitely;
- or because they remain in detention in violation of national laws and procedures or even though the measure or punishment which has been applied to them has been executed;
- or because of the growing and preoccupying practice of administrative detention, notably for those seeking asylum;
- or, finally, because they have been deprivation of liberty purely for reasons of discrimination based on birth; national, ethnic or social origin; language; religion; economic condition; political or other opinion; gender; sexual orientation; or disability or other status.

Since detention in itself is not a violation of human rights, international law has progressively endeavoured to define the limits beyond which a detention, whether administrative or judicial, would become arbitrary.

The former United Nations Commission on Human Rights addressed the disturbing expansion of such practices since 1985. In 1990, it requested the former Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities to undertake a thorough study of the matter and submit recommendations to it for the reduction of such practices.

At the same time, concern about the guarantees which should be enjoyed by all persons deprived of their liberty was manifested in the adoption by the United Nations General Assembly in December 1988 of the [Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment](#) and the elaboration of the now revised Standard Minimum Rules, known as the [Nelson Mandela Rules](#).

In 1991, the former Commission on Human Rights established the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, which thus joined the existing procedures set up at the initiative of the Commission to guarantee protection of the right to life and physical integrity, religious intolerance, and other rights. The first session of the Working Group was held in September 1991.

In 2006, the mandate of the Working Group, along with other Special Procedures, was assumed by the newly established Human Rights Council. The mandate of the Working Group has been renewed by the Council every three years since.

### **III. MANDATE AND COMPOSITION OF THE WORKING GROUP**

The Human Rights Council has entrusted the Working Group with the following mandate:

- (a) To investigate cases of deprivation of liberty imposed arbitrarily or otherwise inconsistently with the relevant international standards set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or in the relevant international legal instruments accepted by the States concerned. This is usually done through the regular communications procedure resulting in the adoption and issuance of an Opinion of the Working Group.
- (b) To seek and receive information from Governments and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, and receive information from the individuals concerned, their families or their representatives;
- (c) To act on information submitted to its attention regarding alleged cases of arbitrary detention by sending urgent appeals and communications to concerned Governments to clarify and to bring to their attention these cases. This can be done either through urgent appeals, allegation letters or other letters, in accordance with the [Manual of Operations of the Special Procedures](#).
- (d) To conduct field missions upon the invitation of Government, in order to understand better the situations prevailing in countries, as well as the underlying reasons for instances of arbitrary deprivation of liberty;
- (e) To formulate deliberations on issues of a general nature in order to assist States to prevent and guard against the practice of arbitrary deprivation of liberty and to facilitate consideration of future cases;

(f) To present an annual report to the Human Rights Council presenting its activities, findings, conclusions and recommendations.

The Working Group is the only non-treaty-based mechanism whose mandate expressly provides for the consideration of individual complaints aimed at qualifying a detention as arbitrary or not. This means that its actions are based on the right of petition of individuals anywhere in the world. In other words, since the Working Group is one of the Human Rights Council's Special Procedures, it can engage with any UN Member State irrespective of what treaties that State has or has not ratified.

The mandate also stipulates that the Working Group must carry out its task with discretion, objectivity and independence. Against this background, the Working Group adopted the rule that when the case under consideration concerns a country of which one of the members of the Working Group is a national, that member shall not participate in the discussion.

The Working Group is composed of five independent experts appointed by the Human Rights Council, following consultations with and the selection process by the Consultative Committee of the Human Rights Council, in the light of the [criteria](#), including those governing equitable geographical distribution which apply in the United Nations. It must be emphasized that all members serve in their personal capacities. They undertake to uphold independence, efficiency, competence and integrity through probity, impartiality, honesty and good faith. They are not United Nations staff members and do not receive any remuneration or other benefits as per the [Code of Conduct for the Special Procedures](#). The independent status of the mandate-holders is crucial for them to be able to fulfil their functions with impartiality. A mandate-holder's tenure in a given function, whether it is a thematic or country mandate, is limited to a maximum of six years.

The Working Group holds three sessions per year, usually in April, August and November, each lasting between five to ten working days. At the end of its April session every year, the members of the Working Group elect their Bureau, comprised of the Chair-Rapporteur, Vice Chair on Communications and Vice Chair on Follow up. Since 2017, the Working Group also appoints a focal point on reprisals from among its members.

The Working Group is assisted by the Secretariat from the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) throughout the year. The working languages of the Working Group are English, French and Spanish.

