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FOREWORD

“Overcoming poverty is not a gesture of charity. It is an act of justice. It is the protection of fundamental human rights. Everyone everywhere has the right to live with dignity, free from fear and oppression, free from hunger and thirst, and free to express themselves and associate at will.”

Nelson Mandela

UNDP’s work is based on the belief that people experience poverty not only as a lack of income but also as a lack of education or health care or as a lack of dignity and participation in their community. These dimensions of people’s lives have been considered so important by governments all around the world that they have recognized them as entitlements - as human rights - of their people, both in national and in international law. So the strive for human development is not an act of charity but is about creating an enabling environment for people to exercise their choices which includes their civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights, including the right to development. Human Rights thus serve as a bedrock in advancing UNDP’s development mandate.

Our overall objective is to strengthen the capacities of duty-bearers to fulfill their obligations and of rights-holders to claim their rights. In practice, this may take different forms, for example supporting the Guatemalan Ministry of Health in ensuring that basic health services consider indigenous practices so that people actually use the services (see Case Study Guatemala), assisting persons with disabilities in Liberia in assessing whether they benefit equally from the implementation of the country’s Poverty Reduction Strategy (see Case Study Liberia), or by enabling National Human Rights Institutions to strengthen their capacity in engaging on human rights with governments, civil society and others.

The aim of this folder of issue briefs is to make this growing body of experience of UNDP and its partners in mainstreaming human rights in development policies and programmes accessible to a wider audience. The initial issue briefs in this folder draw largely on experiences from a pilot project, supported by the Government of Germany between 2004 and 2011 and the Global Human Rights Strengthening Project of UNDP. There are three types of issue briefs: Concepts, Tools and Case Studies. They provide, inter alia, information on:

- Conceptual Framework – What does Mainstreaming Human Rights mean?
- Human Rights Bodies – What information does the UN human rights system produce on human development?
- Three-Step Problem Analysis
- Mainstreaming Human Rights into Development Policies and Programmes – An Initial Checklist
- Using Human Rights to Achieve the MDG Target on Water and Sanitation
- Case Study: Argentina
- Case Study: Bosnia & Herzegovina
- Case Study: Guatemala
- Case Study: Liberia

We hope that these initial briefs will serve as useful guidance and inspiration. Moreover, we consider this publication a collective work in progress and invite your feedback and experiences in mainstreaming human rights for inclusion in future issue briefs.

Many thanks in advance!

March 2012

Selim Jahan
Director, Poverty Practice
Bureau for Development Policy
United Nations Development Programme

Geraldine Fraser-Moleketi
Director, Democratic Governance Group
Bureau for Development Policy
United Nations Development Programme
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Introduction:
Mainstreaming Human Rights in Development Policies and Programming

Why Should We Mainstream Human Rights into Development Policies and Programmes?

It is part of our mandate

UN member States and UN agencies have committed to integrating human rights into development policies and programmes. Already in 1945, the UN member States agreed “to achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all”, according to Article 1 of the UN Charter.

For a few decades, the link between the UN’s work on development/humanitarian issues and its work on human rights was weak, mainly for political reasons: human rights had become highly politicized — with some States prioritizing civil and political rights and others stressing the importance of economic, social and cultural rights — while development was dealt with more pragmatically through technical assistance. With the end of this global ideological divide in the 1990s, the link between human rights and development was re-established, including through the UN. Some examples are:

• 1997 — In his UN Reform Agenda, the Secretary-General Kofi Annan calls for the integration — or mainstreaming — of human rights into all of the UN’s work:
  “A major task for the future will be to enhance the human rights programme and integrate it into the broad range of the Organization’s activities, including in development and humanitarian areas.”

• 2000 — In the Millennium Declaration, member States resolve to “spare no effort to promote […] respect for all internationally recognized human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the right to development”.

• 2005 — In his milestone report ‘In Larger Freedom’, the UN Secretary-General states, “We will not enjoy development without security, we will not enjoy security without development, and we will not enjoy either without respect for human rights”.

• 2008 — UNDP’s Strategic Plan recalls the 2005 Summit Outcome and affirms that “UNDP will uphold universal United Nations norms and standards, including those related to human rights” (while clarifying that UNDP does not have a normative or monitoring role with regard to human rights).

• 2010 — In the MDG Summit Outcome Document, member States recognize that “our common fundamental values, including freedom, equality, solidarity, tolerance, respect for all human rights, respect for nature and shared responsibility, are essential for achieving the Millennium Development Goals”. It also explains the relevance of this for various areas, including health and education.
Mainstreaming human rights contributes to a human development approach (see diagram).

For an effective application of human rights in development, professionals from a variety of disciplines need to work together, understand each other's terminologies and draw on each other's perspectives and experiences. This makes it important to ensure a collaborative and constructive environment and to agree on substantive questions that everybody can relate to.

**What is this publication about?**

This publication provides guidance to UNDP colleagues on how to mainstream human rights into development policies and programmes at the national, regional and global levels. It consists of a set of Issue Briefs reflecting experiences to mainstream human rights into UNDP policies and programmes and, in collaboration with national partners, into national policies and programmes. This publication does not intend to be comprehensive and will be expanded as the body of experience across the organizations grows. The publication includes three types of Issue Briefs:

**Concepts** provide a succinct introduction to key human rights concepts, such as human rights standards and principles and key bodies in the UN human rights system.

**Tools** help colleagues and development practitioners use human rights standards and principles throughout the programming cycle. For example, the 'Three-Step Analysis' helps analyse immediate, underlying and root causes of development issues as well as the roles and capacity gaps of the involved actors.

**Case Studies** offer examples from countries where UNDP, often in collaboration with other UN agencies, has supported national partners in their efforts to apply human rights standards and principles in development policies or programmes. The case studies highlight the principles and standards of particular relevance in each example. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, for example, municipalities developed and implemented development plans that addressed the situation of the most marginalized. In Guatemala, the health ministry involved patients to review its basic health programme from a right-to-health perspective and is now working to ensure that services are more culturally acceptable and responsive to patients' feedback.

Please note that the electronic version of this publication includes numerous hyperlinks to additional resources.
Conceptual Framework: Mainstreaming Human Rights in Development

What does ‘mainstreaming human rights’ mean?

Mainstreaming human rights in development refers to the overall process of integrating human rights in development programming, and the realization of human rights through development programming. The UN was mandated to mainstream human rights by the UN member States in the 2005 World Summit Outcome (A/RES/60/1 — “We resolve to [...] support the further mainstreaming of human rights throughout the United Nations system”). The Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA) is the methodology that is commonly used to mainstream human rights into development. In order to do so within the UN system, in 2003, UN agencies, funds and programmes agreed on the UN Common Understanding on a HRBA (UNCU). The UNCU is derived from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and the nine core international human rights treaties such as the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICECSR, 1966) and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC, 1989) (see Issue Brief: Human Rights Bodies).

The key tenets of the UNCU are:

• All programmes of development cooperation, policies and technical assistance should further the realization of human rights as laid down in the UDHR and other international human rights instruments.

• Human rights standards contained in, and principles derived from, the UDHR and other human rights instruments guide all development cooperation and programming in all sectors and in all phases of the programming process.

• Development cooperation contributes to the development of the capacities of duty-bearers to meet their obligations and/or rights-holders to claim their rights.

What are the Human Rights Principles that the UN Common Understanding refers to?

Equality & Non-discrimination: All human beings are entitled to their human rights without discrimination of any kind on the grounds of race, colour, sex, age, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, disability, property, birth or other status (UNCU, 2003). This means that an effort needs to be made to ensure that everyone, not just those easiest to reach or those with most influence, can benefit from policies and programmes on health, education or employment. In practice, this will often require the collection and analysis of more highly disaggregated data and prioritized attention to those most disadvantaged.

Participation & Inclusion: Every person and all peoples are entitled to active, free and meaningful participation in, contribution to, and enjoyment of civil, economic, social, cultural and political development (UNCU, 2003). This means going beyond occasional consultations and requires concrete measures to ensure that people can voice their expectations and opinions throughout decision-making processes that affect them, e.g., by allowing free association and ensuring access to information. Practically, it may require developing the capacity of civil society actors to participate in policy processes or making public information available in accessible formats and minority languages.

Accountability & Rule of Law: Good development programming requires stakeholders to be accountable for results. Human rights go further by grounding those responsibilities in a framework of entitlements and corresponding obligations (OHCHR, 2006). In other words, human rights highlight that States and other duty-bearers have not only a moral or political, but also a legal obligation to achieve national and international standards and principles that they have set themselves, and that people, rights-holders, can demand action and seek redress if aggrieved. In practice, this requires identifying who is affected by a development issue (rights-holders), who is supposed to do something about it (duty-bearers) and the capacities that duty-bearers need to fulfill their obligations and for rights-holders to claim action (see Issue Brief: Three-Step Analysis). For example, capacities may be needed to collect and analyse disaggregated data or to conduct impact assessments and policy or budget analyses.

What is the content of the Human Rights Standards that the UN Common Understanding refers to?

