



**Convention against Torture
and Other Cruel, Inhuman
or Degrading Treatment
or Punishment**

Distr.: General
11 March 2026

Original: English

Committee against Torture

Eighty-fourth session

Geneva, 13 April–8 May 2026

Organizational and other matters

**Nineteenth annual report of the Subcommittee on Prevention
of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading
Treatment or Punishment***

Summary

In the present annual report, the Subcommittee provides an update on matters relating to the system of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, including the number of States Parties, the Subcommittee's sessions and membership and the operation of the Special Fund established by the Optional Protocol (sect. II).

The Subcommittee also provides substantive information concerning its visits, visit reports and follow-up dialogues (sect. III), national preventive mechanisms (sect. IV) and engagement with other bodies in the field of torture prevention (sect. V).

The Subcommittee concludes by describing its plan of work for 2026 (sect. VI) and sharing reflections and future challenges (sect. VII).

* Agreement was reached to publish the present report after the standard publication date owing to circumstances beyond the submitter's control.



Contents

	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	3
II. Organizational and other matters	3
A. States' participation in the Optional Protocol system	3
B. Sessions	3
C. Membership, officers and mandates	4
D. Special Fund established by the Optional Protocol.....	5
III. Visits	5
A. Visits conducted during the reporting period.....	5
B. Visit reports	6
C. States' responses to visit reports and follow-up dialogues	7
IV. National preventive mechanisms.....	7
A. Obligations of States regarding national preventive mechanisms	7
B. Meetings	8
C. Advice to national preventive mechanisms	10
V. Engagement with other bodies in the field of torture prevention	13
A. Subcommittee as part of the United Nations human rights system.....	13
B. Regional cooperation	15
C. Cooperation with civil society and other stakeholders	15
VI. Plan of work for the year ahead.....	16
A. Sessions	16
B. Visits.....	16
C. Other activities.....	16
VII. Looking forward.....	17

I. Introduction

1. Pursuant to article 16 (3) of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and rule 33 of its rules of procedure, the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment prepares an annual report on its activities as a public document. The present report covers the Subcommittee's activities from 1 January to 31 December 2025 and was adopted intersessionally as decided by the Subcommittee during its fifty-sixth session, held in Geneva from 10 to 14 November 2025. Intersessional adoption of the report was required because the Subcommittee, as an extraordinary and temporary cost-cutting measure, decided to adjust its sessions for 2026. Specifically, the Subcommittee would not hold a session in February 2026, the session at which the annual report would ordinarily be adopted.

II. Organizational and other matters

A. States' participation in the Optional Protocol system

2. As at 31 December 2025, 96 States were Parties and 11 States were signatories to the Optional Protocol.¹ Bangladesh acceded to the Optional Protocol on 17 July 2025, Colombia acceded on 10 November 2025.

3. The pattern of regional participation was as follows:

African States	25
Asia-Pacific States	14
Eastern European States	21
Latin American and Caribbean States	16
Western European and other States	20

4. The regional breakdown of the 11 signatories remains as follows:

African States	7
Asia-Pacific States	1
Eastern European States	0
Latin American and Caribbean States	1
Western European and other States	2

B. Sessions

5. The Subcommittee was scheduled to have three sessions in 2025: from 27 January to 7 February, from 16 to 20 June and from 10 to 14 November. Due to constraints caused by the liquidity crisis during the reporting period, the Subcommittee held only two sessions, both in person, in Geneva: the fifty-fifth session (27 January–7 February 2025) and the fifty-sixth session (10–14 November 2025).

6. Due to the financial challenges posed by the liquidity crisis affecting the United Nations, and understanding that undertaking preventive visits to States Parties should be prioritized, after internal consultations, the Subcommittee proactively decided to postpone its second session of the year, planned for 16 to 20 June 2025, to November, opting instead

¹ As at 31 December 2025, the 11 signatory States were Angola, Belgium, Cameroon, Chad, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Ireland, Sierra Leone, Timor-Leste, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Zambia. See https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-9-b&chapter=4&clang=_en.

to utilize the funds to undertake its first two visits of the year, to Peru and Serbia. In June, due to the lack of funds to support the third sessions of human rights treaty bodies, the fourth week of session time allocated to the Subcommittee was cancelled, limiting the Subcommittee's November session time to one week.

7. The regional teams met at both sessions, without interpretation, reporting to the Subcommittee in plenary session, and made recommendations as appropriate. The working group on jurisprudence and the working group on the health aspects of torture prevention met during the plenary at both sessions. The working group on the Special Fund established by the Optional Protocol met intersessionally, on 14 and 15 October 2025.

8. At the fifty-fifth session, the regional teams for Africa, for the Americas, for Asia and the Pacific and for Europe conducted their annual regional meetings with national preventive mechanisms. The Subcommittee held an informal public meeting with 36 States Parties and signatories,² explaining its work and activities, including its role in the treaty body strengthening process, as well as challenges, including resource shortages. It also explained the objectives of its general comment No. 1 (2024) on the definition and scope of places of deprivation of liberty. In addition, the Subcommittee met with the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions, the United Against Torture Consortium³ and various other stakeholders. At its fifty-sixth session, the Subcommittee hosted the joint meeting with the Committee against Torture and met with representatives of the Finance and Budget Section of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). At both sessions, the Subcommittee met with the Association for the Prevention of Torture.

C. Membership, officers and mandates

9. The Subcommittee's membership changed during the review period.⁴ At the 1st meeting of the fifty-fifth session, the six newly elected members, Djordje Alempijevic, Omar Battas, Barbara Bernath Thévenoz, Kalliopi Kambanella, Luciano Mariz Maia and Paul Lam Shang Leen, made their solemn declaration under rule 14 of the rules of procedure of the Subcommittee and assumed their duties.

10. Also at its fifty-fifth session, the Subcommittee elected María Luisa Romero as Chair and the following members as Vice-Chairs and members of the Bureau: Marie Brasholt (Vice-Chair for external relations), Hamet Saloum Diakhaté (Vice-Chair for visits), Aisha Shujune Muhammad (Vice-Chair and Rapporteur) and Elīna Šteinerte (Vice-Chair for national preventive mechanisms). All Bureau terms last two years. Anica Tomšić was elected as Rapporteur for reprisals for a two-year term.

