



SUBMISSION

TO THE 51st SESSION OF THE UNIVERSAL PERIODIC REVIEW

AUSTRIA

Conscientious objection to military service and juvenile recruitment

July 2025

1

Contact:
Zaira Zafarana
International advocacy coordinator
zaira.zafarana@connection-ev.org

INTRODUCTION

1. This submission focuses on various aspects of the **right to conscientious objection to military service**, including problems in the procedures and conditions for granting conscientious objector status:
 - a. **punitive and discriminatory length of alternative civilian service**
 - b. **strict time limits for applications,**
 - c. **automatically disqualifying conditions,**
 - d. **insufficient wage,**
 - e. **non-recognition for serving members of the armed forces.**
2. The submission also examines the issue of **juvenile recruitment** which has raised concerns in the context of four different UN mechanisms (CRC-OPAC, UPR, CRC, ICCPR).

PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS

3. Despite specific contributions by civil society organisations,¹ the issue of **conscientious objection to military service** has not been adequately addressed, so far, in the context of the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) of Austria. There have been, though, broader recommendations about protection from all forms of discrimination, *inter alia*, on the basis or grounds of religion and belief.² In Austria, despite noting³ or even accepting⁴ some of these broader recommendations, discrimination on the basis of religion and belief concerning specifically conscientious objectors to military service continues, as it has been highlighted by the Human Rights Committee (see below).

4. Furthermore, broader recommendations on freedom of religion or belief,⁵ (in which the right to conscientious objection to military service inheres⁶), only “noted”,⁷ did not result in addressing the problems concerning specifically conscientious objectors to military service.

5. As for **juvenile recruitment**, during the first cycle of UPR, Austria received recommendations to: “Raise the age for all enrolments into armed forces to the age of at least 18 years in line with the CRC recommendation”.⁸

The State under review rejected the recommendation stating:

“Austria does not accept the recommendation. The option of performing the military service starting at the age of 17 is based solely on the voluntary enlistment of the person concerned and requires the consent of his legal guardian. Neither the direct participation in combat nor the voluntary enlistment for military service in international operations is admissible. Under these provisions, full respect of the entire Convention on the Rights of the Child including its Optional Protocol is guaranteed”.⁹

6. Notwithstanding specific reporting from civil society organisations,¹⁰ (and the continuous recommendations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child – see below), it appears that the issue of juvenile recruitment has not been explicitly included in the recommendations of the second cycle.

7. Worth noting that a broader recommendation, “accepted”, to “Continue to harmonize its national legislation on children with the international standards contained in the Convention on the Rights of the Child and its Protocols, and any other relevant instrument to which it is party” during the second cycle,¹¹ did not result in resolving the issue of juvenile recruitment.

8. During the third cycle, a recommendation on juvenile recruitment reappeared (“Increase the minimum age for voluntary recruitment to 18 in line with the recommendation of the Committee on the Rights of the Child”) but it was not accepted, only “noted”.¹²

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION TO MILITARY SERVICE

Punitive and discriminatory length of alternative civilian service

9. In the Replies to the List of Issues concerning the fifth periodic report of Austria to the Human Rights Committee, the State party explained that the basic military service is 6 months, while the civilian service is 9 months¹³ (**1.5 times, 50% increase**).

10. Worth noting also that Austria stated that “The amendment to the Civilian Service Act of 1991 facilitated access to alternative civilian service by eliminating the examination of conscientious objection. Following this amendment, alternative civilian service became more attractive and easier to access”.¹⁴ Therefore, despite other explanations, this seems to imply that the length of alternative civilian service was “extended” rather in order to test the sincerity of applicants, which is, however, contrary to the **jurisprudence of the Human Rights Committee**; such reason is not among the reasonable and objective criteria which would justify a differentiation in length.¹⁵

11. According to the **OHCHR**, “Any duration longer than that of military service is permissible only if the additional time for alternative service is based on reasonable and objective criteria. Equalizing the duration of alternative service with military service should be considered a good practice.”¹⁶

12. The **European Parliament** has repeatedly stated that the length of alternative service should be the same and not last longer than military service.¹⁷

13. In its Concluding Observations, the **Human Rights Committee** stated:

“33. The Committee notes that the length of the civilian alternative service to military service for conscientious objectors is longer than military service and may be punitively long if not based on reasonable and objective grounds (arts. 18 and 26).