Human rights standards are contained in international treaties and national constitutions (see Overview of Human Rights). For economic, social and cultural rights (ESCR, e.g., the right to food, education, water and sanitation, health) specifically, the UN committee in charge of monitoring the implementation of the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICECSR) develops General Comments that describe the core content of those rights (see Issue Brief: Human Rights Bodies). To ensure national policy coherence, this core content needs to guide the objectives of development policies and programmes. The key dimensions of ESCR can be summarized as follows.

Availability: Facilities, goods and services need to be available in sufficient quantity and equipped with what they require to function.

Accessibility (physical and economic): Facilities, goods and services need to be within safe reach for all sections of the population, especially vulnerable or marginalized groups, such as ethnic minorities and indigenous peoples, women, children, adolescents, older persons or persons with disabilities. They must also be affordable and poorer households must not be disproportionately burdened by expenses. This also requires the removal of administrative barriers that can prevent the poor from accessing facilities, goods and services.

Quality (including cultural acceptability): Facilities, goods and services need to be relevant, culturally appropriate and of good quality.

Human rights law recognizes that a lack of resources can make it more difficult to realize some human rights, especially economic, social and cultural rights. Therefore, the International Covenant for Economic, Social
and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) introduces the concept of 'progressive realization,' which allows States to realize ESCR over time as long as they:

- Take concrete steps to the 'maximum of their available resources'—States must demonstrate that every effort has been made to use all resources at their disposal to achieve minimum essential levels of each right.
- Monitor progress—Systems must be established to ensure that progress, or lack thereof, can be measured.
- Avoid retrogression—Any deliberately retrogressive measures, e.g., those instituted during an economic recession, will require the most careful consideration and need to be fully justified.
- Prevent discrimination—Progress must be achieved for the entire population as equally as possible.

### What kind of human rights obligations does a State have?

By becoming parties to international human rights treaties, States assume the obligations to respect, to protect and to fulfil human rights (OHCHR, 2006):

- To respect means States must not interfere with people’s human rights (e.g., in the case of the right to water, not to disconnect water supply without due process).
- To protect means States must ensure that third parties such as private actors do not interfere with people’s human rights. This is achieved primarily through the enactment of laws and the establishment of redress procedures, e.g., by ensuring pro-poor price regulation when water supplies are privatized.
- To fulfil means States must take pro-active steps. This includes the facilitation of the realization of human rights by strengthening people’s abilities to meet their own needs, e.g., by implementing technical and vocational education plans to facilitate access to employment. Only in exceptional cases, when people are unable, for reasons beyond their control, to realize that right themselves, are States obliged to provide people with goods, facilities or services (e.g., shelter or food in the case of a humanitarian disaster).

### How do we mainstream human rights into policies and programmes?

This publication provides information on mainstreaming human rights into policies and programming. As the UNCU outlines, human rights should inform the outcome and the process of policies and programmes. Human rights standards are particularly useful for guiding the formulation of desired outcomes, while human rights principles can especially guide the processes of policy and programme design and implementation. The Issue Briefs in this publication provide specific tools and examples of how to achieve this. The case studies highlight the principles and standards of particular relevance in each example.

### Key Resources

#### Mainstreaming Human Rights – General
- UNDP (2005), Human Rights in UNDP — Practice Note
- OHCHR (2006), Frequently Asked Questions on a Human Rights-Based Approach to Development Cooperation
- UN Human Rights Policy Knowledge Network (HuriTALK)
- UN Practitioner’s Portal on HRBA ([www.hrbaportal.org](http://www.hrbaportal.org))
- UNDG-Human Rights Mainstreaming Mechanism (2003, revised 2011), UN Common Learning Package on the Human Rights Based Approach and Results-Based Management

#### Mainstreaming Human Rights in Poverty Reduction Policies and Programmes:
- Jahan, S. (Unpublished), Human Rights-Based Approach To Poverty Reduction — Analytical Linkages, Practical Work And UNDP
- UNDP (2003), Poverty Reduction and Human Rights — Practice Note
- UNDP (2007), Human Rights and the MDGs — Making the Link (see also: [www.hurilink.org](http://www.hurilink.org))
- UNDP (2008), Claiming the MDGs: An Empowerment Framework
- OHCHR (2006), Principles and Guidelines for a Human Rights Approach to Poverty Reduction Strategies
- OHCHR (2008), Claiming the Millennium Development Goals: A human rights approach
- OHCHR (2010), Human Rights and the Millennium Development Goals in Practice: A review of country strategies and reporting
- Balakrishnan, R., Elson, D. et al. (2009), Rethinking Macro Economic Strategies from a Human Rights Perspective

For more information: humanrights-talk@undp.org or [www.hrbaportal.org](http://www.hrbaportal.org)
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The human rights system of the UN consists of two types of mechanisms: bodies that are based on the UN Charter (charter-based bodies) and bodies that are based on UN human rights treaties (treaty-based bodies). All of these bodies produce information on human development.

Charter-based bodies include all UN organs established by or derived from the UN Charter that either directly or indirectly play a role in the protection and promotion of human rights, such as the General Assembly, Security Council, ECOSOC, etc. Among them, the Human Rights Council (HRC) deals exclusively with human rights. Its main purpose is to identify human rights issues worldwide and make recommendations. Two of its most relevant functions are: Universal Periodical Review (UPR) — a peer-review process in which member States review the overall human rights situation three times a year (‘troikas’) and produce recommendations. By way of this process, each State is reviewed every four years. Special Procedures — the HRC appoints Special Rapporteurs, Independent Experts and Working Groups to monitor the human rights situation in specific countries (country mandates) or on specific issues (thematic mandates), such as extreme poverty or water and sanitation. Special Procedures can make country visits, conduct research and prepare recommendations.

Treaty-based bodies are committees composed of independent experts who monitor the implementation of the nine core human rights treaties:
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)
- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)
- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD)
- Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW)
- Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT)
- Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)
- International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (ICRMW)
- Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD)
- International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (ICCPED)

The Committees are in charge of:
- Reviewing how States fulfill their obligations in relation to the relevant human rights treaty. Each Committee receives periodic reports from the governments of the countries that have ratified the relevant treaty (e.g., Kenya submitted its latest report on the situation of women to CEDAW in 2010). They review the reports along with information from other sources and prepare Concluding Observations, which provide an analysis and recommendations to the country.

Receiving Individual Complaints or Communications from individuals against a State party claiming that specific rights in the treaty have been violated. This quasi-judicial function is currently exercised by five committees (CCPR, CERD, CEDAW, CAT, CRPD) and will resume soon for CESCR and CMW.

Issuing General Comments/Recommendations that clarify how treaty provisions should be interpreted and implemented by States parties (e.g., CESCR General Comment No. 12 outlines what the right to food entails).

How can I find this information?

Information by Country
- Which human rights treaty has country X signed and/or ratified? www.unhchr.ch/tbs/doc.nsf/Statusfrset?OpenFrameSet
- What reports have been submitted by/on country X? www.ohchr.org/EN/Countries/Pages/HumanRightsintheWorld.aspx
  - Select desired country for a selection or full list of reports.

Information by Issue
- For which issues does a Special Rapporteur or Working Group exist (e.g., food, extreme poverty, foreign debt?) www.tinyurl.com/ohchr1
  - Click on the left for list of country/thematic mandates, names and contact details
- What does a specific human rights standard, principle or issue entail? For a list of all General Comments: www.tinyurl.com/ohchr2
  For General Comments by treaty: www.tinyurl.com/ohchr5
  - Choose treaty and click on General Comment/Recommendations on the left for a list

