

Thank you very much.  
So, the paper that I have written should be in your pack.  
On participation and public and political life.  
The obligations under the UNCRPD.  
I tend to speak a little bit too fast.  
Wave at me if I start to speed up a bit.  
So, this is the structure of the paper here.  
And the presentation.  
I am going to give you context.  
Building on some of the issues Paula referred to yesterday.  
Then I want to move on to look at political participation.  
And looking at the UNCRPD and looking specifically at article 29.  
Which provides the right to public and political life of persons with disabilities.  
And look in detail at what those substantial provisions are.  
I'll look at the general comments and concluding observations met by the UN  
committee on the rights of persons with disabilities.-  
The body that is responsible for ensuring state compliance under the UN  
convention.  
So, as we discussed yesterday morning.  
Persons with disabilities have been excluded from enjoying human rights on  
equal basis with others.  
In this millennium the first treaty from the UN was looking at the rights of  
persons with disabilities.  
And the background to the convention was that the rights of persons with  
disabilities.  
They were able to enjoy them in theory.  
In reality in many areas of life.  
They were denied.  
And excluded from the rights.  
Including the right of participation.  
And looking at article 29 and then looking at how article 29 is right to  
participation.  
How it interconnects with other rights.  
Article 12 we discussed yesterday, which is important.  
And article 9, around accessibility.  
Okay, so, just to look at the origins of the right to political participation.  
Under the framework.  
The founding document of international human rights from 1948.  
That was the first articulation of the right to political participation.  
Article 21 of the universal declaration.  
Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country.  
Directly or through freely chosen representatives.  
This was further articulated in the international covenant on civil and political  
rights.  
In the 1960s at the UN level.  
And where this set out the civil and political rights to apply.  
And in article 25 of the ICCPR, the right to political participation.  
And requires the level of accountability of the state.

This brought the right of political participation in legally binding force.  
You can see it in the paper of your pack.  
What it says is that every citizen shall have the right and the opportunity without any of the distinction mentioned in article 2 -  
and without unreasonable restrictions to take part in the conduct of public affairs directly through freely chosen representatives,-  
to vote and to be elected at genuine periodic elections. And to have access on general terms to public service in this country.  
these are the rights in article 25.  
And in 1996, the Human Rights committee, the UN body for monitoring state compliance with their obligations.  
They issued a general comment.  
In relation to article 25.  
It is basically an opportunity for the committee to say, this is what it has to do.  
And in the general comment this notion of the right to public and political participation is clearly.  
As an important norm.  
The committee said, it lies at the core of democratic government.  
And conformity of the principles of the covenant.  
The HRC stated that the right to vote must be established by law.  
And only be subject to reasonable restrictions.  
Only reasonable restrictions.  
You can have a minimum age for the right to vote.  
That's a common restrictions in all jurisdictions.  
You have to be 18 to have the right to vote.  
Of particular relevance in the general comments from the 1990s was the statement.  
It would be unreasonable to restrict the right to vote on the ground of physical disability or to impose literacy, educational or -  
property requirements.  
It is unreasonable to restrict access to participation if someone has a physical disability.  
Or impose restrictions having a certain level of literacy.  
And the HRC said the restrictions on the right to vote are only permitted when they are based on objective and reasonable criteria-  
When they oppose restrictions, they have to be set out in the reports.  
And then they can be discussed then when they are before the committee.  
Controversial elements looking at the general comments.  
For the UNCRPD.  
Was in relation to throw away comments that the committee made in relation to mental capacity.  
I'll read out the section from the general comments.  
What the committee said was, Any conditions which apply to the exercise of the rights protected by article 25 should be based on objective and reasonable criteria. It may be reasonable to require a higher age for election or appointment to particular offices than the exercising the right to vote. The exercise may not be suspended or excluded except on grounds which are established by law a-

d objective and reasonable.

For example, established mental incapacity may be the ground for denying a person the right to vote or to hold office.

This is inconsistent with the notion of legal capacity.

I'll talk about it later on.

And what we discuss there.

Legal capacity is having rights, about exercising rights.

You can't deny someone legal capacity.

Including the right to vote.

On the basis on the mental capacity.

This is in odds with Article 12 on the UNCRPD.

So, that's a negative aspect of the human rights committees.

In the 1990s. But there were some positive elements in relation to disability.

The human rights committee interpreted article 25.

In relation to mental capacity.

There could be a restriction there.

They talked in different parts about positive measures.

These positive measures, which articulated amounted to accommodations.