34. The State party is encouraged to ensure that the length of service alternative to military service required for conscientious objectors is not punitive in nature.”¹⁸

It should be emphasized that the Human Rights Committee invoked both article 18 of ICCPR, concerning **the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion**, as well as article 26, concerning **freedom from discrimination**.

14. Recently, in the List of issues prior to submission of the sixth periodic report of Austria, the Human Rights Committee requested:

“21. Recalling the Committee’s most recent concluding observations (para. 34), please report on the measures taken to provide all conscientious objectors with an alternative to military service that is not punitive or discriminatory in terms of its nature, cost or duration.”¹⁹

15. According to the most recent Annual Report of the European Bureau for Conscientious Objection, the duration of alternative civilian service remains 9 months, instead of 6 months of military service,²⁰ and thus it is still punitive and discriminatory.

Strict time limits for applications

16. Applications may be submitted within 6 months of the initial fitness assessment and no later than 3 days before receiving a call-up order for military service.²¹

According to the **OHCHR minimum standards**:

“No time limit should be applicable for the submission of a request to be recognized as a conscientious objector. Conscripts and volunteers should be able to object before the commencement of military service, or at any stage during or after military service”.²²

17. In the List of issues prior to submission of the sixth periodic report of Austria, the **Human Rights Committee** requested:

“Please clarify whether the State party intends: (a) to revise article 1 (2) of the Civilian Service Act establishing a time limit on the submission of applications for recognition of a conscientious objector status”.²³

Automatically disqualifying conditions

18. In Austria, it is not possible to submit an application for civilian service:

- a. if the conscript has been convicted of an intentional criminal offence in which armed force was used or threatened against persons or which was committed in connection with weapons or explosives, unless the conviction has been expunged or is subject to restrictions on disclosure from the criminal record.
- b. if the conscript belongs to a federal or municipal police corps.²⁴

19. The above conditions do not take into consideration the right to change beliefs,²⁵ the possibility of reform, or the right to selective conscientious objection.²⁶

20. The **OHCHR** has consistently highlighted the existence of such automatically disqualifying conditions in Austria.²⁷

According to the **minimum OHCHR standards**:

“Application procedures should be based on reasonable and relevant criteria, and should avoid the imposition of any conditions that would result in the automatic disqualification of applicants”.²⁸

Insufficient wage

21. Another issue is the insufficient wage provided to conscientious objectors to military service. In 2025 such wage has become 605.60 euros²⁹ (instead of the previous 585.10 euros³⁰). However, it still appears to be extremely low compared to the collectively agreed minimum wage in the State under review.

“Most collective agreements already provide for minimum wages of at least EUR 1,700 gross 14 times a year, resulting in an average monthly wage of EUR 1,983 gross.”³¹

Non-recognition for serving members of the armed forces

22. The lack of procedures to resign on grounds of conscience for those serving voluntarily in the armed forces has been highlighted by the **OHCHR**.³²

According to the **OHCHR minimum standards**:

- a. “Conscripts and volunteers should be able to object before the commencement of military service, or at any stage during or after military service”;³³
- b. “The right to conscientious objection should be recognized for conscripts, for professional members of the armed forces and for reservists”.³⁴

23. Austria is also a member of the **Council of Europe**, whose **Committee of Ministers** recommended in 2010:

“H. Members of the armed forces have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. Any limitations on this right shall comply with the requirements of Article 9, paragraph 2 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

40. Members of the armed forces have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, including the right to change religion or belief at any time. [...]

41. For the purposes of compulsory military service, conscripts should have the right to be

granted conscientious objector status and an alternative service of a civilian nature should be proposed to them.

42. Professional members of the armed forces should be able to leave the armed forces for reasons of conscience.

43. Requests by members of the armed forces to leave the armed forces for reasons of conscience should be examined within a reasonable time. Pending the examination of their requests they should be transferred to non-combat duties, where possible.

