



EUROPEAN UNION OF THE DEAF

A European Non-Governmental Organisation in official
liaison with European Parliament, European Commission
and the Council of Europe

EUD Submission to the OHCHR Annual Thematic Study on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (HRC resolution 61/9)

Twenty Years of the CRPD: From the Recognition to the Officialisation of National Sign Languages in Europe

Submitted by the European Union of the Deaf

1. Introduction

The European Union of the Deaf (EUD) welcomes the opportunity to contribute to the annual thematic study requested by the Human Rights Council in resolution 61/9 on the twentieth anniversary of the adoption of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD).¹

EUD is the only supranational organisation representing deaf people at European level. Its members are the national associations of the deaf of the 27 EU Member States, Iceland, Norway, Switzerland and the United Kingdom, with the Ukrainian Deaf Federation as an affiliated member. EUD is a full member of the European Disability Forum, a regional co-operating member of the World Federation of the Deaf, holds participatory status with the Council of Europe and special consultative status with the Economic and Social Council.²

EUD fully endorses the submission of the World Federation of the Deaf and its recommendation that the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities develop a General Comment on sign language rights.³ The present submission is intended to complement it by documenting the European experience of the past twenty years and by identifying one specific normative problem that this experience brings into focus.

That problem can be stated simply. In Europe, the Convention has been remarkably effective in securing the legal recognition of national sign languages (NSLs), in line with Article 21(e) CRPD. It has

¹Human Rights Council, resolution 61/9, UN Doc. A/HRC/RES/61/9 (1 April 2026).

²European Union of the Deaf, www.eud.eu. EUD estimates the deaf sign language community of the European Union at approximately one million people, or some 0.2 per cent of the Union's population.

³World Federation of the Deaf, submission to the present call for input, "Twenty Years of the CRPD: The Need for a General Comment on Sign Language Rights" (2026).

been considerably less effective in securing the legal status that would allow deaf people actually to use those languages when they deal with public authorities. Recognition and status are not the same thing, and twenty years of implementation have shown that the first does not automatically produce the second.

The European Union illustrates this in the sharpest possible terms. The EU is a party to the Convention in its own right. Twenty-nine national sign languages are used within its territory. It has twenty-four official languages, none of which is a signed language. Interactions with its institutions may take place only in one of those twenty-four. Deaf citizens therefore hold, under article 21 (b) of the Convention, a right they cannot exercise. In 2022, the, then, UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities recommended the EU to officialise its national sign languages⁴. In its 2025 Concluding Observations to the European Union, the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities recommended the EU to tackle this issue⁵ but, to date, no initiatives have been taken by the EU.

This submission addresses the questions raised in the call for input by setting out, in turn: the normative contribution of the Convention (section 2); what has been achieved in Europe as a result (section 3); why recognition alone has not translated into the enjoyment of rights (section 4); how this plays out at the level of the European Union itself (sections 5 and 6); the concrete impact on deaf citizens, through the case of Petition 1056/2016 (section 7); and why officialisation is the only remaining route out of the deadlock (section 8). Section 9 contains our recommendations.

2. The normative contribution of the CRPD: articles 2 and 21 read together

The single most consequential innovation of the Convention for deaf communities is contained in article 2. By providing that “language” includes spoken and signed languages, the Convention settled, as a matter of international human rights law, a question that had been contested in domestic legal orders for decades. It also distinguished language from modes and means of communication, which matters because sign languages had for a long time been classified in law and policy as a communication support for persons with a hearing impairment rather than as languages belonging to deaf and sign language communities.

Article 21 gives that classification operative effect. Subparagraph (b) requires States parties to accept and facilitate the use of sign languages in official interactions. Subparagraph (e) requires them to recognise and promote the use of sign languages. Read together with articles 29 and 30 (4), these provisions establish something more than an accessibility guarantee.⁶

EUD reads the two precited paragraphs of article 21 as follows. On one hand, article 21 (b) is directed at use: to accept a language in official interactions is to legitimise its presence in dealings between the individual and the authority, and to facilitate its use is to refrain from placing obstacles in the way of that use. On the other hand, Article 21 (e) is directed at status: to recognise a language is to

⁴ G. Quinn, Visit to the European Union: report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities, UN Doc. A/HRC/52/32/Add.1 (2022), <https://www.ohchr.org/en/documents/country-reports/ahrc5232add1-visit-european-union-report-special-rapporteur-rights>.