For additional information on thematic issues: www.tinyurl.com/ohchr4

Additional detail on many of these questions is also now available through a new online OHCHR tool accessible at www.tinyurl.com/ohchr6.
Quick access: What does the UN Human Rights System say about different aspects of human development?1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDGs</th>
<th>Human Rights Mechanisms (with examples of their reports)</th>
<th>Human Rights Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Poverty Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty | • Special Rapporteur on human rights and extreme poverty (e.g., CCTs, old age, financial crisis, country reports)  
  • The draft guiding principles on extreme poverty and human rights: the rights of the poor | UDHR article 25(1); ICESCR article 11 |
| Hunger Goal 1: Eradicate hunger | • Special Rapporteur on the right to food (e.g., biofuels, food crisis, seed policies, land acquisitions, country reports)  
  • CESCR General Comment No. 12 on the right to food | UDHR article 25(1); ICESCR article 11 |
| Work Goal 1: Achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all | • CESCR General Comment No. 18 (the right to work) and 19 (the right to social security)  
  • CEDAW Recommendations No. 13 (equal remuneration for work of equal value) and No. 16 (unpaid women workers in rural and urban enterprises) | UDHR, articles 23, 24; ICESCR articles 6, 7, 10, 14; CERD, article 5; CMW; CEDAW, article 11; ILO standards |
| Education Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education | • Special Rapporteur on the right to education (e.g., financing education, education in emergencies, country reports)  
  • CESCR General Comments No. 11 (plans of action for primary education) and 13 (right to education)  
  • CRC General Comment No. 1 on the aim of education  
  • CEDAW Recommendation No. 3 on education and public information programmes | UDHR article 25(1); ICESCR articles 13, 14; CRC article 28(1)(a); CEDAW article 10; CERD article 5(e)(v) |
| Gender Equality Goal 3: Promote gender equality | • Special Rapporteur on violence against women  
  • CEDAW Recommendations 1-28 (e.g., temporary special measures, older women, migrant workers)  
  • CESCR General Comment No. 16 on the equal right of men and women to the enjoyment of all economic, social and cultural rights | UDHR article 2; CEDAW; ICESCR article 3; CRC article 2 |
| Health Goal 4: Reduce child mortality Goal 5: Improve maternal health Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases | • Special Rapporteur on the highest attainable standard of health (e.g., access to medicines and intellectual property rights, country reports)  
  • CESCR General Comment No. 14 on health  
  • CEDAW Recommendations No. 14 (female circumcision), 15 (women and AIDS), and 24 (women & health)  
  • CRC General Comments No. 3 (HIV/AIDS and the right of the child) and 4 (adolescent health) | UDHR article 25; ICESCR article 12; CRC article 24; CEDAW article 12; CERD article 5(e)(iv) |
| Environment Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability | • Special Rapporteur on the human rights implications of environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes (e.g., country reports) | ICESCR articles 11(2a), 12; CRC article 24 |
| Water Goal 7: Access to safe drinking water and sanitation | • Independent Expert on the right to safe drinking water and sanitation (e.g., private sector participation, MDGs, best practices, climate change, country reports)  
  • CESCR General Comment No. 15 on the right to water | UDHR article 25(1); ICESCR article 11(1); UN GA Resolution on the right to water |
| Housing Goal 7: Improve the situation of slum dwellers | • Special Rapporteur on adequate housing (e.g., women, forced evictions, country reports)  
  • CESCR General Comment No. 7 on housing and forced eviction | UDHR article 25(1); ICESCR article 11(1); CEDAW article 14(2) (h); CRC article 24; CERD article 5(e)(iii) |
| Globalization Goal 8: A global partnership for development | • Working Group on the right to development (e.g., consultation on criteria for the RGD)  
  • Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and HR rights (e.g., international trade, vulture funds, draft guidelines)  
  • Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises (replaced Special Representative of the SG on business and human rights)  
  • CESCR General Comment No. 8 on economic sanctions  
  • CESCR General Comment No. 3 on the nature of States parties’ obligations | UDHR articles 22, 28; ICESCR articles 2(1), 11(1), 15(4), 22, 23; CRC articles 4, 24(4), 28(3); CRPD, articles 4 (II), 32; GA Resolution on the right to development |
| Inclusion Cutting across all MDGs | • Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples (e.g., impacts of development projects, education systems, country reports)  
  • CERD General Comment No. 23 on indigenous peoples  
  • CRC General Comment No. 11 on indigenous children  
  • Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants (e.g., criminalization, children, country reports)  
  • Independent Expert on minority issues (e.g., conflict prevention, citizenship, country reports)  
  • Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons (e.g., peace processes, climate change, country reports)  
  • Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement  
  • CESCR General Comment No. 5 on persons with disabilities  
  • CESCR General Comment No. 6 on the economic, social and cultural rights of older persons  
  • Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons (e.g., prevention, regional cooperation, country reports) | CRPD; CRPD; CEDAW; CESCR; GA Declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples |

1 The list includes relevant mechanisms and instruments, but is not exhaustive.
Tool: The Three-Step Problem Analysis

**WHAT can this tool be used for?**
- To identify immediate, underlying and root causes of development challenges.
- To identify population groups that are particularly affected.
- To identify state institutions and other actors who have a responsibility to act.
- To identify key capacities that those responsible and those affected need in order to bring about change.

**WHEN can this tool be used?**
At all stages of the programming cycle, especially during the Assessment and Analysis phase (e.g. for the situation analysis of a UNDP Project Document). UNDP’s *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results* refers to this stage as Problem Analysis.

**WHO can use this tool?**
UN(DP) policy and programme staff at global, regional or country levels, government partners, civil society partners, donors, etc.

**HOW was this tool developed?**
Originally, it was developed for the UN Common Learning Package on the Human Rights-Based Approach and has been used in UN planning processes (e.g., CCA/UNDAF) in many countries. Here, the tool has been adapted for analysis at the programme or project level, in line with UNDP’s capacity development framework.

*How to start:*
UNDP’s *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results* recommends selecting main problems to focus on before beginning the analysis. These should be problems facing the region, country or community, not problems confronting UNDP or a particular stakeholder. Problems should be stated in terms of negative conditions or realities, not in terms of specific things being unavailable (e.g., the formulation ‘minorities and other marginalized groups do not participate in elections’ would be preferable to ‘minorities and marginalized groups do not have the right to vote’). This is important so as not to pre-empt solutions. At the same time, the problem statement needs to be concrete and focused on people — it should state who is affected. To this end, disaggregated data should be used as much as possible (see below).

*How to use the tool:*
The tool guides the user through key questions involving three steps:

- **Who has been left behind and why? (Causal Analysis)**
- **What are they (rights-holders) entitled to?**
- **Who has to do something about it (duty-bearers)? (Role Analysis)**
- **What capacities do duty-bearers and right-holders need to take action? (Capacity Gap Analysis)**

For all three steps, it is important to involve key stakeholders as well as colleagues from different professional disciplines so as to draw on each other’s perspectives, knowledge and experiences, even if finding a common language may initially be challenging. If the group doing the analysis is larger than five to ten people, it can be broken into several smaller groups, perhaps with each working on different problems or aspects.

**STEP 1: Causal Analysis**
This step helps understand multiple and interrelated causes of the identified development issue. It is helpful to use a problem tree: The selected problem manifestation is written at the top of a board or sheet of paper. The group first brainstorms freely about immediate, underlying and root causes of the problem by writing them on smaller sheets of paper. Through discussion, it is then decided how to order those causes. Asking ‘why?’ to see whether statements from top to bottom can be linked is an easy way to check the flow of causality.

When reflecting on the causality chains, it is important to
- Use varied and reliable data — data should be sought from different governmental and non-governmental sources at the national and international levels (see the box below for examples).
- Use disaggregated data as much as possible, e.g. along sex but also age, ethnicity, language, disability, religion, etc.
- Be as specific as possible. For example, when analysing the causes of the HIV epidemic, rather than identifying ‘poor policy environment’, explore more specific causes such as ‘policy on compulsory testing prevents persons living with HIV from using health services’.

---

**Problem Tree**

**Manifestation**
Lower educational attainment by children with disabilities in country X

**Immediate Causes**
- Lack of accessible buildings, learning materials and of adequately skilled teachers
- Tendency to keep children with disabilities out of the public

**Underlying Causes**
- Lack of expertise on accessibility
- High teacher absenteeism
- Little awareness of the skills and aspirations of children with disabilities

**Root Causes**
- Low priority of education in the national budget and low political commitment to the rights of persons with disabilities
- Negative view of disability in dominant traditional beliefs

---

**WHAT**
- To identify immediate, underlying and root causes of development challenges.
- To identify population groups that are particularly affected.
- To identify state institutions and other actors who have a responsibility to act.
- To identify key capacities that those responsible and those affected need in order to bring about change.

**WHEN**
At all stages of the programming cycle, especially during the Assessment and Analysis phase (e.g. for the situation analysis of a UNDP Project Document). UNDP’s *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results* refers to this stage as Problem Analysis.

**WHO**
UN(DP) policy and programme staff at global, regional or country levels, government partners, civil society partners, donors, etc.

**HOW**
Originally, it was developed for the UN Common Learning Package on the Human Rights-Based Approach and has been used in UN planning processes (e.g., CCA/UNDAF) in many countries. Here, the tool has been adapted for analysis at the programme or project level, in line with UNDP’s capacity development framework.
• Distinguish between different levels of causes: Immediate causes determine the current status of the problem and usually describe how the individual experiences the problem. Underlying causes are often consequences of policies, laws and availability of resources. Root/structural causes reveal conditions that require long-term interventions to change societal attitudes and behaviour at different levels, including those at family, community and higher decision-making levels.

• To gain a more refined understanding of the causes, use the dimensions of economic, social and cultural rights (availability, accessibility and quality of goods, facilities and services) and key human rights principles such as non-discrimination, participation, and accountability (for a checklist, see Issue Brief: An Initial Checklist). For example, an immediate cause of ‘low school enrolment of girls in province x’ may be ‘inadequate access to schools’, but this could be refined by asking whether this inadequacy results from a lack of schools or teachers (availability), school fees or unsafe transport to school (accessibility) or a curriculum that is not sensitive to indigenous culture or language (quality).

A selection of useful data sources:
• Government reports and official national statistics
• National and international NGOs, including sectoral and human rights NGOs, national and international think tanks
• Academic institutions, national and international media
• National Human Rights Institutions and Ombuds offices
• International and regional human rights mechanisms such as treaty bodies and special rapporteurs and the UPR (see Issue Brief: Human Rights Bodies)
• UN Secretariat and relevant UN agencies
• National, regional or global Human Development Reports
• UN Economic Commissions and international financial institutions (WB, IMF)

STEP 2: Role Analysis
This step helps identify what those affected by the development challenge are entitled to (as rights-holders) and who has to do something about it (as duty-bearers). For this, as well as the third step, it is helpful to use a simple matrix to map the claims and obligations of different actors (see example below). It is recommended to focus on the one causal chain of the problem tree that is seen as most critical to address a root cause of the problem.

