

# Supplementary Materials

The Proof is in the Process  
Self-Reporting under International Human Rights Treaties

Cosette D. Creamer & Beth A. Simmons

September 2019

---

## A Report Quality and Responsiveness

### A.1 Report Collection Process

We first sought to collect all state reports submitted under four core international human rights treaties: ICCPR, CEDAW, CAT, and CRC. The majority of these reports can be found in the UN Treaty Body Database (available here: <https://tbinternet.ohchr.org>). Some of the earlier reports are not available online; for those, we scanned reports from microfiche records. For the ICCPR, 467 reports were submitted between 1977 and 2014. We were able to collect and code the majority of these, but are missing 38 reports, primarily those submitted during the years 1987-1991. For CEDAW we were able to collect all reports submitted between 1982 and 2014 (584 in total). For CAT, we collected and coded all reports submitted between 1988 and 2011 (315 in total). For CRC, we collected and coded the majority of reports submitted between 1992 and 2014 (475 in total). For each treaty, a team of undergraduate research assistants was trained in a treaty-specific coding procedure (described below). The RAs read each report and filled out a treaty-specific coding worksheet in order to assign scores based on quality, responsiveness, and the inclusion of treaty-relevant data. These scores constitute the underlying data for in-text Figures 1, 2, and 3. Due to slight differences in coding instruments and score ranges across treaties, the underlying data was standardized by proportion of total possible score.

### A.2 ICCPR Coding Procedure

For the ICCPR, three RAs were trained to evaluate a report's quality and responsiveness under four treaty provisions: Article 17 (Right to Privacy); Article 19 (Freedom of Opinion/Expression); Article 26 (Equality before the Law/Non-Discrimination); Article 27 (Rights of Minorities). The RAs first completed a coding worksheet to assign scores on **implementation** and **compliance** (See Figure A1). The RA first identified whether the state recognized shortcomings in implementation and/or compliance of each article. For example, if the state recognized that its laws or policies fall short of fulfilling ICCPR requirements for the right to privacy (i.e. the law discriminates in some way, or fails to fully provide a right to privacy), the RA placed a check in the cell for recognition of shortcomings in **implementation** of Article 17 and indicated paragraph or page number from the report. If not, the RA left the cell blank. This was distinguished from recognizing shortcoming in terms of **compliance**, by which we mean actual practices on the ground or outcomes, and not laws, policies, or institutions. For example, if a state recognizes that there exists unequal enjoyment of the right to freedom of expression (Article 19), even if relevant laws are not discriminatory in any respect, and the report recognizes explicitly or somehow notes that actual practices are not

complying with Article 19, the RA checked the cell for recognition of shortcomings in compliance of Article 19. If not, the RA left the cell blank.

The second set of columns—Specificity of Measures to Address Shortcomings—was used to evaluate whether the state outlined within the report concrete and specific measures or plans to address the shortcoming in implementation or compliance, or whether changes had been enacted to address the shortcoming. For example, if a law is deficient, the report describes how the state is drafting a new law to remedy this, that there is a bill under consideration, etc. A measure is not considered specific if it is especially vague and not concrete, i.e. ‘the government is looking into ways to ensure the right to freedom of expression.’ On changes that have already been undertaken, the RA looked for the date of change and date of prior report submission, and only counted measures that had been undertaken after the date of prior report submission. Similar to Recognition of Shortcomings, if the report outlined specific measures, the RA placed a check and indicated paragraph/page number(s) in the relevant cell for Specificity of Measures to Address Shortcomings for implementation or compliance for a given article. If it did not, the RA left the cell blank.

Figure A1: ICCPR Reports Coding Worksheet

Country:

Report Number(s):

Article(s)	Implementation		Compliance	
	Recognition of shortcomings	Specificity of measures to address shortcomings	Recognition of shortcomings	Specificity of measures to address shortcomings
Article 17 (Right to Privacy)				
Article 19 (Freedom of Opinion or Expression)				
Article 26 (Equality before the Law/ Non-Discrimination)				
Article 27 (Rights of Minorities)				

Notes:

The worksheet was then used to complete the following coding instrument, which also included evaluation of a report in terms of **responsiveness** under each of the four treaty provisions and **data provision**.