⁵ Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, concluding observations on the combined second and third periodic reports of the European Union, UN Doc. CRPD/C/EU/CO/2-3, adopted at the thirty-second session on 18 March 2025, paras. 52 (a) and 53 (a).

⁶ Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, adopted 13 December 2006, General Assembly resolution 61/106, annex I, arts. 2, 21 (b) and (e), 29 and 30 (4).

incorporate it into the legal order as a language, and to promote it is to support its acquisition, documentation, transmission and use.⁷

Reading them together yields the central legal proposition of this submission. An “official interaction” is, by definition, an interaction conducted in a language that the legal order authorises for official purposes: proceedings before courts, dealings with the administration, the submission of petitions and complaints, contact with the police, participation in public consultations. A State party that recognises a sign language as a full language, but does not confer on it the status that permits its use in those settings, has complied with article 21 (e) and has not complied with article 21 (b). Therefore, the right in article 21 (b) presupposes official status.

3. The legal recognition of national sign languages as the European norm.

The first legal improvement we would like to highlight is a positive one. On the legal recognition of national sign languages, the CRPD has been one of the more successful instruments of treaty-driven legal change in the past twenty years.

Globally, the World Federation of the Deaf recorded in June 2026 that 84 of the 190 States parties to the Convention had granted legal recognition to their national sign language.⁸ In Europe, the position is close to universal. Every EU Member State has legally recognised its national sign language or languages, France being the only one to have done so exclusively through its Education Code rather than through a dedicated recognition instrument.⁹ Across the wider set of 31 European countries surveyed by EUD, 29 recognise their national sign language as a full language, with France and Switzerland as the exceptions to the rule.

Two features of this development are worth drawing out.

First, it happened through a wide variety of legal instruments: constitutional provisions, framework language laws, disability statutes, education acts, sectoral regulations and, in the cases of Greece and Italy, instruments that do not fit any of the established categories.¹⁰ The Convention did not prescribe a form, and States parties did not converge on one. What they converged on was the substantive proposition that sign languages are languages, as aligned with Article 2 CRPD.

Second, and importantly for the European context, this occurred without any intervention by the European Union. The European Union has no competence to confer full-language status on a national sign language; under articles 6 (c) and 167 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, culture is an area in which the Union may only support, coordinate or supplement the action of Member States. Thus, it is a national competence, and only EU Member States can legally confer full language status to their national sign languages. Recognition was achieved in 27 separate national

⁷F. Venade de Sousa, “Sign language rights in European Union law: the effective implementation of language rights”, in A. Bloxs (ed.), *From Recognition to Officialisation – A European Evolution of Sign Language Rights* (Brussels, European Union of the Deaf, 2025), chap. 3, available at <https://eud.eu/wp-content/uploads/2026/02/SL-Rights-Ebook.pdf>. See also F. Venade de Sousa, “Essential framework of the legal status of sign language: recognition and officiality”, *Revista de Llengua i Dret / Journal of Language and Law* (2022), pp. 177–193.

⁸World Federation of the Deaf, *The Legal Recognition of National Sign Languages* (May 2025), available at <https://wfdeaf.org/the-legal-recognition-of-national-sign-languages>.

⁹A. Bloxs, “Deciphering the implications of the dichotomy ‘full languages vs. official languages’ within the work of the European Union”, in *From Recognition to Officialisation* (2025), chap. 2. In France, recognition is effected through article L312-9-1 of the Education Code rather than through a dedicated recognition instrument adopted for that purpose.

¹⁰M. De Meulder, J. J. Murray and R. McKee (eds.), *The Legal Recognition of Sign Languages: Advocacy and Outcomes Around the World* (Multilingual Matters, 2019); M. De Meulder, foreword to *From Recognition to Officialisation* (2025).

legal orders, by 27 separate legislatures, in response to a shared international obligation. That is a strong indication that the Convention combined with the sustained advocacy of National Associations of the Deaf was the catalyst.