Which are designed to overcome specific difficulties.

These are language barriers, poverty, movement.

For example, a person with disability.

In Ireland in the 1980s somebody took a challenge under the constitution.

Trying to get postal voting for people with disabilities.

It was for the Defense forces.

The Supreme Court wouldn't recognize that.

Here under article 25.

What you have is the committee saying, to make adjustments.

Or positive measures for the right to vote.

The human rights committee also stated that information and materials about voting should be available in minority languages.

And accommodations such as symbols should be used to ensure illiterate voters have adequate information.

They are positive elements in relation to accommodating people.

In order to exercise their right to vote.

It is interesting to note, I have a reference to a report of 2014 from the Fundamental rights agency.

Has everybody heard of that agency?

A Human rights body for the EU.

They did a report in this.

They were looking at the comments from the Human Rights committee about mental capacity.

What they said was, there was a need in relation to those comments and the perspective to evolve.

In order to take into account.

In the disability area.

Specifically Article 12 of the UNCRPD.

So, I want to move on to talk about the UNCRPD.

Like I said, the UNCRPD, is the first Human rights treaty of the UN this millennium.

There was a need for a specific convention for the rights of persons with disabilities.

The existing human rights were not sufficiently inclusive for people with disabilities.

Think about the general comment.

That's an example where in theory the people with disabilities have the right to vote.

But yes, there is a restriction in relation to people with mental capacity.

Not to create new rights perse.

But to articulate and enhance understanding of how the existing body of human rights apply to persons with disabilities.

There is a larger debate there.

That's a point I wanted to say.

I want to pick up what Paula said on the social model of disability.

This new vision has been very influential in policy making at domestic and international level.

It is embedded in the UNCRPD.

It is important, it removes barriers.

For participating in public life.

Just to reiterate some of the principles and obligations in the convention.

That can help us to discuss in greater detail article 29.

And in the preamble the CRPD requires state parties to ensure full and effective participation in society.

For persons with disabilities.

And to respect the difference and acceptance of persons with disabilities as part of diversity.

They are very important aspects in the CRPD.

These aren't new concepts. They are new in the context of disability.

Where people with disabilities have traditionally been treated as objects.

Objects and subjects of charity, rather than human subjects.

These are important principles that allow us to challenge restrictions and exclusions of persons, with disabilities.

In the area of accessing and participating in public life.

The principles of the CRPD are useful.

To look at those.

It looks at disability a concept.

And the preamble also talks about participation as equal members of society.

Recognizing that.

These notions of participation and inclusion which are set out in the preamble and the general principles.

They are very important.

Actually, they facilitate people with disabilities to exercise their rights.

Including in the area of political and public life.

If you look at the general principles as Paula discussed.

They are very important.

They are very important looking at this area and other areas in the convention.

Things like respect for inherent dignity, autonomy, freedom to make own choices.  
These general principles are set out in article 3.  
And are important for article 2.  
Article 29.  
The text is very short.  
There are ambiguities in a number of articles.  
This can help the Committee in monitoring with the compliance of the convention.  
And they are an important tool for understand what article 29 means.  
I want to point out article 4 in relation to general, obligations on state parties.  
Why this is important. It puts a positive obligation on the state.  
To adopt fresh legislation and appropriate administrative measures to implement the convention.  
That involves modifying or repeating laws.  
Customs or practices.  
That constitute discrimination.  
That' s really important.  
If you think about it, in jurisdictions, there are a lot.  
Where there are restrictions imposed.  
From exercising the right to political participation.  
There is an obligation on parties that ratified the convention.  
To move those and change the law.  
Where they are inconsistent with the convention.  
I wanted to point that out.  
The convention has been very successful.  
Iceland earlier this week ratified the convention.  
There are 167 ratifications.  
There are 89 ratifications for the optional protocol.  
It has been a successful convention.  
States agree with these principles.  
With these rights.  
They are committing themselves to be bound by the principles.  
In the EU every, member state has ratified the convention, with the exception of Ireland.  
Hopefully by the end of the year.  
I' ll look at substantial provisions in article 29.  
This is the text. You can read it out. It is in the paper.  
I' m prepared for this conference.  
You can also see, it is actually in the copy of the CRPD..  
I have broken it down and made it more accessible.  
So, article 29 on the right to participation in public and political life.  
It is a right of access and participation.  
There are different rights.  
That try to restore autonomy, article 12.  
Around protection.  
Access and participation.

The rationale for including article 29 specifically in the UN convention on persons with disabilities.