Based on the causal analysis: 1) Identify as rights-holders those individuals or groups most affected and describe their right or claim as precisely as possible and 2) Identify as duty-bearers those who have a responsibility to respect, protect or fulfil the right or claim, based either on international human conventions that the country has signed and ratified or on the national constitution and more detailed national laws, regulations and policies. To identify obligations, it is thus important to check the obligations that the international treaty bodies outline in their General Comments (see Issue Brief: Human Rights Bodies) and to carefully review the relevant (sectoral) legal and administrative framework of the country. In the analysis, it is useful to bear in mind that:

• An individual can be a rights-holder or a duty-bearer, depending on the role in which he/she acts (e.g., a teacher will be a duty-bearer in his/her role as a public official toward students, but a rights-holder in his/her role as an individual employee toward the public school administration).

• For each claim, there may be several duty-bearers at different levels of the state, e.g., central and local parts of the administration.

• Duty-bearers are primarily state actors, but there are exceptions (e.g., the Child Rights Conventions give parents and care-givers a duty-bearer role), and other actors such as private companies or communities may also have responsibilities.

STEP 3: Capacity Gap Analysis
This step helps understand what capacities rights-holders need to claim their rights and what capacities duty-bearers need to fulfil their obligations. When going through claims and obligations identified in Step 2, use UNDP’s capacity development approach and capacity assessment framework (see UNDP Practice Note on Capacity Assessment) to analyse capacity assets and needs:

Levels: individual (e.g. skills, knowledge, experience), organisational (e.g. internal policies, procedures, frameworks), and enabling environment (e.g. legislation, policies, power relations).

Type: functional (e.g. engage stakeholders, assess situation and define vision, formulate policies and strategies, budget, manage and implement, monitor and evaluate) or technical (e.g. expertise).

Issues: institutional arrangements (e.g. coordination mechanisms, roles and responsibilities, incentive mechanisms), leadership (e.g. leadership development, succession planning), knowledge (e.g. knowledge sharing tools and mechanisms, brain gain strategies), and accountability (e.g. participatory planning and feedback mechanisms, audit systems).

The matrix used for Step 2 can also be used to summarise capacities of (groups of) rights-holders and duty-bearers.

Role and Capacity Gap Matrix (example)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights Holder</th>
<th>Obligation</th>
<th>Capacity Gap: Needs</th>
<th>Capacity Gap: Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children with disabilities in X</td>
<td>Access to quality education on equal basis with others</td>
<td>Limited channels for children with disabilities to voice issues</td>
<td>Active student councils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local School Administrations</td>
<td>Ensure accessible classrooms &amp; teacher attendance</td>
<td>low planning and management capacity</td>
<td>Mandate to carry out school inspections and address complaints</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duty-bearer (2)</th>
<th>Obligation</th>
<th>Capacity Gap: Needs</th>
<th>Capacity Gap: Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Education Direction</td>
<td>Ensure implementation of inclusive education policy</td>
<td>Lack of clear standards and audit processes</td>
<td>Inclusive education (IE) policy adopted, expertise on IE in neighbouring country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duty Bearer (3)</th>
<th>Obligation</th>
<th>Capacity Gap: Needs</th>
<th>Capacity Gap: Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>Allocate budget to implement inclusive education policy, incl. for teacher training</td>
<td>Low expertise &amp; leadership on IE</td>
<td>Inclusive education (IE) policy adopted, expertise on IE in neighbouring country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How to use the results:
The results of the Three-Step Analysis directly feed into programme/project planning:
• Situation Analysis: Step 1 (Causal Analysis) helps clarify the issues and the reasons for the existing development conditions, and Step 2 (Role Analysis) and Step 3 (Capacity Gap Analysis) help further reveal the actors and factors contributing to the situation.

• Strategy: The results of Step 3 (Capacity Gap Analysis) and Step 2 (Role Analysis) will help identify what areas and whose capacities need strengthening. Step 2 will also inform the Partnership Strategy.

• Results & Resources Framework: The results of Step 2 (Role Analysis) and Step 3 (Capacity Gap Analysis) will help in the formulation of outputs that specify whose capacity will have improved and in what way, as well as activities to be undertaken by whom.
Tool: Mainstreaming Human Rights in Development Policies and Programmes — An Initial Checklist

### WHAT can this tool be used for?
- To analyse systematically key (substantive and process) aspects of a development situation.
- To align a development policy or programme with human rights standards and principles that a country has committed to at the national or international levels (policy coherence).

### WHEN can this tool be used?
- When analysing or measuring human development, e.g., HDRs, MDG reports, impact assessments or in the Assessment and Analysis phase of a project or programme (see Issue Brief: Three-Step Analysis).
- When developing policies or when reviewing policy options to achieve human development.
- When developing, implementing, monitoring or evaluating programmes to achieve human development.

### WHO can use this tool?
Primarily, UN(DP) policy and programme staff at the global, regional or country levels; possibly also government partners, civil society partners, donors.

### HOW was this tool developed?
Based on the UN Common Learning Package on the HRBA (see Issue Brief: Conceptual Framework), this tool was developed among colleagues in UNDP’s Poverty Practice in an effort to apply human rights principles and standards systematically in their work (see examples below).

### How to use the tool:
- This checklist can be used as a desk-based exercise — for instance, when developing a framework for thematic research or analysis — or in group settings (see examples below).
- The generic questions in the checklist can be used as they are. It is, however, preferable to adapt them to the specific sector or issue under consideration and to align them with human rights standards and principles established at the country level (e.g., if the country’s constitution stipulates human rights principles not covered here). The Template can be used to adapt the generic questions or to add additional questions.
- It is strongly recommended to involve specialists from different professional disciplines in the use of the tool so that they can draw on each other’s perspectives, knowledge and experiences.
- In order to answer the questions, information from governmental and non-governmental sources should be used (see Issue Brief: Three-Step Analysis), including reports by national and international NGOs, reports from national human rights institutions, and country or thematic reports and recommendations from international and regional human rights mechanisms such as treaty bodies, special rapporteurs and the UPR (see Issue Brief: Human Rights Bodies).
- Where gaps are identified, concrete follow-up action should be recorded.

### Examples
- **UNDP/UNDG's MDG Acceleration Framework (MAF):** The checklist was used by a multidisciplinary team to conduct a desk-review of the MAF draft. The MAF aims at helping national partners identify bottlenecks which are hampering the achievement of the MDGs. While issues of availability and accessibility of services were already well covered in the four areas of the framework (‘policy’, ‘financing’, ‘service delivery’ and ‘service utilization’), questions about the cultural acceptability of services as well as on non-discrimination were addressed less. As a result of the review, additional questions were integrated into the MAF, e.g., ‘What categories of disaggregated data are available (e.g., sex, ethnicity, age, income, rural, urban) and what do they tell us about the effectiveness of the interventions? Does the service meet the cultural/religious criteria and are the services provided in minority languages? Can representatives from the civil society support and participate in the monitoring process?’
- **UNDP's forthcoming ‘Self-Assessment Tool to Achieve Balanced Plant Regimes’:** The checklist can also be used in group settings. In this case, the checklist was first refined to focus specifically on the right to food and was then incorporated into a tool to guide multi-stakeholder assessments of national laws related to access to and protection of plant resources and how these laws impact farmers livelihoods, biodiversity, climate change and food security. In a pilot application in the Philippines, various stakeholders (including Departments of Environment, Agriculture and Trade, the patent office, the Human Rights Commission as well as farmers’ and indigenous peoples’ groups) came together and used the checklist to review the content and interrelation of the relevant national policies and international norms. The checklist was seen as providing a useful common conceptual framework and the government is now using the results of the assessment to address some of these interrelations at the country level and to develop a national position at international fora.
Generic Question

Human Rights Principles

Non-discrimination & Equality*

- Is relevant statistical data disaggregated beyond sex, population quintiles and urban/rural location, i.e., along at least some of the prohibited grounds of discrimination stated in the ICESCR and ICCPR or in the national constitution or legislation (e.g., race, colour, ethnicity, age, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, etc.)? If not, are capacities being developed to do so?
- Does the analysis of (quantitative or qualitative) data provide information on individuals and groups that are more affected by a development issue or that benefit less from policies and programmes, e.g., public services? Does this coincide or go beyond pre-conceived notions of who is marginalized?
- Does the analysis identify immediate, underlying and root causes for these disparities? (see Issue Brief: Three-Step Analysis)
- Do policies, programmes and budget allocations address these causes, for example, by prioritizing marginalized groups? Are there safeguards to ensure that such prioritization does not increase stigma and discrimination?
- How is implementation monitored to detect unintended impacts, especially on marginalized groups?

