

## **Guiding questions to inform the process of rationalisation, particularly decisions to reduce reporting of Special Procedures mandates to the General Assembly**

June 2026

In March 2026, ISHR and partner organisations [expressed concern](#) over reduced reporting by Special Procedures, warning that this would weaken oversight, visibility, and political support for critical human rights issues.

Building on these initial concerns, and in light of the ongoing decisions to further reduce the number of Special Procedures reports presented to the General Assembly as part of the Council's efficiency efforts, ISHR has developed the following guiding questions to inform the process and ensure that all efforts to streamline, rationalise and review the work of the Human Rights Council and its mechanisms remain consistent with Council resolution 5/1 and do not inadvertently weaken human rights protection.

### **General principles regarding the reduction of reporting to the GA**

- Initiatives to rationalise the work of Special Procedures should build on, rather than duplicate, existing rationalisation and efficiency processes.
- Due consideration should be given to the unique characteristics and context of each mandate. States must refrain from standardised approaches and the adoption of one-size-fits-all measures.
- Early and meaningful consultation with all relevant stakeholders is paramount to assessing the impact of reporting reductions and any other streamlining measures.
- Any criteria should be applied impartially, and only when substantially informed by the perspectives of the United Nations Secretariat, mandate holders, and other stakeholders, including civil society.

### **Initial guiding questions**

- ☐ Is the mandate affected, or likely to be affected, by other UN reform or rationalisation processes, including mandate reviews under UN80?
- ☐ How have the liquidity crisis and budgetary constraints affected the mandate's capacity to carry out its functions, including travel, stakeholder engagement, and consultations?

- ☐ When deciding to reduce reporting, has the suggested reduction in reporting levels by a “desirable range of up to 3-5 per year until the 84th session”<sup>1</sup> established by the Third Committee’s “Methods of Work” resolution Roadmap already been sufficiently met? Are the efforts going beyond the suggested numbers contained in the Roadmap?

### **Rationalisation Assessment**

- ☐ Is this mandate distinctively placed to address a specific human rights issue?
- ☐ Are there other mandates covering similar issues from a similar perspective in the GA?
  - ☐ If yes, what is the degree of complementarity or duplication with such mandates? Do such mandates share the same scope (thematic, geographic, temporal or other), objectives and targets?

### **Political Visibility and Normative Development**

- ☐ How would reduced reporting affect the visibility of the issue within the UN system in New York, in particular at the General Assembly level?
- ☐ What implications would the reduction of reporting have for normative development, including opportunities for consultation with different stakeholders, dialogue and cooperation, awareness-raising, the advancement of human rights standards, and the prevention of human rights violations and their root causes?
- ☐ What additional opportunities could be explored to compensate for the loss of engagement resulting from reduced reporting?
  - ☐ Are there alternative forums, processes or opportunities that could potentially mitigate the loss of presentation and discussion of the annual report in the Third Committee?

### **Thematic balance**

- ☐ How would the proposed reduction affect the balance of thematic issues considered by the General Assembly?
- ☐ Would the reduction disproportionately affect particular rights, thematic areas, regions, or groups of rights-holders such as people of African descent, Indigenous Peoples, traditional communities, and other groups who have been historically marginalised and disproportionately affected by human rights violations?

### **Transparency and Consultations**

---

<sup>1</sup>The document titled Implementation of GA resolution 79/192 – Elements for a Roadmap, requested in operative paragraph 3 of the resolution 79/192, was presented and discussed, but not formally adopted by the General Assembly. It is instead a set of guiding principles for the progressive reduction of the number of mandates reporting to each session of the Third Committee by an indicative 3–5 mandates per year until its 84th session, in total between 9–15 reports.

- ☐ Has the mandate holder been consulted in a timely and constructive manner, and have their views been taken into proper consideration?
- ☐ Has the OHCHR been consulted, and have their views been taken into proper consideration?
- ☐ Have civil society organisations working on the mandate's thematic area, as well as affected communities, been consulted in a timely and meaningful manner and have their views been taken into proper consideration?
- ☐ Have relevant marginalised, underrepresented, or directly affected groups been adequately included in the consultation process and have their views been taken into proper consideration?
- ☐ Have stakeholders been provided with sufficient information to assess the rationale, expected benefits, and potential risks of the proposed measures?
- ☐ What justification has been provided for the proposed approach, and is that justification transparent, based on an impact assessment, and publicly available?