11. Membership changes also occurred in the regional teams and standing working groups. As at 31 December 2025, the heads of the regional teams were Mr. Lam Shang Leen for Africa, Victor Zaharia for Asia and the Pacific, Vasiliki Artinopoulou for Europe and Marco Feoli Villalobos for the Americas. Details of the composition of the regional teams are available on the Subcommittee's website.⁵

12. As at 31 December 2025, the heads of the permanent working groups – on jurisprudence, on the health aspects of torture prevention and on the Special Fund established by the Optional Protocol – were Jakub Julian Czepek, Mr. Alempijevic and Ms. Romero, respectively.

² See <https://webtv.un.org/en/asset/k1j/k1jp9dkh5b>.

³ The United Against Torture Consortium unites the global members of the World Organisation against Torture, the International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims and the International Federation of Action by Christians for the Abolition of Torture (ACAT) with the Association for the Prevention of Torture, the Omega Research Foundation, Limited, and Redress Trust.

⁴ See <https://www.ohchr.org/en/treaty-bodies/spt/membership>.

⁵ See <https://www.ohchr.org/en/treaty-bodies/spt/regional-teams>.

D. Special Fund established by the Optional Protocol

13. The Special Fund established under article 26 (1) of the Optional Protocol supports projects to establish or strengthen national preventive mechanisms, aiding the implementation of the Subcommittee's recommendations following its country visits. National preventive mechanisms can also submit proposals for projects to fund their educational programmes, independently of a Subcommittee visit. In 2025, grants amounting to \$423,926 were awarded to support 16 torture prevention projects in 15 States for implementation in 2026. The Subcommittee assisted in assessing proposals and recommending the awarding of grants.

14. A capacity-building project to support the newly established national preventive mechanism in Nigeria was approved for the first time, and projects continued in Benin and Gabon. Projects were also approved for Argentina, Maldives, Mauritania, Senegal and Togo; those projects were aimed at strengthening the capacity of members of national preventive mechanisms, judicial officials, magistrates, law enforcement officials, prison administration staff and other stakeholders in torture prevention; increasing the mechanisms' visibility; strengthening the collaboration of national preventive mechanisms with civil society organizations; developing monitoring tools to track the implementation of the recommendations of national preventive mechanisms; and monitoring non-traditional places of deprivation of liberty in accordance with general comment No. 1 (2024) of the Subcommittee.

15. To increase the impact and visibility of the Special Fund, the Subcommittee supported, through the Special Fund, meetings of the national preventive mechanism network of Africa, held in Cabo Verde on 25 and 26 June 2025, and of the national preventive mechanism network of South America, held in Chile on 24 and 25 July 2025, and participated in both meetings through Subcommittee members who attended in person. The Subcommittee also participated, online, in side events on the margins of the eighty-fifth session of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, held in Banjul from 21 to 30 October 2025. In addition, on 15 and 16 September 2025 a Subcommittee member conducted an advocacy and capacity-building mission in Monrovia to support the establishment of the national preventive mechanism in Liberia as part of both a Special Fund project and Association for the Prevention of Torture activities in the country.

16. The Subcommittee greatly appreciates the first-time contributions to the Special Fund from Armenia (\$5,000) and Saudi Arabia (\$50,000), and the continued support from Austria (\$81,871), Denmark (\$141,000), Germany (€200,000), Spain (€10,000) and Switzerland (\$120,000).

17. The Subcommittee wishes to note that its members engaged actively in fundraising activities throughout the year, and that it is heartened by the positive response received from States. The Subcommittee encourages the provision of further support to enable the Special Fund to launch its 2026 call for applications in support of torture prevention projects worldwide and will continue to meet with relevant stakeholders to discuss potential financial contributions.

III. Visits

A. Visits conducted during the reporting period

18. Due to the liquidity crisis affecting the United Nations, which by March 2025 had resulted in the postponement of the Subcommittee's first four visits scheduled for 2025, the Subcommittee was compelled to pivot strategically, as it was able to undertake only four of the eight initially planned visits. As a result, the planned visits to Afghanistan, Burundi, France and Mexico were postponed. Pursuant to its mandate under articles 11 and 13 of the

Optional Protocol, the Subcommittee conducted the following visits in 2025:⁶ Peru (15 to 21 June), Serbia (15 to 21 June), New Zealand (13 to 25 September) and Mozambique (18 to 30 October).

19. The Subcommittee also wishes to note that because the financial envelopes provided to undertake the visits were disclosed and disbursed in intervals, the Subcommittee experienced several challenges in planning and effectuating the visits, as no effective managerial predictability was possible. The Subcommittee thanks the members of the delegations for the visits to Mozambique and New Zealand, who chose to forgo certain entitlements to facilitate the execution of the visiting mandate under the Optional Protocol. The Subcommittee also appreciates the tireless efforts of the secretariat staff to ensure that the visits the Subcommittee was able to undertake in 2025 materialized, despite the organizational complexities.

20. During those visits, the Subcommittee conducted over 550 individual and collective interviews with more than 900 persons – mostly persons deprived of their liberty, but also officials, law enforcement personnel and medical staff. It visited more than 100 places of deprivation of liberty: 29 prisons, 7 detention facilities for women, 35 police stations, 13 detention centres for children, 1 psychiatric and healthcare institution, 5 detention centres for undocumented migrants, 3 drug rehabilitation centres, 4 court holding cells and 5 social care facilities for older persons.

21. Following each visit, the Subcommittee issues a press release. After visiting Peru, the Subcommittee expressed concern regarding the detention of children in prisons for adults, and about the prevalence of lengthy sentences and the extensive use of preventive detention, despite the overcrowding in the country's penitentiary system. The Subcommittee emphasized that it was essential to strengthen the national preventive mechanism so that it could carry out its important work effectively.⁷

22. Following the visit to Serbia, the Subcommittee called upon Serbian authorities to take further action to protect persons deprived of their liberty from torture and ill-treatment and ensure that the national preventive mechanism played an effective and crucial role in that process; the Subcommittee also emphasized that, to fulfil that role, the mechanism must be independent, well-resourced and effective.⁸

23. Following the visit to New Zealand, the Subcommittee indicated that the State Party must take action to reduce the rising prison population, and that it should take better advantage of the country's independent monitoring mechanism by adequately funding it and implementing its recommendations.⁹

24. After visiting Mozambique, the Subcommittee emphasized the need to strengthen the mandate and effectiveness of the country's national preventive mechanism and reiterated that sustained institutional reform was essential to translate commitments into concrete action towards the effective prevention of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.¹⁰

B. Visit reports¹¹

25. Pursuant to article 16 of the Optional Protocol, the substantive aspects arising from the Subcommittee's visits are confidential. Reports are made public only at the request of the

⁶ See <https://www.ohchr.org/en/treaty-bodies/spt/visits>.