1. How forthcoming is the report on implementation of the ICCPR provision (Articles 17, 19, 26, and 27), independent of responses to Committee concerns/questions from the previous review?

0 = includes only positive information about laws, policies and programs relevant to treaty obligations under the respective Article. Within worksheet, Recognition of Shortcomings not checked

1 = acknowledges at least one shortcoming with respect to implementation of the treaty provision. Within worksheet, Recognition of Shortcomings checked, but not Specificity of Measures

2 = acknowledges at least one shortcoming with respect to implementation of the treaty provision and outlines specific measures to address the shortcoming recognized. Within worksheet, both Recognition of Shortcomings and Specificity of Measures cells checked

2. How forthcoming is the report on compliance with the ICCPR provision (Articles 17, 19, 26, and 27), independent of responses to Committee concerns/questions from the previous review?

0 = includes only positive information about compliance outcomes relevant to treaty provision obligations or minimal but implicit recognition of shortcomings. Within worksheet, Recognition of Shortcomings not checked

1 = explicitly acknowledges shortcomings in compliance outcomes relevant to treaty provision obligations, but does not outline specific actions or measures to address those shortcomings. Within worksheet, Recognition of Shortcomings checked, but not Specificity of Measures

2 = explicitly acknowledges at least one shortcoming with respect to compliance outcomes relevant to treaty provision obligations, and outlines specific measures to address the shortcoming recognized. Within worksheet, both Recognition of Shortcomings and Specificity of Measures boxes checked

3. For all subsequent reports, how responsive is the report to Committee questions and recommendations from the previous review on the ICCPR provision?

0 = report does not reference, acknowledge or respond to any concerns of the treaty body with respect to that treaty provision

1 = references or acknowledges at least one concern of the treaty body with respect to that treaty provision. However, either only vague or passing reference, or largely justifies current policies and efforts

2 = references or acknowledges at least one concern of the treaty body with respect to that treaty provision and develops programs and approaches to address the concern(s) acknowledged

- 
4. Does the report contain meaningful data/statistics? Meaningful = provides information about outcomes relevant to treaty obligations

0 = no

1 = yes

For each report, the scores received for **implementation** and **compliance** for each of the four identified treaty provisions were combined to produce an overall **Quality Score**, which ranges from 0 to 16. The scores received for **responsiveness** under each Article were combined to produce an overall **Responsiveness Score**, which ranges from 0 to 8.

### A.3 CEDAW Coding Procedure

For CEDAW, a team of five RAs read and coded the entirety of each report. The RAs first completed a coding worksheet to assign scores on **implementation** and **compliance** (See Figure A2). The worksheet is broken down by CEDAW provision, as this is how the state report is typically structured. For each article, the RA placed a check in the ‘Recognition of Shortcomings’ column of the worksheet if the report has recognized shortcomings in implementation and/or compliance of that article. For example, if the state recognizes that its laws or policies fall short of fulfilling equality in education for females (i.e. the law discriminates in some way), a check was placed under recognition of shortcomings in implementation of Article 10. This is distinct from recognizing shortcoming in compliance with Article 10, in that compliance focuses on actual practices on the ground and not laws or policies or institutions, i.e. a state recognizes that there is unequal enrollment of females in primary education institutions. If a report recognizes explicitly or somehow notes that practices are not complying with Article 10, the RA placed a check in the recognition of shortcomings in compliance with Article 10 cell. The second set of columns—Specificity of Measures to Address Shortcomings—was used for the RA to evaluate whether the report lays out concrete and specific measures or plans to address the shortcoming in implementation or compliance it recognized. For example, if a law is deficient, it describes how it is drafting a new law to remedy this, that there is a bill under consideration, etc. A measure is not considered specific if is especially vague and not concrete, i.e. ‘the government is looking into ways to increase female enrollment.’