Participation & Inclusion*

- Is there an enabling environment of laws, processes and mechanisms that ensures access to information, freedom of expression and of association and the right to participation?
- How is it ensured that a representative number of people, incl. those who are usually not heard, are involved actively and meaningfully in the design, implementation and monitoring of policies and programmes that affect them? Which existing participatory mechanisms are effective and can be used? How is it ensured that people are not just heard, but also have a role in decision-making?
- If necessary, how can people’s capacities to organize and participate in policy and programme processes be strengthened?
- Do some (groups of) persons participate less or not at all? If so, what are immediate and structural reasons for this? Are there issues that need to be considered, such as social or cultural barriers and sensitivities or power dynamics?

Accountability & Rule of Law*

- Which roles and responsibilities does the applicable administrative or legal framework give to the relevant institutions? Are relevant processes transparent? In other words, is it clearly defined who is supposed to be doing what and when?
- Are the effects of policies and programmes being monitored?
- How can people access official information (e.g., via publication or upon request)? Are there any barriers (e.g., language, fees)?
- Are complaint/redress mechanisms (judicial, quasi-judicial or administrative) in place so that people can demand accountability at all stages of the policy or programme cycle? Are there informal or traditional justice mechanisms that can be used? Are people aware of and do they have access to these mechanisms and the capacity to use them?

Human Rights Standards (esp., economic, social and cultural rights, e.g., right to health, to food, to water & to sanitation)

Availability**

- Are facilities, goods and services in the sector available continuously in sufficient quantity?
  - This may require infrastructure, salaries or equipment. For example, for food, it includes well-functioning distribution, processing and market systems; for water, it requires supply for personal and domestic use according to WHO guidelines.

Accessibility**

- Physical: Are facilities, goods and services of the relevant sector accessible within safe reach for all?
  - This may relate to infrastructure such as appropriate siting or transportation. For example, for water, it requires accessibility in the immediate vicinity of all households, educational institutions and workplaces, and security during access.
- Economic: Are facilities, goods and services affordable for all?
  - This requires that the cost of attaining one basic need not threaten the satisfaction of other basic needs and that poorer households are not disproportionately burdened with expenses. In practice, this may involve provision of subsidies, abolition of service fees, or research and development of low-cost technologies.

Quality, including Acceptability**

- Is the quality of facilities, goods and services of the relevant sector ensured and are quality standards set?
  - This may require capacity development, competitive salaries and quality monitoring. For health, for example, it may require skilled medical personnel or scientifically approved and unexpired drugs; for food, it may require contamination control.
- Are different cultural values, user patterns and needs considered, particularly groups that have been identified as marginalized?
  - This requires respect for the culture of individuals, minorities, peoples and communities, as well as sensitivity to gender and lifecycle requirements. In practice, it may require offering services in minority languages or in culturally acceptable forms.

* Useful country information related to non-discrimination, participation and accountability can be found in country reports by treaty bodies, special procedures and UPR (see Issue Brief: Human Rights Bodies).

** Details on what availability, accessibility and quality/acceptability requires in different sectors can be found in the CESCR General Comments (see Issue Brief: Conceptual Framework).
### Human Rights Principles

**Non-discrimination & Equality**

- Is relevant statistical data disaggregated beyond sex, population quintiles and urban/rural location, i.e., along at least some of the prohibited grounds of discrimination stated in the ICESCR and ICCPR or in the national constitution or legislation (e.g., race, colour, ethnicity, age, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, etc.)? If not, are capacities being developed to do so?

- Does the analysis of (quantitative or qualitative) data provide information on individuals and groups that are more affected by a development issue or that benefit less from policies and programmes, e.g., public services? Does this coincide or go beyond pre-conceived notions of who is marginalized?

- Does the analysis identify immediate, underlying and root causes for these disparities? (see Issue Brief: Three-Step Analysis)

- Do policies, programmes and budget allocations address these causes, for example, by prioritizing marginalized groups? Are there safeguards to ensure that such prioritization does not increase stigma and discrimination?

- How is implementation monitored to detect unintended impacts, especially on marginalized groups?

**Participation & Inclusion**

- Is there an enabling environment of laws, processes and mechanisms that ensures access to information, freedom of expression and of association and the right to participation?

- How is it ensured that a representative number of people, incl. those who are usually not heard, are involved actively and meaningfully in the design, implementation and monitoring of policies and programmes that affect them? Which existing participatory mechanisms are effective and can be used? How is it ensured that people are not just heard, but also have a role in decision-making?

- If necessary, how can people’s capacities to organize and participate in policy and programme processes be strengthened?

- Do some (groups of) persons participate less or not at all? If so, what are immediate and structural reasons for this? Are there issues that need to be considered, such as social or cultural barriers and sensitivities or power dynamics?

*Useful country information related to non-discrimination, participation and accountability can be found in country reports by treaty bodies, special procedures and UPR. See Issue Brief: Human Rights Bodies.*
## Generic Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Rights Principles</th>
<th>Adapted / Additional Questions</th>
<th>Action: The issue can be addressed (how? by whom?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability &amp; Rule of Law*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Which roles and responsibilities does the applicable administrative or legal framework give to the relevant institutions? Are relevant processes transparent? In other words, is it clearly defined who is supposed to be doing what and when?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are the effects of policies and programmes being monitored?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How can people access official information (e.g., via publication or upon request)? Are there any barriers (e.g., language, fees)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are complaint/redress mechanisms (judicial, quasi-judicial or administrative) in place so that people can demand accountability at all stages of the policy or programme cycle? Are there informal or traditional justice mechanisms that can be used? Are people aware of and do they have access to these mechanisms and the capacity to use them?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights Standards (especially economic, social and cultural rights, e.g. right to health, to food, to water and sanitation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are facilities, goods and services in the sector available continuously in sufficient quantity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Physical: Are facilities, goods and services of the relevant sector accessible within safe reach for all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic: Are facilities, goods and services affordable for all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality, incl. Acceptability**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is the quality of facilities, goods and services of the relevant sector ensured and are quality standards set?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are different cultural values, user patterns and needs considered, particularly groups that have been identified as marginalized?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Useful country information related to non-discrimination, participation and accountability can be found in country reports by treaty bodies, special procedures and UPR (see Issue Brief: Human Rights Bodies).

** Details on what availability, accessibility and quality/acceptability requires in different sectors can be found in the CESCR General Comments (see Issue Brief: Conceptual Framework).
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Tool: Using Human Rights to Achieve the MDG Target on Water and Sanitation (W&S)

The Millennium Development Goal 7 (target 7.c) aims to “halve, by 2015, the proportion of the population without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation.” Globally, 1.6 billion people have gained access to improved water sources between 1990 and 2008 and 1.1 billion have gained access to improved sanitation. At this rate, the world is expected to meet the MDG target on water by 2015. From the perspective of human rights, though, and especially in view of the principle of non-discrimination and equality, it is problematic, for example, that these average improvements often do not affect those most in need of progress, such as rural girls and women – who usually shoulder the largest burden of collecting water – and those who are marginalized or hard to reach, such as indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities or persons living in informal settlements. The technical specifications of ‘improved’ drinking water sources or sanitation facilities also do not capture all elements required from a human rights perspective. Countries that have legally committed to realizing the Right to W&S by ratifying the ICESCR (and confirmed their commitment in a recent UN General Assembly resolution, A/64/L.63/REV.1) can use its standards to review whether W&S is available and accessible (physically and economically) and of good quality (see box below). The above graphic shows some of the proposed W&S interventions that can help countries achieve the MDGs sustainably and realize the Right to W&S progressively. Concrete examples of the interventions highlighted in the graphic are described in more detail below.
Planning: Developing Strategies that Prioritize the Needs of Marginalized People in Kenya

In 2007, Kenya adopted its National Water Services Strategy (2007–2015), which reflects a political commitment to recognize safe water and basic sanitation as a human right, confirmed later in the new Kenyan Constitution of 2010. The main goals of the strategy are to increase by 2015:

- Sustainable access to safe water, complying with the pre-defined quality standards: 1) from 60 percent to 80 percent in urban areas while reducing the distance to the nearest public/communal sources to an average of 30 minutes and 2) from 40 to 75 percent in rural areas while decreasing the maximum fetching distance to 2 kilometers.

The strategy ensures accountability through the establishment of a monitoring system and regulatory enforcement.

- In terms of sanitation, the National Environmental and Sanitation Strategy and the Hygiene Policy and Sanitation Concept for the Water Sector aim so that, by 2015, all schools, institutions, markets, and other public places will have hygienic, affordable, functional, and sustainable toilets and hand-washing facilities.

The Kenyan Strategy also gives specific attention to the ‘settlements of the poor urban population’, considering that, in 2007, only 20 percent of the population living in poor urban settlements had access to safe water, compared to 60 percent in other urban areas and 40 percent in rural areas. For this particularly vulnerable group, the Strategy has adopted strategic actions (and related monitoring indicators), including investments to improve access and quality, improvement of monitoring systems, and a special basket funding mechanism (Water Services Trust Fund) to financially support these efforts. (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ), 2009; www.tinyurl.com/gtz2009kenya)

Planning & Implementation

Involve communities in Uganda: In Mukunyu parish, the water provision system (Gravity Flow Scheme) was not working properly because of mismanagement and technical problems. Moreover, the community was not involved and existing management structures did not sufficiently consider the community’s concerns. In response, a Water Board was established, composed of representatives of all groups of water users, as well as local authorities. Women played an especially vital role. The new management system considerably improved the supply of safe water. This transparent and accountable process has even encouraged communities to make financial contributions for maintenance (MDG Good Practices, UNDG, 2010).