## **IV. CRITERIA ADOPTED BY THE WORKING GROUP TO DETERMINE WHETHER A DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY IS ARBITRARY**

### **A. What is meant by "deprivation of liberty"?**

International human rights instruments protect the right to personal liberty, in that no one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his or her liberty.

[Commission on Human Rights resolution 1991/42](#), under which the Working Group was set up, did not define the term "detention". This led to differing interpretations of the term, which were solved by adoption of [Commission Resolution No. 1997/50](#).

Accordingly, there may be legitimate deprivations of liberty, such as of convicted persons or of those accused of serious offences. In addition, the right to personal liberty may be limited during states of emergency, in accordance with article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

There may also be other forms of deprivation of liberty attributable to different authorities, as in the case of confinement in a psychiatric institution or administrative holding of asylum seekers. Finally, there are deprivations of liberty which are per se prohibited in international law, such as imprisonment for debt.

It must also be noted that international instruments do not always use the same terminology to refer to deprivations of liberty: they may refer to “arrest”, “apprehension”, “holding”, “detention”, “incarceration”, “prison”, “reclusion”, “custody”, “remand”, etc. For this reason the former Commission on Human Rights, in its Resolution 1997/50, opted for the term “deprivation of liberty”, a term that eliminates any differences in interpretation between the different terminologies.

This terminology was chosen since the objective entrusted to the Working Group relates to the protection of individuals against arbitrary deprivation of liberty in all its forms, and its mandate extends to deprivation of liberty either before, during or after the trial (a term of imprisonment imposed following conviction), as well as deprivation of freedom in the absence of any kind of trial (administrative detention). As the Working Group has stated, whether the person is deprived of liberty is a question of fact: if the person in question is unable to leave at will, the safeguards which are in place to guard against arbitrary detention must be observed. The Working Group also regards other measures such as house arrest and rehabilitation through labour, when they are accompanied by serious restrictions on freedom of movement, as forms of detention.

## **B. When does deprivation of liberty become arbitrary?**

The question of when detention is or becomes arbitrary is not definitively answered by the international instruments. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights merely provides in article 9 that “no one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile”. Article 9(1) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is scarcely any clearer: “Everyone has the right to liberty and security of person. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest or detention. No one shall be deprived of his liberty except on such grounds and in accordance with such procedure as are established by law.”

When determining the mandate of the Working Group, the former Commission on Human Rights used a pragmatic criterion: while it did not define the term “arbitrary”, it considered as arbitrary those deprivations of liberty which for one reason or another are contrary to relevant international provisions laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or in the relevant international instruments ratified by States (Resolution 1991/42, as clarified by resolution 1997/50).

Resolution 1997/50 considers that deprivation of liberty is not arbitrary if it results from a final decision taken by a domestic judicial instance and which is (a) in accordance with domestic law; and (b) in accordance with other relevant international standards set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the relevant international instruments accepted by the States concerned.

To enable it to carry out its tasks using sufficiently precise criteria, the Working adopted criteria applicable in the consideration of cases submitted to it, drawing on the above-mentioned provisions of the Declaration and the Covenant as well as the Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment. Consequently, according to the Working Group, deprivation of liberty is arbitrary if a case falls into one of the following five categories:

**Category I:** when it is clearly impossible to invoke any legal basis justifying the deprivation of liberty (such as, for example, when a person is kept in detention after the completion of his or her sentence or despite an amnesty law applicable to the detainee). The instances of detention falling under this category may also concern cases when an

individual has been deprived of liberty in absence of any legislative provision that would authorise such detention. It also often involves the failure of the national authorities to invoke a legal basis for an arrest: it is not sufficient that there is a national law authorising the arrest in question, the authorities must invoke that national law, usually through the notice of the reasons for arrest and charges, the presentation of a duly issued arrest warrant and the regular judicial review, to justify the particular instance of detention.

**Category II:** when the deprivation of liberty results from the exercise of the rights or freedoms guaranteed by articles 7, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20 and 21 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, insofar as States parties are concerned, by articles 12, 18, 19, 21, 22, 25, 26 and 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The cases falling under this category are those when detention is used in response to the legitimate exercise of human rights, such as arresting peaceful protesters for the mere exercise of their rights to freedom of opinion and expression, freedom of assembly and freedom of association, or detaining refugees for exercising their right to seek asylum and/or freedom to leave their own country.