Figure A2: CEDAW Reports Coding Worksheet

**Country:**  
**Report Number(s):**

Article(s)	Implementation		Compliance	
	Recognition of shortcomings	Specificity of measures to address shortcomings	Recognition of shortcomings	Specificity of measures to address shortcomings
Art 5: Social and Cultural Standards				
Art 6: Suppression of trafficking in women and exploitation of prostitution				
Art 7: Political and public life (voting and political participation)				
Art 8: International representation				
Art 9: Nationality				
Art 10: Right to education				
Art 11: Right to employment				
Art 12: Right to health				
Art 13: Equality in economic and social life				
Art 14: Women in rural areas				
Art 15: Legal Rights – equality before the law				
Art 16: Marriage and family relations				
<b>TOTAL CHECKS:</b>				

---

The worksheet was then used to complete the following coding instrument, which also included evaluation of a report in terms of **responsiveness** and **data provision**.

1. How forthcoming is the report on implementation of CEDAW provisions, independent of responses to Committee concerns/questions from the previous review?

0 = includes only positive information about laws, policies and programs relevant to treaty obligations

1 = mostly positive information about laws, policies and programs relevant to treaty, some discussion of shortcomings. Based on worksheet, state recognizes shortcomings for 4 or fewer provisions; of those recognized, state outlines specific measures to address 3 or fewer shortcomings

2 = positive information, but fairly systematically acknowledges shortcomings in implementation with some specificity regarding measures to address shortcomings. Based on worksheet, state either: (i) recognizes shortcomings for 5-12 provisions, and outlines specific measures to address less than or equal to half of those shortcomings recognized; OR (ii) recognizes shortcomings for 4 provisions and outlines specific measures to address all four of those shortcomings

3 = positive information, but fairly systematically acknowledges shortcomings in implementation with fairly systematic specificity regarding measures to address shortcomings. Based on worksheet, state recognizes shortcomings for 5-12 provisions, and outlines specific measures to address greater than half of those shortcomings recognized

2. How forthcoming is the report on compliance with CEDAW provisions, independent of responses to Committee concerns/questions from the previous review?

0 = no mention of compliance

1 = includes only positive information about compliance outcomes relevant to treaty obligations or minimal recognition of shortcomings. Based on worksheet, minimal recognition is defined as recognition of shortcomings for 1-3 provisions. Even if the state outlines specific measures to address all shortcomings recognized, still code as 1

2 = mostly positive information about compliance outcomes relevant to treaty, some discussion of shortcomings and minimal discussion of specific measures to address those shortcomings. Based on worksheet, state recognizes shortcomings for 4-7 provisions, and of those recognized, state outlines specific measures to address less than 4 shortcomings

---

3 = positive information, but fairly systematically acknowledges shortcomings in compliance outcomes relevant to treaty obligations, with some discussion of specific measures to address those shortcomings. Based on worksheet, state either: (i) recognizes shortcomings for 4-7 provisions, and outlines specific measures to address four or more shortcomings recognized; OR (ii) recognizes shortcomings for 8-12 provisions, and outlines specific measures to address less than or equal to half of those shortcomings recognized

4 = positive information, but fairly systematically acknowledges shortcomings in compliance outcomes with fairly systematic specificity regarding measures to address shortcomings. Based on worksheet, state recognizes shortcomings for 8-12 provisions, and outlines specific measures to address greater than half of those shortcomings recognized

3. For all subsequent reports, how responsive is the report to Committee questions and recommendations from the previous review?