⁷ See <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2025/06/peru-un-experts-raise-concern-over-juvenile-detention-adult-prisons>.

⁸ See <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2025/06/serbia-needs-strengthen-effective-torture-prevention-measures-un-torture>.

⁹ See <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2025/10/new-zealand-needs-cut-prison-population-and-strengthen-oversight-un-torture>.

¹⁰ See <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2025/11/mozambique-pivotal-moment-strengthen-torture-safeguards-un-body-says>.

¹¹ Data concerning visit reports, including those that have been made public, are available at https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/TreatyBodyExternal/CountryVisits.aspx.

State Party visited. By 31 December 2025, 95 visit reports had been transmitted to States Parties by the Subcommittee, including 6 during the reporting period, to Albania, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Gabon, Greece, Mongolia and Peru.

26. Of the 95 visit reports to States Parties, 58 had been made public by 31 December 2025, at the request of States Parties, including 3 during the reporting period, on the visits to Croatia, Kazakhstan and Senegal.¹²

27. While fully respecting the principle of and right to confidentiality provided for in the Optional Protocol, the Subcommittee welcomes and encourages the publication of its visit reports, as it reflects the spirit of transparency that underpins preventive visiting, facilitates better implementation of the respective recommendations and allows other States Parties and national preventive mechanisms to learn from each other's practices, challenges and progress in torture prevention. The Subcommittee urges the States Parties that have received visit reports since its first visit, in 2007, and had not requested their publication by the end of 2025 to do so in the spirit of transparency. The Subcommittee reiterates that States that have requested publication of their visit reports gain access to the Special Fund established by the Optional Protocol, an important resource that supports the Optional Protocol through the financing of projects for the implementation of the Subcommittee's recommendations.

C. States' responses to visit reports and follow-up dialogues

28. Pursuant to article 12 of the Optional Protocol, recipients of reports are requested to submit a written reply within six months of the transmission thereof, detailing actions taken and planned to implement the Subcommittee's recommendations. A timely and comprehensive State Party response is an essential basis for constructive dialogue with the Subcommittee on the implementation of its recommendations, as envisioned in article 12 (d) of the Optional Protocol. In the reporting period, the Subcommittee received six replies, from Croatia, Honduras, Guatemala, Lebanon, Mozambique and Senegal. The replies of Croatia, Mozambique and Senegal were requested to be made public,¹³ a step the Subcommittee commends. The Subcommittee encourages all States Parties to request publication of their responses as a preventive tool and in the spirit of transparency.

29. In line with the Subcommittee's practice and the spirit of constructive dialogue with States Parties, which is central to the Optional Protocol system, the Subcommittee continues discussions with States Parties on implementing recommendations following receipt of their replies, pursuant to article 12 (d) of the Optional Protocol. In 2025, follow-up dialogues were held with Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Georgia, Guatemala, Honduras, Nauru and Türkiye.

30. In accordance with its established practice, the Subcommittee does not request publication of reports to national preventive mechanisms, thus reinforcing its privileged communication with them. However, as with States Parties, the Subcommittee requires all national preventive mechanisms to reply, facilitating ongoing dialogue. At the end of 2025, the Subcommittee undertook follow-up dialogues with the national preventive mechanisms of Guatemala, Honduras and Mongolia.

IV. National preventive mechanisms

A. Obligations of States regarding national preventive mechanisms

31. The Subcommittee maintains a dialogue with States Parties, signatory States and national preventive mechanisms concerning the designation and/or functioning of national preventive mechanisms and related issues.

¹² CAT/OP/HRV/ROSP/1, CAT/OP/KAZ/ROSP/1 and CAT/OP/SEN/ROSP/1.

¹³ CAT/OP/HRV/CSPRO/1, CAT/OP/MOZ/CSPRO/1 and CAT/OP/SEN/CSPRO/1.

32. In 2025, the Subcommittee accepted with appreciation notifications from Australia, Benin, Madagascar, Nigeria and South Africa regarding the establishment of their national preventive mechanisms. The Subcommittee welcomes these newly established mechanisms and looks forward to working with them as they join the family of mechanisms under the Optional Protocol.

33. At its twenty-seventh session, the Subcommittee decided to create a list of States Parties whose establishment of a national preventive mechanism was substantially overdue. To clarify the criteria for determining whether a national preventive mechanism has been maintained, designated or established, as appropriate, under article 17 of the Optional Protocol, and for removing a State Party from the above-mentioned list, the Subcommittee has set out on its website the elements to be included in the State Party's note verbale.¹⁴ The Subcommittee underlines the importance of promptly receiving all relevant information on the establishment or designation of national preventive mechanisms.

34. As at 31 December 2025, the following 12 States Parties were listed as not in compliance with article 17: Afghanistan, Belize, Burundi, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gabon, Ghana, Liberia, Nauru, Philippines, South Sudan and State of Palestine. It remains a matter of the utmost concern to the Subcommittee that some of the States Parties on the list still appear to be making little or no progress towards fulfilling their long-overdue obligations. Some of those States Parties have been on the list for over a decade.

35. The Subcommittee emphasizes that establishing the national preventive mechanism and affording it the requisite mandate is a core obligation of each State Party. It is also a crucial step to further the fulfilment of States Parties' obligations, under the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, to prevent acts of torture and other ill-treatment. The Subcommittee reiterates its readiness to assist these States Parties with the establishment of their national preventive mechanisms, in line with its advisory function pursuant to article 11 of the Optional Protocol.

B. Meetings

Engagement with national preventive mechanisms

36. In accordance with its mandate under article 11 (b) (i) and (ii) of the Optional Protocol, the Subcommittee established and maintained direct contact with national preventive mechanisms during and between sessions. Additionally, the regional groups held annual online meetings with national preventive mechanisms from their regions in line with usual practice.