Nepal: Provide affordable payment schemes to construct household latrines: In Nepal, 54 percent of the population and approximately 9.1 million children do not have access to improved sanitation facilities. The School-Led Total Sanitation (SLTS) is a project that aims to improve sanitation and hygiene in schools in 15 districts. This programme also promotes creative financing strategies to assist poor people to construct latrines in their households. The SLTS facilitates the provision of loans from revolving funds, basket funds and local cooperative strategies. In many school catchment areas, fifty-fifty matching funds that provide loans to households have been established (MDG Good Practices, UNDG, 2010).

W&S Availability

Water must be continuously available, in a sufficient quantity to meet the necessary requirement for drinking, and personal hygiene, as well as other domestic uses. A sufficient number of sanitation facilities must be available at all times within a community. Implication: measures must be in place to ensure equitable allocation of water resources.

W&S Accessibility

Physical: Water and sanitation services and facilities must be available for everyone within, or in the immediate vicinity of every household, health or education institutions, public institutions and places, and the workplace. Implication: the facilities need to take into account and consider the particularities and special needs of each of its users (women, persons with disabilities, etc). Appropriate siting and construction of facilities are crucial.

Financial: (Affordability) – Water and sanitation services must be affordable and not harm the ability to pay for other essential needs, such as food, housing and health care. Implication: mechanisms must be in place to make services affordable, such as through tariff systems, subsidies, microcredit programs, etc.

W&S Quality

Water quality (including the water’s colour, odour and taste) must be acceptable so that it does not endanger health. Implication: measures need to monitor water quality and to ensure that water resources are not polluted and that everyone practices good hygiene. Sanitation facilities need to be acceptable; culturally, this often means that the facilities need to be gender-specific and to guarantee privacy.


Monitoring: Use of accountability mechanisms in Argentina

Accountability mechanisms such as the judiciary can effectively monitor the implementation of the right to water. In Argentina, a poorly functioning sewage treatment plant was contaminating communal water sources in poor neighbourhoods in Córdoba. A local NGO launched legal action and the court ordered the municipality to ensure, among other things, that the applicants were provided with 200 litres of safe drinking water a day until they were connected to the water network. As a result of this case, the municipality developed a plan for the rehabilitation of the plant capacity and work started to provide piped connections to the affected neighbourhood. The municipal congress declared that all sewage-related taxes — US$10 million a year — were to be invested only in the sewage system (Claiming the MDGs: A human rights approach, OHCHR, 2008).
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Case Study: Argentina – Using Human Rights to Target MDGs at the Local Level

Policy Cycle

Development Issues
Local partners expressed that local development plans often do not sufficiently, comprehensively and effectively address the most critical issues faced by communities. UNDP Argentina and local partners identified the following main reasons for this:

- Civil society organizations (CSOs) and communities were consulted during implementation of local plans, but not during analysis and planning, when information on the most pressing needs of the community can influence critical decisions.
- A lack of capacity of local government to effectively coordinate policies across sectors and administrative levels (national, regional and municipal).
- Local authorities lacked the necessary statistical data, i.e., data that was disaggregated enough to provide information about the situation of vulnerable and marginalized groups at the local level.

Results
With the support of UNDP from 2004 to 2008, civil society organizations and local government in Morón and Rosario developed their capacities to:

- Conduct participatory situation analyses to inform local development plans. As a result, the adopted plans better reflected needs and priorities of the community, particularly those of marginalized groups.
- Tailor MDGs to local priorities and use them as a tool for local planning, e.g., to restructure local budgets or include MDG targets and relevant monitoring mechanisms in existing plans.
- Improve management of and access to information and data, e.g., through the creation of municipal statistics offices and creation of local indicators.
- Strengthen the relationship between civil society and local authorities to foster a collaborative environment.

The project was coordinated by Abuelas de Plaza de Mayo (APM), a prominent and well-respected national human rights NGO. APM and UNDP Argentina developed a methodology to mainstream human rights into all stages of the local policy cycle, as illustrated in the above graphic.

Activities highlighted in bold are described in more detail below. The approach has been documented in the Guide For Local Planning From A Human Rights Approach and is being replicated by other municipalities.
Preparation Stage: Analysis of Local Participation Mechanisms

Stakeholders in both municipalities considered it important first to map and analyse existing mechanisms for community participation in order a) to identify civil society organizations and groups of individuals for their involvement throughout the process, b) to assess how representative and inclusive existing structures were and c) to avoid the creation of new structures where existing ones were effective.

To this end, a survey among communities, CSOs and local authorities was administered. It included questions such as:
- Are there any participatory mechanisms currently operating in the municipality? How do they work? Who participates?
- What types of civil society organizations are there? Are there any human rights-related organizations?
- Are there any second-tier organizations or networks of these organizations? Do they focus on any particular subject?
- What degree and kind of interrelation do they have with the local government?
- Do these organizations enjoy social representativeness and legitimacy?

Assessment & Analysis Stage

Identification of affected human rights, roles and responsibilities

After identifying pressing issues, the municipalities analysed the problems from a human rights perspective, using the Three-Step-analysis (see Issue Brief: Three-Step Analysis), in order to:
- Identify which human rights are affected by the problems;
- Identify the rights of rights-holders and the obligations of duty-bearers;
- Evaluate if and how human rights are protected by the national/provincial/municipal legal framework;
- Assess whether it is a problem of legal protection or law enforcement;
- Identify not only ‘bad’ examples, but also good ones of human rights protection and promotion.

Informing the community about the local situation analysis

The diagnostic report is the first result of the joint planning between the local government and the community. Since, naturally, not every community member has participated directly, public presentations were held to:
- Give feedback to those who directly participated in the diagnostic;
- Inform the entire community about activities and results;
- Consolidate the next steps of the process; and
- Obtain opinions, suggestions and critiques to enrich the diagnostic.

The Municipality of Rosario organized an event at the Museum of Fine Arts to present the local situation analysis report. It was co-chaired by the mayor, the UNDP Deputy Resident Representative, the president of APM and the director of the Human Rights Office of Rosario. Around 160 participants attended, including local authorities, CSO and members of local communities, indigenous peoples, professional associations and the National University of Rosario. The event was well covered by the local media. This ensured legitimacy of the process and provided the basis for accountability of the local government.

Planning Stage: Participatory Workshops

A series of workshops served to bring civil society and government officials together to develop the municipal development plan.

Experiences from the Municipality of Morón:

In Morón, four workshops were organized:

1) **To identify and link MDGs with human rights**: Participants (CSOs and local officials) prioritized MDGs that were most relevant to their municipality and linked each MDG to specific human rights.

2) **To propose relevant policies to achieve the MDGs**: Participants proposed policies that would help the population achieve the MDGs. The proposals were then compared with the municipality's list of on-going public policies and programmes for each MDG. This was perceived as a critical exercise, since some of the existing programmes were not known to civil society. Moreover, government officials appreciated that the exercise provided them with a comprehensive and structured overview of existing municipal projects.

3) **To propose concrete activities**.

4) **To create a space for follow-up and debate**.

Some of the key lessons learned from the pilot experience were:
- Clarifying roles and responsibilities of each level of government helps the development of strategies that are within the purview of local municipalities but that also directly contribute to the achievement of national-level MDGs. It also facilitates coordination of programmes across sectors.
- Action plans should thus clearly identify which entity is politically responsible for the implementation of each task.
- Coordination and discussion should take place in existing fora and mechanisms rather than in new, possibly parallel structures.
- Participation should be open to all community members and individuals, even to those with no organizational affiliation.

In Macedonia, a similar effort was undertaken to support the elaboration of MDG-based local development strategies — please refer to Going Local to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals: Stories from eight countries, SNV and UNDP, 2010.
Case Study: Bosnia & Herzegovina (BiH) – Using Human Rights to Strengthen Local Development Planning

**Development Issues**
A survey conducted by UNDP BiH in 2005 revealed that:
- 50 percent of BiH municipalities had not adopted any local development strategies to systematically address local needs and to improve municipal performance. Among municipalities with valid strategies, there were serious shortcomings in implementation and follow-up. Most municipalities stressed the need for technical support in policy development, planning and project cycle management.
- There was further evidence that, despite overall growth, inequality in BiH was still rising, with the poorest and most marginalized segments of the population being further sidelined. Therefore, there was a need for a comprehensive and multi-sectoral approach to local development in BiH.

**Results**
UNDP, together with municipal authorities, implemented the Rights-Based Municipal Development Programme (RMAP) (from 2006-2008) in 15 municipalities. It strengthened the capacities of local authorities to:
- Understand their role as human rights duty-bearers and to develop local development plans that addressed priorities of the most marginalized groups as well as the overall needs and human rights of the local population.
- Implement local development plans through projects benefiting marginalized groups, including rural populations, persons with disabilities, the Roma community, the elderly and youth in sectors as varied as education, agriculture, water and sanitation and health. UNDP provided seed funding for more than 40 projects.

