



# Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

Distr.: General  
19 November 2025

Original: English

---

## Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

### Report on follow-up to the concluding observations of the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities\*

#### I. Background

1. Between 26 August 2024 to 30 June 2025, the Committee received follow-up information from various sources, including organizations of persons with disabilities, civil society organizations, research centres and national human rights institutions, regarding five States Parties on whose reports submitted under article 35 of the Convention the Committee had previously adopted concluding observations. The information submitted by the various stakeholders related to the issues addressed by the Committee in its concluding observations on the States Parties concerned.

2. Pursuant to article 36 (1) of the Convention and rule 44 of the Committee's rules of procedure, the Committee sent follow-up letters to the States Parties concerned, requesting additional information. The present report contains summaries of the Committee's follow-up letters, of the replies provided by the States Parties concerned and of the submissions of organizations of persons with disabilities and other stakeholders, and the Committee's follow-up assessments in each case.

#### II. Assessment of information on follow-up to the concluding observations

##### A. Argentina

###### Concluding observations

3. In its concluding observations on the combined second and third periodic reports of Argentina,<sup>1</sup> the Committee expressed concerns about the following with regard to the rights to an adequate standard of living and to social protection:

(a) The limited access of persons with disabilities to the non-contributory "invalidity" pension, and the delays in its processing;

(b) The fact that the non-contributory "invalidity" pension was based on inability to work, pursuant to Act No. 13.478 of 1948, that its amount was insufficient and that it was not available to persons receiving other income in the form of remuneration;

(c) The inadequacy of the social protection system to cover the additional costs of living with a disability;

---

\* Adopted by the Committee at its thirty-third session (11–26 August 2025).

<sup>1</sup> [CRPD/C/ARG/CO/2-3](#), para. 53.



(d) The restriction of access to social benefits for persons with disabilities due to the measures taken by the State Party to reduce the budget deficit and consolidate public debt under its agreement with the International Monetary Fund.

4. The Committee recommended that the State Party, taking into account the links between article 28 of the Convention and target 1.3 of the Sustainable Development Goals:<sup>2</sup>

(a) Step up actions to eliminate the barriers hindering the access of persons with disabilities to the non-contributory “invalidity” pension, including further measures to make the criteria for granting such pensions more flexible, simplify the process and allocate a larger budget;

(b) Amend legislation on the non-contributory “invalidity” pension to replace the medical model with the human rights model, change the name of the pension, increase the amount to at least the adjustable minimum living wage and allow recipients to receive other income;

(c) Strengthen the social protection system based on the Convention to ensure an adequate standard of living for persons with disabilities throughout the country and cover the additional costs related to disability;

(d) Ensure that economic reform policies and related loan agreements did not negatively impact the rights of persons with disabilities and their access to social services.

#### **Summary of the Committee’s follow-up letter**

5. On 26 June 2025, the Committee, pursuant to article 36 (1) of the Convention, sent a follow-up letter to the State Party,<sup>3</sup> requesting information about the following:

(a) The reforms introduced in Emergency Decree No. 600/2024 to the Solidarity Redistribution Fund, particularly the reduction of contribution coefficients for the largest social security funds, and the potential implications for the sustainability of the basic benefits system for habilitation and rehabilitation services;

(b) The reforms introduced in Emergency Decree No. 843/2024 with regard to eligibility criteria for non-contributory pensions for persons with disabilities and how they differed from the previous criteria, the regulatory provisions adopted to implement the reforms and their impact in practice on beneficiaries;

(c) The criteria, methodology and outcomes of audits carried out on non-contributory pensions, and the measures taken following these reviews;

(d) The restructuring of the National Disability Agency, and the extent to which any changes in financial and human resources have affected its capacity to fulfil its mandate;

(e) The status and substantive content of the draft emergency act on disability, adopted at first reading in June 2025;

(f) The modifications introduced in joint resolution No. 9/2024 of the Ministry of Health and the National Disability Agency to the nomenclature used in the system of basic services for persons with disabilities, and their impact on the availability and accessibility of essential services to persons with disabilities, particularly individuals requiring high levels of support;

(g) Procedures for close consultation with and the active involvement of persons with disabilities.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., para. 54.

<sup>3</sup> Available at [https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/\\_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2FCRPD%2FFUL%2FARG%2F63699&Lang=en](https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2FCRPD%2FFUL%2FARG%2F63699&Lang=en).

### Summary of the State Party's reply

6. In its reply,<sup>4</sup> the State Party informed the Committee that since December 2023, it had been undertaking a broad institutional restructuring to address an inherited economic and administrative crisis. The reforms were aimed at rationalizing the functioning of the State, improving efficiency and transparency and strengthening public services while upholding constitutional rights. It further informed the Committee of the following points:

(a) Regarding Emergency Decree No. 600/2024, the reforms to the Solidarity Redistribution Fund had not compromised the sustainability of disability benefits, since the Fund was only one source of financing. The reforms standardized contributions by large health funds at 15 per cent, correcting asymmetries and reinforcing equity and free choice;

(b) Emergency Decree No. 843/2024 redefined eligibility for non-contributory disability pensions to prevent misuse of resources and to focus support on the most vulnerable. An official medical certificate was required from a public health institution demonstrating incapacity to work of at least 66 per cent, but the disability certificate was not required. Other factors considered included lack of income, social security coverage, significant assets or family being legally responsible for providing support. Safeguards included accommodation for persons with conditions affecting their mobility, individualized assessments and access to administrative defence and appeals;

(c) Through Decree No. 585/2024, the National Disability Agency was brought under the Ministry of Health. A system of audits was also introduced, designed to optimize the non-contributory pension regime and ensure effective access for persons with disabilities. Care services had not been affected, as internal restructuring and digitalization had reinforced technical and operational capacities;

(d) The draft emergency act on disability, which had been approved by the Senate in July 2025, had been vetoed in its entirety through Decree No. 534/2025. The draft act sought to declare a national emergency with regard to disability until 2026, create a new non-contributory pension compatible with formal work and establish automatic tariff updates. The National Executive noted that the fiscal cost of implementation would be more than 2 trillion pesos in 2025 and 4.7 trillion in 2026 and that no provision had been made for financing sources, which would compromise the stability of the system;

(e) Broader reforms were aligned with human rights, including programmes under the National Fund for the Social Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities to promote economic autonomy and employment, support for inclusive education and training, and significant tariff adjustments for services, constituting an increase of 99 per cent in 2024.