37. During the fifty-fifth session, the regional teams of the Subcommittee conducted webinars with national preventive mechanisms on the Subcommittee's general comment No. 1 (2024). During the webinars, Subcommittee members gave a brief presentation regarding the general comment – the first issued by the Subcommittee. Representatives of national preventive mechanisms who participated in the webinars shared their experiences regarding the definition of places of deprivation of liberty. The observations included, but were not limited to, matters regarding the practical application of the definition, access issues experienced by national preventive mechanisms that related to the definition of a place of deprivation of liberty, and the level of awareness about the general comment itself among State Party authorities.

38. Furthermore, in November and December 2025, the Subcommittee, in collaboration with the International Drug Policy Consortium, hosted intersessional webinars on the impact of drug policies on the effective prevention of torture and ill-treatment, in which national preventive mechanisms, institutions undertaking torture prevention work in States Parties and civil society partners in the Americas region and the Asia and the Pacific region

¹⁴ See <https://www.ohchr.org/en/treaty-bodies/spt/non-compliance-article-17>.

participated.¹⁵ The webinars were the first two of four such webinars organized in collaboration with the International Drug Policy Consortium; webinars for the regions of Africa and Europe are scheduled for the first half of 2026.

39. These webinars were preceded by the issuance of the Subcommittee's advice to national preventive mechanisms on the impact of drug policies on the effective prevention of torture and ill-treatment, referred to in the eighteenth annual report of the Subcommittee.¹⁶ The discussions at the webinars were focused on recognizing the various drug policy approaches adopted by different States Parties and the significant impact of such policies on the rights of persons deprived of liberty, including freedom from torture and other ill-treatment, in a wide variety of settings.

Involvement in meetings related to national preventive mechanisms

40. The Subcommittee continued to receive invitations to numerous national, regional and international meetings concerning the designation, establishment and development of national preventive mechanisms and on the effective discharge of their powers and mandate. Given that the liquidity crisis affecting the United Nations has hindered the efforts of the Subcommittee to carry out its core mandate of visiting places of deprivation of liberty in States Parties, the Subcommittee is particularly grateful for the invitations to attend events concerning national preventive mechanisms and expresses its appreciation to the organizers for the invitations received and to partners for the funding provided when needed.

41. Through participation in such events, the Subcommittee was able to discharge its mandate to advise on and assist in the designation, establishment or maintenance of national preventive mechanisms and/or the effective discharge of the powers and mandate of national preventive mechanisms. Online participation by the Subcommittee allowed for participation in more events than would otherwise have been possible. However, attendance in person in national, regional and international meetings also provided important networking opportunities that built trust and relationships that facilitate the current and future work of the Subcommittee.

42. The Subcommittee notes with great satisfaction that collaboration across borders is increasingly strengthening national preventive mechanisms through mutual support and the exchange of experiences. In that context, at the regional level, the Subcommittee's activities included the following:

(a) On 9 and 10 April, the Subcommittee was represented at a workshop – on monitoring by national preventive mechanisms in the context of migration – organized by the European National Preventive Mechanism Forum of the Council of Europe, in which the definition of places of deprivation of liberty in that context was examined; the first general comment of the Subcommittee was highly relevant to the discussion;

(b) The Subcommittee participated in a two-day conference organized by the African National Preventive Mechanisms Network, held in Cabo Verde on 25 and 26 June 2025, which brought together 14 national preventive mechanisms and other relevant stakeholders; at the meeting, discussions were focused on the use of technology for the prevention of torture;

¹⁵ Representatives of the national preventive mechanisms of Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay were present at the webinar for the Americas region, held in November 2025. Representatives of the national preventive mechanisms of Australia, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Maldives, Mongolia, New Zealand and Sri Lanka, and a representative of the monitoring body from the State of Palestine, were present at the webinar for the Asia and the Pacific region, held in December 2025.

¹⁶ CAT/C/82/2, paras. 40–45.

(c) The Subcommittee was represented at a summit for Latin American national preventive mechanisms, hosted and organized by the Association for the Prevention of Torture and the national preventive mechanism of Chile, held in Santiago on 23 and 24 July 2025; the participants reflected on the common challenges of the national preventive mechanisms and on the prevention of torture generally in Latin America, and the Subcommittee's presentation was focused on women in prison and on mental health.

43. In addition, the Subcommittee provided support to States Parties in which the establishment of a national preventive mechanism is pending. High-level meetings and a multi-stakeholder round table on the establishment of a national preventive mechanism were held in Liberia. In Gabon, high-level meetings and workshops on the same topic were held with parliamentarians and civil society.

44. On 8 and 9 September 2025, the Subcommittee was represented at a workshop on environmental conditions of detention, held in Lima and hosted by the national preventive mechanism of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the University of Edinburgh Law School. The workshop was aimed at strengthening the capacity of national preventive mechanisms to improve their oversight, advocate for systemic reforms and ensure compliance with national, international and regional standards, including the recommendations of the Subcommittee. In addition, the Subcommittee participated in a seminar on the prevention and eradication of torture in Latin America, focused on international oversight and preventive action, held in Argentina on 30 September and 1 October, which brought together the national preventive mechanisms of the region.

45. Additionally, prior to the accession by Colombia to the Optional Protocol, the Subcommittee welcomed invitations from government representatives in the country to participate in dialogues with relevant stakeholders and explain States Parties' obligations, including with regard to the establishment of a national preventive mechanism.

46. The country rapporteurs maintained close contact with the national preventive mechanisms assigned to them throughout the year. Additionally, the Subcommittee provided support to the national preventive mechanisms of Kyrgyzstan and South Africa, and attended events arranged by the national preventive mechanisms of the United Kingdom, Mongolia and Tunisia. Finally, the Secretary of the Subcommittee participated, in December, in a colloquium organized by the national preventive mechanism of Tunisia, held in Tunis, which brought together national preventive mechanisms in the region.

C. Advice to national preventive mechanisms

47. During the reporting period, the Subcommittee received requests for advice from national preventive mechanisms. Noting that these may concern challenges faced by other national preventive mechanisms globally, the Subcommittee wishes to share the advice provided.

United Nations standards as basis for the national preventive mechanism approach

48. Article 19 (b) of the Optional Protocol sets out the mandate of the national preventive mechanisms in relation to making recommendations and empowers such mechanisms to make recommendations to the relevant authorities with the aim of improving the treatment and the conditions of the persons deprived of their liberty and to prevent torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, "taking into consideration the relevant norms of the United Nations". As such, this provision clearly requires national preventive mechanisms to anchor their recommendations and their overall approach to the implementation of their mandates in the standards set by the United Nations, including specialized human rights treaties.