Is that the other rights in relation to preventing abuse, in relation to restoring autonomy.

They are very important rights.

They are insufficient by themselves.

You need these types of rights.

To ensure the full range of rights are realised.

So, essentially rights in the CRPD.

What they are concerned with is tackling barriers, removing barriers.

In general and in specific concepts.

Access to justice.

Access to cultural life.

It is about removing those barriers.

And this aspect of the CRPD is innovative.

These identify and remove obstacles that make participation.

It is taken for granted for a lot of people.

About participation, inclusion, removing barriers.

So, I am going to talk about what kind of barriers persons with disabilities experience.

Maybe suggest some.

What kind of barriers are in place?

For political participation.

Any examples you can think of?

- In particular, in Bulgaria.

People with disabilities face problems with accessing the places where they can vote.

Where they can exercise their voting.

And also, at the same events.

Political elections.

I mean, due to different types of disabilities they need some assistance.

Which is not connected with moving.

But maybe with directing to here and there.

Or to have some additional explanation at the moment.

Of the elections.

- Great. Accessibility and reasonable accommodation.

, absolutely.

Anybody else?

Yes? Eva?

- Maybe the voting ballot is not accessible for blind people for instance.

- Yes, a lot of issues around accessibility.

I'll talk about what the UN committee said.

There are massive issues around accessibility.

Also restrictions based on legal capacity.

Is a big issue as well.

Really, when you read through the different parts of Article 29.

What you can see actually is that, what it is trying to do is address this historical exclusion of people with disabilities.

From the political arena.  
And in terms of the WHO they describe persons with disabilities as the world's largest minority.  
Despite the fact there are a lot of persons with disabilities.  
The reality is that they haven't been able to access the political arena.  
That's because people with disabilities have struggled to access services and employment.  
They don't have the opportunity to engage with the political system.  
In addition to that there are additional barriers.  
The lack of political information.  
Party manifesto's.  
If you look at the drafting of the CRPD.  
These were the issues. When they were discussing.  
The article 29 drafting.  
What it is seeking to do is remove these barriers.  
And make facilities that are easy to use.  
That is the requirement for article 29.  
When you read it, you'll see article 29 respects the right to secret ballot.  
With appropriate assistance.  
Also to protect the secret ballot for the persons with disabilities.  
A key to exercising political influence is to form civil society groups.  
You'll see it requires state parties to promote environment.  
Where people with disabilities can effectively and fully and meaningfully participate in political parties.  
Specifically in organisations for persons with disabilities themselves.  
It is really important.  
It is also about the public context.  
And about accessing political parties and civil society groups.  
And people with disabilities can formulate their own organisations.  
Article 29 in action.  
I give an example where it has been successful.  
In 2010, the European Commission for Democracy through the law.  
They issued a regressive statement for the eligibility for persons with disabilities.  
To vote and stand for elections.  
It stated that no person with a disability can be excluded from the right to vote or to stand for election on the basis of his/her-  
physical mental disabilities unless the deprivation of the right to vote and to be elected is imposed by an individual decision -  
of a court of law because of proven mental disability. They were surprised when a lot of organisations and other people started to-  
criticize them.  
It is at odds with the CRPD.  
Which came into force at that time.  
There was a large campaign.  
Oliver Lewis was involved in this.  
This campaign used the CRPD, articles 8, 12, 13, 29.  
And the Venice Commission amended its position.  
How article 29 has been used for people with disabilities.

And the ability to remove restrictions that would prevent them the right to exercise to vote and engage in political participation-

What I propose to do for the last 15 minutes of the presentation.

Is to look at what the UN committee of the rights of persons with disabilities have said about article 29.

Here I' m going to look at the general comments.

And I' m going to look at some of the concluding observations of the committee.

So, I have taken an example from Brazil and Australia.

You can see yourself.

You can go to the website.

And you can look through the concluding observations.

The committee in the concluding observation have in most of the comments of state parties in article 29.

Accessibility is a real issue and impediment for people with disabilities.

And realising the role to political participation.

Under article 29.

They have been critical in inaccessibility in voting stations.

And that has restricted the enjoyment for persons with disabilities.

I' m taking 1 example Brazil.

In the concluding, observations.

Article 29.

The committee expressed its concerns.

That polling stations were not accessible.

And that voting information is not provided in sufficient accessible.

Increased the efforts to ensure the voting procedures, that materials are accessible.

Another theme that emerges in addition to accessibility in the concluding observations.