### Summary of other submissions

7. The Committee received information from organizations of persons with disabilities and the Public Defence Service. They shared information about recent reforms and measures that prioritized fiscal adjustment over rights, imposed stricter eligibility requirements and audits while dismantling support structures and disregarded the structural barriers faced by persons with disabilities. They stressed that Emergency Decree No. 843/2024 had introduced major restrictions on access to non-contributory pensions for persons with disabilities who were unable to work, reinstated outdated requirements such as proof of incapacity to work of at least 66 per cent, exclusion from any formal work or social security scheme and strict socioeconomic conditions, and introduced recurring audits and reviews, both for new applicants and existing beneficiaries, which had created widespread uncertainty and fear of losing essential income. They also noted that Emergency Decree No. 600/2024 had restructured the Solidarity Redistribution Fund, lowering contributions from large health insurance schemes and threatening the sustainability of the basic benefits system for habilitation and rehabilitation services; that the veto on fiscal grounds, through Decree No. 534/2025, of the draft emergency act on disability – which had aimed to establish a new

<sup>4</sup> Available at [https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/\\_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRPD%2FC%2FARG%2FFCO%2F2-3&Lang=en](https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRPD%2FC%2FARG%2FFCO%2F2-3&Lang=en).

pension compatible with formal work, automatic updates of service tariffs and measures to strengthen social protection – had left many without safeguards that were urgently needed, fearing loss of pensions and uncertain about access to social and health services; and that the reforms had failed to address systemic issues such as inadequate pension amounts far below the poverty line, stigmatizing terminology used in official regulations and later repealed, the dismantling of disability-related institutions and reduced resources for the National Disability Agency. They noted that discrimination had increased, worsened by hostile political discourse.

### **Committee’s assessment**

8. On the basis of the information received and its concluding observations, the Committee recommends that the State Party:

(a) Conduct a comprehensive review of its legal and institutional framework to address the “inherited economic and administrative crisis” in the light of the Convention, and amend, adapt or repeal, as appropriate, its content to fully ensure the rights of persons with disabilities;

(b) Strengthen and ensure the independence of institutions tasked with the protection of persons with disabilities and provide them with sufficient financial and human resources to carry out their mandates;

(c) Improve transparency in the receipt, management and use of public funds allocated for compliance with the Convention and the realization of the rights of persons with disabilities; ensure that any emergency and/or austerity measures do not hinder the enjoyment by persons with disabilities of their rights and do not have disproportionate effects on their rights, and that such measures do ensure the progressive realization of their rights; preserve budget lines related to social investment in the most disadvantaged groups and facilitate the effective and sustainable implementation of public policies to safeguard their economic, social and cultural rights; and implement accountability and anti-corruption measures to protect the funding allocated for the realization of the rights of persons with disabilities.

## **B. France**

### **Concluding observations**

9. In its concluding observations on the initial report of France, the Committee noted with concern the high suicide rate among autistic persons and persons with psychosocial disabilities.<sup>5</sup>

10. The Committee recommended that the State Party strengthen measures to implement a national suicide prevention strategy for persons with disabilities, with specific measures to target autistic persons and persons with psychosocial disabilities, and to ensure close consultation and active involvement of persons with disabilities through their representative organizations.<sup>6</sup>

11. The Committee also noted with concern the lack of arrangements for living independently and in the community, including the lack of independent accessible and affordable housing, individualized support, and equal access to services in the community.<sup>7</sup>

12. The Committee recalled its general comment No. 5 (2017), and recommended that the State Party, in consultation with organizations of persons with disabilities:

(a) Recognize the right to live independently and to be included in the community in legislation and take measures to implement it, and develop awareness-raising measures, including campaigns, about it and about the harmful effects of institutionalization on persons with disabilities;

<sup>5</sup> CRPD/C/FRA/CO/1, para. 21 (a).

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., para. 22 (a).

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., para. 40 (d).

(b) Ensure the availability of support to live independently and in the community, such as user-led budgets and personalized support, and enable persons with disabilities to exercise choice and control over their lives and to make decisions concerning where and with whom to live, as outlined in general comment No. 5 (2017);

(c) Adopt measures to ensure the access of persons with disabilities to affordable and accessible housing on the basis of individual choice and outside any type of congregated premises;

(d) Establish a time frame and benchmarks for achieving full accessibility for persons with disabilities to mainstream community services, such as education, health, work and employment.<sup>8</sup>

### **Summary of the Committee’s follow-up letter**

13. On 23 June 2025, the Committee, pursuant to article 36 (1) of the Convention, sent a follow-up letter to the State Party,<sup>9</sup> requesting information about the measures taken to ensure that draft act No. 1100, on assisted dying, was in compliance with the Convention, in particular about the following:

(a) The provisions on the proposed eligibility criteria, including “having a serious and incurable condition” and “experiencing physical or psychological suffering linked to the condition that is either treatment-resistant or unbearable”;

(b) The rationale for the punishment with fines and imprisonment of anyone attempting to dissuade a person from seeking euthanasia or assisted suicide;

(c) How the draft act guaranteed the right to choice of persons with disabilities, safeguards against coercion, undue influence and abuse of power, the availability of alternatives to assisted dying and the accessibility of information provided to persons with disabilities;

(d) Measures taken to ensure that persons with disabilities, through their representative organizations, were closely consulted and actively involved in the process of drafting the legislation;

(e) Measures taken to ensure that public officials refrained from publicly and incorrectly asserting that the Committee supported the legalization of euthanasia.