Remuneration for the experts of national preventive mechanisms

49. In line with article 18 (2) of the Optional Protocol, the experts of national preventive mechanism, as a collective, must have the requisite diversity of knowledge and professional

capacities to enable the mechanism to deliver the mandate effectively.¹⁷ At times, however, this may require that the national preventive mechanism engage experts to complement the in-house expertise.

50. Further, as stipulated in article 18 (3) of the Optional Protocol and clarified by the Subcommittee,¹⁸ the national preventive mechanism should be provided with the resources necessary for effective delivery of the mandate. To this end, it is paramount that there are no administrative obstacles that would jeopardize or preclude the ability of a national preventive mechanism to engage the requisite experts.

51. In that vein, while the Optional Protocol of course does not set the level of remuneration pertaining to members of national preventive mechanisms and/or experts engaged to assist with a mechanism's work, it is clear that such remuneration must be commensurate with the expert advice provided and that it should not be set at such a low level as to effectively discourage the experts from supporting the work of the national preventive mechanism, as that would have a negative impact on the ability of the mechanism to fulfil its mandate. In that regard, it is pertinent to recall that the Subcommittee's has clearly stated, in a specific context but applicable more broadly, that it is implausible to believe that a small group of unpaid, part-time and unsupported persons could effectively undertake preventive visits to all places within the scope for their mandate in a manner compatible with the Optional Protocol.¹⁹ It derives therefrom that proper remuneration for the work of national preventive mechanism members, including experts, is essential to fulfilling the requirements of the Optional Protocol.

National preventive mechanisms in multi-mandate institutions

52. The establishment of a national preventive mechanism is the key obligation of all States Parties to the Optional Protocol. National preventive mechanisms may consist of one or more bodies, be these existing bodies or entirely new ones set up specifically as the national preventive mechanism.²⁰ There is no one-size-fits-all approach for the establishment of the mechanism and there is no preferred national preventive mechanism model.²¹ It is for each State Party to decide which type of national preventive mechanism may work best for it.

53. However, when choosing the national preventive mechanism, it is imperative that this mechanism, whatever form it may take, be structured and that it carry out its mandate in accordance with the requirements laid out in the Optional Protocol.²² These requirements can be broadly divided into two types: institutional and operational. Institutional requirements oblige States Parties to ensure the independence of their national preventive mechanisms, including independence of the personnel, functional independence and financial independence, and States Parties are to give due consideration to the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles).²³ Operational requirements set out the fundamentals of the mandate of the national preventive mechanism, including the rights to visit all places of deprivation of liberty and their facilities and installations, to have access to information concerning persons deprived of their liberty, to interview such persons and others in private and to make recommendations, and also sets out the corresponding obligation of the authorities to engage in a dialogue with the national preventive mechanism about the implementation of the recommendations.²⁴

¹⁷ See also [CAT/OP/12/5](#), para. 20.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, para. 11.

¹⁹ [CAT/OP/8](#), para. 20.

²⁰ Optional Protocol, arts. 3 and 17.

²¹ [CAT/C/57/4](#) and [CAT/C/57/4/Corr.1](#), annex, para. 17; [CAT/C/79/2](#), annex I, para. 2; and [CAT/OP/CYP/1](#), para. 89.

²² [CAT/C/79/2](#), annex I, para. 2.

²³ Optional Protocol, art. 18.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, arts. 19, 20 and 22.

54. To date, some 80 national preventive mechanisms are operational globally. The majority of those are national human rights institutions, such as human rights commissions and ombudsperson offices. In this regard, the Subcommittee recalls that the human rights mandates with which national human rights institutions are vested are much broader than the specific focus on torture prevention required from national preventive mechanisms under the Optional Protocol. Nevertheless, there are many advantages in having the national human rights institution vested with the national preventive mechanism mandate, including the possibility to draw upon the institution's extensive expertise in the domestic human rights arena, well-established relationships and a well-established reputation, which contribute significantly to national preventive mechanism effectiveness. However, national preventive mechanisms are not to be equated with national human rights institutions,²⁵ and where the body designated as the national preventive mechanism performs other functions in addition to those set out in the Optional Protocol, its national preventive mechanism functions should be located within a separate unit or department, with its own staff and a ring-fenced budget,²⁶ and be able to autonomously discharge the national preventive mechanism mandate.

55. Ensuring the visibility of the distinct national preventive mechanism mandate and identity in institutions such as national human rights institutions may still be challenging as, in addition to fulfilling the overall human rights mandate, covering the very broad spectrum of various rights, and/or serving as the office of the ombudsperson, national human rights institutions are increasingly becoming vested with other mandates stemming from national and/or international commitments. These may include being designated as national equality bodies, whistle-blower protection bodies, anti-corruption offices, data protection institutions, national monitoring mechanisms under the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, independent monitoring mechanisms under the Pact on Migration and Asylum of the European Union and national preventive mechanisms.

56. Undoubtedly, such a multitude of mandates brings opportunities for useful cross-fertilization, enables the maximization of established mechanisms for exchanges with various authorities and facilitates effective mutual reinforcement between the mandates, especially in terms of follow-up. However, each of these mandates has a different focus, which must be duly preserved; in that light, and in line with the Optional Protocol, the mandate of the national preventive mechanism should always be visible and clear, both institutionally and operationally. Furthermore, national preventive mechanisms, as preventive bodies, must always retain a forward-looking approach,²⁷ which differs considerably from the protection and more reactive, investigative and complaints-driven approach of the other mandates vested in the same national human rights institution.

57. Finally, the requirements of the Optional Protocol, especially in terms of providing adequate funding, safeguarding independence and implementing the national preventive mechanism recommendations, are permanent and ongoing irrespective of any other mandate or mandates the institution designated as the national preventive mechanism serves. The State Party obligations towards its national preventive mechanism do not cease with the designation of the mechanism, as those obligations are continuous, requiring the State Party to maintain its national preventive mechanism, including through the provision of requisite resources for the national preventive mechanism mandate specifically. This obligation remains unaltered when the institution designated as the national preventive mechanism also serves other mandates.