0 = does not acknowledge or respond to any concerns of the treaty body

1 = only passing reference to committee concerns or vague response to committee concerns; OR responds to questions posed by the treaty body; OR responds to General Recommendations of the treaty body; OR acknowledges 1-3 concluding observations of treaty body but largely justifies current policies and efforts

2 = acknowledges 4+ concluding observations of the treaty body but largely justifies current policies and efforts; OR acknowledges 1-3 concluding observations of treaty body and develops programs and approaches to address the majority of these concerns

3 = acknowledges 4+ concluding observations of the treaty body and develops programs and approaches to meet the majority of those concerns acknowledged

4. Does the report contain meaningful data/statistics? Meaningful = provides information about outcomes relevant to treaty obligations

0 = no

1 = yes

For each report, the scores received for **implementation** and **compliance** were combined to produce an overall **Quality Score**, which ranges from 0 to 7.



---

## A.4 CAT Coding Procedure

For CAT, one RA read and coded the entirety of each report, employing the following coding instrument:

1. How forthcoming is the report on implementation of CAT provisions, independent of responses to Committee concerns/questions from the previous review?

0 = includes only positive information about laws, policies and programs relevant to treaty obligations

1 = mostly positive information about laws, policies and programs relevant to treaty, some discussion of shortcomings

2 = positive information, but explicitly and fairly systematically acknowledges shortcomings in implementation

2. How forthcoming is the report on compliance with CAT provisions, independent of responses to Committee concerns/questions from the previous review?

0 = no mention of compliance

1 = includes only positive information about compliance outcomes relevant to treaty obligations

2 = mostly positive information about compliance outcomes relevant to treaty, some discussion of shortcomings/future goals

3 = positive information, but explicitly acknowledges shortcomings in compliance outcomes relevant to treaty obligations

3. For all subsequent reports, how responsive is the report to Committee questions and recommendations from the previous review?

0 = does not acknowledge or respond to any concerns of the treaty body or only makes passing reference to committee concerns and provides vague response

1 = responds to questions posed by the treaty body

2 = acknowledges some concerns of the treaty body regarding compliance, but largely justifies current policies and efforts

3 = extensively acknowledges concerns of the treaty body and develops programs and approaches to meet concerns

- 
4. Does the report contain meaningful data/statistics? Meaningful = provides information about outcomes relevant to treaty obligations

0 = no

1 = yes

For **implementation**, a report received a score of *0* if it did not explicitly note shortcomings in domestic laws or institutions. If the report only briefly mentioned that its domestic criminal law does not contain a definition of torture, it still received a score of *0*. If the report noted the lack of a definition of torture and discussed this shortcoming thoroughly or supplemented it with other acknowledgments of laws that are lacking, it received a score of *1*. Reports containing shortcomings presented as a criticism from a domestic body or committee, as well as those from the The European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (ECPT) also received a score of *1*. For a score of *2*, ‘systematically’ is defined as including some discussion of changes in response to the shortcomings (i.e. amendments proposed, a new draft bill, etc). Changes to legislation as a result of recommendations of a domestic committee or ECPT would also count for a score of *2*. The actions or changes referenced can be either those taken before the report was submitted (but subsequent to the previous report), currently ongoing, or detail plans for future action (i.e. point out problems that existed and were then fixed, being fixed, or will be fixed).

For **compliance**, a report received a score of *0* if the report only discussed laws or policies and made no reference to human rights outcomes or practices on the ground. If a report made any mention of results or practices, including any statistics presented that contribute to the data score, it received a score of *1*. A report also received a score of *1* if it acknowledged individual cases of events occurring, such as violations, extraditions, etc., or if it stated that ‘there were no cases of . . .’ Citing supreme court cases does not count for a score of *1*. A report received a score of *2* if it acknowledged one or two substantial shortcomings, even if other positive information is mentioned or if it referenced specific difficulties or challenges as reasons for the shortcomings (i.e. financial constraints, lack of capacity). Unlike reports that received a score of *1*, the report is not simply presenting facts that are (objectively) shortcomings but explicitly acknowledges them as such. Shortcomings presented as a criticism from a domestic body or committee also count for a score of *2*, but the report must acknowledge the occurrence of the shortcomings, not merely the allegation. A report received a score of *3* if its discussion of compliance shortcomings was systematic and referenced some action taken to address the shortcoming(s). These reports were distinguished from those receiving a high score on implementation in that the responses were focused on an application/result rather than legislation (i.e. training more judges, adjusting prisoners’ diets). For a report to receive a score of *3* it must either mention briefly actions taken in response to multiple