4. Recognition has not granted enjoyment of rights

In 2025 EUD published a comparative evaluation of the legal frameworks governing national sign languages in the same 31 European countries, applying eight criteria derived from the guidelines of the World Federation of the Deaf.¹¹ The results, summarised below, describe a pattern that will be familiar from other areas of implementation of the Convention:¹²

- 29 of 31 countries recognise their national sign language as a full language;
- 30 safeguard the right of access to information, including in emergency situations;
- 29 recognise the right to professional national sign language interpreters;
- 24 recognise the right to be educated in the national sign language, and 24 the right to the national sign language as a school subject;
- 17 protect against discrimination on the ground of the use of a national sign language;
- 14 guarantee the involvement of deaf people in decision-making processes concerning them;
- 4 recognise the cultural and linguistic identity of deaf communities as part of the national heritage.

The frameworks are strongest where sign language is treated as a service to be delivered, such as interpreting, information, and education provision. However, the framework is at its weakest when cultural and linguistic rights are to be provided through Article 30.4 CRPD. In addition, the participatory rights of deaf communities through their representative organisations as granted by Article 4.3 CRPD are yet to be a reality. Only a minority of countries have established a national sign language council or board with a mandate to advise government and monitor implementation on sign language. Spain and Bulgaria meet all eight criteria; Spain and Portugal are among the very few that link sign language recognition explicitly to anti-discrimination provisions.

Among the 31 frameworks examined, three countries conferred official status to their national sign languages, namely Malta, Norway and Iceland. Recognition as a full language has become the European norm; official status remains the exception.

This distinction is important and deserves clarification. “Full language”, as recognised by Article 2 CRPD is a linguistic determination: the language possesses the properties of a natural human language and is acknowledged as such. “Official language” is a legal and political determination: the language is authorised for use in the official proceedings of the public administration. The two are frequently conflated, including by public authorities, and the conflation is not innocent: it allows a State party to point to the status of recognition as evidence of compliance with article 21 while deaf citizens remain

¹¹D. le Maire, “Analysis of national sign language frameworks” and A. Bloxs, “Beyond symbolic recognition: evaluating national sign language frameworks in Europe”, in *From Recognition to Officialisation* (2025), chaps. 10–12. The eight criteria are derived from the World Federation of the Deaf, *Guidelines for Achieving Sign Language Rights*.

¹²The 31 countries surveyed are the 27 EU Member States, Iceland, Norway, Switzerland and the United Kingdom.

unable to file a petition, address the administration or conduct proceedings in the language that statute recognises.

5. The European Union as a party to the Convention that has not transposed the right

The European Union ratified the CRPD on 23 December 2010. It remains the only international human rights treaty the Union has joined in its own right, and the Union remains the only regional integration organisation to have done so. The Union is therefore bound by article 21 in respect of matters falling within its competence, and its own institutions are among the “public authorities” with which deaf people interact.

The European Union has undertaken two reporting cycles before the CRPD Committee, respectively in 2015 and 2025, and notable evolutions can be observed in how sign languages are treated. In 2015, the Committee addressed sign languages only in general terms, within a broader recommendation on accessible formats, and called on the Union to promote the official recognition of sign language and Braille.¹³ Ten years later, in the concluding observations on the combined second and third periodic reports adopted on 18 March 2025, the Committee was specific. It expressed concern that national sign languages are not considered part of the Union’s multilingualism, and it recommended that the Union amend the Rules of Procedure of its institutions to reflect the rights of deaf persons and recognise the 29 national sign languages of the EU as official EU languages.¹⁴ It further recommended that deaf culture be included and promoted as part of the cultural and linguistic landscape of the Union,¹⁵ and that the Union apply to itself the accessibility standards it requires of its Member States, including sign language interpretation for all its web-streams and audiovisual content regardless of topic.¹⁶

To our knowledge, this is the most precise instruction a treaty body has ever given a State party on the official status of sign languages. It is also a useful illustration of what twenty years of accumulated Committee practice makes possible. The 2025 recommendation could not have been drafted in 2015.