44. Any request to leave the armed forces for reasons of conscience should ultimately, where denied, be examined by an independent and impartial body.

45. Members of the armed forces having legally left the armed forces for reasons of conscience should not be subject to discrimination or to any criminal prosecution. No discrimination or prosecution should result from asking to leave the armed forces for reasons of conscience.

46. Members of the armed forces should be informed of the rights mentioned in paragraphs 41 to 45 above and the procedures available to exercise them.”³⁵

24. In 2012, in a questionnaire on the implementation of the above recommendations, to the question about whether professional members of the armed forces can leave the armed forces for reasons of conscience, Austria responded negatively.³⁶

25. In the List of issues prior to submission of the sixth periodic report of Austria, the **Human Rights Committee** requested:

“Please clarify whether the State party intends: [...] (b) to amend the legal framework to allow for serving members of the armed forces to apply for early release for reasons of conscience”.³⁷

JUVENILE RECRUITMENT

26. In 2004, in its **initial report under the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict (OPAC)**, Austria detailed the possibility for voluntary recruitment of a person between 17 and 18 years.³⁸

27. The **Committee on the Rights of the Child**, in its concluding observations stated:

“Voluntary recruitment

5. The Committee notes that Section 9, paragraph 2, of the National Defence Act, sets the minimum age of voluntary recruitment at 17 years. It also notes that according to the State party, “no systematic or comprehensive debate took place in Austria” (CRC/C/OPAC/AUT/1, para. 26) regarding possible review of legislation to increase this age to 18 as “the existing legislation reflected consensus on the minimum age”.

6. The Committee recommends that the State party consider the possibility to increase the minimum age for voluntary recruitment to 18 years.”³⁹

28. Following the combined third and fourth periodic report of Austria for the Convention on the Rights of the Child itself, which included relevant information on the Optional Protocol on the involvement of children in armed conflict,⁴⁰ the **Committee on the Rights of the Child**, in 2012, in its Concluding Observations stated:

“Children in armed conflict

56. While noting the State party’s indication during the dialogue that under 18-year old recruits may not participate in any hostilities and in United Nations peacekeeping operations, the Committee remains concerned that Section 9, paragraph 2, of the National Defence Act

sets the minimum age of voluntary recruitment at 17 years. The Committee also notes with concern that students from age 14 are trained on the use of small arms at the Vienna military academy (“Militärrealgymnasium”), albeit on an extracurricular basis.

57. The Committee reiterates its recommendation (CRC/C/OPAC/AUT/CO/1, para. 6) that the State party consider the possibility of increasing the minimum age for voluntary recruitment to 18 years. It also recommends that the State party ensure that the education of child cadets at military academies is free from any form of arms training and military drill and consistent with the aims of education, as recognized in article 29 of the Convention and in its general comment No. 1 (2001).⁴¹

29. Following relevant information in the combined fifth and sixth periodic report of Austria for the Convention on the Rights of the Child,⁴² the **Committee on the Rights of the Child**, in 2020, in its Concluding Observations stated:

“Optional Protocol on the involvement of children in armed conflict

44. While noting the explanations provided by the State party in its report in response to the Committee’s recommendations made in 2005 on the Optional Protocol on the involvement of children in armed conflict and reiterated in 2012 (CRC/C/AUT/CO/3-4, para. 57), the Committee regrets that the State party has not taken any specific measures to implement its recommendations. The Committee urges the State party to reconsider its position that it will not increase the minimum age for voluntary recruitment to 18 years⁴³”.

30. In addition to the above-mentioned recommendations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child, and those in the context of UPR, the issue has been raised also by the **Human Rights Committee** in the context of periodic reports for the ICCPR.

In 2015, in the List of issues in relation to the fifth periodic report of Austria, the Human Rights Committee requested:

“Please also indicate whether the State party is considering raising the minimum age for voluntary recruitment into the armed forces to 18 years⁴⁴”.