### **Summary of the State Party’s reply**

14. The State Party was granted an extension to respond to the follow-up letter.

15. In its reply,<sup>10</sup> the State Party informed the Committee of the following:

(a) The draft act had not been adopted, but was currently at the stage of first reading; further discussion on it had been interrupted by the dissolution of Parliament in June 2024;

(b) Assisted dying concerned all persons, regardless of whether they had a disability. The fact of having a disability did not render a person more or less eligible for assisted dying, and excluding persons with disabilities would be discriminatory and would violate the principle of equality. Measures were deployed to improve access to care for persons with disabilities and to take account of their specific situations, in particular in the context of national conferences of disability, interministerial committees of disability, recommendations of the National Consultative Council of Persons with Disabilities, specifics of the consent procedures and the assisted dying procedure. The criminal offence included in

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., para. 41 (c)–(f).

<sup>9</sup> Available at [https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/\\_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2FCRPD%2FFUL%2FFRA%2F63700&Lang=en](https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2FCRPD%2FFUL%2FFRA%2F63700&Lang=en).

<sup>10</sup> Available at [https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/\\_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRPD%2FC%2FFRA%2FFCO%2F1&Lang=en](https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRPD%2FC%2FFRA%2FFCO%2F1&Lang=en).

the draft legislation was modelled on the offence of obstruction of voluntary termination of pregnancy, with the aim of protecting the professionals and establishments involved in assisted dying, and the draft legislation laid out several interpretation principles regarding the proposed offence;

(c) Another draft act that was at the stage of first reading was aimed at ensuring equal access for all to palliative care and support and, in conjunction with the draft act on assisted dying, at improving the quality of care services;

(d) The Government had deliberately chosen to avoid the terms “euthanasia” and “assisted suicide” in favour of the term “assisted dying” (*“aide à mourir”*), emphasizing dignity and autonomy in line with the French model of end-of-life care.

16. The State Party did not reply to the Committee’s concerns about the dissemination by the authorities of misleading information that incorrectly implied that assisted dying and similar concepts were in alignment with the Convention.

### Summary of other submissions

17. The Committee received information from organizations of persons with disabilities, human rights organizations, palliative care organizations, medical organizations, medical students, law professors, mental health experts and psychoanalysts, expressing concern about the draft act. In particular:

(a) The draft act on assisted dying had a clear eugenic orientation, reflecting deeply entrenched ableism in the State Party, and stemmed from a medical model whereby disability was seen as a “social disease” whose treatment could only lead to the eradication of the source of the disease: that is, persons with disabilities themselves. It failed to address the societal and financial shortcomings determining the experience and vulnerability of persons with disabilities, such as poverty, unemployment, discrimination and exclusion from an unwelcoming society. The legislative process had not ensured consultation with and the active participation of persons with disabilities, through their representative organizations and lacked impact assessments, and there had been uncommon pressure for the expedited approval of the draft act. Furthermore, the eligibility criteria proposed in the draft act were vague and misleading, and they lacked a scientific and objective approach, as concepts such as “serious and incurable condition”, “life-threatening”, “advanced stage” and “constant physical or psychological suffering” were not clearly defined, which would result in arbitrary interpretations with potentially lethal consequences for persons with disabilities and open the door to ableist value judgments about what constituted a life “worth living”;

(b) The procedure regulating assisted dying was broad and informal, allowed for requests to be made verbally, leaving no record and with no witnesses, and could be implemented in as little as 48 hours, which was swift compared with time frames for access to other medical procedures; for example, the time frame for access to pain management centres was up to six months, and access to vasectomy was subject to a legal waiting period of four months between the initial consultation and the date of the procedure. The assisted dying procedure lacked adequate procedural safeguards and accountability mechanisms, effective protection against coercion, abuse of influence and abuse of power, such as appeal procedures for families of persons with disabilities, and independent oversight mechanisms. Experts in the law of the State Party had also warned that the classification of the act of dissuading a person from seeking euthanasia or assisted suicide as a crime that was punishable by imprisonment or a fine would effectively criminalize suicide prevention by sick persons, persons with disabilities and the families of persons with disabilities, while failing to incorporate criminal provisions for people who encouraged others to seek assistance to die;

(c) Medical experts expressed concern that the draft act lacked comprehensive procedures for seeking informed consent and informing about the treatments and support mechanisms available, including palliative care and future medical innovations, that it trivialized medical disciplines, particularly psychiatry, and the concept of suicide, and that it fostered a subtle form of medical ableism, a documented tendency toward diagnostic overshadowing that occurred when a healthcare professional incorrectly attributed a patient’s new symptoms to their pre-existing disability, particularly if intellectual or psychological in

nature. Organizations of persons with disabilities expressed concern that the National Consultative Council of Persons with Disabilities – the consultative body responsible for organizing the participation of persons with disabilities, through their representative organizations, in the development and implementation of public policies – had endorsed the draft act and the statements by the Minister of State for Autonomy and Disability that assisted dying was supported by the Convention. Organizations and experts also expressed concern that media coverage of assisted dying undertaken without hindrance legitimized the concept of withdrawing life instead of guaranteeing dignity in life.