**Category III:** when the total or partial non-observance of the international norms relating to the right to a fair trial, established in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the relevant international instruments accepted by the States concerned, is of such gravity as to give the deprivation of liberty an arbitrary character. In order to evaluate the arbitrary character or otherwise of cases of deprivation of liberty under category III, the Working Group considers, in addition to the general principles set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, several fair trial and due process criteria drawn from the Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment and, for the States parties to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the criteria laid down particularly in articles 9 and 14 thereof. If the Working Group arrives at a finding that there have been violations of such due process rights, it then considers whether these violations, taken together, are of such gravity as to give the deprivation of liberty an arbitrary character, thus falling under category III.

**Category IV:** when asylum seekers, immigrants or refugees are subjected to prolonged administrative custody without the possibility of administrative or judicial review or remedy. When considering cases under this category, the Working Group notes the basic principle of international law that detention in the course of migration proceedings must be the last resort and permissible only for the shortest period of time in each individual case with the grounds for detention clearly and exhaustively defined in national legislation. The Working Group further examines whether the legality of detention is open for challenge before a court within fixed time limits. The immigrants in irregular situations should not be qualified or treated as criminals.

**Category V:** when the deprivation of liberty constitutes a violation of international law for reasons of discrimination based on birth; national, ethnic or social origin; language; religion; economic condition; political or other opinion; gender; sexual orientation; or disability or other status, and which aims towards or can result in ignoring the equality of human rights.

The Working Group frequently receives communications requesting it to declare a deprivation of liberty “unfair”, or to take a view on the value of evidence produced during a trial. These are areas which fall outside the Working Group’s remit. It is not for the Working Group to evaluate the facts and evidence in a particular case or to substitute itself for domestic appellate tribunals.

Similarly, it is not for the Working Group to examine complaints about the disappearance of individuals, about alleged torture, or about inhuman conditions of detention. If such human rights violations occur, the Working Group will refer the matter to the competent body, wherever appropriate (such as the Special Rapporteur on Torture or the Working

Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances). However if in the view of the Working Group, the conditions of detention or treatment of the detained person inhibit the right to fair trial, to defence or to habeas corpus, then the Working Group will be mandated to look into the facts submitted to it.

## **V. PROCEDURES FOLLOWED BY THE WORKING GROUP**

### **A. The procedure involving investigation of individual cases**

This procedure comprises the following five stages.

#### **STAGE 1: *Bringing the matter to the attention of the Working Group***

The Working Group's involvement is generally triggered by written submissions sent to it by the individuals directly concerned, their families, their representatives or civil society organizations, although it may also receive submissions from Governments, inter-governmental organizations and national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights. All those making such written submissions to the Working Group are referred to as "sources". The Working Group has prepared a [model questionnaire](#) to facilitate the task of those submitting submissions. The questionnaire is not obligatory and failure to use it to submit cases to the Working Group does not result in the inadmissibility of the submissions. Similarly, the Working Group does not require local remedies to be exhausted in order for a submission to be declared admissible. The Working Group does require that the submissions made to it do not exceed 20 pages and any additional material, including annexes, exceeding that limit may not be taken into account by the Working Group. Similarly, the Working Group requires explicit consent of the alleged victim or his or her family or legal representatives in order to proceed with the examination of the submission".

The Working Group issues an automated message acknowledging the receipt of the submission, but it does not provide any further information on the progress of its consideration.

In 1993, the former Commission on Human Rights authorized the Working Group to take up cases on its own initiative when its attention is drawn to sufficiently substantiated allegations of arbitrary deprivation of liberty. The Working Group retains this power.

#### **STAGE 2: *Offering the Government an opportunity to refute the allegations***

The Working Group attaches great importance to the adversarial character of its procedure. Consequently, the submission is forwarded to the Government concerned through diplomatic channels with an invitation to communicate to the Working Group within 60 days its comments and observations on the allegations made, both as regards the facts and the applicable legislation and concerning the progress and outcome of any investigations that may have been ordered. These replies must not exceed 20 pages. If the Government requires an extension of this time limit, it must request this from the Working Group, before the expiry of the set deadline, and inform it of the reasons for requesting one, so that it may be granted a further period of a maximum of one month in which to reply. However if the reply is not submitted within the time limit, the Working Group may render an opinion on the basis of all the information it has obtained.

The Working Group, whose terms of reference require it to discharge its duties with discretion, does not reveal the identity of the source to the Government to which it transmits the substance of the allegations made in the submission nor to the public once

the Working Group concludes its procedure through the issuance of an opinion or by filing the case.

**STAGE 3: *Offering the source an opportunity to make comments on the Government's response***

A reply sent by the Government to the Working Group is transmitted to the source for any additional comments.