The RMAP programme started from the premise that there was no need to reinvent local planning processes and that, at strategic points throughout the process, the use of human rights principles and standards could add value by deepening participation, non-discrimination and accountability and by using human rights standards as benchmarks in education, health and social protection. To facilitate this, RMAP ensured that the composition of teams for each activity was interdisciplinary, bringing together perspectives and skills of economists, local governance experts and human rights specialists.

The table below illustrates the entry points for human rights principles and standards during all stages of the policy cycle and how they were incorporated into the existing local planning process. For more on this programme, see Primer on Rights-Based Local Development Planning, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Methodology for Integrated Local Development Planning in Bosnia and Herzegovina (MiPRO).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Cycle</th>
<th>Key Stages</th>
<th>Mainstreaming Human Rights Helped To</th>
<th>Tools and Methodologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>Ensure political commitment</td>
<td>• Raise awareness of authorities about the role of the state as a human rights duty-bearer and of their responsibilities as public service providers (accountability) while assuring them that technical support would be provided.</td>
<td>• Orientation meetings with senior officials and concise communications about human rights and their role in (local) development. • Memorandum of Understanding between the mayor and UNDP, specifying UNDP’s and the municipality’s roles and responsibilities in the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder identification, analysis and assessment</td>
<td>• Ensure wide representation of local communities, with a special focus on the identification and inclusion of marginalized and vulnerable groups (non-discrimination). • Create or reinvigorate fora where communities and their representatives participate and voice their needs (participation). • Ensure access to information for all relevant groups and a transparent process (accountability).</td>
<td>• Partnership Group (PG): Composed of representatives of stakeholders (10–40 members). PG serves as a communication platform between local administration and population to articulate the needs and priorities of communities and to agree on development priorities. • Focus Groups (FGs): Ad hoc mechanisms established to ensure that groups unable to participate in PG discussions can still have their views represented. FG discussions are conducted with members of identified marginalized population groups, such as Roma, rural populations, persons with disabilities, returnees, the elderly, youth, etc. FGs are also held in remote areas (Focus Groups Methodology).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and Analysis</td>
<td>Data identification and analysis</td>
<td>• Define targets and indicators to assess the availability, accessibility and quality of services in different sectors (human rights standards). • Collect and analyse data based on those targets and indicators, with a focus on the situation of the most vulnerable groups (non-discrimination).</td>
<td>• Human Rights Checklists offer human rights-based indicators and data sources to assess availability, accessibility and quality of key sectors such as health and education at the municipal level. • Legal Background Papers are drafted to provide basic information on relevant legislation, organization and funding for each sector and on identified responsible government authorities (duty-bearers) at the state, canton and municipal levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Identification of critical issues (main obstacles/ main drivers of local development)</td>
<td>• From the issues mapped in the community profile, prioritize those that: represent main barriers for human development and human rights fulfilment; relate to equality and non-discrimination; and fall within responsibilities of local authorities.</td>
<td>• Critical issues are identified within the PG, which also receives input from discussions in the FGs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft development vision, goals, objectives, and projects</td>
<td>• Define the full realization of human rights as the vision and long-term goal of local development and define objectives and targets to address critical issues and achieve goals progressively.</td>
<td>• Vision and goals are developed within the PG and presented to the Municipal Council/Assembly. • Project concepts (fiches) are developed to briefly describe the required project elements that address the priorities of marginalized groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Project selection and implementation</td>
<td>• Formulate project selection criteria that demonstrated how: a) non-discrimination, equality and empowerment would be advanced, b) local poverty and exclusion would be addressed, or c) access of vulnerable groups to services and social protection would be improved.</td>
<td>• Through a transparent process, projects are selected by a Steering Committee (SC) composed of local authorities and CSOs. UNDP provided technical and financial assistance, developing co-financing modalities (Implementation Manual).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Build monitoring capacities</td>
<td>• Build capacities of local stakeholders to use indicators and targets that are sensitive to human rights.</td>
<td>• Steering Committee evaluates the results of implemented projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example – Kiseljak Municipality**

**Water:** Kiseljak’s Right-Based Development Strategy 2006–2013 assessed the municipality’s infrastructure and environment, including the right to water. Based on qualitative information from focus groups, the community profile showed that the situation in the Hrastovi settlements, inhabited by about 450 Roma, was most urgent, especially with regards to the availability and quality of water. The capacity of the existing water supply system was insufficient and the high bacteriological content of the water had caused water-borne diseases. Based on the new strategy, the municipality prioritized projects that addressed exclusion and access of vulnerable groups to services; one such project was the construction of a sufficiently large reservoir and a new secondary water supply network for Hrastovi.

**Education:** The community profile also showed weaknesses in the quality of education, such as a lack of qualified teaching staff and schools’ low capacity to identify and serve children with special needs. Within the scope of its competency and resources, the strategy thus prioritized an assessment to determine whether primary and secondary schools were in line with pedagogical standards and an action plan to align services with standards by, for example, providing training for teaching staff on inclusive education and adjusting the curriculum for work with children with special needs.
Case Study: Guatemala – Using Human Rights to Improve Basic Health Services

The stages of the pilot work are described in the graph above. The activities highlighted in bold are described in more detail below.

### Development Issues

Providing basic health services to all people has been a challenge in Guatemala. Until 1997, when the country had a population of approximately 10 million and only 860 primary health centres, many communities, mainly in rural areas and from indigenous populations, did not have access to basic health services. Since then, the Ministry of Health (MoH) has tried to address the situation through the Extension of Coverage Programme (ECP). This initiative involves a large network of NGOs and civil associations that, based on agreements with the MoH, provide basic health services to around 4.3 million people from rural areas. To this end, Basic Health Teams (BHTs) composed of medical personnel and other experts were established in different regions and serve as direct service providers. However, despite the overall positive impact of the ECP, parts of the population, especially indigenous communities, still face challenges in accessing adequate health care services.

### Results

Since 2009, UNDP has been supporting the MoH to address the issue by reviewing the ECP from a human rights perspective. This took place in collaboration with public health service providers (BHTs and local authorities) and the population, in two pilot districts. Initial results include:

- While people generally tend to equate health with distribution of medicines, community members who participated in right-to-health workshops felt that it included issues such as access to drinking water, hygiene and respectful treatment of patients.
- In the pilot communities where methods of patient feedback (colour boxes) and oversight (record books) had been introduced, patients used them actively and service providers have started investigating the reasons for negative patient feedback.
- The MoH is planning to use the training materials on the right to health that the pilot developed for all of its programme staff to address issues of discrimination and the quality of its services.

### Identifying capacity gaps in the delivery of health services — a human-rights-based baseline study

#### Methodology

The capacity gap study employed 21 indicators related to the human rights principles of non-discrimination, accountability and participation as well as the dimension of cultural acceptability of the right to health by drawing on the Right-to-health Approach to Strengthening Health Systems, developed by the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Health (UN Doc. A/HRC/7/11). Data for the capacity gap study was gathered in two districts where the government’s ECP is implemented, by conducting a survey among 1,489 household members (rights-holders) and by conducting semi-structured interviews with 16 employees of the ECP (duty-bearers).
More specifically, the study revealed capacity gaps related to:

**Exclusion/Inequality:**

Some of the key constraints identified by the communities relate to the lack of resources. Most others, however, seem to relate to specific characteristics of indigenous communities not being taken into account in the existing health care strategy (e.g., practice to bury placenta post-partum).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causes of lack of adequate health services</th>
<th>% of population in Chipajche</th>
<th>% of population in El Tumbador</th>
<th>HR standards and principles affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of medication</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of medical personnel</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients’ failure to seek care promptly</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients and medical personnel speak different languages</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Cultural acceptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial means</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious convictions</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Cultural acceptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical appearances</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Discrimination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accountability:**

The gap study reveals that, in most cases, patients dissatisfied with the BHTs’ health services did not voice their dissatisfaction. The following is a list of actions that the interviewees in both regions undertook when confronted with problems (31.8 percent of the interviewees did not answer the question):

- Did nothing: 43.9 percent
- Did not return to the health centre: 7.5 percent
- Complained to the BHT: 5.6 percent
- Complained to the assistant mayor: 5.6 percent
- Complained to the health centre: 4.7 percent
- Complained to the NGO authorities: 0 percent
- Other: 0.9 percent

When asked about the reasons, the majority of those that did nothing explained that they were not expecting any improvements in the situation if they complained. Some people were even afraid that the BHT would not take care of them in the future. On the other hand, only 20 percent of those who complained noticed some changes in the situation after submitting their complaints.

**Closing capacity gaps—Identifying and testing mechanisms to improve participation and accountability**

In a set of interactive workshops with local communities (individuals and CSOs) as well as public service providers (BHT and local authorities), a number of ways were identified to close the identified capacity gaps.