Change in the national preventive mechanism designation

58. While the designation of a national preventive mechanism is the core obligation of each State Party to the Optional Protocol, it is also a continuous obligation, requiring that the effectiveness of the national preventive mechanism be regularly appraised by both the State Party and the national preventive mechanism itself, considering the views of the Subcommittee, with a view to the mechanism being reinforced and strengthened as and when

²⁵ CAT/C/79/2, annex III.

²⁶ CAT/OP/12/5, para. 32.

²⁷ See CAT/OP/12/6.

necessary.²⁸ This may mean, in exceptional circumstances, that the State Party changes its national preventive mechanism designation. In the event that such a change occurs, States Parties are advised to duly inform the Subcommittee.²⁹

59. Furthermore, where there is a change in designation, it is imperative that Optional Protocol requirements are always respected, especially in relation to the powers and mandate of the national preventive mechanism,³⁰ the independence of the mechanism³¹ and the continuity of the obligation to maintain the mechanism.³² Crucially, a change in the designation of the national preventive mechanism does not justify any limitation on its powers, mandate or independence, nor a reduction in the human or financial resources allocated to it.

60. It is, furthermore, paramount that the national preventive mechanism always be identified through an open, transparent and inclusive process, involving a wide range of stakeholders, including civil society.³³ Without such a process, the perceived legitimacy, and the future of, the national preventive mechanism can be severely undermined, negatively affecting its ability to implement its mandate effectively.

V. Engagement with other bodies in the field of torture prevention

A. Subcommittee as part of the United Nations human rights system

61. On 14 April 2025, the Chair of the Subcommittee presented the eighteenth annual report of the Subcommittee³⁴ to, and discussed it with, the Committee against Torture in plenary session at the Committee's eighty-second session. On 14 October, the Chair also presented (online) the annual report to the Third Committee of the General Assembly at the eightieth session of the Assembly. This represented the second consecutive year in which the annual report could not be presented in person in New York as a result of the United Nations financial and liquidity crisis affecting the United Nations.

62. To mark the United Nations International Day in Support of Victims of Torture, which is commemorated on 26 June, the Subcommittee, the Committee against Torture, the Special Fund established by the Optional Protocol, the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture issued a joint statement calling for more responsible and accountable policing of protests amid serious human rights violations.³⁵

63. During the joint meeting between the Subcommittee and the Committee against Torture, on 13 November 2025, the two treaty bodies reflected on their work over the past year, including both achievements and challenges, in a context marked by the liquidity crisis affecting the United Nations; matters arising from, and ways forward in respect to, States Parties that are unresponsive; and matters relating to mutual collaboration vis-à-vis the respective mandates of the two bodies.

64. The Chair of the Subcommittee represented the Subcommittee at the thirty-seventh meeting of Chairs of the human rights treaty bodies, held in Geneva from 2 to 6 June 2025. The Subcommittee regrets that the meeting could not take place in New York in accordance with established practice, due to funding and logistical challenges, as meeting in New York would have enabled broader engagement with United Nations leadership and Member States,

²⁸ CAT/OP/12/5, para. 15.

²⁹ Ibid., para. 23.

³⁰ Optional Protocol, arts. 19 and 20.

³¹ Ibid., art. 18.

³² Ibid., art. 17.

³³ CAT/OP/12/5, para. 16.

³⁴ CAT/C/82/2.

³⁵ Available at <https://www.ohchr.org/en/statements-and-speeches/2025/06/protecting-protests-un-anti-torture-mechanisms-call-responsible-and>.

strengthened the institutional visibility of the human rights treaty body system and provided an important forum for discussing both the substantive work of treaty bodies and the challenges affecting the effective discharge of their mandates, including the impact of the liquidity crisis. The Chairs' conclusions emphasized the major negative impact of the crisis on the effective discharge of the treaty bodies' mandates, highlighting, among other things, that the unique preventive mandate of the Subcommittee had been severely undermined with the postponement of half of its planned visits for 2025. The Chairs emphasized that Member States needed to take urgent action to ensure the sustainability of the treaty body system, and recognized that the current crisis required treaty bodies to adopt urgent measures themselves to ensure the continuity of the functions provided for in the treaties. Furthermore, with regard to the implementation of the Guidelines against Intimidation or Reprisals (San José Guidelines), and marking an important recognition of the torture prevention system and the specific risks that members of national preventive mechanisms may face in fulfilling their preventive mandate, the Chairs decided to include members of national preventive mechanisms as actors potentially impacted by reprisals.³⁶

65. The Chair also participated in several informal meetings throughout the year to discuss the treaty body strengthening process, with a particular focus on the challenging context the United Nations is facing. This included an informal meeting held in Geneva on 5 and 6 December, hosted by the Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights, in which the Chair participated virtually and the Subcommittee was represented in person by the Vice-Chair for external relations.

66. The Subcommittee continued its cooperation with the regional offices of OHCHR, United Nations country teams and the treaty body capacity-building programme, in support of the work of national preventive mechanisms and the ratification of the Optional Protocol. The Subcommittee cooperated with the Regional Office for Central Asia to hold dialogues with State institutions in Kyrgyzstan to discuss the State Party's plans to change the type of its national preventive mechanism, namely, its plans to place the mechanism, which was independent, under the national human rights institution. The Subcommittee also took part in the sixty-eighth session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, held in Vienna, and in four side events of the session. The Subcommittee's engagement on drug policies was discussed, in particular with regard to the information it has gathered, and the insight it has gained, through country visits and through cooperation with national preventive mechanisms. In addition, the impact of drug policies on human rights was highlighted at the session, and the importance of ensuring that such policies were fully anchored in respect for human rights was highlighted; the Subcommittee emphasized its role and that of national preventive mechanisms in that regard.

67. Furthermore, with the assistance of the Regional Office for South-East Asia, the Subcommittee undertook in-person consultations on Optional Protocol ratification in Thailand and held an online meeting with the national human rights institution of Timor-Leste.

68. The Subcommittee was represented at the International Congress on Human Mobility and Human Rights, which was held in Panama City on 29 and 30 April 2025 in conjunction with the General Assembly of the Network of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in the Americas, with support from the OHCHR Regional Office for Central America and the Dominican Republic. The Chair participated in a panel discussion regarding a monitoring guide for the prevention of torture and ill-treatment in the context of human mobility and of the Subcommittee's general comment No. 1 (2024).