Is the particular discrimination experienced by persons, with intellectual disabilities.

And psychosocial disabilities.

So for example, Australia.

The go vernment enacts legislation to restore presumption of the capacity of persons with disabilities to vote and exercise choice-

I' m pointing at 2 things. There are 2 themes.

Around inaccessible voting procedures.

And the exclusion of people on the basis of perceptions of mental capacity.

Which is inconsistent with article 12.

In terms of losing the rights of the persons with disabilities.

The UNCRPD have issued 4 general comments.

The first one was on article 12.

Which is legal capacity. The second one on article 9.

The third on article 6.

And article 24, the right to inclusive education.

Interesting for this presentation.



If you read the general comments. The committee dedicated a couple of paragraphs to article 29.  
For the challenges of realising the rights.  
And the interconnection.  
Let' s talk through what the committee said.  
I want to reiterate what Oliver said yesterday.  
It can be confusing for people.  
Everybody has legal capacity.  
The universal legal capacity.  
Under the CRPD.  
And the reality is that on the basis of assessment of people' s mental capacity.  
In many jurisdictions throughout the world.  
Then you are not considered to be able to make legally effective decisions.  
The CRPD have been very clear that that is wrong.  
Inconsistent with article 12.  
Provides with universal legal capacity.  
You don' t want to take it away if there is some kind of deficit.  
What you need to do is provide support and reasonable accommodation.  
There is the focus. And not on denying somebody their legal capacity.  
Or allowing to make a third party to make their decisions.  
So the committee in the concluding observations and general comment number 1.  
Has highlighted the deprivation of legal capacity is one of the most significant impediments of the enjoyment of the right to political and public participation.  
For article 29, one of the biggest things is the denial of article 12.  
The laws and many jurisdictions have to respect.  
Having their autonomy. Their political decision making is restricted.  
What the committee said was that persons with disabilities have historically been denied their right.  
Where restrictions are in place, they must be abolished in order to ensure full legal capacity is restored to the persons on equal-basis with others.  
Really, you can see here the legal capacity is a gate keeper right.  
If you don' t have legal capacity, you aren' t able to exercise your right.  
All of the other rights can be done away.  
If you are denied your legal capacity.  
I have 2 little excerpts.  
From the committee.  
On the rights of persons with disabilities.  
Denial or restriction of legal capacity has been used to deny political participation, especially the right to vote, for certain persons with disabilities. In order to fully realise the equal recognition of legal capacity in all aspects of life, it is important-  
to recognize the legal capacity of persons with disabilities in public and political life. This means that a person' s decision making ability cannot be a justification for any exclusion of persons with disabilities from exercising their political rights, inclu-

ing the right to vote, the right to stand for election and the right to serve as a member of jury.

You can't deny legal capacity to stop political participation. What they say there is that participation on a jury.

For example in a trial. That is part of political participation.

It can be the basis for restricting the right to vote and participate in public life.

So, the problem of accessibility was further addressed in the general comment number 2 and article 9.

This was something that comes up a lot in the concluding observations.

And in the general comment number 2 on accessibility article 9.

And the committee highlighted this is a major impediment. Inaccessible polling stations and voting procedures are common.

That meant that the right on article 29 was denied for persons with disabilities.

This was what the committee said.

Article 29 of the convention guarantees persons with disabilities the right to participate in political and public life, and to take part in running public affairs.

Persons with disabilities would be unable to exercise those rights equally and effectively if states parties failed to ensure that voting procedures, facilities and materials were appropriate, accessible and easy to understand and use.

It is important that political meetings and materials used and produced by political parties or individual candidates participating in public elections are accessible.

If not, persons with disabilities are deprived of their right to participate. Persons with disabilities who are elected to public office must have equal opportunities to carry out their mandate in a fully accessible manner.

You can see here the committee is trying to keep guidance to state parties to make sure the voting process, information is accessible, appropriate accessible and easy to understand and use.

That's essential for people with disabilities for the right to vote.

The third general comment looked at article 6 on women and girls.

And in the general comment the committee notes that women and girls with disabilities have been silenced and thus women and girls with disabilities are disproportionately underrepresented in public decisionmaking.

The committee identified that the power imbalances and multiple forms of discrimination have meant that girls and women with disabilities have fewer opportunities to establish or join organisations that can represent their needs as women, children and persons with disabilities.

That's a major issue under article 6. Ensuring that women and girls have access to participation.

The final general comment published earlier this year, number 4. On article 24, the right to inclusive education.