**Example: Workshop methodology for BHTs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Module 1</td>
<td><em>Intro</em>: The right to health in the work of Basic Health Teams (BHT), e.g., ensuring quality and cultural acceptability of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 2</td>
<td><em>Participation</em>: How can it improve quality of services, e.g., considering community life and work cycle, learning from traditional health practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 3</td>
<td><em>Accountability</em>: How can our interactions with patients affect their rights and how can we improve, e.g., providing suggestion boxes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshops identified three key actions that were then tested in the pilot communities.

- Assessment mechanism — Colour Boxes: Patients assess the quality of the service received by placing a chip in either a green, yellow or red box.
- Oversight mechanism — Record Book: The BHTs document the assessment results in the record book, which the local health authority reviews.
- Accountability mechanism — Situation Room: Every three months, a community assembly is held with BHTs to discuss community feedback.

The results of the pilot were shared with different parts of the MoH, which expressed a keen interest in learning materials not only for ECP staff, but for all of the ministry’s programme staff. In response, three sets of learning materials were produced:

1. **Training guide** to sensitize MoH staff with regards to cultural acceptability, accountability and participation.
2. **Induction manual** for BHTs, offering management guidance to team leader and guidance to identify situations where the right to health may be affected.
3. **Training materials** to develop people’s capacities to demand adequate health services.
Case Study: Liberia – Using a Human-Rights-Based Approach to the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) to Prevent Conflict

Policy Cycle

Planning
- Review interim PRS from perspective of human rights standards and principles
- Involve communities through drafting of County Development Agendas

Implementation

PRINCIPLES
Participation

Non-discrimination

Accountability

STANDARDS
Availability

Accessibility

Quality

Monitoring and Evaluation
- Strengthen capacity of people to engage in the monitoring process of the PRS
- Strengthen capacity of the government to use participatory methodologies and accountability mechanisms.

Development Issues

In 2008, the Government of Liberia adopted its Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) 2008-2011, which explicitly addresses the two main causes of the 14-year conflict: 1) traditionally, in Liberia, “significant portions of society were systematically excluded and marginalized from institutions of political governance and access to key economic assets” and political and economic power were concentrated in a small ruling elite and 2) the economic collapse starting in the 1970s left the country widely impoverished, affecting especially marginalized groups of the population. Therefore, the government considered it paramount for the PRS to focus on the reduction of poverty, the elimination of inequalities and the revitalization of the economy.

Results

With joint support from UNDP and UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), a number of Liberian civil society organizations (CSOs) and the Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs:
- Developed their capacities to conduct human-rights-based situation analyses and to collect and analyse data to monitor the implementation of the first PRS, including its results for those most marginalized (‘Who has been left behind?’).
- Contributed to rebuilding people’s trust in the country’s governance institutions by initiating constructive collaboration during the implementation of the first PRS.
- Are planning to further strengthen government accountability by institutionalizing civil society participation in the design and implementation of Liberia’s second PRS.

Reviewing Liberia’s first PRS from a human rights perspective

During the formulation of the PRS, the president requested support from OHCHR to review the interim PRS from a human rights perspective. The so-convened expert mission identified several key issues and recommendations for the final PRS. For example:

- **Distributional effects and equity** — The necessity to address discrimination and disparities and to ensure equity as an important means to prevent conflict. Recommendations:
  - Promotion of a pro-poor economic growth strategy that focuses more on small-scale farming investments that will more directly benefit peasants, landless workers and women heads of households.

---

These and other recommendations were integrated to different degrees into the final PRS. For example, the final PRS includes strategies to promote investments in smallholder agriculture to improve food security and nutrition, especially for children and women. The PRS also highlights the need to develop capacities for gathering disaggregated data.

Supporting Government and Civil Society to Monitor the Implementation of the PRS

During the formulation of the PRS, the government invested in a nationwide participatory prioritization process in order to rebuild trust among the population and to include those in the economic and political processes that had traditionally been excluded: Consultations were held at the county, district and clan levels to allow men and women to articulate their development priorities and aspirations. These were summarized in County Development Agendas (CDAs), which formed the basis of the PRS. Liberians became very involved in the consultation process and expected to be equally informed and consulted during the implementation phase of the PRS (see above quote). To support the government in delivering on this promise, OHCHR and UNDP jointly supported civil society and the government in developing capacities to assess progress of the PRS. This included:

- **A CSO network monitoring the implementation of the PRS focusing on the process:** The network conducted research in five counties on infrastructure and service delivery, by using Community Score Cards, focus group discussions, and a household survey (see table for an extract of the questionnaire). Initial results showed that there was low participation of people, for example, in the implementation of education and health projects. One of the stated reasons was that little information was shared with communities and meetings were held too far away for people to attend. Another finding was that teaching materials in some counties were insufficient (e.g., five students using one text book). The research also found that monitoring and evaluation frameworks under the PRS were generally weak, e.g., some projects had no definite timelines for implementation and completion.

- **A network of organizations of persons with disabilities raising awareness about the PRS and developing the capacities of persons with disabilities to monitor the PRS on the basis of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD):** Radio talk shows, drama groups, interviews, workshops and town hall meetings were organized in five counties to assess whether and how persons with disabilities have benefited from programmes based on the CDAs/PRS and how they are included in related decision-making processes. Initial results indicated that the activities made persons with disabilities feel more comfortable to raise issues of concern to them.

- **Introducing public officials to human-rights-based planning and budgeting:** Officers from the Ministries of Planning and Economic Affairs and of Finance studied tested human-rights-based methodologies for situation analysis and budget monitoring, including Community Score Cards.

- **The Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs inviting CSOs to present their monitoring results and to discuss possibilities for collaboration in the context of the next PRS:** Both planning officers and CSOs stressed that the human rights based situation analysis complemented existing results-based management tools and called for more involvement of CSOs along the process of development planning (e.g. by sharing local level monitoring data).

Some of the key **lessons learned** from the pilot experience were:

- **Leadership of national partners:** Champions within government agencies are critical to testing and promoting human rights principles and methodologies among their peers (“Don’t divert responsibilities to others. We are the duty-bearers, we have Liberia in our hand and we can change it!”).

- **Facilitator role of UN:** UN(DP) can add value by providing a platform for government and civil society to explore collaboration in order to increase participation and accountability.

- **Division of labour between UNDP and OHCHR:** While OHCHR brings human rights technical expertise to the table, UNDP can facilitate close collaboration with national partners such as the Ministry of Planning. Partners requested even more extensive UN collaboration in mainstreaming human rights.

More Examples: UNDP in Comoros and Benin supported similar efforts to apply human rights standards and principles in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) process: see interview with Social Watch Benin at [www.hrbaportal.org/voices-on-hrba](http://www.hrbaportal.org/voices-on-hrba)
An Overview of Human Rights

Human rights are laid down in a variety of instruments at the global, regional and national level and are continuously interpreted through the relevant institutions at these levels. As a result, it represents a challenge to provide a comprehensive list of human rights at any one point in time. To provide at least an overview, the below offers an unofficial summary¹ of key standards that are outlined in two core human rights conventions at the global level: the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). Both conventions were signed in 1966 and came into force in 1976.

The rights guaranteed by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) include:
- The right to effective remedy for any person whose rights or freedoms as recognized in the Covenant are violated (Art. 2)
- The equal rights of men and women (Art. 3)
- The right to life (Art. 4)
- The prohibition of torture and of cruel, inhuman or degrading punishment (Art. 7)
- Freedom from slavery and servitude; prohibition of compulsory labour (Art. 8)
- The right to liberty and security of person; protection against arbitrary arrest or detention (Art. 9)
- The right to liberty of movement and freedom to choose one’s residence (Art. 12)
- The right to equality before courts and tribunals; the right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty and the right to a fair hearing before an independent tribunal (Art. 14)
- The right to privacy and to protection from arbitrary or unlawful interference in one’s privacy (Art. 17)
- The right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion (Art. 18)
- The right to hold opinions without interference, and the right to freedom of expression (Art. 19)
- The prohibition of any propaganda for war and of advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred (Art. 20)
- The right of peaceful assembly (Art. 21)
- The right to freedom of association with others (Art. 22)
- The right to marry and found a family (Art. 23)
- The right of children to receive protection by the State without discrimination (Art. 24)
- The right to take part in the conduct of public affairs; the right to vote and to be elected (Art. 25)
- The right to equality before the law and to equal protection of the law (Art. 26)
- The rights of ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities (Art. 27)

The rights guaranteed by International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) include:
- The right to all peoples to self-determination (Art. 1)
- The right to enjoy the rights enunciated in the Covenant without discrimination (Art. 2)
- The equal rights of men and women (Art. 3)

Rights to and at work:
- the right to freely choose and accept work (Art. 6),
- the right to just and favourable work conditions, including fair wages and safe & healthy work conditions (Art. 7)
- the right to form trade unions, to join a trade union and to go on strike (Art. 8)
- The right to social security, including social insurance (Art. 9)
- The right to family and married life and the protection of children and young people (Art. 10)
- The right to an adequate standard of living (Art. 11), including:
  - the right to food
  - the right to adequate housing, including the prohibition of ‘forced eviction’
  - the right to water and sanitation
- The right to education, including free and compulsory primary education (Art. 13 and 14)
- The right to take part in cultural life and to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress (Art. 15)