### **Committee’s assessment**

18. On the basis of the information received and its concluding observations, the Committee reiterates its previous recommendations and further recommends that the State Party:

(a) Consider conducting, before continuing with the process of approval of the draft act on assisted dying, and in close consultation with and with the active participation of persons with disabilities, a comprehensive assessment of its alignment with the Convention – in particular articles 10 (right to life), 16 (freedom from exploitation, violence and abuse), 17 (protecting the integrity of the person), 19 (living independently and being included in the community), 25 (right to health) and 28 (adequate standard of living and social protection) – and the foreseeable increased vulnerability of persons with disabilities facing intersecting forms of discrimination if the draft act were to be approved; and develop, in close consultation with and with the active participation of persons with disabilities, a legislative agenda to address their needs;

(b) Establish a capacity-building programme for the legislative branch (comprising the National Assembly and the Senate), the Ministry of Labour and Solidarity and the Ministry of Health, Families, Autonomy and Persons with Disabilities on the Convention and its underpinning principles, including the human rights model of disability and the obligation of the States Parties to repeal medical and ableist models;

(c) Introduce comprehensive measures to address the current implementation gaps in relation to the social determinants of health and the well-being of persons with disabilities, and to the provision of community-based mental health support, care and palliative services at home, personal assistance and employment support;

(d) Prevent further public statements to the effect that the Convention and/or the Committee recognize the “right to die” and conduct outreach and awareness-raising on the Convention and the rights of persons with disabilities.

## **C. Georgia**

### **Concluding observations**

19. In its concluding observations on the initial report of Georgia, the Committee observed with concern the lack of provisions to ensure access to national public funds by organizations of persons with disabilities, which relied mainly on international cooperation to function and to carry out their advocacy work.<sup>11</sup>

20. With reference to its general comment No. 7 (2018), the Committee recommended that the State party ensure the right of persons with disabilities to freedom of association, including by making national funds available to all organizations of persons with disabilities, including organizations of women with disabilities and self-advocacy organizations, and guaranteeing their right to seek and gain access to legitimate foreign funding.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> [CRPD/C/GEO/CO/1](#), para. 9 (a).

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 10 (a).

### Summary of the Committee's follow-up letter

21. On 23 June 2025, the Committee, pursuant to article 36 (1) of the Convention, sent a follow-up letter to the State Party,<sup>13</sup> requesting information about the following:

(a) Measures taken to ensure that the Foreign Agents Registration Act and amendments to article 355 of the Criminal Code and to the Law on Grants were in compliance with the Convention and respected, protected and guaranteed the right of persons with disabilities to freedom of association, including by guaranteeing their right to seek and gain access to legitimate foreign funding;

(b) The number and type of organizations of persons with disabilities – and human rights defenders advocating the rights of persons with disabilities – already affected by the above-mentioned pieces of legislation, measures imposed on them, the outcomes of any administrative or judicial resources lodged by the persons or organizations affected and the remedies available to them.

### Summary of the State Party's reply

22. In its reply,<sup>14</sup> the State Party noted that the Foreign Agents Registration Act ensured transparency regarding the interests of foreign powers operating in Georgia. Under the Act, the registration of recipients of foreign funding was envisaged only in cases characterized by the following: (a) the subjects defined by law, namely a foreign principal and an agent of the foreign principal; (b) control exercised by the foreign principal over the agent; and (c) engagement in political activities. Accordingly, activities aimed at protecting, advocating for and providing services to persons with disabilities were not subject to registration under the Act. The Anti-Corruption Bureau monitored the implementation of the Law on Grants and had issued an advisory opinion that the work of organizations working on disability-related issues did not involve engagement in political activities aimed at influencing or altering the domestic or foreign policy of Georgia. The Government was finalizing a decree outlining procedures, including submission criteria and decision timelines, with regard to the amendments to the Law on Grants. Until that process was completed, the approval process for foreign-funded projects would remain on hold. The Anti-Corruption Bureau had not received any information indicating that regulations under the Foreign Agents Registration Act or the amendments to the Law on Grants restricted the rights of persons with disabilities.

### Summary of other submissions

23. The Committee received information from organizations of persons with disabilities indicating that the Foreign Agents Registration Act and the amendments to article 355 of the Criminal Code and to the Law on Grants were not in alignment with the Convention, and that they appeared to silence critical organizations, including those working on issues relating to persons with disabilities facing intersecting forms of discrimination, such as women with disabilities. The broad interpretation of such legislation could affect and impede the ability of organizations of persons with disabilities to carry out their essential functions as human rights defenders. The Law on Grants allowed the State to deny funding for organizations that were not aligned with its interests. Organizations of persons with disabilities were experiencing systematic discrediting and repression by and financial pressure from the State Party, incidents of violence and mistreatment during protests, and the imposition of fines. The State-controlled Grants Management Agency could introduce politically selective funding mechanisms, in violation of the Convention principles of pluralism, independence, fairness and inclusivity. The Anti-Corruption Bureau was not independent of the Government and had the authority to request personal and confidential information without court permission. There was a lack of mechanisms for the active involvement and meaningful

<sup>13</sup> Available at [https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/\\_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2FCRPD%2FFUL%2FGEO%2F63701&Lang=en](https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2FCRPD%2FFUL%2FGEO%2F63701&Lang=en).

<sup>14</sup> Available at [https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/\\_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRPD%2FC%2FGEO%2FFCO%2F1&Lang=en](https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRPD%2FC%2FGEO%2FFCO%2F1&Lang=en).



participation of persons with disabilities in the legislative process regarding those laws and amendments.