Again it was identified that participation is enhanced and facilitated through the realisation of inclusive education.

the committee met a number of comments about how inclusive education can facilitate political participation. The committee recommended a curricula for all students, must include the topic of citizenship and promote the skills of self advocacy and self representation.

ntation, as these skills are a fundamental basis for participation in political and public life. People with disabilities are given the tools to challenge and to demand that state parties remove barriers that prevent them from exercising the rights.

The committee in relation to inclusive education. Noted that public affairs include forming and participating in student organisations.

And all state parties should promote an environment where people with disabilities can form, join and effectively and fully participate in student organisations. And in order to facilitate that, the committee said that state parties have to provide accommodations such as forms of communication and interpretation to facilitate students, joining the organisations.

Okay. So, to ask you. In terms of the right to political participation. What is the situation? Good or bad?

Do you think your state is fully compliant with the obligations under article 29? I see somebody nodding.

- Just thought, they are on a good way.

But article 29 is not fully implemented.

-Anybody else?

- In the UK we have a situation, because we have the equality act 2010. Then the rights of people with disabilities gets governed.-

And article 29 is compliant.

- Anybody else?

Well, this graph is from the fundamental rights agency 2014.

In terms of restrictions on legal capacity and article 29.

Only 7 at that time member states of the EU had no legal restrictions in place. Whereas 21 states did.

That report I have a reference to it in the paper.

You can look that up and you can see in the research how your state actually does.

That research is interesting.

And identified 5 main issues in relation to political participation at the EU level. They said there was a need to lift legal and administrative barriers to political participation.

Accessibility was a big issue. Voting procedures, facilities and election materials needed to be more accessible.

Their scope for greater accessibility.

One of the interesting things in this report. They acknowledged the need of opportunities for participation in public life for people with disabilities.

That has been neglected in a lot of the conversation around article 29.

The need to increase awareness of the right to political participation.

And collecting data was a big issue.

In research, the Fundamental rights agency found there was a deficit of data.

And need for more data in order to better assess if state parties did their job.

The formulation of article 29 on the right of persons with disabilities.

It has to be seen as an innovative provision and articulation to the right of public and political participation.

It is quite useful.

And what article 29 does is that it requires the electoral process designed in a manner that it is non discriminatory.

As such the state parties are required to make accommodations. So that persons with disabilities can exercise their rights of political participation on equal basis with others.

Inadequate amount of attention has been given to participate in public life and political system.

A lot of work has been looked at the restrictions.

And hasn't been broader to encompass all of the scope.

Provisions in the crpd dealing with issues such as access and participation.

What these rights is to try to remove barriers in general and in specific contexts. I want to emphasize.

what we should see as human rights lawyers, advocates, is that article 29 is a tool where the barriers can be removed.

That restrict the full realisation of the right.

And the committee on the rights of persons with disabilities, if you look what they are saying, accessibility and restrictions of - equal capacity.

They have a clear obligation to protect and promote the right of persons with disabilities.

I leave it there. Thank you very much.

I look forward to having discussion with you. Thank you.

- Thank you very much for a fascinating presentation.

And so timely.

The floor is now open for questions.

A lot of the issues around the question of political participation.

Are ultimately quite practical questions.

Can people get into the polling station would be one of them.

What restrictions do you put as a state on the right to vote?

Can you put any restrictions on the right to vote?

So these are all the questions.

And I'm sure there will be many others from within the room.

I'm very pleased to see that Charles stimulated you by asking questions during the session.

Steven?

- I can entirely understand all the accommodation issues.

I was startled when you mentioned juries.

How does the right of the individual to get a fair decision from a jury, the dependants?

How is that compatible with the suggestion that somebody who is incapable of making decisions can sit on a jury?

- This is something that I spent a lot of thinking about.

I worked for the law reform in Ireland.

I wrote a paper on that. One chapter was on the eligibility to participate in jury service.

I know in England, the act of 1974. The only people excluded from juries are persons with disabilities and people victim from serious offenses.

The right to a fair trial is hugely important.

And the exclusion of people who are deaf and hearing impaired. That seems to be the major issue in relation to the current law reform conversation.

Around eligibility of jury service.

Somebody who is deaf or hearing impaired.

They require a sign language interpreter to ensure that they can understand proceedings.

And discharge their civic duty.

They also need that person to go with them in the jury room.

We have this rule called the jury secrecy rule.

You can only have 12 people in the jury room.

That's one of the big impediments.

To people who have a hearing impairment or deaf.