69. Considering that the preventive mandate under the Optional Protocol is grounded in the principle that social reintegration is the central aim of deprivation of liberty,³⁷ the Subcommittee submitted a confidential contribution for the report prepared by OHCHR on the social reintegration of persons released from detention and persons subjected to non-custodial measures.³⁸ The Subcommittee, in its almost two decades of functioning and

³⁶ See [A/80/294](#).

³⁷ See, for example, [CAT/OP/CHL/1](#), para. 113.

³⁸ [A/HRC/60/55](#). See also <https://www.ohchr.org/en/calls-for-input/2025/call-input-ohchr-comprehensive-study-human-rights-and-social-reintegration>.

visiting places of deprivation of liberty in States Parties, has reflected extensively on the issue of social reintegration. In presenting a summary of its rich body of observations and recommendations concerning the prevention of torture and the social reintegration of persons deprived of liberty, the Subcommittee highlighted the importance of upholding human dignity, supporting individual treatment and preparing individuals to return to society capable of leading a law-abiding and self-supporting life despite having been deprived of liberty. The Subcommittee has also emphasized that reintegration measures are critical for preventing recidivism.³⁹

70. The Subcommittee also acknowledges and appreciates the invitation of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime to contribute to the development of a new guide on corruption risk management in prison systems. The Subcommittee is pleased to note that online and in-person contributions for the guide ensured that issues concerning the Subcommittee's mandate, especially regarding the importance of monitoring in reducing the risks for corruption, are reflected in the guide.

B. Regional cooperation

71. The Subcommittee continued its cooperation with the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and took steps to strengthen cooperation with other regional bodies. The Subcommittee had a productive meeting with the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights on 21 May 2025, at which the strengthening of cooperation between the two bodies was discussed, especially with regard to national preventive mechanisms.

C. Cooperation with civil society and other stakeholders

72. The Subcommittee continued to benefit from, and appreciated, the support of civil society, notably the Association for the Prevention of Torture, with which the Subcommittee maintained close collaboration. The Subcommittee contributed at a torture prevention workshop for national human rights institutions organized jointly by the Association of Prevention of Torture and the Asia Pacific Forum of National Human Rights Institutions. The Subcommittee also maintained good relations with the World Organisation against Torture and other members of the United Against Torture Consortium.

73. In addition, the cooperation between the Subcommittee and the International Drug Policy Consortium resulted in the design and initial roll-out of webinars on the impact of drug policies on the effective prevention of torture and ill-treatment (see paras. 38 and 39 above).

74. Recognizing that national preventive mechanisms are part of national human rights institutions in many States Parties, the Subcommittee continues to maintain close contact with the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions and attended two webinars organized by the Alliance on monitoring places of detention. This included a webinar on strategies for effective national human rights institution monitoring of places of detention, held in September 2025, which was part of the webinar series entitled "Strengthening NHRI Roles in Torture Prevention and OPCAT Implementation" hosted by the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions in collaboration with the Association for the Prevention of Torture.

75. The Subcommittee is also pleased to have received invitations to participate in several events organized by civil society organizations to mark the occasion of the International Day in Support of Victims of Torture and values all collaborative efforts.

76. Additionally, prior to and during its visits, the Subcommittee engaged extensively with both national and international civil society organizations, which provided the Subcommittee with valuable information. The Subcommittee would like to thank those

³⁹ [CAT/OP/NZL/1](#), paras. 33 and 52; [CAT/OP/UKR/3](#), para. 29; and [CAT/OP/ROU/1](#), para. 38.

organizations for promoting and supporting the mandate set out in the Optional Protocol and looks forward to collaborating further with civil society organizations.

77. The Subcommittee stresses the important role of academia in the torture prevention space. Universities co-organized some of the above-mentioned events, and Subcommittee members attended conferences of relevance in Belgium, Kazakhstan, Peru and Ukraine.

VI. Plan of work for the year ahead

A. Sessions

78. The Subcommittee usually holds three sessions each year, in Geneva. However, as an extraordinary and proactive cost-saving measure, taken in response to the liquidity crisis the United Nations is currently facing, after robust discussions, the Subcommittee decided that in 2026 it would hold only two sessions, both in Geneva. There have been indications that the session time available to the Subcommittee will be reduced, as was the case in 2025, due to the limited funds available. Further, while the Subcommittee has been informed that its sessions will take place in May and November, at the time of writing the present report, the exact dates for the sessions in 2026 had not been confirmed.

B. Visits

79. Given the challenges encountered in 2025 with regard to planning and undertaking visits and the lessons learned as the Subcommittee navigated the complexities arising from the financial situation, during its fifty-sixth session the Subcommittee devoted substantial time to discussions, both at the regional team level and in plenary, to reflect on its strategic priorities in the light of the current financial and operational constraints and on the options available should further adjustments be required. The discussions covered the consideration of, among other things, how to safeguard the effectiveness of the Subcommittee's preventive visiting mandate under the current circumstances, including through greater flexibility in the duration and focus of visits, the size of delegations and the types of activities undertaken; the continuation of cost-saving measures; and ensuring coherence and synergy with national preventive mechanisms and other human rights systems despite the current limitations.

80. Following the fifty-sixth session, the Subcommittee announced that it would undertake the postponed visits to Burundi, France and Mexico in 2026. It also announced newly planned visits to Paraguay, Rwanda and Sri Lanka, also to be undertaken in 2026. The visiting programme for 2026 reflects the careful and deliberate considerations of the Subcommittee and recognizes that the current context does not allow for business as usual. It represents a strategic adaptation designed to ensure that prevention remains at the centre of the Subcommittee's mandate, despite limited resources, while highlighting the importance of flexibility, innovation and institutional resilience.

81. As resourcing directly impacts the Subcommittee's abilities to execute its mandate effectively, the Subcommittee is cognizant of the fact that it will need to continue to be flexible and creative in its planning, including in relation to its visits; at the same time, it reiterates that preventive visiting is a core function entrusted to it. The Subcommittee therefore reserves the right to adjust the visit plan as may be required, depending on the realities it is likely to face in 2026, especially in relation to the funding made available for this core element of its mandate.