The institutional response has been to decline the question on competence grounds. Asked in February 2025 by the Committee on Petitions of the European Parliament how the recognition of the 29 national sign languages could be given effect, the European Commission replied that the legal status of languages in each national legal order is a matter of national competence, that its own responsibility extends to providing accessibility in International Sign, and that the revision of Regulation 1/1958 is a matter for the Council acting unanimously under article 342 TFEU.¹⁷ A materially identical answer had been given in 2021¹⁸.

¹³Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, concluding observations on the initial report of the European Union, UN Doc. CRPD/C/EU/CO/1 (2015), paras. 54–55.

¹⁴Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, concluding observations on the combined second and third periodic reports of the European Union, UN Doc. CRPD/C/EU/CO/2-3, adopted at the thirty-second session on 18 March 2025, paras. 52 (a) and 53 (a). See also EUD, “CRPD concluding observations: EU to prioritise the rights of deaf people to national sign languages”, available at <https://eud.eu/crpd-concluding-observations-eu-to-prioritise-the-rights-of-deaf-people-to-national-sign-languages/>.

¹⁵UN Doc. CRPD/C/EU/CO/2-3, paras. 70 (d) and 71 (d).

¹⁶*Ibid.*, paras. 92–93.

¹⁷European Parliament, question for written answer E-000499/2025 (5 February 2025), https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/E-10-2025-000499_EN.html, and answer of the European Commission E-000499/2025(ASW) (24 April 2025), https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/E-10-2025-000499-ASW_EN.html.

¹⁸ Answer to written question E-005238/2020 (13 March 2021).

6. A wrongful use of the competence objection

The EUD considers that this response confuses two distinct legal questions, and this is the principal systemic obstacle to implementation at the EU level.

The first question is whether a given sign language is a full language within a national legal order. That is indeed a matter for the Member States, under the principle of subsidiarity and the Union's merely supporting competence in the field of culture.¹⁹ The EUD does not contest this. It also observes that the question has already been answered affirmatively in every Member State.

The second question is entirely different: which languages may be used in and with the institutions of the Union. That question is governed by article 342 TFEU and by Council Regulation No. 1 of 1958, which lists the languages of the institutions, provides that documents may be sent to the institutions in any of them and answered in the same, and permits each institution to stipulate in its Rules of Procedure which languages are to be used in specific cases.²⁰ This is not a national competence, but a decision taken at Union level, by a Union institution, under a Union legal basis. The Union has never suggested, and could not credibly suggest, that it lacks competence here.

The systemic obstacle identified is not the absence of competence over linguistic status, that belong to Member States, but rather the unanimity requirement outlined in Article 342 TFEU. This provision foresees that any modification of the linguistic regime within the European Union has to be unanimously approved by all 27 EU Member States within the Council of the European Union. This leads to a legal loop: the European Union keeps referring to Member States for the status of recognition of their national sign language as full languages, but any decision on the official status of national sign languages by the EU can only happen through the unanimity of Member States²¹.

The second obstacle lays in the fact that national sign languages are handled as an accessibility feature rather than as languages. The Commission's reference to International Sign is the clearest example. International Sign interpretation is provided at some events organised by the European Commission and, in fact, fulfil the accessibility obligation under Article 9(b). However, this should not be seen as a substitute for the linguistic status of national sign languages foreseen in Article 21.

7. Impact on the enjoyment of rights: the case of Petition 1056/2016

The case of Petition 1056/2016 can serve as an example of the legal and institutional frameworks on the enjoyment of rights.

Article 227 TFEU and article 44 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights give every citizen of the European Union the right to petition the European Parliament. Rule 232 (6) of the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament requires that a petition be written in an official language of the Union.²²

¹⁹Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, arts. 5 (3), 6 (c) and 167, and Protocol No. 2 on the application of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality.

²⁰Council Regulation No. 1 determining the languages to be used by the European Economic Community (31958R0001), arts. 1, 2 and 6; Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, art. 342.

²¹European Union of the Deaf, position paper "National Sign Languages as EU Official Languages" (23 September 2024), <https://eud.eu/eud/position-papers/national-sign-languages-as-eu-official-languages/>.

²²Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, art. 227; Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, art. 44; Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament, Rule 232 (6) (formerly Rule 226 (6)).

National sign languages have no written form. The requirement therefore obliges a deaf citizen who wishes to exercise a Treaty right to do so in a language that is not their own.