#### **Committee's assessment**

24. On the basis of the information received and its concluding observations, the Committee reiterates its previous recommendations and further recommends that the State Party conduct, in close consultation with and with the active involvement of persons with disabilities, an assessment of the Foreign Agents Registration Act, the amendments to article 355 of the Criminal Code and to the Law on Grants, the Anti-Corruption Bureau and the State-controlled Grants Management Agency in the light of the Convention, and amend, correct and repeal, as appropriate, all provisions and institutions that are not in alignment with it.

### **D. Hungary**

#### **Concluding observations**

25. In its concluding observations on the combined second and third periodic reports of Hungary,<sup>15</sup> the Committee expressed concern about:

(a) The lack of independence and non-substantive nature of the established consultation bodies, including the National Disability Council, the National Coordinating Body for Deinstitutionalization, the Human Rights Working Group and the Intergovernmental Disability Committee, and the lack of effective involvement of organizations of persons with disabilities in public decision-making;

(b) The lack of accessibility to informational material in public decision-making processes, limiting the participation of organizations of persons with disabilities;

(c) Reports of reprisals against and continuing pressure on civil society organizations for their advocacy work on the rights of persons with disabilities.

26. The Committee recalled its general comment No. 7 (2018) and recommended that the State Party:<sup>16</sup>

(a) Strengthen mechanisms for the effective involvement of persons with disabilities through their representative organizations in public decision-making processes by adopting measures to safeguard their independence from public authorities and with the participation of the full range of organizations of persons with disabilities, including children with disabilities, persons with intellectual disabilities, persons with psychosocial disabilities, intersex persons, women with disabilities, persons with disabilities living in rural areas, autistic persons, Roma and gender-diverse persons with disabilities, those requiring high levels of support and refugees and migrant persons with disabilities;

(b) Provide organizations of persons with disabilities with accessible information, including information in Easy Read and other accessible formats, and with timetables of the consultation processes concerning any law and policy reforms related to persons with disabilities;

(c) Recognize the role of civil society organizations as human rights defenders, prohibit any reprisals against individuals and organizations promoting the rights of persons with disabilities and take measures to protect the civic space.

<sup>15</sup> CRPD/C/HUN/CO/2-3, para. 8.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., para. 9.

### Summary of the Committee's follow-up letter

27. On 23 June 2025, the Committee, pursuant to article 36 (1) of the Convention, sent a follow-up letter to the State Party,<sup>17</sup> requesting information about the following:

(a) Measures taken to ensure that the proposed bill on the transparency of public life protected the role of organizations of persons with disabilities, civil society organizations and human rights defenders;

(b) Measures taken to ensure that persons with disabilities, through their representative organizations, were meaningfully consulted and actively involved in the process of drafting the proposed bill;

(c) Measures taken to recognize the role of organizations of persons with disabilities and civil society organizations as human rights defenders, to prohibit reprisals against individuals and organizations promoting the rights of persons with disabilities and to protect the civic space.

### Summary of the State Party's reply

28. In its reply,<sup>18</sup> the State Party asserted that the rights of persons with disabilities were enshrined in its Constitution and that the Government was fully dedicated to supporting an independent way of life for persons with disabilities and strengthening their social inclusion. The bill on the transparency of public life was in alignment with the Convention, but had been removed from the agenda of the parliament's summer session. The Government had introduced measures to improve quality of life for persons with disabilities, such as the establishment in 2024 of the independent State Secretariat for Disability Affairs within the Ministry of the Interior; the nomination of the world's first and only athlete to win medals at both the Olympic and the Paralympic Games, Pál Szekeres, to represent Hungary in the European Parliament, in order to promote disability issues within the European Union; the establishment in 2025 of the Disability Coordination Committee to develop the national disability programme; regular funding for organizations of persons with disabilities and the establishment, pursuant to article 33 (1) of the Convention, of the National Disability Council. The Government recognized the role of organizations of persons with disabilities and civil society organizations as human rights defenders, and condemned any reprisals against them.

### Summary of other submissions

29. The Committee received information from organizations of persons with disabilities and civil society organizations indicating that the bill on the transparency of public life represented a threat to democratic freedoms, including freedom of association, freedom of expression and the independence of civil society, including its right to receive funding. The bill stigmatized independent actors, and granted the State the authority to brand organizations and media outlets as serving foreign interests, blacklist them, freeze or seize their funding, and subject them to intrusive monitoring. The bill would also allow the Sovereignty Protection Office to designate organizations as serving foreign interests, obligating banks to monitor accounts in real time. Organizations could face burdensome approvals for receiving foreign funds, the risk of confiscation, heavy fines and dissolution, and their leaders could be treated as "politically exposed persons", forced to disclose assets, subjected to scrutiny in the context of efforts to combat the financing of terrorism and barred from leadership roles. The bill lacked effective legal remedies, organizations of persons with disabilities had not been consulted in the drafting process and the National Disability Council had not made public any discussion or opinion on the bill. The Office of the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights, acting as the national monitoring mechanism under the Convention, and its Disability Advisory Board had not made public any minutes or decisions related to the bill, and the

<sup>17</sup> Available at [https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/\\_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2FCRPD%2FFUL%2FHUN%2F63702&Lang=en](https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2FCRPD%2FFUL%2FHUN%2F63702&Lang=en).

<sup>18</sup> Available at [https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/\\_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRPD%2FC%2FHUN%2FFCO%2F2-3&Lang=en](https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRPD%2FC%2FHUN%2FFCO%2F2-3&Lang=en).

Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions had downgraded the national human rights institution to B status in 2022.

#### **Committee's assessment**

30. On the basis of the information received and its concluding observations, the Committee reiterates its previous recommendations and further recommends that the State Party:

- (a) Conduct a human rights assessment of the alignment of the proposed bill with the Convention, and develop a mechanism for the active involvement and close consultation of persons with disabilities regarding the bill;
- (b) Develop a strategy to strengthen the independence of the National Disability Council and the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights.

### **E. United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland**

#### **Concluding observations and inquiry reports**

31. In its concluding observations on the initial report of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Committee expressed concern that the State Party's legislation provided for involuntary, compulsory treatment and detention both inside and outside hospitals on the basis of actual or perceived impairment.<sup>19</sup>

32. The Committee recommended that the State Party repeal legislation and practices that authorized non-consensual involuntary, compulsory treatment and detention of persons with disabilities based on actual or perceived impairment.<sup>20</sup> The Committee made a similar recommendation in its report on follow-up to the inquiry concerning the State Party conducted under article 6 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention.<sup>21</sup>

33. The Committee also expressed concern about:

- (a) The negative impact on the standard of living of persons with disabilities of, among others, the reductions in social support, unemployment allowance, independence payments and Universal Credit payments and the insufficient compensation for disability-related costs;
- (b) The eligibility criteria for and the local differences to social protection and support, and the introduction of the Personal Independence Payment, which had reduced the number of recipients of disability-related allowances and had had a negative impact on the standard of living of many persons with disabilities and their families;
- (c) The detrimental impact of the Employment and Support Allowance conditionality and sanctions on persons with disabilities and the limited access to reconsideration and appeal procedures.<sup>22</sup>

34. The Committee recommended that the State Party, in close collaboration with organizations of persons with disabilities across all territorial entities, guided by article 28 of the Convention and implementing target 10.2 of the Sustainable Development Goals, carry out a cumulative impact assessment, based on disaggregated data, of the recent and forthcoming reforms of the social protection system for persons with disabilities, and define, implement and monitor measures to tackle retrogression in their standard of living.<sup>23</sup>

35. In its report on its inquiry concerning the State Party conducted under article 6 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention, the Committee recommended, inter alia, that the State Party:

<sup>19</sup> CRPD/C/GBR/CO/1, para. 34.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., para. 35 (a).

<sup>21</sup> CRPD/C/GBR/RFIR/1, para. 90 (h).

<sup>22</sup> CRPD/C/GBR/CO/1, para. 58 (b)–(d).

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., para. 59 (b).

(a) Ensure that any intended measure of the welfare reform was rights-based, upheld the human rights model of disability and did not disproportionately and/or adversely affect the rights of persons with disabilities to independent living, to an adequate standard of living and to employment; and, to prevent adverse consequences, carry out human rights-based cumulative impact assessments of the whole range of intended measures that would have an impact on the rights of persons with disabilities;<sup>24</sup>

(b) Actively consult and engage with persons with disabilities through their representative organizations and give due consideration to their views in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of any legislation, policy or programme related to the rights addressed in the inquiry report;<sup>25</sup>

(c) Ensure that, in the implementation of legislation, policies and programmes, special attention was paid to persons with disabilities living on a low income or in poverty and to persons with disabilities at higher risk of exclusion, such as persons with intellectual, psychosocial or multiple disabilities and women, children and older persons with disabilities.<sup>26</sup>

36. In its report on follow-up to the inquiry concerning the State Party, the Committee, *inter alia*:

(a) Called on the State Party, as a matter of urgency to take all the legislative and administrative measures necessary to ensure a nationally consistent framework for implementing and monitoring obligations under the Convention across the State Party, in order to avoid regression in relation to the standards and principles enshrined in the Convention, and to establish a comprehensive process for close consultation with and the active involvement of persons with disabilities, through their representative organizations;<sup>27</sup>

(b) Concluded that no significant progress had been made in the State Party concerning the situation of persons with disabilities addressed in the inquiry proceedings; and noted that while some measures had been taken to address its recommendations issued pursuant to article 6 of the Optional Protocol, there were also signs of regression in relation to the standards and principles enshrined in the Convention, in contravention of article 4 (2) of the Convention.<sup>28</sup>

### **Summary of the Committee's follow-up letter**

#### *Mental Health Bill*

37. On 23 June 2025, the Committee, pursuant to article 36 (1) of the Convention, sent a follow-up letter to the State Party,<sup>29</sup> requesting information about the Mental Health Bill, in particular about the measures taken:

(a) To ensure the removal from the Bill of provisions allowing for the deprivation of liberty of persons with disabilities on the basis of actual or perceived impairment, in conjunction with any other criteria, such as posing a danger to oneself or to others;

(b) To incorporate into the Bill provisions to ensure that community-based mental healthcare services were available to everyone, including persons with disabilities, and that the provision of health services was based on the free and informed consent of the person concerned, through supported decision-making;

(c) To ensure the removal from the Bill of references portraying persons with disabilities as "patients";

<sup>24</sup> CRPD/C/15/4 and CRPD/C/15/4/Corr.1, para. 114 (b).

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., para. 114 (g).

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., para. 114 (i).

<sup>27</sup> CRPD/C/GBR/RFIR/1, para. 90 (a).

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., para. 88.

<sup>29</sup> Available at

[https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/\\_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2FCRPD%2FFUL%2FGBR%2F63703&Lang=en](https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2FCRPD%2FFUL%2FGBR%2F63703&Lang=en).

(d) To ensure that persons with disabilities, through their representative organizations, were closely consulted and actively involved in the process of drafting the proposed legislation.