On the other hand, if the Government has not communicated its response within the above-mentioned 60-day deadline, or within the extended deadline, the Working Group may take a position on the case on the basis of all the information available to it.

**STAGE 4: *The Working Group's Opinion***

In the light of the information collected under this adversarial procedure, the Working Group adopts one of the following measures in private session:

- (a) If the Working Group decides that the arbitrary nature of the deprivation of liberty is established, it shall render an opinion to that effect and make recommendations to the Government;
- (b) If the Working Group considers that the case is not one of arbitrary deprivation of liberty, it shall render an opinion to this effect; the Working Group can also make recommendations in this case if it considers it necessary;
- (c) If the person has been released, for whatever reason, following the reference of the case to the Working Group the case is filed; the Working Group, however, reserves the right to render an opinion, on case-by-case basis, whether or not the deprivation of liberty was arbitrary, notwithstanding the release of the person concerned;
- (d) If the Working Group considers that further information is required from the Government or the source, it may keep the case pending until that information is received.

The opinion is sent to the Government, together with the recommendations. 48 hours after this notification, the opinion is also conveyed to the source. An advance edited version of the opinion is published [online](#) once available.

The opinions rendered are brought to the attention of the Human Rights Council in the annual report of the Working Group.

The opinions of the WGAD are available on its [webpage](#).

**STAGE 5: *Follow-up***

In 2016, the Working Group introduced a new follow-up procedure. All opinions adopted by the Working Group in which it concludes that the deprivation of liberty is arbitrary now contain the follow-up procedure in the final paragraphs. The follow up procedure requests the government concerned and the source to respond within 6 months of the date the opinion is sent to each party on the steps taken by the government to implement the opinion. This includes whether the victim has been released, reparations and compensation given to the victim, as well as the steps taken to ensure non-repetition of the violation. The WGAD also welcomes information on the implementation of the suggested measures from other parties such as civil society.

**B. "Deliberations" of the Working Group**

The Working Group may also formulate “deliberations” on matters of a general nature involving a position of principle in order to develop a consistent set of precedents and assist States, for purposes of prevention, to guard against the practice of arbitrary deprivation of liberty. The Working Group has already adopted various such “deliberations”, specifically in the above-mentioned areas of house arrest and deprivation of liberty for purposes of rehabilitation through labour as well as detention of migrants; by means of these “deliberations” it defines the criteria on the basis of which deprivation of liberty linked with such situations may become arbitrary.

The Deliberations of the Working Group are available on its [website](#).

### **C. The “urgent action” procedure**

The Special Procedures have developed an “urgent action” for cases in which there are sufficiently reliable allegations that a person is being detained arbitrarily and that the continuation of the detention may constitute a serious danger to that person’s health or life. The urgent action procedure may also be resorted to in other circumstances, when the Working Group deems that the situation warrants such an appeal. In such cases, an urgent appeal or allegation letter is sent, by the most rapid channel of communication, to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the State concerned, requesting that his or her Government should take appropriate measures to ensure that the detained person’s right to life and to physical and mental integrity are respected.

This is an initially confidential procedure to facilitate engagement from the Government concerned. However all urgent appeals and allegation letters are automatically made public after 60 days. These are also published in the [Communications Report](#) of the Human Rights Council three times per year.

In addressing such communications, the Working Group emphasizes that such urgent actions in no way prejudice the Working Group’s final assessment of whether the deprivation of liberty is arbitrary or not and it reserves the right to take up the case under its regular procedure.

### **D. Country visits**

[Country visits](#) constitute an opportunity for the Working Group, through a direct dialogue with the Government concerned, members of the national legislature and judiciary, national human rights institutions, prosecutors and representatives of civil society and lawyers, to understand better the situation prevailing in that country, as well as the underlying reasons for instances of arbitrary deprivation of liberty. Discussions conducted during such visits with the judicial, penitentiary and other officials concerned, as well as with detainees and their representatives, enable the Working Group members to enhance their understanding of the state and the evolution of the national legislation from the perspective of international human rights norms, taking into account the social, political and historical context in each country. Such visits bring about a spirit of cooperation between the country visited and the Working Group. They take place on the basis of an invitation from the Government concerned. This is why the Human Rights Council has on numerous occasions encouraged Governments to invite the Working Group to their countries so as to enable the Working Group to discharge its mandate even more effectively.