The EUD submitted Petition 1056/2016 in 2016, asking that petitions be admissible in a national sign language independently of a written version.²³ The practical arrangements were worked out with the secretariat of the Committee on Petitions: the petitioner uploads a video to the petitions portal, which already accepts audiovisual files; a translator drawn from a list covering the 29 national sign languages renders it into the written national language; the Parliament's translation service then proceeds as it would with any other petition. No technical obstacle was identified at any point.

The third subparagraph of Rule 232 (6) permits the Bureau to accept petitions in other languages which, in accordance with the constitutional order of the Member State concerned, enjoy official status in all or part of its territory. Whether national sign languages fall within that provision depends on whether they enjoy official status at the national level. That is the question the Parliament has never answered. Political groups have taken opposing views: some reading Rule 232 (6) together with article 21 (b) CRPD as already permitting submission in a national sign language, others insisting on a written submission to which a signed translation may be attached, which would give the languages a purely symbolic standing.²⁴ Ten years since its introduction, the petition is still open and being processed.

Twenty years of Convention implementation have produced sophisticated machinery for addressing accessibility failures, but have not produced an equivalent route to language status. The deaf citizen who wishes to petition the European Parliament in German Sign Language today is in the same position as in 2016.

8. Officialisation: the exit from the deadlock, and its compatibility with the Convention

The argument set out above resolves into a short chain of propositions:

1. The European Union is bound by article 21 (b) CRPD to accept and facilitate the use of sign languages in official interactions.
2. Under Regulation 1/1958, interactions with the institutions of the Union take place in one of its 24 official languages.
3. None of those 24 is a signed language, and none of the 29 national sign languages existing in the European Union is among them.
4. It follows that the right in article 21 (b) cannot be exercised as against the Union so long as Regulation 1/1958 stands unamended.

The only measure that removes the incompatibility is the amendment of Regulation 1/1958 to include the 29 national sign languages alongside the 24 spoken official languages. It is the sole route by which the EU can comply with an obligation it has assumed through the ratification of the CRPD, given the

²³Petition 1056/2016, submitted by Mark Wheatley on behalf of the European Union of the Deaf, requesting that the European Parliament allow the tabling of petitions in national sign languages used in the EU.

²⁴European Parliament decision of 11 April 2024 on discharge in respect of the implementation of the general budget of the European Union for the financial year 2022, Section I – European Parliament (2023/2130(DEC)), paras. 108 and 147.

architecture of its own linguistic regime. This is what EUD means by officialisation, and it is what the Committee recommended in its Concluding Observations to the EU in March 2025.

The Convention itself is the source of the dual-framing of deaf communities as both persons with disabilities and members of cultural and linguistic minorities: Article 2 addresses language status, Article 9 addresses accessibility, Article 21 addresses language use, and Article 30 (4) addresses cultural and linguistic identity of deaf communities. Difficulties arise not from that duality but from legal and policy frameworks that only recognise one of the identities, but rarely both at the same time²⁵. Officialisation is not an alternative to the Convention framework. It is the means by which article 21 (b) is given effect.

EUD considers that the pathway runs at two levels, respectively, national and EU levels.

At national level

States parties should elevate their national sign languages from the status of full languages to that of official languages within their own legal orders, accompanied by measures to give effect to this officialisation, so that they may be used in court proceedings, in dealings with the administration, in the submission of petitions and complaints, and in contact with the police. This is the decisive step for two reasons. It delivers the substance of article 21 (b) domestically, where the great majority of official interactions of deaf people take place. And, in the European context, it unlocks both of the routes that are currently blocked: it supplies the national official status on which the third subparagraph of Rule 232 (6) of the European Parliament turns, and it changes the position of the Member States who, sitting in Council, must decide unanimously on the linguistic regime of the EU.