shortcomings or provide a substantial, thorough response to one or two compliance shortcomings. The actions taken in response to shortcomings can be either taken before the report was submitted (but subsequent to the previous report), currently ongoing, or plans for future action (i.e. point out problems that existed and were then fixed, being fixed, or will be fixed).

For each report, the scores received for **implementation** and **compliance** were combined to produce an overall **Quality Score**, which ranges from  $0$  to  $5$ .

For the **Responsiveness Score**, each report was searched for reference to the Committee's concluding observations, recommendations, or questions. Reports that received a score of  $0$  made no mention of the Committee's recommendations, while those receiving a score of  $1$  answered questions raised by the Committee (either requests for information included at the end of the Committee's concluding observations on its previous report or additional information requested by the Committee prior to report submission). Reports receiving a score of  $2$  either responded to recommendations by explaining why the status quo already meets the recommendation or by rejecting the recommendation on other grounds. These reports 'largely' justified current policies and efforts in that they either justified three or more recommendations (when the report discusses a large number of concluding observations) or a substantial proportion of the recommendations referenced. Reports scored  $3$  discuss the majority of the Committee's concluding observations and includes references to a change that has already been made since the recommendations were received or plans for current/future changes.

## A.5 CRC Coding Procedure

For the CRC, three RAs were trained to evaluate a report's quality and responsiveness under three 'clusters' of treaty provisions:

- Cluster IV: Civil Rights and Freedoms (Articles 7, 8, and 13-17)
- Cluster V: Violence against children (Articles 19, 34, 39, and female genital mutilation and forced marriage)
- Cluster VIII: Education, leisure and cultural activities (Articles 28-31)

Figure A3: CRC Reports Coding Worksheet

Country:Report Number(s) & Year:Year of Last Report:

	Recognition of Shortcomings (paragraph numbers)	Specificity of Measures to address shortcomings (paragraph numbers)	Total Score (out of 2)
<b>CLUSTER IV: CIVIL RIGHTS &amp; FREEDOMS</b>			
Article 7: Birth registration, name & nationality			
Article 8 - Preservation of identity			
Article 13 – Freedom of expression and the right to information			
Article 14 - Freedom of thought, conscience and religion			
Article 15 - Freedom of association and of peaceful assembly			
Article 16 - Protection of privacy and protection of image			
Article 17 - Access to information from a diversity of sources			
<b>CLUSTER V: VIOLENCE AGAINST CHILDREN</b>			
Article 19 – Abuse and neglect			
Article 34 – Sexual exploitation and sexual abuse			
Article 39 – Measures to promote the physical and psychological recovery of child victims			
Female Genital Mutilation & Forced Marriage			
<b>CLUSTER VIII: EDUCATION, CULTURE &amp; LEISURE ACTIVITIES</b>			
Article 28 – The right to education			
Article 29 – The aims of education			
Article 30 – Cultural rights of children belonging to indigenous and minority groups			
Article 31 – Rest, play, leisure, recreation and cultural and artistic activities			

---

The RAs first completed a coding worksheet to assign scores on **Report Quality** (See Figure A3). For each article identified within the coding worksheet, the RA first evaluated a report for whether the state recognized shortcomings in implementation and/or compliance of that article. For example, if the report recognized that its laws or policies fall short of fulfilling CRC requirements for the right to protection from sexual exploitation and abuse, the RA placed a check in the cell for recognition of shortcomings of Article 34 and indicate paragraph or page number. Similarly, the RA would place a check in that cell for recognition of shortcomings if the report noted deficiencies in actual practices on the ground or outcomes, i.e. a state recognizes that it falls short in practice in protecting children from sexual exploitation and abuse (Article 34), even if relevant laws are in place to prohibit such violence against children.