C. Other activities

82. Furthering the implementation of the mandate set out in the Optional Protocol is a priority for the Subcommittee, and it will continue to engage with States Parties, national preventive mechanisms and other relevant stakeholders, including civil society organizations, in that regard. This engagement will be pursued through, among other efforts, strengthened collaboration, sustained dialogue and active participation at conferences, seminars and

training activities. Looking ahead, the Subcommittee is committed to fostering inclusive and constructive partnerships that enhance shared understanding, capacity, and impact in the prevention of torture and ill-treatment. Invitations to official events should be sent through the Subcommittee secretariat.

VII. Looking forward

83. The year 2025 proved to be one of the most complicated years in the history of the Subcommittee, save the circumstances resulting from the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic. The liquidity crisis faced by the United Nations has been felt by all treaty bodies over the past years, but has had a particularly detrimental impact on the Subcommittee and its ability to discharge its mandate under the Optional Protocol, given that the core mandate is preventive visiting. As mentioned above, the ongoing crisis meant that the Subcommittee was able to undertake only half of the visits it had planned for 2025 (which already numbered fewer than the previous year), despite the fact that members of the Subcommittee and the secretariat forwent certain entitlements to facilitate the undertaking of visits. The challenges faced by the Subcommittee must be understood in the context of a broader global erosion of commitment to human rights and multilateralism, which has impacted the capacity of States to fulfil their human rights obligations under international law and has rendered the Subcommittee's mandate to prevent torture all the more vital.

84. Undertaking preventive visits is at the heart of the work of the Subcommittee. This requires work on the ground, visiting places of deprivation of liberty and engaging with the States Parties, national preventive mechanisms and other stakeholders. That mandate exists because States recognize that prevention of torture requires a different approach and that regular visits have a positive impact on torture prevention efforts. This is the basis on which this preventive system has advanced, owing to independent monitoring, cooperation, dialogue and transparency, with visits to States Parties being a key component, as required by the Optional Protocol, for two decades. When the Subcommittee fails to conduct a planned visit, there are direct consequences for persons deprived of liberty, whose voices are left unheard and whose conditions of detention remain unmonitored by the international body established by the international community specifically for the purpose of monitoring.

85. For the Subcommittee to be able to undertake its specific and unique mandate effectively, not only must its mandate under the Optional Protocol – and the crucial differences that characterize it – be recognized and understood, but also sufficient resources must be allocated to undertake the distinct work the Subcommittee is tasked with. The work that needs to be done remains the same; the predicaments of persons deprived of liberty cannot be ignored, and the values that the Subcommittee strives to uphold in the prevention of torture and ill-treatment cannot be compromised.

86. While the Subcommittee will continue to explore ways to mitigate the shortfall in resources through innovative approaches wherever possible, the distinct nature of its work allows the Subcommittee to be creative only to a certain extent. Creativity and flexibility cannot replace the financial and political commitment of States. The Subcommittee therefore calls upon States to renew and strengthen their commitment to human rights and to the system established by the Optional Protocol in order to prevent torture in this time of profound transformation of the multilateral order.

87. In the context of the continued relevance of the Optional Protocol, the Subcommittee is pleased to welcome Bangladesh and Colombia as States Parties to the Optional Protocol. The Subcommittee looks forward to engaging with the new States Parties and undertaking consultations on the establishment of their respective national preventive mechanisms and advancing work on torture prevention in general. The Subcommittee also welcomes the newly appointed national preventive mechanisms of Australia, Benin, Madagascar, Nigeria and South Africa to the family of mechanisms under the Optional Protocol and hopes to build a constructive working relationship with them to ensure that they are adequate and operate efficiently.

88. Moving forward, the Subcommittee seeks to continue to work closely with national preventive mechanisms to ensure that the preventive regime remains resilient in the face of

the repercussions arising from the current situation. The work of national preventive mechanisms lies at the core of the system established by the Optional Protocol and its torture prevention architecture, and the Subcommittee regards those mechanisms as essential partners. The Subcommittee recognizes that remote engagement with national preventive mechanisms, while necessary, presents specific challenges owing to the diverse mandates, capacities and resources of national preventive mechanisms worldwide. In this context, the Subcommittee invites national preventive mechanisms to engage actively with the Subcommittee, with one another and with other relevant partners and, where possible, to share information, tools and resources within the framework of the Optional Protocol, with a view to minimizing the impact of the current crisis on torture prevention efforts.

89. The Subcommittee will maintain its engagement in and commitment to the treaty body strengthening process, and will continue to highlight the different modality within which it is mandated to work, including the human and financial resource implications flowing therefrom. This engagement is of increasing importance to the Subcommittee, given the significant operational challenges it faces, both in terms of the severe human resource situation and, as explained above, in relation to discharging its core mandate of undertaking preventive visits.

90. The Subcommittee is also cognizant that elections for membership in the Subcommittee will take place, in accordance with articles 5 through 9 of the Optional Protocol, in 2026, potentially changing half of the membership. The Subcommittee believes that these changes, built into the design, is necessary to balance continuity with fresh ideas and perspectives regarding torture prevention work. The Subcommittee therefore encourages States Parties to nominate experienced candidates from a variety of related professions and backgrounds, and of different national and ethnic backgrounds and genders, so that the Subcommittee may meet challenges and address issues in a holistic and robust manner.

91. The Subcommittee will endeavour to work even more strategically with States Parties, national preventive mechanisms, civil society organizations and others to further the implementation of the Optional Protocol. In this respect, the Subcommittee welcomes initiatives by various stakeholders on different aspects relating to the Optional Protocol and torture prevention, including, but not limited to, the establishment and strengthening of national preventive mechanisms and other substantive issues pertaining to the effective implementation of the Optional Protocol in various contexts.

92. The Subcommittee will also continue discussions on ways to mitigate the impact that the liquidity crisis has on the mandate under the Optional Protocol and possible means to maximize the impact and productivity of the Subcommittee in these challenging times. The Subcommittee remains committed to and focused on adapting to serve the mandate it is entrusted with under the Optional Protocol.

93. In 2026 and 2027, significant anniversaries relating to the Optional Protocol will be commemorated, marking, respectively, two decades since the entry into force of the Optional Protocol and two decades since the establishment of the Subcommittee. These milestones provide a timely opportunity to take stock of achievements to date, to foster renewed commitment and engagement by States Parties, national preventive mechanisms and other stakeholders in advancing the prevention of torture, and to reflect on the future direction of the preventive system.