At the European Union level

Two measures should be pursued in parallel. The first is the amendment of Regulation 1/1958 under article 342 TFEU. The second, which the Committee expressly recommended, is the amendment of the Rules of Procedure of the individual institutions. The European Parliament called for official recognition of national and regional sign languages within the EU institutions as long ago as 2016,²⁶ and the former Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities recommended in 2022 that the granting of official EU language status to sign languages be put on the agenda for change.²⁷

Officialisation does not displace the obligations of the EU to safeguard accessibility: the Union remains bound under article 9 to caption and interpret its own output, and the delayed accessibility of the single European emergency number 112 for deaf sign language users remains a serious concern the Committee shared in 2025.²⁸ Officialisation cannot be designed or monitored without data. Deaf

²⁵De Meulder, Maartje, and Joseph J. Murray. "Buttering their bread on both sides? The recognition of sign languages and the aspirations of deaf communities." *Language Problems and Language Planning* 41, no. 2 (2017): 136-158; and R. Wilks, "Recognising the EU's national sign languages: a deaf legal theory perspective", in *From Recognition to Officialisation* (2025), chap. 4. See also R. Wilks, "Deaf legal theory: challenging the law's hearing bias", *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, vol. 30, No. 3 (2025), pp. 293-305.

²⁶European Parliament, resolution of 23 November 2016 on sign languages and professional sign language interpreters (2016/2952(RSP)), para. 1 (a).

²⁷See footnote 4.

²⁸UN Doc. CRPD/C/EU/CO/2-3, paras. 26 (b) and 27. Directive (EU) 2019/882 (European Accessibility Act), art. 4 (8); Directive (EU) 2018/1972 (European Electronic Communications Code).

people in Europe are still counted medical categories of hearing loss rather than by language use, which makes it very difficult to design or evaluate any policy concerning their languages.²⁹

9. Recommendations

On the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Convention, the European Union of the Deaf respectfully recommends the following:

1. OHCHR record in its thematic study that the legal recognition of national sign languages is among the clearest measurable achievements of twenty years of Convention implementation, noting that 84 of 190 States parties have granted such recognition and that in Europe recognition is now close to universal, achieved through 27 separate national legislative processes and without regional-level intervention.
2. OHCHR identify the distinction between recognition as a full language and official status as a principal remaining normative gap, and records that recognition alone does not enable deaf people to use their languages in official interactions.
3. OHCHR reflect the interpretation of article 21 (b) and (e), read together with articles 2, 29 and 30 (4), according to which the right to use a national sign language in official interactions presupposes a legal status permitting that language to be used for official purposes; and that a State party that has recognised its national sign language but not conferred such status has not yet fully implemented article 21.
4. OHCHR address in the study the obligations of regional integration organizations that are parties to the Convention under Article 44 CRPD, noting that the European Union is the only such party, that 29 national sign languages are used within its territory, that its own linguistic regime falls squarely within its own competence, and that the Committee recommended in March 2025 that it recognise those languages as official EU languages.³⁰
5. OHCHR record the case of Petition 1056/2016 as illustrating that where the enjoyment of a right depends on the official status of a language, accessibility measures and administrative accountability mechanisms cannot substitute for a legislative act conferring that status.
6. States parties be encouraged to move from recognition to officialisation of their national sign languages, and to accompany that step with implementation measures across education, interpreting, access to information including in emergencies, cultural and linguistic identity, and the establishment of national sign language councils or boards mandated to advise and monitor.
7. States parties and the European Union collect data on sign language communities disaggregated by language use rather than by hearing status, and by intersecting identities, so that policies concerning national sign languages can be designed, financed and evaluated on an evidential basis.
8. The Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities consider developing a General Comment on sign language rights, as recommended by the World Federation of the Deaf, and

²⁹UN Doc. CRPD/C/EU/CO/2-3, para. 21 (d). See A. Bloxs and M. de Wit, "Mapping sign language peoples: the urgent need for comprehensive data collection in the European Union", in *From Recognition to Officialisation* (2025), chap. 7.

³⁰Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, art. 44, on regional integration organizations.

that such a General Comment address expressly the legal status of national sign languages, including the distinction between recognition and official status and the obligations flowing from each.

9. Any process towards such a General Comment ensures the close consultation and active involvement of deaf people through their representative organisations at national, regional and global levels, in accordance with articles 4 (3) and 33 (3) of the Convention, with all consultations conducted accessibly.

The European Union of the Deaf and its member national associations of the deaf stand ready to provide further information, comparative material and expertise to OHCHR in the preparation of the study.

For more information on our contribution, please reach out to the EUD Policy Team at policy@eud.eu.