The second column of cells—Specificity of Measures to Address Shortcomings—was used to evaluate whether the state within the report outlined concrete and specific measures or plans to address the shortcoming in implementation or compliance, or whether changes had already been enacted to address the shortcoming. For example, if a law is deficient, the report describes how the state is drafting a new law to remedy this, that there is a bill under consideration, etc. A measure is not considered specific if it is especially vague and not concrete, i.e. ‘the government is looking into ways to increase ensure the right to freedom of expression for children.’ On changes that have already been undertaken, the RA looked for the date of change and date of prior report submission, and only counted measures that had been undertaken after the date of prior report submission. Similar to Recognition of Shortcomings, if the report outlined specific measures, the RA placed a check and indicated paragraph/page number(s) in the relevant cell. If it did not, the RA left the cell blank.

For each report, the number of checks (0-2) was summed for each article and then all article scores combined to produce an overall **Quality Score**, which ranges from 0 to 30. The RAs further coded each report for **Responsiveness** and **Data** by answering the following questions:

1. For all subsequent reports, how responsive is the report to Committee questions and recommendations from the previous review on each CRC provision?

0 = report does not reference, acknowledge or respond to any concerns of the treaty body with respect to the treaty provisions

1 = references or acknowledges at least one concern of the treaty body with respect to treaty provisions. However, either only vague or passing reference, or largely justifies current policies and efforts

2 = references or acknowledges at least one concern of the treaty body with respect to treaty provisions and develops programs and approaches to address the concern(s)

acknowledged

2. Does the report contain meaningful data/statistics? Meaningful = provides information about outcomes relevant to treaty obligations

0 = no

1 = yes

---

## B Media Attention in Latin America

This section describes the search process for domestic newspaper references to the CAT/CmAT or CEDAW/CmEDAW (and specifically the periodic review process) employed for each states party within Latin America. The data collection procedure was developed by the authors and undertaken by two research assistants (fluent in Spanish and Portuguese), in conjunction with one of the authors. Each country-publication search was performed more than once, through all digital databases available through Harvard University and University of Minnesota Libraries, in order to ensure the most comprehensive coverage feasible.

1. For each country, identify the top seven newspapers (by circulation).<sup>1</sup> When their rank is unclear but they were marked as a major newspaper in the country, include in a second column of newspapers to distinguish those from newspapers that were clearly ranked as top circulation newspapers. We focused on publications with national circulation and/or regional papers that are widely read or influential. We started with the top three, but if there are others with high circulation, included those as well. Note any particularities or characteristics of newspaper, i.e. government-sponsorship or affiliation; ideological bias; monthly, weekly, daily; circulation (by year if available). Information on ideological leanings of publications and context of media and news publications was supplemented through conversations with Latin Americanists, experts on a particular country, and in some instances nationals of the country.
2. For the top two or three newspapers by circulation, identify for the country the requisite search-years, based on timing of reports to the Committee and consideration by the Committee (date of concluding observations). Search one year prior to date of submission of report to one year following date of concluding observations of the Committee. Indicate for each publication the search years available in full-text, and the database where available. You may have access to or be required to use multiple databases for each newspaper/search year—please indicate when this is the case and perform searches within each database separately.
3. To identify available databases, consult the following:
  - <http://libguides.utsa.edu/latamnews>
  - Search newspaper title in <http://hollis.harvard.edu/>. Library references should provide information on electronic access, years available and whether it is full-text searchable. Note permanent electronic link to hollis reference on country worksheet.

---

<sup>1</sup>Circulation figures obtained either via: [www.pressreference.com](http://www.pressreference.com) or the World Association of Newspapers and News Publishers, World Press Trends Database (<http://www.wptdatabase.org/>).