31. In its replies to the List of issues, Austria stated:

“132. Austria is State Party to the Convention on the Rights of the Child as well as to its Optional Protocol on the involvement of children in armed conflict. Article 9, Article 41, para. 2, and Article 57 of the Defence Act 2001 (Wehrgesetz 2001) comply fully with the requirements set out by this Convention. It is possible in Austria, however, to join the army voluntarily at the age of 17, provided certain conditions are met. According to Article 9 in conjunction with Article 57 of the Defence Act 2001, a 17-year-old has to act of his own accord and requires the written consent of a parent or legal guardian to be able to join the army. The idea behind this rule is to provide young men, who have successfully completed their apprenticeship or education at the age of 17, with the opportunity to join the army. Most employers consider the completion of the mandatory military service or the substitute civilian service as a necessary prerequisite for offering a job. The Austrian Federal Army, however, does not actively advertise this opportunity and does not promote the recruitment of under 18-year-olds in any way.⁴⁵”

32. Recently, in the List of issues prior to the submission of the sixth periodic report of Austria, the **Human Rights Committee** insisted:

“Please clarify whether the State party intends: [...] (c) to raise the minimum age for voluntary recruitment into the military to 18 years of age⁴⁶”.

SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATIONS

33. Connection e.V. suggests the following recommendations:

- A. Reduce the length of alternative civilian service in order to comply with the Human Rights Committee's recommendations.
- B. Provide all conscientious objectors with an alternative to military service that is not punitive or discriminatory in terms of its nature, cost or duration.
- C. Revise article 1 (2) of the Civilian Service Act establishing a time limit on the submission of applications for recognition of conscientious objector status, so that conscripts and volunteers are able to object before the commencement of military service, or at any stage during or after military service
- D. Eliminate all automatically disqualifying conditions concerning applicants for alternative civilian service, such as the one about previous crimes, in order to comply with international human rights standards about conscientious objection to military service and the right to change one's beliefs.
- E. Increase the wage provided to both conscripts and conscientious objectors to military service performing military and alternative civilian service respectively.
- F. Amend the legal framework to allow for serving members of the armed forces to apply for early release for reasons of conscience.
- G. Raise the minimum age for voluntary recruitment into the military to 18 years of age, according to the recommendations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child, the Human Rights Committee and previous UPR recommendations.

¹ [2nd Cycle] A/HRC/WG.6/23/AUT/3, 14 August 2015, para. 43. <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/WG.6/23/AUT/3>

It refers to Joint Submission 1 by International Fellowship of Reconciliation and Conscience and Peace Tax International, which can be accessed through: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/hr-bodies/upr/uprat-stakeholders-info-s23>

[3rd Cycle] A/HRC/WG.6/37/AUT/3, 5 November 2020, para. 22. <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/WG.6/37/AUT/3>

It refers to the submission by the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, which can be accessed through: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/hr-bodies/upr/uprat-stakeholders-info-s37>

² E.g. [1st Cycle] A/HRC/17/8, 18 March 2011, Recommendation 93.44 (Canada). <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/17/8>

[2nd Cycle] A/HRC/31/12, 22 December 2015, Recommendations 141.18 (Belgium), 141.19 (Uruguay), 141.32 (Bulgaria), 141.34 (Canada), 141.36 (Germany). <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/31/12>

[3rd Cycle] A/HRC/47/12, 9 April 2021, Recommendations 141.31 (Croatia), 141.32 (Denmark), 141.39 (Netherlands), 141.41 (Turkey), 141.42 (Costa Rica), 141.43 (Democratic People's Republic of Korea).

<https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/47/12>

³ E.g. [2nd Cycle] A/HRC/31/12/Add.1, 3 March 2016, para. 4. <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/31/12/Add.1>

⁴ E.g. [1st Cycle] A/HRC/17/8/Add.1, 1 June 2011, p. 6, Recommendation 93.44. <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/17/8/Add.1>

⁵ E.g. [3rd Cycle] A/HRC/47/12, 9 April 2021, Recommendations 141.55 (Sudan), 141.56 (Australia).

<https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/47/12>

⁶ See, *Min-Kyu Jeong et al. v. Republic of Korea* (CCPR/C/101/D/1642-1741/2007), para. 7.3.

