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<td>European Committee of Social Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbr.</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECtHR</td>
<td>European Court of Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>European Social Charter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCNM</td>
<td>Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNV</td>
<td>Federatie Nederlandse Vakbeweging (trade union confederation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>United Nations General Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>General Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL</td>
<td>GroenLinks (Dutch green left party)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>General Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRC</td>
<td>Human Rights Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IACHR</td>
<td>Inter-American Court of Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCPR</td>
<td>International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICERD</td>
<td>Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICESCR</td>
<td>International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICJ</td>
<td>International Court of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>International Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILA</td>
<td>International Law Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO</td>
<td>Interstedelijk Studenten Overleg (Dutch National Student Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWS</td>
<td>Johannes Wier Stichting (Dutch NGO for health professionals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBR</td>
<td>Landelijk Bureau Racismebestrijding (Dutch National Bureau against Racial Discrimination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOI</td>
<td>List Of Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOIPR</td>
<td>List Of Issues Prior to Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Member of Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICM</td>
<td>Nederlands Juristen Comité voor de Mensenrechten (Dutch section of the International Commission of Jurists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZBORA</td>
<td>New Zealand Bill Of Rights Act 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAS</td>
<td>Organisation of American States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCHR</td>
<td>Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Optional Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPCAT</td>
<td>Optional Protocol to the UN Convention Against Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PvdA</td>
<td>Partij van de Arbeid (Dutch centre-left social democratic labour party)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVV</td>
<td>Party Voor de Vrijheid (Dutch right-wing party)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rb.</td>
<td>Rechtbank (Dutch district court)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGP</td>
<td>Staatkundig Gereformeerde Partij (Dutch orthodox protestant party)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIM</td>
<td>Studie- en Informatiecentrum Mensenrechten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEU</td>
<td>Treaty on European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFEU</td>
<td>Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDHR</td>
<td>Universal Declaration of Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPR</td>
<td>Universal Periodic Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCLT</td>
<td>Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVD</td>
<td>Volkspartij voor Vrijheid en Democratie (Dutch centre-right liberal-conservative party)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVR</td>
<td>Vereniging voor Vrouw en Recht (Netherlands association for women and law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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