- 
- ProQuest Latin American Newsstand (available at: [http://www.proquest.com/products-services/pq\\_latin\\_am\\_news.html](http://www.proquest.com/products-services/pq_latin_am_news.html))
  - LexisNexis Academic sources for Latin America (available: [http://www.amdev.net/rpt\\_download.php?reg=LAT](http://www.amdev.net/rpt_download.php?reg=LAT))
  - Newspaper website archive<sup>2</sup>

#### 4. CAT Search terms:

- ‘convencion contra tortura’
- ‘Comité contra la Tortura’
- ‘Comité’ + ‘tortura’
- ‘convencion’ + ‘tortura’
- ‘tortura’

#### 5. CEDAW Search terms:

- ‘convencion’ + ‘discriminación + ‘mujer’
- ‘Comité’ + ‘discriminación + ‘mujer’
- ‘cedaw’
- ‘convencion’ + ‘mujer’
- If too many results, combine ‘convencion’ or ‘Comité’ with ‘discriminación contra mujer’

6. Browse through search results, reading headlines/summaries, and collect those articles that discuss, in reference to the search-specific country, either the Committee OR Convention. Make a special note if the article discusses the periodic review process for that country.

#### 7. Article summaries:

- For each article-hit, provide: date, article title (translation in parentheses), and direct URL (if available; if not, describe database/search used to find the article).
- Write 2-3 sentence summary of article content
- Code each article for: tone; reference to CmAT/CmEDAW; reference to reporting procedure; reference to any non-governmental organizations (and name); reference to any government official/actor (and name).

---

<sup>2</sup>During the first search, LexisNexis, Factiva, and the newspapers’ websites were all used. Factiva returned no results for all the newspapers; LexisNexis included some, but not many, and those were still limited by the date at which the archive started uploading them. For newspapers’ websites, the quality of website search and dates of archives varied considerably across countries. A major issue is that most newspapers have not been digitized before 2000 or even later, so almost none of the searches are complete for all relevant years.



Table A1: CAT &amp; CEDAW Periodic Review in Latin America

<b>Country</b>	<b>News Outlets</b>	<b>Search Years</b>
Argentina	<i>La Nación</i>	2004-present
	<i>Clarín</i>	1997-1999
	<i>Clarín</i>	2004-present
Bolivia	<i>La Razón</i>	2008-present
	<i>La Prensa</i>	2011-present
	<i>El Diario Nacional</i>	2014-present
	<i>El Deber</i>	2010-present
Brazil	<i>O Globo</i>	2006-present
	<i>Folha de Sao Paulo</i>	2005-present
Chile	<i>El Mercurio</i>	2005-present
	<i>La Tercera</i>	2006-present
Colombia	<i>El Espectador</i>	2009-present
	<i>El Tiempo</i>	1995-present
Costa Rica	<i>La Nación</i>	1995-present
Ecuador	<i>El Universo</i>	2005-present
	<i>El Comercio</i>	2005-present
El Salvador	<i>El Salvador</i>	2005-present
Honduras	<i>La Tribuna</i>	2006-present
	<i>La Prensa</i>	2008-present
	<i>El Heraldo</i>	2009-present
Mexico	<i>El Universal</i>	2005-present
	<i>La Prensa</i>	2011-present
	<i>Reforma</i>	1995-present
Nicaragua	<i>El Nuevo Diario</i>	2009-present
	<i>La Prensa</i>	2009-present
Paraguay	<i>La Nación</i>	2010-present
	<i>Ultima Hora</i>	2010-present
	<i>Paraguay Noticias</i>	2010-present
	<i>ABC Color</i>	2006-present
Peru	<i>El Comercio</i>	2005-present
	<i>Peru.21</i>	2004-present
	<i>Ojo</i>	2012-2014
Uruguay	<i>El Pais</i>	2005-present
	<i>La Republica</i>	2005-present
Venezuela	<i>El Universal</i>	1998-present
	<i>El Nacional</i>	2005-present
	<i>Ultimas Noticias</i>	2005-present