*Universal Credit and Personal Independence Payment Bill and the “Pathways to Work” Green Paper*

38. On 7 July 2025, the Committee sent a separate follow-up letter to the State Party,<sup>30</sup> requesting information about the Universal Credit and Personal Independence Payment Bill and the “Pathways to Work” Green Paper, in particular about the following:

(a) Whether an impact assessment had been conducted of the budget cuts proposed in the Bill on disability benefits, and any measures to address the foreseeable risk of increasing poverty rates among persons with disabilities if cuts were approved;

(b) The potential consequences of the Bill for persons with disabilities facing intersecting forms of discrimination;

(c) The changes introduced in the Bill to the eligibility criteria for the Personal Independence Payment, including changes to assessment thresholds and conditionality and sanctions for benefit recipients;

(d) The limitations to the health element of Universal Credit envisaged in the Bill;

(e) The limited scrutiny of the Bill by the House of Lords as the Government had considered it as a “Money Bill”;

(f) The extent to which other bills, such as the Public Authorities (Fraud, Error and Recovery) Bill, would enable the Government to monitor the bank accounts of recipients of Universal Credit with algorithms scanning for fraud;

(g) Public statements by politicians and authorities negatively portraying persons with disabilities as taking advantage of social benefits, making false statements to obtain social and disability benefits or being a burden to society;

(h) The extent to which persons with disabilities, through their representative organizations, had been closely consulted and actively involved in the drafting and parliamentary consideration of the Bill.

**Summary of the State Party’s reply**

*Mental Health Bill*

39. In its reply,<sup>31</sup> the State Party informed the Committee that the Government was in the process of reforming the Mental Health Act, and that the reforms incorporated many of the recommendations from the Independent Review of the Mental Health Act. Both the Act and the Mental Health Bill were compatible with the Convention. The Bill proposed measures to provide for patients’ wishes and preferences, including through advance choice documents, to increase family or carer involvement in clinical decision-making and care planning, to increase patients’ access to independent advocacy and to replace the outdated “nearest relative” system with a “nominated person” model.

40. In reply to the Committee’s specific queries, the State Party stated the following:

(a) Detention under the Mental Health Act was not merely based on the existence of an impairment, and was permitted only where justified in conjunction with other criteria such as the risk posed to others or to themselves; furthermore, the Act and the Bill contained safeguards against arbitrary detention, and the Bill would increase the right of individuals to

<sup>30</sup> Available at

[https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/\\_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2FCRPD%2FFUL%2FGBR%2F63716&Lang=en](https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2FCRPD%2FFUL%2FGBR%2F63716&Lang=en).

<sup>31</sup> Available at

[https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/\\_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2FCRPD%2FFCO%2FGBR%2F64081&Lang=en](https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2FCRPD%2FFCO%2FGBR%2F64081&Lang=en).

challenge their deprivation of liberty and would make clear that the least restrictive option for the patient should always be followed;

(b) The Bill would not change the definition of “patient” in the Act, but it would introduce the principle of the “person as an individual”, care and treatment plans for all patients to ensure a personalized strategy towards recovery and timely discharge, a new clinical checklist and other procedures to support patients’ participation in decision-making about their care;

(c) The Bill was informed by the Independent Review of the Mental Health Act and by public consultations, including responses from individuals, workshops and focus groups, and, once published, underwent pre-legislative scrutiny by a joint committee, entailing a public consultation, including with organizations of persons with disabilities.

*Universal Credit and Personal Independence Payment Bill and the “Pathways to Work” Green Paper*

41. In relation to the Universal Credit and Personal Independence Payment Bill and the “Pathways to Work” Green Paper, the State Party informed the Committee that:

(a) It had conducted and published extensive impact assessments of the Bill, including on the impact of proposed budget cuts on disability benefits, as part of the parliamentary process;

(b) It was unable to estimate how many people who had a mental health condition were likely to be affected as result of the Bill;

(c) The Bill had been amended to remove the clauses relating to the Personal Independence Payment, including the proposed changes to eligibility criteria, and was now entitled the “Universal Credit Bill”;

(d) The Bill rebalanced the standard allowance and health top-up payments under Universal Credit, ensured equivalent treatment under the Employment and Support Allowance, and protected both existing claimants of Universal Credit and new claimants who met the “severe conditions” criteria or qualified under the special rules for end of life;

(e) It was estimated that there would be 50,000 fewer individuals in relative poverty after housing costs in 2029/30 as a result of the amendments proposed in the Bill, without factoring in investments across the current Parliament in employment support for persons with disabilities and persons with health conditions;

(f) It had been clear in the Green Paper which proposals were and were not subject to consultation; the latter included the changes delivered in the Bill, which were needed urgently to increase the adequacy of the Universal Credit standard allowance and tackle perverse incentives that drove people into dependency;

(g) Extensive consultation, including 18 public events, had been conducted on key measures in the Green Paper; and the Bill had been subject to scrutiny by members of Parliament, acting on behalf of their constituents, including persons with disabilities and persons with health conditions, and, following the removal of the relevant clauses in response to concerns expressed, the Government would move straight to a comprehensive review of assessment for the Personal Independence Payment, with persons with disabilities;

(h) It was the Speaker of the House of Commons, not the Government, that had the authority to determine whether a bill was certified as a “Money Bill”, reflecting the constitutional principle that it was the elected chamber (the House of Commons) that had primacy in relation to taxation and public spending; such certification did not, however, prevent consideration by the House of Lords, which had indeed debated and passed the Bill on 22 July 2025;

(i) It did not recognize the allegation that politicians and authorities had made public statements negatively portraying persons with disabilities in the context of social benefits;

(j) The Public Authorities (Fraud, Error and Recovery) Bill, and the eligibility verification measure proposed therein, would safeguard public money by reducing public

sector fraud, error and debt; the Department for Work and Pensions would not have any access to claimants' bank accounts through that measure.