From sitting on a jury.

So, there is a big debate around that.

In some jurisdictions they have been able to, since the Americans disability act.

There has been a change that law.

People who are deaf are able to sit in jury service.

Your question...

- It wasn't the issue I was interested in.

- In the general comment, the exclusion of people who are also deaf and hearing impaired.

The other issue who may have a mental health problem.

The law can be discriminatory.

In Ireland under the act of 1976. Anybody who has a mental illness.

Who regularly attends a doctor, is excluded.

It is inconsistent with the CRPD.

The greater difficulty is around somebody with an intellectual disability.

Whether or not they have the mental capacity to discharge.

What the committee are getting at here.

There are blanket exclusions for people with disabilities on juries.

They have the view that that is an unlawful discrimination.

Nobody should sit on the jury... The right of fair trial is most important.

I think from a law reform perspective.

The best way to deal with that is not to have a discriminatory restriction of people with intellectual disabilities.

From sitting on juries.

I think it should be up to a judge who has the evidence.

At the impediment stage.

To make decisions who can sit on a jury.

What the committee are doing is that these blanket exclusions of people discharge of civic duty should be done away with.

In the US some of the research actually on participation in juries.

They link actually participating on juries to be more politically engaged.

They become better citizens, they vote more. More engaged.

I think this type of process, sitting on a jury.

I don't think you should exclude people with disabilities on a blanket discriminatory perspective.

That people with disabilities can serve in a jury.

- Any other questions?

(no sound)

Sorry. I should have spoken in the microphone.

Any other questions?

While you are thinking about that.

Can I just throw this reflection in.

We focused a lot on mental capacity.

If you think about the project of non discrimination law in relation to disability is trying to do.

From the point of view of states parties.

At its heart it is trying to work out when something is impossible for a person to do.

It is a bit like some of the other things we do as lawyers.

Suppose you are only to do something only at night.

If it is day, you are not able to do that thing.

Some lawyers, have to work out when it is day or night.

Of course there is a continuum between day and night.

What I think is interesting. I'd be interested to hear people's reflections on this.

I leave you very little time to give them.

Is, whether that direction of travel that the convention indicates, is something that we are always going to grapple with.

Or something that the states can manage quite easily.

For example, we know that the Strasbourg court doesn't view mental incapacity as completely unacceptable.

As a way of stopping people voting.

We know this.

Because they have envisaged a situation with weighty reasons that might justify the reasons.

On the other hand, we are hearing promoting the convention believe it should never be a ground.

For prohibiting somebody from voting.

Do people think we are going to see a convergence between those 2 positions?

Oliver yesterday thought it would be a change of heart.

By the Strasbourg court.

It is that consistent with the UN convention being an interpretative convention.

Through existing human rights.

These are some of the questions.

I throw them out.

So that people can have 3 minutes in which me to give a concise answer.

On those very easy questions.

Any other questions?

We have, yes.

- One small comment. Does this fit with the idea that the convention is interpretive.

That the Human rights might change the view.

We treat the European convention as a living instrument.

That enables us to change our approach.

To more modern ways of thinking about disability.

I don' t think that, I think that that fits okay with the convention being an interpretive treaty.

It is not something new.

- Thank you for that.

The purpose of my question was to provoke some thoughts on the living instrument concept of the convention of human rights.

And indeed other human rights instruments.

It seems to me though, that what we are doing as lawyers.

And everybody else who talks to lawyers and legislators.

What we are trying to do is narrow down the area in which we say a person cannot do something.

And to that extent, blanket bans will go.

Although shrink over time.

But there is a question as to whether you simply assert that capacity should never be a ground for prohibition.

Or whether you try to chip away at the areas in which the blanket ban can be applied.

Or a ban can be applied.

I' m interested of Charles.

- the real focus is how you can support somebody, accommodate them in exercising their right.

I think there is that tension between the interpretation of legal capacity by the European court.

Which isn' t fully on board with the commission of article 12 of the UNCRPD.

I think the focus, coming from the conversation on article 12 and 29.

Needs to be about ensuring accessibility.

And ensuring that as far as possible states are doing what they can to support people to exercise the right.

If there is a genuine effort, not only to remove the restrictions.

But also to provide the supports.

I think we' ll be making great progress on ensuring the realisation for public and political participation.

- Thanks very much Charles.

No other questions? He says in a leading manner.

Very good. At this point I should put on one of the hats.

To move from being the person asking the questions.

To the person supposedly with some of the answers.