<https://undocs.org/CCPR/C/101/D/1642-1741/2007>

See also: *Jong-nam Kim et al. v. Republic of Korea*, para. 7.4; *Abdullayev v. Turkmenistan*, para. 7.7; *Mahmud Hudaybergenov v. Turkmenistan*, para. 7.5; *Ahmet Hudaybergenov v. Turkmenistan*, para. 7.5; *Sunnet Japparow v. Turkmenistan*, para. 7.6; *Akmurad Nurjanov v. Turkmenistan*, para. 9.3; *Shadurdy Uchetov v. Turkmenistan*, para. 7.6; *Dawletow v. Turkmenistan*, para. 6.3 and others.

⁷ [3rd Cycle] A/HRC/47/12/Add.1, 7 May 2021, para. 54 concerning recommendations 141.55, 141.56.

<https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/47/12/Add.1>

⁸ [1st Cycle] A/HRC/17/8, 18 March 2011, Recommendation 93.47 (Ghana, Slovakia). <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/17/8>

⁹ [1st Cycle] A/HRC/17/8/Add.1, 1 June 2011, p. 6, Recommendation 93.47. <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/17/8/Add.1>

¹⁰ [2nd Cycle] A/HRC/WG.6/23/AUT/3, 14 August 2015, para. 27. <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/WG.6/23/AUT/3>

It refers to Joint Submission 1 by International Fellowship of Reconciliation and Conscience and Peace Tax International, which can be accessed through: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/hr-bodies/upr/uprat-stakeholders-info-s23>

¹¹ [2nd Cycle] A/HRC/31/12, 22 December 2015, Recommendation 139.4 (Nicaragua).

<https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/31/12>

¹² E.g. [3rd Cycle] A/HRC/47/12, 9 April 2021, Recommendation 141.63 (Croatia).