In accordance with these principles, the Working Group carries out country visits which are initial visits by the Working Group to undertake a comprehensive analysis of the situation concerning arbitrary deprivation of liberty in a country. In addition, the Working

Group also has the possibility of undertaking follow-up visits after the initial country visit. These follow-up visits are usually carried out 2-5 years after the country visit and focus predominantly (but not exclusively) on the implementation of the recommendations issued in the report following the initial country visit.

At the conclusion of its visit, the Working Group presents its preliminary findings to the Government, which are shared with the authorities and subsequently made public. A full report on the visit and recommendations is presented together with the Annual Report of the Working Group to the Human Rights Council.

In principle, the Working Group does not visit countries in respect of which provision has already been made for a special rapporteur (or similar mechanism) unless the Special Rapporteur appointed for the country in question requests or agrees that it should do so.

## VI. THE ANNUAL REPORT

Each year, the Working Group [reports](#) to the Human Rights Council on its activities. In this report, the Working Group expresses its observations on the different institutions, policies, and practices which, in its opinion, are the cause of arbitrary deprivation of liberty. In its conclusions, the Working Group has made critical comments on, for example, abuses of states of emergency, of criminal legislation which fails to define criminal offences with sufficient precision, excessive recourse to special tribunals, particularly military courts, absence of an independent judiciary or bar association, violations of the right to freedom of expression and opinion, detention in the context of drug prevention, secret detention, arbitrary detention and customary international law, deprivation of liberty on discriminatory grounds, irregular forms of deprivation of liberty etc. In accordance with its methods of work, the Working Group formulates specific recommendations for the States.

The report includes the following sections:

- A. opinions adopted on individual cases;
- B. reports on country visits;
- C. statistics;
- D. thematic issues; and
- E. recommendations.

The Working Group, in cooperation with the Human Rights Council and other United Nations bodies, has been striving to find means which would lead not only to the release of those whose detention has been declared by the Working Group to be arbitrary, but above all to the adoption by the States concerned of legislative and executive measures which would protect against arbitrary detention.

## VII. COOPERATION WITH OTHER BODIES

### A. Cooperation with other human rights protection mechanisms

In recent years, there has been growth of multiple mechanisms for the protection of human rights, either through resolutions ([thematic](#) or [country-specific](#) procedures) or through treaties ([treaty-bodies system](#), set up under conventions, such as the Human Rights Committee established under the International Covenant on civil and Political Rights, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination or the Committee against Torture). This made it necessary to develop rules for coordination in order to prevent duplication in the consideration of cases. These rules are in accordance with the principle under which

two bodies may not simultaneously consider a single case involving the same persons, subject-matter and cause of action.

In order to avoid such duplication, the following procedure is followed: as soon as a case is brought before the Working Group, the Secretariat checks whether it falls under the Working Group's mandate. If the principal violation suffered by the detained person falls under the practice of torture, summary execution or enforced disappearance, for example, the case is forwarded to the appropriate special rapporteur or working group.

In contrast, when the alleged violation fundamentally has to do with the lawfulness of detention, the Working Group, with the backing of the Human Rights Council, will act in accordance with paragraph 33 of its [Methods of Work](#).

## **B. Cooperation with non-governmental organizations**

The Working Group continuously cooperates with non-governmental organizations, both international, regional and national, which are its main sources of information. In this context, the Working Group periodically meets with representatives of those non-governmental organizations that submit individual cases as well as information of a general nature, in order to consider ways of enhancing mutual cooperation. The Working Group devotes specific time to meeting with civil society organisations during its country visits and welcomes reports from such organisations prior to such visits.

## **ANNEXES**

1. [Universal Declaration of Human Rights](#)
2. [International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights](#)
3. [Convention relating to the Status of Refugees of 1951](#)
4. [The Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees of 1967](#)
5. [International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination](#)
6. [Convention on the Rights of the Child](#)
7. [Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment](#)
8. [International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families](#)
9. [Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities](#)
10. [Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment](#)
11. [United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners](#) (the Nelson Mandela Rules)

12. [United Nations Rules for the Protection of Juveniles Deprived of Their Liberty](#)
13. [United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice \(the Beijing Rules\)](#)
14. [United Nations Basic Principles and Guidelines on Remedies and Procedures on the Right of Anyone Deprived of Their Liberty to Bring Proceedings Before a Court](#)
15. [Composition of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention](#)
16. [Methods of Work of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention](#)
17. [Terms of Reference for Country Visits by the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention](#)
18. [Model questionnaire](#) (to facilitate bringing cases before the Working Group)
19. [Contact details of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention](#)
20. [Acts of intimidation and reprisal for cooperation with the special procedures](#)