### **Summary of other submissions**

#### *Mental Health Bill*

42. Organizations of persons with disabilities and other stakeholders provided information and arguments to show that the Mental Health Bill further exacerbated existing contraventions of the Convention, including compulsory admission to hospitals on the basis of actual or perceived disability; violations of the human rights of persons with disabilities in institutions; the denial of legal capacity, the increased number of guardianships and limited access to legal aid and procedural accommodation in the justice system to challenge, inter alia, compulsory treatment, admissions into institutions and hospitals and guardianship; and the lack of a procedure for obtaining free and informed consent and for refusing or opting for another medical treatment. The continued identification of persons with psychosocial disabilities solely as "patients" was disempowering and reduced them to passive clinical subjects, and compulsory treatment orders contravened the Convention, extended the clinical gaze into private and intimate spaces and had not been demonstrated to be effective.

#### *Universal Credit and Personal Independence Payment Bill and the "Pathways to Work" Green Paper*

43. Organizations of persons with disabilities and other actors, including the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission, stated that the Universal Credit and Personal Independence Payment Bill and the "Pathways to Work" Green Paper:

(a) Had not been subject to human rights impact assessments, lacked mitigation measures and failed to reflect the best use of the maximum available resources, in accordance with the principle of non-retrogression; had been swiftly approved without addressing the root causes of the increased prevalence of disability and long-term health conditions; and had failed to comply with the Gunning principles, relating to the common-law duty to consult on significant changes when proposals were at a formative stage and to provide sufficient information for stakeholders to understand the rationale behind the proposal;

(b) Would affect the rights of persons with disabilities to live independently, to an adequate standard of living and to employment and would entrench an already complicated and bureaucratic procedure for gaining access to disability and social entitlements; contained language that stigmatized benefits claimants and implied that they were abusing and cheating the system; contained a discriminatory proposal for a two-tier system of eligibility based on the date of commencement of a claim; would mean that individuals whose impairments affected several areas of their daily lives but did not meet the new threshold in any individual category would forfeit entitlement despite having significant overall needs; and contained a proposal for binary categorization for work assessment – as being either able or unable to work – that was overly simplistic and might limit access to disability aids, therapies, home adaptation and personal support, reducing independence among persons with disabilities.

### **Committee's assessment**

44. On the basis of the information received and its concluding observations,<sup>32</sup> its report on the inquiry concerning the State Party<sup>33</sup> and its report on follow-up to the inquiry,<sup>34</sup> the Committee reiterates its previous recommendations and makes the following further recommendations.

45. While noting the State Party's assertion that the reforms to the social security system include a commitment to replace the work capability assessment with a single streamlined assessment, as the Committee had recommended, the Committee recalls that the relevant

<sup>32</sup> CRPD/C/GBR/CO/1, in particular para. 58 (a), (b) and (d).

<sup>33</sup> CRPD/C/15/4 and CRPD/C/15/4/Corr.1, in particular paras. 45 and 114.

<sup>34</sup> CRPD/C/GBR/RFIR/1.

recommendations in its report on follow-up to the inquiry<sup>35</sup> must be interpreted in the light of articles 3, 4 and 5 of the Convention, which establish the principle of close consultation with and the active involvement of persons with disabilities as an obligation of the State Party, meaning that any reform should be designed and implemented in close consultation with and with the active involvement of persons with disabilities.

46. The Committee recommends that the State Party:

(a) Conduct a comprehensive human rights assessment of the Mental Health Bill prior to its approval, in close consultation with and with the active involvement of persons with disabilities, to ensure that it is in full compliance with the Convention; ensure that the assessment is informed by the Committee's guidelines on the right to liberty and security of persons with disabilities and its guidelines on deinstitutionalization, including in emergencies, and comply, at a minimum, with article 14 of the Convention (liberty and security of person) in terms of the prohibition of deprivation of liberty on the basis of impairment, and with articles 12 (equal recognition before the law) and 25 (health) in terms of the principle of free and informed consent; and remove any language from the Bill that perpetuates the medical model of disability and introduce comprehensive community-based healthcare for persons with disabilities;

(b) Conduct a comprehensive human rights assessment of the "Pathways to Work" Green Paper before implementing other measures contained therein, to ensure that it is in full compliance with the Convention;

(c) Implement mitigating measures to eliminate and reduce, as appropriate, the adverse impact of the Universal Credit Bill on persons with disabilities; and improve existing procedures to measure the impact of laws on the rights of persons with disabilities, including the impact of the Universal Credit Bill, the Mental Health Act and the Green Paper;

(d) Conduct an ex post human rights assessment on the impact of the Universal Credit Bill and develop, in close consultation with and with the active involvement of persons with disabilities, a plan to implement additional mitigating measures to ensure that persons with disabilities, including those facing intersecting forms of discrimination, have access through a streamlined procedure to social security payments, benefits and allowances that comprehensively fulfil their the rights to live independently, to be included in the community, to employment, to an adequate standard of living and to social protection;

(e) Ensure that the Universal Credit Bill does not entail retrogressive measures, improve transparency in the receipt, management and use of public funds and ensure that the State Party's budgetary situation complies with the principle of the progressive realization of human rights;

(f) Take measures to ensure that banks cannot access the personal and private information of recipients of disability and social entitlements.

---

<sup>35</sup> [CRPD/C/GBR/RFIR/1](#), para. 90 (a), (d) and (f).