<https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/47/12>

- ¹³ CCPR/C/AUT/Q/5/Add.1, 24 August 2015, para. 131. <https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/AUT/Q/5/Add.1>
- ¹⁴ CCPR/C/AUT/Q/5/Add.1, 24 August 2015, para. 130. <https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/AUT/Q/5/Add.1>
- ¹⁵ Human Rights Committee, Views on Communication No 666/1995, Frédéric Foin v. France, (CCPR/C/67/D/666/1995), 9 November 1999, para. 10.3. <https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/67/D/666/1995>
- Human Rights Committee, Views on Communications No. 690/1996 & 691/1996, Marc Venier and Paul Nicolas v. France, (CCPR/C/69/D/690/1996 & 691/1996), para. 10.4. <https://www.refworld.org/jurisprudence/caselaw/hrc/2000/en/89601>
- ¹⁶ A/HRC/41/23, 24 May 2019, para. 60, (l). <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/41/23>
- ¹⁷ https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=OJ:JOC_1993_115_R_0139_01&from=EN, page C 115/183, para. 51.
- https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=OJ:JOC_1994_044_R_0075_01&from=EN, page C 44/105, para. 9.
- <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P5-TA-2003-0012+0+DOC+XML+V0/EN>, para 42.
- ¹⁸ CCPR/C/AUT/CO/5, 3 December 2015, paras. 33-34. <https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/AUT/CO/5>
- ¹⁹ CCPR/C/AUT/QPR/6, 30 August 2024, para. 21. <https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/AUT/QPR/6>
- ²⁰ EBCO, *Annual Report, Conscientious Objection to Military Service in Europe 2024*, Brussels 5th June 2025, p. 27. https://ebco-beoc.org/sites/ebco-beoc.org/files/2025-06-05-EBCO_Annual_Report_2024.pdf
- ²¹ <https://www.zivildienst.gv.at/zivildienster/weg-zum-zivildienst.html>
- ²² A/HRC/41/23, 24 May 2019, para. 60(f). <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/41/23>
- See also: A/HRC/50/43, 11 May 2022, para. 57(g). <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/50/43>
- ²³ CCPR/C/AUT/QPR/6, 30 August 2024, para. 21. <https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/AUT/QPR/6>
- ²⁴ <https://www.zivildienst.gv.at/zivildienster/weg-zum-zivildienst.html>
- ²⁵ <https://www.ohchr.org/en/special-procedures/sr-religion-or-belief/international-standards#2>
- ²⁶ A/HRC/41/23, 24 May 2019, para. 60(d). <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/41/23>
- See also: A/HRC/50/43, 11 May 2022, para. 57(e). <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/50/43>
- ²⁷ E/CN.4/2006/51, 27 February 2006, para. 34. <https://docs.un.org/en/E/CN.4/2006/51>
- OHCHR, *Conscientious Objection to Military Service*, New York and Geneva, 2012, Formal requirements and conditions resulting in disqualification, p. 54. https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/ConscientiousObjection_en.pdf
- A/HRC/41/23, 24 May 2019, para. 46. <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/41/23>
- ²⁸ A/HRC/41/23, 24 May 2019, para. 60(h). <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/41/23>
- See also: A/HRC/50/43, 11 May 2022, para. 57(j). <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/50/43>
- ²⁹ <https://www.zivildienst.gv.at/einrichtungen/finanzielles.html> (in German) (accessed 11 July 2025).
- ³⁰ See also in: Graham Crewe, “National service in Austria (military and civilian service)”, *English Speakers in Austria*, Updated 29 January 2024. <https://www.englishspeakers.at/post/national-service-in-austria> (accessed 11 July 2025).
- ³¹ Republic of Austria, Federal Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs, Health Care and Consumer Protection, “Minimum Wage in Austria”. <https://www.sozialministerium.gv.at/en/Topics/Labour/Labour-Law/Remuneration/Minimum-Wage-in-Austria.html> (accessed, 11 July 2025).
- ³² A/HRC/23/22, 3 June 2013, para. 65. <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/23/22>
- ³³ A/HRC/41/23, 24 May 2019, para. 60(f). <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/41/23>
- See also: A/HRC/50/43, 11 May 2022, para. 57(g). <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/50/43>
- ³⁴ A/HRC/41/23, 24 May 2019, para. 60(c). <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/41/23>
- See also: A/HRC/50/43, 11 May 2022, para. 57(d). <https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/50/43>
- ³⁵ CM/Rec(2010)4 - Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers to member states on human rights of members of the armed forces (Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 24 February 2010 at the 1077th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies), paras. 40-46. <https://search.coe.int/cm/?i=09000016805cf8ef>
- ³⁶ CDDH(2012)016 – AUSTRIA, H4. <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=0900001680695e4b>
- ³⁷ CCPR/C/AUT/QPR/6, 30 August 2024, para. 21. <https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/AUT/QPR/6>
- ³⁸ CRC/C/OPAC/AUT/1, 8 July 2004, paras. 17-20, 24-27. <https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/OPAC/AUT/1>
- ³⁹ CRC/C/OPAC/CO/2 [also referenced as CRC/C/OPAC/AUT/CO/1], January 2005, paras. 5-6. An unedited version can be accessed in: https://archive.crin.org/sites/default/files/attachments/crc_c_opac_co_2.pdf
- ⁴⁰ CRC/C/AUT/3-4, 16 November 2011 [29 September 2009], paras. 258-266. <https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/AUT/3-4>
- ⁴¹ CRC/C/AUT/CO/3-4, 3 December 2012, paras. 56-57. <https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/AUT/CO/3-4>
- ⁴² CRC/C/AUT/5-6, 21 March 2019 [Date received: 4 April 2018], paras. 247-251. <https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/AUT/5-6>
- ⁴³ CRC/C/AUT/CO/5-6, 6 March 2020, para. 44. <https://docs.un.org/en/CRC/C/AUT/CO/5-6>
- ⁴⁴ CCPR/C/AUT/Q/5, 28 April 2015, para. 18. <https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/AUT/Q/5>
- ⁴⁵ CCPR/C/AUT/Q/5/Add.1, 24 August 2015, para. 132. <https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/AUT/Q/5/Add.1>
- ⁴⁶ CCPR/C/AUT/QPR/6, 30 August 2024, para. 21. <https://docs.un.org/en/CCPR/C/AUT/QPR/6>